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Although the twentieth century is perceived as the era of international wars and revolutions, the basis of these proceedings are actually rooted in the events of the nineteenth century. When anything that challenged the authority of the state – concepts based on enlightenment, immigration, or socialism – were deemed to be a threat to the status quo and immediately eliminated by way of legal restrictions. Once the façade of the Old World was completely severed following the Great War, nations in Europe and throughout the West started to revive various nineteenth century laws in an attempt to suppress the outbreak of radicalism that preceded the 1919 revolutions. What this dissertation offers is an extended understanding of how nineteenth century government policies toward radicalism fostered an environment of increased national security during Germany’s 1919 Spartacist Uprising and the 1919/1920 Palmer Raids in the United States. Using the French Revolution as a starting point, this study allows the reader the opportunity to put events like the 1848 revolutions, the rise of the First and Second Internationals, political fallouts, nineteenth century imperialism, nativism, Social Darwinism, and movements for self-government into a broader historical context. This background also underscores the problems between Austria-Hungary and the Ottoman Empire that resulted in the two Balkan Wars and the eventual Great War. By this point in time, 1914-1918, the structure of the Old World was shattered beyond repair and the social problems of the pre-war period were erupting throughout the west as ancient regimes collapsed, borders were redrawn, and new republics emerged. For nations like
Germany, a Bolshevik revolution was thought probable since the state had been weakened during the war years. While Germany actually came closer to succumbing to the ideals of bolshevism, both the Weimar Republic and the United States government used this time as a means of further restricting civil liberties in an effort to rid the nation of radicalism and preserve the authority of the national executive. Therefore, instead of peace after the Great War, surveillance states soon emerged as nations rushed to eradicate all forms of foreignism from the national environment.
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INTRODUCTION

By the turn of the nineteenth century, Europe and the Western world had undergone a significant change in power. Incessant warfare in areas of Europe, North America, and Asia throughout the eighteenth century placed additional pressure on Europe’s imperial powers and further strained the economies. As a result, empires like Great Britain, France, Prussia, Austria-Hungary, and Russia struggled to maintain political authority over their subjects. Following the loss of British dominance in the New World in the immediate aftermath of the American Revolutionary War and the murder of France’s monarchs in 1793 during its own revolution, the challenge to Europe’s imperial powers for continual dominance over land, resources, and people was starting to fracture both internally and abroad. Movements toward self-determination and calls for constitutional monarchs forced many imperial governments to enact laws that would restrict civil liberties in the event that those privileges – speech, press, and assembly – were being used by the nation’s general population as a means of overthrowing the current political system. In an attempt to safeguard their own concepts of national security, Europe’s surviving empires opened the Congress of Vienna in 1814 and entered into negotiations that permitted the heads of Europe’s Five Great Powers (Great Britain, France, Prussia, Austria-Hungary, and Russia) to secure their titles for nearly 100 years. Nevertheless, while power was restored by the European monarchs, the ideals that led to the revolutionary movements in 1774 and 1789 had not been defeated. In fact, the principles that resulted in the two revolutions were quickly being adopted by new organizations throughout Europe. Advocating, freedom, liberty, equality, civil rights, and independence from foreign rule and internal corruption, these radical beliefs fostered the rise of philosophies like liberalism, nativism, socialism, communism, and anarchism.
throughout the 1800s. Although the twentieth century is perceived as the era of international wars and revolutions, the basis of these proceedings are actually rooted in the events of the nineteenth century. When anything that challenged the authority of the state – concepts based on enlightenment, immigration, ethnicity, religion, poverty, or even striking laborers – were deemed to be a threat to the status quo and immediately eliminated by way of legal restrictions. Once the façade of the Old World was completely severed following the Great War, nations in Europe and throughout the West started to revive various nineteenth century laws in an attempt to suppress the outbreak of radicalism that preceded the 1919 revolutions.

To date, the uprisings of 1919 are restricted to geographical regions and timeframes that are limited to the events surrounding the Great War. In most instances, the Russian Revolution of 1917 is used as a means of explaining the volatile post-war period, however, the division between capital and labor already existed long before the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand. Consequently preliminary laws and state reactions toward extremism, liberalism, and the rise of social democracy, particularly in Germany, are often times omitted from secondary literature. What this dissertation offers is an extended understanding of how nineteenth century government policies toward radicalism fostered an environment of increased national security during Germany’s 1919 Spartacist Uprising and the 1919/1920 Palmer Raids in the United States. Using the French Revolution as a starting point, this study allows the reader the opportunity to put events like the 1848 revolutions, the rise of the First and Second Internationals, political fallouts, nineteenth century imperialism, nativism, Social Darwinism, and movements for self-government into a broader historical context. This background also underscores the problems between Austria-Hungary and the Ottoman Empire that resulted in the two Balkan Wars and the eventual Great War. By this point in time, 1914-1918, the structure of
the Old World was shattered beyond repair and the social problems of the pre-war period were erupting throughout the west as ancient regimes collapsed, borders were redrawn, and new republics emerged. For nations like Germany, a Bolshevik revolution was thought probable since the state had been weakened during the war years. While Germany actually came closer to succumbing to the ideals of bolshevism, both the Weimar Republic and the United States government used this time as a means of further restricting civil liberties in an effort to rid the nation of radicalism, while preserving the authority of the national executive. As C. L. R. James writes, “the basis of it all is self-preservation, and when that is at stake men do not reason.”

Therefore, instead of peace at the end of the Great War, surveillance states soon emerged as nations rushed to eradicate all forms of foreignism from the national environment.

Currently a project of this scope is not a part of the larger body of literature that deals with the revolutionary period, the Great War, socialism or communism either individually or collectively. While works like William K. Klingaman’s *The Year Our World Began: 1919*, David Mitchell’s *1919: Red Mirage*, and Margaret MacMillan’s *Paris 1919 Six Months that Changed the World* all serve as starting points to a broader understanding of the world following the Great War, they do not offer an extensive understanding of any issues from before the war period that are relevant to a broader history of Germany or the United States. In order to understand nineteenth century Germany, Lynn Abrams’s *Bismarck and the German Empire*, David Blackbourn’s *History of Germany, 1780-1918: The Long Nineteenth Century*, William Carr’s *A History of Germany, 1815-1985*, Christopher Clark’s *Iron Kingdom: The Rise and

---


2 While Klingaman approaches 1919 by following a typical day by day account of events that occurred, Mitchell uses a thematic approach to understanding the year, as does MacMillan who particularly offers a world perspective by focusing specifically on the peace talks.
*Downfall of Prussia, 1600-1947*, Edgar J. Feuchtwanger’s *Imperial Germany, 1850-1918*, and James Retallack’s *Imperial Germany, 1871-1918* all provide the necessary backgrounds to imperial Germany’s early domestic and imperial policies as well as laws pertaining to the restriction of civil liberties especially toward Catholics and social democrats. Regarding Germany’s move toward social democracy and the struggles the organization underwent in an effort to become part of the government, works like Abraham Joseph Berlau’s *The German Social Democratic Party, 1914-1921*, Vernon Lidtke’s *The Outlawed Party: Social Democracy in Germany, 1878-1890*, Susanne Miller and Heinrich Potthoff’s *A History of German Social Democracy: From 1848 to the Present*, and Carl Schorske’s *German Social Democracy, 1905-1917: The Development of the Great Schism* have been used in order to gain a better perspective on the initial backlash against the party as well as some of the early debates that threatened the party’s overall stability. Works pertaining to the German Revolution materials that have been written in German are fairly outdated and not since the publication of books like Eberhard Kolb’s *Die Arbeiterräte in der deutschen Innenpolitik, 1918-1919* (1962) and Walter Tormin’s *Zwischen Rätediktatur und sozialer Demokratie. Die Geschichte der Rätebewegung in der deutschen Revolution 1918/19* (1959) has anything else related to the subject been published. As a result, books on the subject of the German Revolution, Spartacist Uprising and Weimar Republic also include Pierre Broué’s *The German Revolution, 1917-1923*, Peter Gay’s *Weimar Culture: The Outsider as Insider*, Ruth Henig’s *The Weimar Republic, 1919-1933*, Ian Kershaw’s *Weimar: Why Did German Democracy Fail?*, Eberhard Kolb’s *The Weimar Republic*, Walter Laqueur’s *Weimar: A Cultural History, 1918-1933*, Ralph Haswell Lutz’s *The German Revolution, 1918-1919*, A. J. Ryder’s *The German Revolution, 1918-1919*, and Eric Waldman’s *The Spartacist Uprising of 1919 and the Crisis of the German Socialist Movement: A Study of*
the Relation of Political Theory and Party Practice. Government documents from the Congress of Vienna to the Paris Peace Talks, memoirs, diaries, and letters have also been used as a means of creating an extensive view of the buildup to 1919.

For resources on the subject of the history of the United States, a similar problem also exists seeing that the current literature is generally focused on a particular topic or subject. While the works of Frederick Lewis Allen (Only Yesterday: An Informal History of the 1920s), Thomas Bender (A Nation among Nations: America’s Place in World History) David H. Bennett (The Party of Fear: Form Nativist Movements to the New Right in American History), Christopher Capozzola (Uncle Same Wants You: World War I and the Making of the Modern American Citizen), Henry David (The History of the Haymarket Affair: A Study in the American Social-Revolutionary and Labor Movements), Ann Hagedorn (Savage Peace: Hope and Fear in America, 1919), and J. Woodrow Sayre and Robert E. Rowland (Labor and the Government: Changing Government Policies toward Labor Unions) are used as a means of exploring the nineteenth century including policies toward immigration and anarchism, additional sources are necessary in order to create a broader understanding of the Great War, socialism, Bolshevism, and the Palmer Raids. And so, works including Daniel Bell’s Marxian Socialism in the United States, Roberta Strauss Feuerlicht’s America's Reign of Terror: World War I, the Red Scare, and the Palmer Raids, Christopher M. Finan’s From the Palmer Raids to the Patriot Act: A History of the Fight for Free Speech in America, David S. Foglesong’s America’s Secret War Against Bolshevism: U.S. Intervention in the Russian Civil War, 1917-1920, Joel Kovel’s Red Hunting in the Promised Land: Anticommunism and the Making of America, Robert K. Murray’s Red Scare: Study in National Hysteria, 1919-1920, Regin Schmidt’s Red Scare: FBI and the Origins of Anticommunism in the United States, 1919-1943, and James Weinstein’s The Decline of
Socialism in America 1912-1925 have been referred to as a way of expanding on the history of the First Red Scare in the United States. Beyond this, the papers of President Woodrow Wilson and Secretary of State Robert Lansing have been consulted in an effort to gain a better understanding of both foreign and domestic policies relating to socialism, the Great War, and the Palmer Raids. Although papers from the Department of Justice have been reviewed concerning the structure of the raids, any documents specifically concerning Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer have been lost.³ Since the literature of the time period is deeply fractured, a method involving layering historical narratives relating to various aspects of European and Western history as well as the Spartacist Uprising and Palmer Raids offers a new understanding of both the nineteenth and twentieth century’s.

Using the resistance to nineteenth century socialism and imperialism, the Great War and the rise of Bolshevism as a build up to 1919, events in Germany and the United States demonstrate how two diverse nations reacted internally to an external crisis. After a four-year interruption, globalization reemerged as nations were not only were coping with the war, but struggling against new ideas fostered as a result of the conflict such as the concept of self-determination. As Peter Sterns argues,

World War I was a huge blow to globalization, because it effectively divided much of the world into warring camps. There were some unexpected new links. Soldiers from India and Africa used by Britain and France gained exposure to novel experiences and ideas, among other things learning more about European nationalism and what this might imply for their own countries. . . . In the main, however, the war encouraged disruption and new levels of divisive national commitments.⁴

³ According to archivists at the Library of Congress, Palmer’s letters were all lost in a fire.
Even though nations affected by participation in the Great War attempted to withdraw from the international community, “globalization hardly ended in consequence.”5 In this sense, a more transnational approach to the Spartacist Uprising and Palmer Raids not only connects them to the larger argument regarding the spread of Bolshevism, but in turn it allows for a reassessment to be made of their local histories in 1919.6 To achieve this, the theories put forth by Kenneth Pomeranz and Donald R. Wright will be used to “combine [a] comparative analysis, [with] some purely local contingency, and an integrative or global approach,”7 in order to illustrate how two nations “changed most thoroughly, in relatively short periods,”8 as evident by the events of 1919.

In light of the uprisings also occurring in Korea, Finland, Hungary, Egypt, Great Britain, and Canada throughout 1919, it seemed that “the doors of power swung loose. Iconoclastic bourgeois renegades were rising from slimy depths. It was all most unhealthy, and it was all, somehow, connected with the Bolsheviks.”9 If this is the case, how did nineteenth century policies and politics effect the growth of socialism and the restriction of civil liberties in the twentieth century? How and why did Germany and the United States react toward the growing threat of an international Bolshevik Revolution? What is the significance of the Spartacist Uprising and Palmer Raids as bookends to the struggles of 1919? Nevertheless, before the

---

5 Ibid., 119.
revolutions of 1919 can be fully explored, however, a historical overview of the nineteenth
century must first be addressed. Including a general understanding of what the French
revolutionaries fighting for and how those beliefs eventually came to affect not only the
problems of the Great War, but also the revolutionary events of the post-1918 period?
CHAPTER I.
EUROPE IN TRANSITION:
THE RISE OF NINETEEN CENTURY REVOLUTIONS
AND POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS

Prior to the general backlash generated by the Treaty of Versailles and First Red Scare in 1919, European nations and the United States had already encountered general uprisings, labor strikes, imperialism, state sponsored terrorism, and continental warfare throughout the nineteenth century. In fact, the repercussions of the French Revolution, which witnessed the executions of Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette, a failed attempt at democracy, and the rise of Napoleon Bonaparte, who, after being proclaimed Emperor on 18 May 1804, turned his armies to the east, reverberated throughout France and beyond its borders. The dawning of the Napoleonic Wars not only unleashed a new era of intra-continental warfare, as Napoleon attempted to expand his empire, but it also forced the remaining crowned heads to unite in an effort to “squelch any new outbreaks of Bonapartism or revolution” that appeared on the Continent. ¹ Although Napoleon set himself as the supreme authority of France, he continued to carry the ideals of the Revolution throughout Europe. Following defeat in 1815, Napoleon had succeeded in transferring the fundamental concepts of liberty, equality and fraternity to every nation he conquered, which at its height included “Spain, Italy, Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, and much of Germany, Poland, Croatia, and Slovenia.”² In the wake of Napoleon’s downfall, the remaining monarchs of

¹ David S. Mason.  *Revolutionary Europe, 1789-1989: Liberty, Equality, Solidarity*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.; 2005, 54-55 – Formed in 1815, the Concert of Europe was first called the Quadruple Alliance and included Great Britain, Russia, Austria, and Prussia. When France joined the alliance in 1818, “it was referred to as the concert system.” According to Mason, the concert was “designed to prevent or crush any threat to their conservative regimes (226),” which they did when they “intervened in both Italy and Spain in the early 1820s to put down nationalists and liberal revolts (55).”

² Ibid., 34.
Europe were not only left to piece the Continent back together – the largest powers securing their own borders first – but they were also left to deal with the new philosophies of liberalism and nationalism, which continued to threaten the crowns’ power over the state. While the sovereigns were able to put down Napoleon’s bid for a land empire, they were unsuccessful in their attempt to erase the overarching goals of the revolutionaries.

By the mid-eighteenth century, the quest for empire had already been extended well beyond the immediate extended well beyond the boundaries of Europe. Dating back to the late 14th and 15th centuries, the various heads of the more dominant European states clashed both nationally and internationally in the never ending bid to further their desires for territorial expansion. Not only had armies been dispatched, but they were soon followed by missionaries who brought Christianity and civilization to the non-European masses. When Elizabeth I of England defeated the Spanish Armada in 1588, it signified not only the decline of Spain’s power on the mainland, but the rise of new imperial powers including Britain, France, Russia, and Prussia. Of the four, Britain and France had struggled for dominance in Europe since William the Conqueror began the Norman Invasion in 1066. From Britain’s inception, a longstanding rivalry between her and France soon followed and by the time Christopher Columbus stumbled upon the New World, the competition for land and dominance ensued. While Spanish influence continued to decline, Britain and France engaged in an imperial struggle that plunged both nations into a series of wars that started in Europe, but soon spilled over into the Americas.3

During the American War of Independence, France entered into a coalition with the colonists

---

3 When the War of League of Augsburg erupted in Europe (1688-1697), King William’s War (1689-1697) was fought in Canada, Acadia and New England. As the War of the Spanish Succession began (1701-1714), Queen Anne’s War (1702-1713) erupted in the American backcountry. And, while the War of the Austrian Succession (1740-1748) led to King George’s War (1744-1748), six years later, the Seven Years’ War spawned the French and Indian War (1756-1763).
with the hopes of destroying the British Empire. Financing the war through short-term loans, the
American victory was enabled by the arrival of French ships at Yorktown in 1781.

For France, however, aiding the colonists yielded little since the nation did not acquire
any “territorial gains when peace was signed” in 1783. Instead, France entered into a period of
instability as a “decline in tax revenues and the scheduled repayment of short-term war loans
brought [on] a financial crisis.” While borrowing became a common theme at the time for
wealthier nations to finance their wars, it placed an enormous burden on the people themselves,
who rarely benefited from the states’ colonial exploits. According to David S. Mason, “between
1726 and 1789 the cost of living” in France “increased by 62 per cent, while wages rose by only
25 per cent.” Following the American War of Independence, France’s period of economic
decline was soon coupled with food shortages and the ineffectual leadership of Louis XVI; as a
result the nation erupted in revolution during the summer of 1789. As William Doyle claims,
“the Revolution began as an assertion of national sovereignty. Nations – not kings, not
hereditary elites, not churches – were the supreme source of authority in human affairs.” When
France became a Republic on 21 September 1792, it “was the first modern experiment with
democracy in Europe,” which threatened the long held conservative power of Europe’s
traditional monarchs. In fact, the Revolution led to the arrest and imprisonment of Louis XVI.
His execution on 21 January 1793 resulted in Britain, Holland, and Spain joining Austria and
Prussia in declaring war against France. Consequently, “the three great dangers confronting

5 Ibid., 20-21.
6 Mason, 26.
7 Doyle, 81.
8 Mason, 37.
9 Ibid., 31 – Mason maintains that “the threat the French revolutionaries posed to the monarchies of
France in 1793 were counter-revolution, foreign war, and anarchy.”

The absence of a stable government was soon resolved with the declaration of a provisional government in October 1793.

In an attempt to create a democratic government, France inadvertently regressed into a temporary society that utilized violence and terror in an effort to maintain control over the state. Under the new government, “revolutionary government was known to be extraordinary, emergency government, extemporized to meet the need of navigating the rapids of a life-and-death crisis for the Republic,” which has come to be remembered as the infamous Reign of Terror. Nevertheless, the provisional government unleashed a new kind of violence directed not toward foreign threats, but at its very own citizens in France in an effort to prevent a counter-revolution. From the left, Maximilien Robespierre, a lawyer, defended the use of terror, writing that

To establish and consolidate democracy, to achieve the peaceful rule of constitutional law, we must first finish the war of liberty against tyranny. . . . We must annihilate the enemies of the republic at home and abroad, or else we shall perish.

If virtue is the mainstay of a democratic government in time of peace, then in time of revolution a democratic government must rely on virtue and terror. . . . Terror is nothing but justice, swift, severe, and inflexible; it is an emanation of virtue. . . . It has been said that terror is the mainstay of a despotic government. . . . The government of the revolution is the despotism of liberty against tyranny.

Europe was made more immediate and personal by the fact that Marie Antoinette was the sister of the ruler of Austria.” – Marie Antoinette was executed on 16 October 1793, nearly nine months after her husband was executed.

Armed with this kind reasoning, a series of commissions arose in the early 1790s, charged with maintaining not only the peace but also public loyalty.

On 17 October 1792, the Committee of General Security (comité de sûreté générale) was established as “a permanent body, with a long-term policy of police safeguards to secure the country against counter-revolution,” which “dealt with persons rather than policies” and transferred individuals to the Revolutionary Tribunal. Another organization created by the provisional government was the Committee of Public Safety (comité de salut public), which furthered the terror by employing wide scale denouncements, arrests, and executions. At the center of the committee was a council of twelve that included Robespierre and eleven other men from the left. The main targets of the terror “were ex-nobles, the clergy, and conspicuous representative of the Old Regime, including prominent women suspected of misusing their influence.” A growing rivalry between these two agencies soon emerged and by the spring of 1794, the Committee of Public Safety had nearly overtaken the Committee of General Security, with the passage of Law of the 22nd Prairial, Year II on 10 June 1794. Essentially, the law “expanded the definition of “enemies of the people” who were subject to punishment by the Revolutionary Tribunal.” At the time, it was thought by many that Robespierre was clearly overstepping the bounds of his own authority and openly inciting a clash with the Committee of General Security. Shortly after the Law of the 22nd Prairial, Robespierre quickly lost both prestige and privileges not only within the government, but with the public at large. For a man

---

14 Winks and Kaiser, 160.
15 Ibid., 163-164 – Now included as enemies of the state were “those who have sought to disparage the National Convention . . . to have sought to impede the provisioning of Pairs . . . to inspire discouragement . . . to mislead opinion, to deprave morals,” and “those who, charged with public office, take advantage of it in order to serve the enemies of the Revolution, to harass patriots, or to oppress the people.”
who upheld that the principles of democracy were based on the concepts of virtue, Robespierre became a victim to his own state created terror and was executed on 18 July 1794 following his arrest. Admittedly, France was not the only country to endure some type of backlash in the wake of the Revolution. The use of state sponsored terror was a tactic employed by the governments of almost all major powers, who feared the continuation of a revolution. While France implemented the use of actual violence as a means of preserving loyalties, other nations increased their use of public surveillance, by employing spies and informers, or simply through suppressing basic freedoms like speech, assembly and the press. Still, in the wake of Robespierre’s downfall, France continued in her attempts to implement a democratic government, this time under the guidance of the Directory that was founded on 28 December 1795.

During the next four years, France teetered on the brink of a government based on either Jacobinism or royalist reaction, and therefore many were willing to settle for an autocracy, which Napoleon successfully implemented following his coup d’état on 9-10 November 1799. By 1802, Napoleon was First Consul for life and two years later he crowed himself Emperor Napoleon I. From this point forward, Napoleon began his quest for an imperial Empire, when he turned his armies to the east. As Napoleon increased France’s power by acquiring new territories, he also brought along traces of the Revolution’s liberal ideals. Upon entering a new country, Napoleon “undermined feudalism, introduced a legal code, fostered notions of representative government, and awakened the spirit of nationalism.” The further east Napoleon pushed, the more he challenged both the position and power of Europe’s remaining monarchs

---

16 Doyle, 92.
18 Mason, 35.
with his notions of freedom and equality. Over the next eight years, Napoleon pursued imperial expansion that soon brought him to the outskirts of the Russian Empire. And in the spring of 1812, Napoleon “assembled an army of four hundred thousand soldiers and launched an attack on Russia.”\(^{19}\) Like other conquerors of Europe, Russia proved to be a stronger opponent than the principalities of Central Europe and quickly recruited men and acquired additional resources in the wake of Napoleon’s invasion. For Napoleon, his victorious army was too far spread and by the time they marched on Moscow, winter had already set in. While France “still remained the most powerful state on the Continent,” Napoleon’s blunder in Russia sullied his “reputation and the basis of his power had been damaged beyond repair.”\(^{20}\) At the same time that Napoleon retreated, the armies of Britain, Austria, and Prussia were already descending on Paris.

Under the weight of these new alliances, Napoleon abdicated on 11 April 1814. In the wake of his absence, the Bourbon family was restored as Louis XVIII reclaimed the throne and reestablished France’s monarchy. With the allied armies already on French soil and aiming for the capital, France agreed to terms of peace and signed the first Treaty of Paris on 30 May 1814.\(^{21}\) Since “the allies had invaded France proclaiming that they had only come to deliver the French people from Napoleon’s tyranny and had their best interests at heart, they had themselves placed limits on how far they could penalise the country.”\(^{22}\) The treaty, therefore, “was neither vindictive nor punitive, recognising as all the plenipotentiaries did that the best guarantee of peace and stability in Europe lay in the rapid recovery of France form the political evils that had

---

19 Ibid.
21 The Treaty of Paris 1814 was written by representatives from the Four Great Powers: Britain, Russia, Austria, and Prussia and was also signed by delegates from Sweden, Spain, and Portugal.
22 Zamoyski, 197.
overcome her.”

To accomplish these goals, Article 32 of the treaty declared that “all powers engaged on either side in the present war shall, within the space of two months, send plenipotentiaries to Vienna to settle at a general Congress the arrangements which are to complete the provisions of the present treaty.”

And so, without further instructions, delegates from throughout Europe – save for Turkey – began arriving in Vienna on 18 September 1814.

Essentially, the main goals of the Congress were twofold: first the representatives wanted to restore the balance of power throughout Europe; and second, they sought to redistribute colonial land holdings. For the major powers, the Congress provided an open opportunity to reset Europe’s borders in a manner that would guarantee maximum safety against any future disturbances. Although the Congress never formally met, as nations entered into varying negotiations, the Four Great Powers continued to show dominance as the meeting progressed.

Prior to the opening of the Congress, Austrian Foreign Minister Count Klemens Wenceslas Lothor von Metternich-Winneburg-Ochsenhausen (1773-1859), invited the signers of the 1814 Treaty of Paris to his home on 30 September 1814. At this meeting, members of the Quadruple Alliance (Great Britain, Prussia, Austria, and Russia) “signed a protocol to the effect that they intended to settle among themselves the distribution of the Polish, German, and Italian territories, renounced by Napoleon and comprising thirty-two millions of people, the main business in fact of the Congress; [and] that only after having agreed among themselves would they communicate

---

23 Ibid.
25 Hilde Spiel claims that “according to a somewhat daring estimate, the populace of Vienna had swelled by one-third. Five emperors and kings (Alexander I, Czar of all the Russias; Friedrich Wilhelm III, King of Prussia; Frederick VI, King of Denmark; Maximilian Joseph, King of Württemberg; and host Franz II, Emperor of Austria, King of Bohemia, and apostolic King of Hungary), eleven ruling princes, ninety plenipotentiaries, and fifty-three non-invited representatives of European powers had come to the city (The Congress of Vienna: An Eyewitness Account. Richard H. Weber, Tr. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Chilton Book Company; 1968, xiv-xv & 153).”
their decisions to France and Spain, and only then would they listen to any suggestions or objections from those two. . . . all the other powers of Europe were to be entirely ignored.”

Essentially, representatives from the Quadruple Alliance “reserved for themselves the decision in all important matters,” a decision that “had not been communicated to, or accepted by, the other Powers represented at the Congress or even the Powers who had signed the Paris treaty.”

Facing a loss of influence at the Congress, French Chief Delegate Charles-Maurice de Talleyrand-Périgord, Prince de Bénévent (1754-1838) immediately voiced his objections. On 1 October, Talleyrand sent a note to everyone who had attended the meeting at Count Klemens’s home, arguing “that not being the Congress, but only a portion of the Congress, to attribute to themselves a power which could only belong to the entire Congress would be a usurpation.”

Both Talleyrand’s intervention at the meeting and his note were backed by the Spanish delegate Don Pedro Gomez Havela, Marqués de Labrador (1775-1852), which caused considerable difficulty for Metternich, who had hoped to keep the meeting a private affair. Following these events, Friedrich von Gentz (1764-1832), the “Secretary of the Congress,” noted in his diary that “the interference of the latter two [Talleyrand and Labrador] has badly disorganized and overthrown our plans. They protested against the form of our procedures in a scene I shall never forget.”

While this exchange allowed for France to join in the dealings of the Quadruple Alliance, by 9 January 1815, it did not provide for any of smaller powers of Europe to be included in the major discussions. By this point, the Council of Five outweighed any other committee or commission operating within the Congress. As a result, it was the Council, rather
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26 Hazen, 6-7.
28 Hazen, 11.
29 Spiel, 18.
than the Congress as a whole that “determined which nations were to have a political existence over the next hundred years and which were not.” This focus on state sovereignty permitted Europe’s ruling family to continue to retain absolute power over the state. The emphasis on the monarchy was reinforced when Talleyrand requested that a requiem mass be said in honor of the death of Louis XVI on 21 January 1815 at St. Stephan’s. Emperor Franz I even agreed to cover the cost of the ceremony in honor of the “anniversary of a day of terror and eternal sorrow.”

At the time, the requiem served as a moment for Talleyrand to further demonstrate France’s growing influence at the Congress, seeing that he used the “occasion as a pretext for a number of declarations on the theme of legitimacy and the inalienable rights of monarchs.” In the end, despite the massive gathering of European representatives, it was still the thoughts and opinions of the Great Powers that continued to dictate the Congress’s unconventional proceedings. As Gentz noted, even at the very end, it was the Five Powers who were “the real and only Congress.” With this in mind, Charles Downer Hazen suggests that the map of Europe was redrawn not to satisfy a collective intra-continental agreement, but “because they [the Great Powers] had the men and the resources” to obtain what suited them best. And at the time, what the Powers of Europe desired was a return to the old regime, where the ruling families possessed the power and the people continued to serve at their will. Still, in spite of Europe’s new borders and the reestablishment of the monarchy, the language of the Revolution –
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30 Zamoyski, xiii.
31 Spiel, 138 & 141.
32 Zamoyski, 399 – These two cases were meant to be directly applied to the situation regarding Saxony, which David King also makes note of when he writes that the service “honored the past, championed the importance of legitimacy, and, at the same time, subtly though forcefully promoted causes dear to France – from preserving the legitimate king of Saxony to restoring the legitimate king of Naples (Vienna, 1814: How the Conquerors of Napoleon Made Love, War, and Peace at the Congress of Vienna. New York, New York: Three Rivers Press; 2008, 200).”
33 Hazen, 17.
individualism, human rights, and popular sovereignty – had already been spread too far and implemented for too long to simply be fully erased by the Congress of Vienna. Although the Congress was the first international meeting to address matters “to safeguard the immunity and interests of individuals,” like Jews and slavery, it failed to produce any “immediate improvement in their condition.”[^34] Despite their initial willingness to consider matters of humanity, the delegates in Vienna instead

imposed an orthodoxy which not only denied political existence to many nations; [but] enshrined a particularly stultified form of monarchical government; institutionalized social hierarchies as rigid as any that had existed under the ancien régime; and preserved archaic disabilities – serfdom was not abolished in Russia until half a century after the Congress. By excluding whole classes and nations from the benefits, this system nurtured envy and resentment, which flourished into socialism and aggressive nationalism.[^35]

While the events of the twentieth century were not solely defined by the actions at Vienna, the Great War and the clash of so many new ideologies in its wake were without question rooted in the events of the nineteenth century.

Following the Congress of Vienna, a combination of ideals related to the Age of Enlightenment and the French Revolution threatened to further wreak havoc on Europe’s ruling monarchs. Even though the monarchs desired to return to the pre-revolutionary times when they retained full power over the state, principles introduced during the eighteenth century served as an unrelenting reminder that dynastic powers could again be overthrown. In order to prevent revolutionary ideals from spreading, the Great Powers agreed to quickly suppress any activities that could possibly threaten the overall stability of the state. As a result of these agreements, in the decade after Vienna, Europe experienced an era of relative tranquility. Peace, however, was

[^34]: Zamoyski, 568.
[^35]: Ibid., 569.
in fact short-lived and by the 1830s civil uprisings again placed both the state and the power of the monarchy in danger. Beginning in July 1830, France responded to the “economic troubles of the late 1820s” as well as other political problems with the makings of another uprising.36 Although France was the first to be overwhelmed by revolution, it was by no means the only one. By the end of 1833, revolts had also erupted in Belgium, Italy, Germany, and Poland. These early 1830s risings demonstrate that no matter how staunchly Europe’s monarchs tried to retain power, after Vienna, the risk of a revolt never fully ceased as discontent continued to periodically overwhelm the populace. According to Paul W. Schroeder, “the year 1830 may not compare with 1789 or 1848 in drama, violence, and ideological resonance, but its revolutions arguably produced or paved the way for a more solid political, social, and economic progress in Europe than either of them.”37 While the revolutions of 1830-1833 were contained and quickly put down, they give light to some of the additional struggles that kept not only Europe, but the old regime in constant peril.

Along with the ideologies of the Enlightenment and French Revolution, there was an additional system of change that fundamentally altered Europe, the Industrial Revolution. Ultimately, the advent of mechanization gave rise to a new aspect of society during which the overarching problems of society – the struggle for equality – were played out between workers and those who employed them. While industrialization was felt first and foremost in Britain, it “set in motion enormous social and economic forces, including the increasing assertiveness of the new middle class and the proletariat, both of which had interests at odds with those of the

37 Ibid., 666.
social and economic structures of the old regime.”  Although the 1830 revolutions gave way to the traditions of the old regimes, the crowned heads of Europe could not prevent the appeal of two new ideals from spreading. Fully rooted in the principles of the late eighteenth century, liberalism and nationalism sought to fundamentally change politics, the economy, and society. One the one hand, liberalism emerged as two concepts: political, which was rooted in the writings of John Locke and Jean Jacques Rousseau; and economic, based on the concept of “private property,” put forth by individuals like Adam Smith and David Ricardo. At the same time, nationalism sought to “create a unified nation-state” where “people who share a common language, culture, and identity – a nation – should be in charge of their own political destiny. It sees the people as a whole as the repository of culture, rather than only the elites.” Even though Europe reverted into a period of relative stability following the disturbances of the early 1830s, economic decline coupled with several years of bad harvests eventually resulted in another massive uprising in the spring of 1848.

The 1848 Revolutions were initially touched off by uprisings that started in France in February that led to the collapse of the monarchy and the establishment of a Republic. Shortly
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38 Mason, 53.
39 Ibid., 55 – According to Mason, “political liberalism grew out of the Enlightenment ideas of Locke, Rousseau, and others who favored government by consent and elaborate principles of popular sovereignty, constitutionalism (i.e., the powers of government limited by constitutions), and tolerance of divergent points of view. They promoted individual rights, respect for private property, the rule of law, and stronger parliaments, although most accepted the presence of a limited monarchy.” Mason goes on to define economic liberalism as being “related to the Enlightenment ideas of private property but derived more directly from Adam Smith (The Wealth of Nations) and David Ricardo (Principles of Political Economy) who emphasized laissez-faire, the “invisible hand” of the market, and free trade. Economic liberals, like political ones, wanted to limit the power of government, but especially in terms of its regulation of the economy.”

40 Ibid., 56 – This particular form of nationalism is based off the ideas of popular nationalism, which is “the forging of states from the bottom up . . . [it] is linked to the Enlightenment and revolutionary ideas of the people as the source of power.” According to Mason, “the forging of centralized, unified, national states by monarchs, from the top down, is sometimes referred to as civic nationalism.”
after the French rose up in defiance, revolutions quickly spread throughout the Continent and
soon enough, “monarchies were overthrown, constitutions proclaimed, or national independence
declared in . . . Austria, Hungary, Bohemia, Germany, Italy, and elsewhere.”41 In light of these
new and drastic developments, the Europe that the old regimes had attempted to revert to
following the Congress of Vienna no longer seemed plausible. Evidently, when the United
States emerged as an independent nation following her own Revolution, the move not only
“mark[ed] a major transition in world history,” but it also ushered in an “era [where] a world of
states emerged from a world of empires.”42 To the Americans, nationalism symbolized Europe’s
willingness to move out from the old dynastic regimes and embrace new standards of
government that appeared democratic and so it was the United States who first recognized
France’s Republic. As a matter of fact, a month before the February Revolution, then
Congressman Abraham Lincoln “acknowledged that ‘any people anywhere have the right to rise
up, and shake off the existing government.’ Moreover, ‘any people that can, may revolutionize,
and make their own, of so much of the territory as they inhabit.”43 While Europe endured severe
internal struggles, colonists under the sovereignty of Spain and France also led several major
uprisings throughout the Americas that soon resulted in twelve nations declaring their
independence before the turn of the twentieth century.44

41 Ibid., 53.
42 David Armitage. *The Declaration of Independence: A Global History*. Cambridge, Massachusetts:
Harvard University Press; 2007, 104.
43 Thomas Bender. *A Nation among Nations: America’s Place in World History*. New York, New York:
Hill and Wang; 2006, 125.
44 Armitage, 147-151 – A vast majority of newly independent countries came out of Latin America and
the Caribbean including: Argentina, 9 July 1816; Chile, 1 January 1818; Peru, 28 July 1821;
Guatemala, 15 September 1821; El Salvador, 21 September 1821; Mexico, 28 September 1821;
Nicaragua, 28 September 1821 (and again on 1 July 1823 and 30 April 1838); Costa Rica, 29
October 1821; Panama, 28 November 1821; Brazil, 7 September 1822; Bolivia, 6 August 1825;
and The Dominican Republic, 16 January 1844. Four other non-Latin American nations also
For Europe, however, the 1848 Revolutions spawned significant changes that continued to affect varying nations for the rest of the nineteenth century. No longer could the alliances of 1815 hold back revolutionary ideals and by the mid-1800s, reforms were not only expected by the people, they were demanded. In the wake of civil unrest, only Britain and Russia managed to escape the internal strife brought on by the revolutionaries. Mason maintains that “the 1848 revolutions frightened the crowned heads of Europe and caused several to abdicate. Those who remained were cognizant of the threats of liberalism, nationalism, and socialism and some of them took steps in the years afterward to allay the problems that contributed to revolutionary ferment.”

Although Europe’s crowned heads had managed to maintain their power after the Napoleonic Wars, the Revolution of 1848 was not so forgiving. The system of alliances made during the Congress of Vienna, especially the Concert of Europe, not only created a “common determination of the conservative monarchs to stifle revolutions – it also had its weakness, including the tendency for change in one part of Europe to affect all the other parts.” Soon enough, the pursuit of equality, justice, liberty, and freedom, all key concepts that took form at the turn of the nineteenth century, could no longer be permanently held back by the ruling elites after 1848. While the revolutions did result in the “old absolutist and conservative regimes . . . collaps[ing] almost without a fight,” the revolts themselves did not result in a major inter-

asserted their independence during the 19th century, including: New Zealand, 28 October 1835; Liberia, 26 July 1847; Taiwan, 23 May 1895; and The Philippines, 12 June 1898, while only two European nations successfully asserted their own autonomy: Belgium on 4 October 1830 and Hungary on 14 April 1849.

45 Mason, 64 – In particular, “in Russia, a new tsar, Alexander II, began a series of liberalizing reforms including, most importantly, the emancipation of the serfs in 1861. The Austrian emperor Franz Joseph also made some concessions and compromises to both liberals and nationalists, including the 1867 Ausgleich in which the monarchy recognized the desire for autonomy of the Hungarians and established the dual Austro-Hungarian monarchy.”

46 Ibid.
continental war. Instead, the 1848 revolutions applied new philosophic pressures that resulted in a slow, but significant strain to the old order of things.

In the decades between 1848 and the turn of the century, questions regarding equality and citizenship, freedom and liberty for whom were being asked throughout Europe. Soon enough, class struggles led to racial conflicts as smaller nations sought to break with their imperial holders and gain independence for their own people. By the mid-1840s, European states were becoming more diverse, especially as the Industrial Revolution drew people out of the countryside and into more urban areas. This movement of people triggered mass migration throughout the Continent so that “by 1848, [there were already] 47 towns in Europe [that] had a population greater than 100,000 – 28 of them in industrializing Britain.” With mass migration, however, also came new discrepancies among the people, including a great division based on social status and economic income. While immigration statistics increased at this time – “emigration from Britain alone rose from about 57,000 in 1830 to 90,000 in 1840 an 280,000 in 1850” as a result of war, famine, and economic gain – Europe still experienced a considerable population boom reaching 260 million persons by the start of the 1848 revolutions. The arrival of so many people crowding themselves into the cities gave rise to new laws and attitudes in regards to social conditions. Poor working and living conditions soon triggered a wave of epidemics including typhus and cholera, which in turn forced officials to invest in a “better water supply and sewage systems.” Also, in response to the growing rate of poverty, nations like
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47 Schroeder, 800-801.
49 Ibid., 76 & 78 – Briggs and Clavin note that the population in 1848 was “75 million more than in 1800.”
50 Ibid., 78 – As a result of a clean water supply, “the large-scale manufacture and distribution of cheap soap” also came into practice.
Britain started to implement reforms based on improving social conditions. Despite the
government’s willingness to enact new developments aimed at improving society, not all of the
regulations were specifically geared toward providing temporary relief. In 1834, Britain enacted
the Poor Law of 1834, a controversial law “accompanied by a policy that viewed pauperism
among workers as a moral failing. . . . [And] Ultimately, all claimants were forced to forfeit their
civil and political rights.” At the same time of the revolts, reforms and migrations,
intellectuals, relying on pre-nineteenth century philosophies, used scientific and economic
measures as a means of making social comments as they attempted to explain the events that
were transpiring throughout Europe. Of these individuals, it was the concepts put forth by Karl
Marx (1818-1883) and Friedrich Engels (1820-1895) that brought socialism to the forefront of
the political and economic struggle.

Prior to the outbreak of revolution, Marx and Engels published *The Communist
Manifesto*, in February 1848, which “called for a worldwide workers’ revolution that would
overthrow capitalism and establish a society in which all property would be publicly owned.”
Infused with the philosophies of the time, the manifesto attributed political, economic, and social
struggles to a growing divide between capitalism and labor. Although the socialist theory of

California: University of California Press; 2004, 137 – “Under the new law, all relief to the able-
bodied in their own homes was forbidden, so that all who wished to be granted help had to live in
workhouses, where, to discourage relief seekers, conditions were intentionally made callous and
humiliating.”

52 Mason, 67.

53 At this point, “socialists dissented from two aspects of the liberals’ outlook. First, rather than
individualism, they tended to emphasize community, cooperation, and association – qualities that
they believed to be jeopardized by contemporary developments. And, second, rather than
celebrating the proclaimed progress arising from capitalist enterprise, they were preoccupied by
the massive inequality that it was causing, as former peasants and artisans were herded into
overcrowded towns and forced to work in new factories for pitifully low wages. It was in this
context that the term ‘socialist’ was first used in the *London Co-operative Magazine* in 1827,
which suggested that the great issue was whether it was more beneficial that capital should be
Marx and Engels became the most significant, there had been others who were just as intent on reforming society throughout collective means. Including individuals like Étienne Cabet (1788-1856), Henri de Saint-Simon (1760-1825), Charles Fourier (1772-1837), and Robert Owen (1771-1858) had already attempted to fulfill the standards of socialism by establishing utopias. Alternatively, anarchists like William Godwin (1756-1836), Pierre-Joseph Proudhon (1809-1865), Mikhail Bakunin (1814-1876), and Peter Kropotkin (1842-1921) also expanded the concept of socialism, adding a “belief that a revolutionary movement should prefigure the society it wished to create.”

Where Marx differs with these theorists is the “broad theoretical framework for interpreting the world” that is largely based on the relationship between class and capitalism. To Marx, there was a similarity in that a land owner and worker operated in a relationship that was comparable to that of a factory employer and employee, where both laborers toiled for the benefit and betterment of someone other than themselves. This conflict between the bourgeoisie and proletariat fostered further class divisions and economic crises, at the same time that the costs for material goods was on the rise, but wages remained the same. Marx predicted that at one point or another during these economic downturns “the workers will simply seize control of the factories in a revolution that will displace the bourgeoisie and initiate
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owned individually or held in common. Those who believed the latter were ‘the Communists and Socialists’ (Michael Newman. *Socialism: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press; 2005, 6-7).”

54 Newman, 15.
56 One aspect of the struggles within capitalism is that “material and economic relationships constitute the foundation, or substructure, of society on which all else is built. The forms of economic production determine the dominant class, and the dominant class controls the economy, political system, social relationships, and culture of that society, all of which are part of the superstructure of society. As Marx wrote in his *Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* (1859), ‘the mode of production in material life determines the general character of the social, political, and intellectual processes of life. It is not the consciousness of men which determines their existence; it is on the contrary their social existence which determines their consciousness’ (Mason, 73).”
a new stage in history.”57 While Marxism spread throughout Europe, a vast majority of the socialist parties were structured as “parliamentary parties in the sense that they worked for socialist outcomes and programs within the legal constraints of their political systems.”58 Following the 1848 Revolutions, political, economic, and social change continued to affect Europe and while Marxist ideals were not always at the forefront of this transformation, they did gain widespread attention.

Intent on promoting the ideals of socialism, on 28 September 1864, the Working Men’s International Association or the First International was formed at St. Martin’s Hall in London, England. Although Marx was not responsible for the formation of the organization, the group quickly fell under his leadership and he maintained in the Provisional Rules that the “association is established to afford a central medium of communication and cooperation between working men’s societies existing in different countries, and aiming at the same end, viz., the protection, advancement, and complete emancipation of the working classes.”59 Bakunin argued that the formation of the International was in reaction to “the simultaneous awakening of the spirit, courage, and consciousness of the workers in these countries [England, France, Germany, Switzerland, and Belgium] which followed the catastrophic defeat of the 1848 and 1851 uprisings,” along with “the phenomenal enrichment of the bourgeoisie and the concomitant

57 Ibid., 74.
58 Ibid., 77.
59 Karl Marx, Political Writings Volume III: The First International and After. David Fernbach, Ed. New York, New York: Random House; 1974, 83 – As noted in the September 1871, “Resolution of the London Conference on Working-Class Political Action, the “Inaugural Address of the International Working Men’s Association (1864) states: ‘The lords of land and the lords of capital will always use their political privileges for the defence and perpetuation of their economical monopolies. So far from promoting, they will continue to lay every possible impediment in the way of the emancipation of labour . . .To conquer political power has therefore become the great duty of the working classes’; . . . (269).”
Over the next few years, Marx’s concepts of organization and revolution came into conflict first with Proudhon and by the later 1860s with Bakunin when “the battle lines between them were drawn: Bakunin’s doctrine of federalism and grassroots activism on one side, Marx’s vision of a centralized authority guiding the workers towards the coming revolution on the other.” Following the Franco-Prussian War, the competing ideologies of Marx and Bakunin were tested when French workers briefly “set up a revolutionary municipal council, the Paris Commune,” between 18 March and the end of May 1871. Having endured the 1848 Revolutions, “an already nervous bourgeoisie . . . received the news [of the Commune] with profound unease, for it had been ‘the Commune’ of Paris that had deposed Louis XVI in 1792, and that had wielded substantial power behind the scenes throughout the Terror.” On 17 March, the day before the Revolution was announced, Adolphe Thiers, Chief of Executive Power (Provisional President), sought to curtail the uprising by issuing “the following proclamation:

INHABITANTS OF PARIS, – We address ourselves to you, to your reason, to your patriotism, and we hope to be heard. Your great city, which can only live by order, is being deeply disquieted in some districts. This state of things, without spreading to other districts, is, however, sufficient to prevent the resumption of labor and comfort. For some time past some ill-intentioned persons have, under the pretense of resisting the Prussians, who are no longer before your walls, constituted themselves masters of a part of the city, have constructed fortifications

60 Bakunin on Anarchism. Sam Dolgoff, Ed. and Tr. Montréal, Québec, Canada: Black Rose Books; 1980, 248.
62 Ishay, 125 – As Micheline R. Ishay explains, the Commune began when “French Communards took over the streets of Paris, challenging wealthy bourgeoisie, aristocrats, and the clergy while demanding government control over prices and wages, as well as better working conditions. Moreover, the Communards demanded rights for the working class, the development of workers’ cooperatives, a reduction of working hours, free public education for all children, professional education for young workers, and housing rights (including a suspension of rent increases that had gone into effect during the German siege of Paris). Many defended women’s right to equal pay for equal work. Legislation subsidizing single mothers and day nurseries for their children was passed.”
63 Butterworth, 35.
on which they keep guard, and on which they force you to mount guard with them by order of an unknown committee. . . . Their wish is to institute a government in opposition to the legal government instituted by universal suffrage. Those persons who have already done you so much harm . . . those persons have turned their guns so that, if they fired, they would reduce your homes to ruins, kill your children and yourselves. . . . Commerce is stopped; the shops are deserted; large orders, which would arrive from all parts, are suspended; your arms are paralyzed; credit will not revive in capitals . . . .

The criminals, who affect to institute a government, must be delivered to regular justice . . . To carry out this act of justice and reason, the Government counts upon your assistance, and that the good citizens will separate from the bad, that they will support instead of resist public opinion, that they will thus hasten to restore peace in the city, and render a service to the Republic which, in the opinion of France, must be ruined by disorder. Parisians! we speak to you thus, because we esteem your good sense, wisdom and patriotism, but having given you this warning, we shall proceed to have recourse to force, because there must be peace at all hazards without a day’s delay, so that order, the condition of well-being, may return – order, complete, immediate, and unalterable.  

To Prosper Olivier Lissagaray, a Commune soldier, the last line of the public declaration meant that for order to be reestablished, “blood was to be shed,” which was exactly how the state responded. For Thiers, this was the second time he tried to restrain socialism. During the 1848 Revolutions, he served King Louis-Philippe by drafting proposals aimed at suppressing radicalism. Given his history, by 1871, Thiers was fully prepared to utilize all means necessary in order to defeat the Commune. According to Alex Butterworth, brute force used by the state and aimed at the suppression of the Commune quickly resulted in the deaths of thousands. In comparison, during the 1793 Terror “2,500 had been guillotined in eighteen months; in a single week of 1871, ten times that number or more died from bullets sprayed by the mitrailleuses.”
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64 W. Pembroke Fettridge. The Rise and Fall of the Paris Commune in 1871; With a Full Account of the Bombardment, Capture, and Burning of the City. New York, New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers; 1871, 26-27.


66 Ibid., 51 – Lissagaray maintains that “the Paris municipality paid for the burial of 17,000 Communards,
The upheaval surrounding the Commune, however, continued to have a lingering effect on the French government. David Fernbach writes that “Marx’s brilliant vindication of the Commune led to the International being identified as its instigator. . . . [As a result] Martial law was declared throughout France, and in March 1872 Thiers passed through the French Assembly a special bill that made membership of the International a crime punishable by imprisonment. In June 1872 Jules Favre, the French foreign minister, circularized the European governments calling for joint action to stamp out the International, and Bismarck proposed a European alliance against the International a month later.”67 Despite the efforts of the working class, however, fear of revolution and threats against the unity of the state created a long lasting concern regarding socialism at a time when many European nations were still competing for power and prestige among the privileged elite.

To others, however, the Commune served as a pivotal moment in the history of socialism as “the issue that divided the most radical revolutionary reds from all other liberal and radical groups.”68 In particular, Marx was deeply influenced by the events in Paris, which he now viewed “as a beginning of the proletarian revolution, and as an incomplete model of a socialist society harboring profound lessons for the future of the working-class socialism.”69 While Bakunin permanently split from socialism in favor of anarchism, ideals based on Marx’s theories

67 Karl Marx, Political Writings Volume III: The First International and After, 43.
69 Ibid.
soon swept through Europe and in particular affected Germany. Even though Marx and Engels advocated in favor of Germany’s new middle class throughout the 1850s, it was others like Ferdinand Lassalle who were the first to gather supporters in the 1860s. Out of these two groups rose anti- and pro-Prussian supporters in the form of the Social Democratic Workers’ Party (SDAP – Sozialdemokratische Arbeiterpartei) under August Bebel and Wilhelm Liebknecht and the General German Workers Association (ADAV – Allgemeiner Deutscher Arbeiterverein) founded by Lassalle. According to Edgar Feuchtwanger, “the rapid spread of industrialization and urbanization in the boom years up to 1873 heightened class consciousness,” following massive “strike activity” in 1872. Still, there were divisions between the two parties and although their numbers continued to increase – 3.2 per cent of votes in 1871 to 6.8 per cent in 1874 – the organizations were not gaining the necessary seats in government to make a significant contribution. This split among socialist votes was finally remedied when, in an

70 Edgar Feuchtwanger. Imperial Germany, 1850-1918. London, England: Routledge; 2001, 70-71 – Feuchtwanger notes that “Liebknecht knew Marx and the Eisenacher affiliated to Marx’s First International, founded in London in 1864. Their commitment to Marxism as a doctrine was, however, at this stage tenuous. Another peculiarity of the German workers’ movement was that trade unions were less important than the early political parties. It was not until 1869 that, as part of the liberalization legislation of the North German Reichstag, the right of collective bargaining was recognized, though in practice it was still difficult to exercise. What there was of trade unions often arose only in course of actual strikes or under the stimulus of the political workers’ movements. Lassalle believed in the iron law of wages and his followers were slower than the Eisenacher to encourage trade union activity. There were also unions still committed to the Liberals and others to the Catholics. The overall effect of all these circumstances was that in Germany there was not, as there was in England as the original industrial country, a trade union movement before there was a political labour movement; nor was there the possibility after 1866 of the political thrust of the working class taking its place in a broadly based liberal party. As Liberals moved closer to the sill only semi-constitutional state, so the political representatives of the industrial working class were driven into opposition and in due course into the role of enemies of the state, Reichsfeinde.

“The founding of the Reich soon made the division between pro and anti-Prussians in the workers’ movement academic (71).”

71 Ibid., 71 – Feuchtwanger points out that there was an estimated 362 strikes in 1872 alone.
72 Ibid – Even so, Germany became the most dominant organization evidenced by the substantial numbers
attempt to strengthen the political presences of the party, the SDAP and the ADAV united in 1875, creating the Social Democratic Party of Germany or SPD. The union was sealed with the adoption of a new party platform formulated during 22-27 May 1875. Passed by a unanimous vote, the Gotha Program asserted that

Labor is the source of all wealth and culture, and since generally useful labor is possible only through society, the collective product of labor belongs to society, that is, to all of its members on the basis of a universal duty to work and according to equal right, each sharing according to his reasonable needs.

In contemporary society the means of labor are the monopoly of the capitalist class; the consequent dependence of the working class is the cause of all forms of misery and servitude. The emancipation of labor demands the transformation of the means of labor into the common property of society and the cooperative regulation of collective labor to be utilized for the public good and with fair distribution of the proceeds of labor.

The emancipation of labor must be the work of the working class, in contrast to which all other classes are but one reactionary mass.  

Although the SPD leaned more toward Lassalle’s ideology rather than Marx’s, a debate that would continue to divide the party, the merger of SDAP and the ADAV ultimately led to the
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73 Lidtke, 333.
74 On 5 May 1875, Marx wrote a letter from London to Wilhelm Bracke, who “had led the fraction of the Lassallean ADAV which broke away in 1869, and jointed with Liebknecht’s group to form the SDAP (‘Eisenach party’)” critiquing the Gotha Program. Asking Bracke to forward his letter, Marx informed him that “after the unity congress Engels and I are going to publish a short statement dissociating ourselves from the said programme of principles and stating that we have had nothing to do with it.

“This is essential, because people abroad hold the completely erroneous view – carefully nurtured by enemies of the party – that we are secretly steering the movement of the so-called Eisenach party from here. In a very recent Russian publication, Bakunin [his book Statism and Anarchy] still makes me responsible, for example, not only for all the programmes, etc. of that party, but even for every step that Liebknecht has taken since the first day of his cooperation with the People’s Party.
largest and “most powerful” party in the world, “providing a more powerful organization to fight for the interests of the increasing number of German workers.” At the same time that the SPD emerged, Germany was already in the midst of a massive program aimed at ridding the country of social outsiders. Already, members of Germany’s Catholic community were being persecuted as enemies of the state under the *Kulturkampf*. This fear and paranoia was soon projected beyond Germany’s religious sector in an effort to solidify the unification of Germany. And even though the SPD was encouraging the state to allow for better wages and benefits, the organization was soon targeted as a potential threat to the stability of the state and included as *Reichsfeinde* or enemies of the empire.

For Reich Chancellor Otto von Bismarck, the sudden growth of the socialist parties created an atmosphere of distrust especially in light of the Commune. Six years after unification, votes cast on behalf of Germany’s Socialists steadily rose from 102,000 in 1871 to 352,000 in 1874, and 493,000 in 1877. Given the growth of socialist membership, the SPD not only became “an object of fear and suspicion among the ruling élite,” but they were also viewed as standing in opposition to “Bismarck’s conservative *Weltanschauung* (worldview).” Friedrich von Holstein, Bismarck’s subordinate at the German Foreign Office, noted “[Dr. Johannes]“Apart from that, it is my duty not to approve, even by diplomatic silence, a programme which in my opinion is thoroughly reprehensible and demoralizing for the party (*Karl Max, Political Writings Volume III: The First International and After*, 339-340).”

---


77 Karl Marx. *Class Struggles in France, 1848-1850*. New York, New York: International Publishers; 1964, 19 – Statistics were given by Frederick Engels who wrote the introduction on 6 March 1895 a few months before his own death.


79 Lidtke, 70-71.
Miquel . . . was convinced Bismarck had wanted to engineer a clash – or clashes – with the Social Democrats in order to bring about an open trial of strength.”80 As a result, Bismarck became adamant about finding a way to legally break the organization. His first opportunity came on 11 May 1878, when Max Hoedel attempted to assassinate Emperor Wilhelm I as he rode in an open carriage along Unter den Linden in Berlin. Even though both shots were wide, Bismarck “telegraphed from Friedrichsruh that preparations should be made for measures against the Social Democrats,” well before an official inquiry was launched.81 Since Hoedel could not be directly linked to the SPD, many members of the Reichstag rejected Bismarck’s efforts to restrict the party and on 25 May, “the first clause of the Anti-Socialist bill was defeated in Parliament” by a vote of 251 to 57.82 While Bismarck’s first effort to suppress the party failed, a second opportunity soon arose when Dr. Karl Nobiling shot the Emperor from a window on Unter den Linden on 2 June. Unlike Hoedel, Dr. Nobiling succeeded in seriously wounding Emperor Wilhelm I before turning the gun on himself. Again Bismarck blamed the SPD for the assassination attempt and this time he succeeded in gathering support for his anti-socialist legislation. On 17 June 1878, The New York Times published an eye-witness article written from Berlin on 3 June 1878, writing that in the wake of the assassination attempts,

The first sentiment was one of universal horror at the crime. Everyone was filled with indignation, and if the murderer had not been guarded . . . he would have

80 The Holstein Papers – The Memoirs, Diaries and Correspondence of Friedrich von Holstein, 1837-1900: Volume I, Memoirs and Political Observations. Norman Rich and M. H. Fisher, Eds. London, England: Cambridge at the University Press; 1955, 146 – According to Footnote #2: Dr. Johannes Miquel served as “Lord Mayor of Frankfurt-am-Main, 1879-90; Prussian Finance Minister, 1890-1901; co-founder of the Nationalverein; [and was] one of the leaders of the National Liberals in the Prussian Chamber of Deputies and in the Reichstag from 1867.”

81 Lidtke, 70.

been torn to pieces by the exasperated crowd before he reached his prison. Gradually, however, to this feeling of indignation succeeded an uneasy apprehension of consequences which may be fatal to our liberties. What will the Government do? is the question asked. Will it not consider itself justified in taking repressive measures? The proclamation of martial law is hinted [sic]. It is rumored that a Regency under the Presidency of the Crown Prince will be established, and that the Reichstag will be convened to devise some plan to stop the growing evil. German Socialism . . . . is a political sect ready to attain its ends by the perpetration of the most atrocious crimes, and, as such, has of itself renounced the right belonging to all honest political parties of discussing publicly its opinions.83

Throughout the summer of 1878, the SPD faced open persecution by the official authorities well before proper legislation was approved. Shortly after the events of 2 June the government clamped down on socialist activities and “a party congress which had been planned for June 15-18 in Gotha had to be postponed indefinitely when the authorities prohibited it. Everywhere the Social Democrats were on the defensive; it was nearly impossible to quiet the mass hysteria aroused by the charge that they were responsible for the attempts on the Emperor’s life.”84

Although the SPD actually gained seats during the election, this type of blatantly hostile treatment toward the socialists and their denunciation as an organization intent on supporting actions aimed at overthrowing the state prompted the public to support anti-socialist legislation.

By October it appeared that an anti-socialist law would be passed. Anticipating the end of their organization, the Central Election Committee of the SPD convened in Hamburg on 13 October in order to formulate a plan should the Socialist Law pass. Initially many within the SPD were ready to reconcile themselves to a passive approach to the law with the belief that this


84 Lidtke, 73-74 – Lidtke goes on to write that as a result of this assault, “countless obstacles were thrown in the path of their [Social Democrats] campaign [for summer elections in the Reichstag]. The police searched their houses and placed many under arrest; socialist newspapers were confiscated, and meetings were dissolved for every imaginable reason.”
type of response would eliminate the government’s desire to further suppress the organization.\textsuperscript{85}

Despite the party’s willingness to yield in the face of open persecution, Bismarck succeeded in passing the Anti-Socialist Bill, on 19 October, “by a vote of 221 to 149.”\textsuperscript{86} Made effective on 21 October and entitled the “Law Against the Publicly Dangerous Endeavors of Social Democracy,” the new decree – with 30 articles – sought to restrict the power and authority of the SPD, declaring that

\begin{quote}
#1. Societies [\textit{Vereine}] which aim at the overthrow of the existing political or social order through social-democratic, socialistic, or communistic endeavors are to be prohibited.

This applies also to societies in which social-democratic, socialistic, or communistic endeavors aiming at the overthrow of the existing political or social order are manifested in a manner dangerous to the public peace, and, particularly to the harmony among the classes of the population.

Associations of every kind are the same as societies.\textsuperscript{87}
\end{quote}

Immediately Bismarck set out to enforce the Anti-Socialist Law by targeting socialist newspapers and periodicals. Even though Liebknecht and Wilhelm Hasenclever, “editors of the \textit{Vorwärts}, announced on October 21 that in the future they would ‘place themselves on the ground of the Exceptional Law’ and cease to promote any of the ideas or actions prohibited by the Socialist Law,” they were shut down along with the \textit{Berliner Freie Presse}, and the \textit{Hamburg-Altonaer Volkblatt}.\textsuperscript{88} Socialist newspapers in Germany were not the only ones affected by the law. As indicated by Butterworth, it was only “shortly after his expulsion from Germany in 1878

\textsuperscript{85} Lidlke, 78-79 – According to Lidlke, party leader August Geib’s “unconditionally advocated a total dissolution of the party organization in order to avoid prosecution under the new law. Some leaders were reluctant to submit to the Socialist law so hastily, but they did not press their case.”

\textsuperscript{86} Ibid., 77.

\textsuperscript{87} Ibid., 339.

\textsuperscript{88} Ibid., 79.
that [Johann] Most . . . founded the newspaper *Freiheit* in London, to ‘hurl’, as he put it, ‘a thunderbolt at that miserable state of affairs’ created by Bismarck’s suppression of [the] socialists.”

Although both Marx and Engels rejected Most and his publication, *Freiheit* amassed such a following “with its calls for a ‘revolution of the spirit’ that the paper had thrived, consistently outwitting attempts by the German police to infiltrate its distribution network: each edition was published under a different title to avoid censorship and smuggled into Germany inside mattresses exported by a factory in Hull.”

And on 20 January 1879, Bismarck finally succeeded in silencing Most, when the publication was “finally and absolutely forbidden admission into Germany.”

Censorship throughout Germany continued and “by June 30, 1879 . . . the police throughout Germany had suppressed 127 periodical publications (including newspapers) and 278 non-periodical publications,” resulting in the unemployment of thousands.

While socialist papers and pamphlets were primary targets of the Anti-Socialist Law, the government also openly attacked socialists themselves.

In an effort to inhibit the party, martial law was essentially declared through the enforcement of *kleiner Belagerungszustand* or a Minor State of Siege in areas throughout Germany that boasted the highest numbers of membership in the SPD. This authority granted to the state “to expel persons who were considered ‘dangerous to public security and order’”

---

89 Butterworth, 162-163.
90 Ibid., 163.
92 Lidtke, 79-80.
93 Ibid., 78 & 81-82 – This authority granted to the state stems from Article 28 of the “Law Against the Publicly Dangerous Endeavors of Social Democracy” stating that: “For districts or localities where the public safety is menaced by the endeavors described in #1, par. 2 [Refer to block quote top of page 28 of this chapter], the following regulations may be decreed, in case they are not already permitted by state law, with the consent of the Bundesrat for a period not exceeding one year:
resulted in 1,500 arrests by 1890, while others were immediately driven into exile.\textsuperscript{94} When \textit{kleiner Belagerungszustand} was made effective in Berlin on 28 November 1878 it led to the expulsion of “sixty-seven of the best known Social Democrats, including [Ignaz] Aver, [Friedrich Wilhelm] Fritzsche, and Heinrich Rackow.”\textsuperscript{95} When the Anti-Socialist Law passed, Liebknecht commented that the law meant

Freedom has been outlawed together with us, together with the Social Democratic Party: freedom of the press, freedom of association; all constitutional guarantees have been shattered, destroyed by this law. However that may be, the sacrifice can no longer be prevented. The contract has been ratified and lies before us; the sacrifice of freedom will be made. Let the responsibility for this step fall upon them who are performing it. The day will come when the German people will ask an accounting for this crime against its welfare, its liberty, its honor!\textsuperscript{96}

\begin{itemize}
\item “1. that meetings may take place only after the consent of the Police Authority has been obtained; this limitation does not extend to meetings called for the purpose of an announced election to the Reichstag or to the diets of the states [\textit{Landesvertretung}];
\item “2. that the distribution of publications shall not take place on public roads, streets, squares, or other public places;
\item “3. that the residence in districts or localities of persons from whom danger to public safety and order is to be feared may be forbidden;
\item “4. that the possession, bearing, importation, and sale of weapons is to be forbidden, limited, or made conditional upon certain requirements.
\end{itemize}

“The Reichstag must be informed immediately, that is, upon its first reassembling, about any decree that has been issued under the foregoing provisions.

“The decrees are to be announced in the \textit{Reichsanzeiger} and by whatever manner is prescribed for local police orders.

“Whoever, knowingly or after public notice is given, acts in contravention of these regulations, or of the decisions based thereon, is to be punished by a fine not exceeding one thousand marks, or with arrest or imprisonment not exceeding six months (344-345).”

\textsuperscript{94} Butterworth, 129.
\textsuperscript{95} Lidtke, 81-82.
And soon enough, Liebknecht’s words proved true. Even with the “campaign of repression”
against members of the SPD, the Anti-Socialist Law eventually “proved to be as
counterproductive as the *Kulturkampf*.”97 Specifically, the law failed to prohibit the SPD from
seeking public office and although many members were pushed underground the party continued
to thrive. During the elections of 1884 and 1887, David Blackbourn cites that the SPD won
“around ten per cent of the national vote” and by 1890, the numbers had doubled.98 While the
Anti-Socialist legislation solidified the organization, internal fractions again threatened the
stability of the organization. According to Waldman, there “was an outgrowth of basic
disagreements on major political and tactical issues, resulting partly from different
interpretations of Marxian doctrines and partly from the conflicting objectives of an organization
which regarded itself as a proletarian party in a bourgeois state.”99 Nevertheless, even though
the central organization of the SPD changed tactics over the next few decades, party membership
continued to grow.

Throughout the 1880s, Blackbourn reveals, “the party gave structure to the lives of
millions, through its press, meetings, and recreational organizations. . . There was no equivalent
anywhere in the world of the SPD: an independent, class-based, explicitly socialist party of
labour with a mass membership.”100 Although the law was supposed to expire on 31 March
1881, it was renewed until 1884, and then again in 1886 and 1888. During this time, socialism

---
97 Blackbourn, 198.
98 Ibid., 313-314.
99 Waldman, 3 – Waldman goes on to write that “those who held romantic nationalism and democratic
concepts of the Lassallean group had complete confidence in the possibility of improving the
workers’ lot by reforms within the framework of the existing state. The other groups accepted the
Marxian concepts regarding eh historic mission of the proletariat and the ultimate socialist
revolution as the final stage of the inevitable class struggle within the capitalist society. It was
the second group which gained dominance in the SPD and caused at least a temporary
subordination of Lassalleanism (4-5).”
100 Blackbourn, 313-314.
was not the only ideology to come under attack by government authorities. Without a clear understanding of what socialism was, the Anti-Socialist Law also targeted communists, anarchists, and those who were members of local labor unions. Instead of breaking the bonds of socialism, the law actually served as a moment that united members of the SPD and the organization experienced support and growth during their time of trial. When the Anti-Socialist Law was finally allowed to expire 25 January 1890 with a Reichstag vote of 169 to 98 – shortly before Bismarck’s forced resignation on 20 March\(^{101}\) – there were 100,000 SPD members, by 1906, that number grew to 384,327 and in 1910, numbers grew to 720,038.\(^{102}\) Not only did the SPD amass a large following, but they were also establishing a presence within the national government. Waldman estimates that votes for the SPD “grew from roughly 1,000,000 to 4,250,329 and the number of representatives in the Reichstag increased to 110” and “in the elections for the Reichstag on January 12, 1912, every third man over 25 years of age voted for the SPD.”\(^{103}\) Even with this growth, there were other political parties that also started to attract followers throughout Germany at the turn of the century. Throughout the 1890s, specialist organizations like the German Peace Society, the Federation of German Woman’s Association,

\(^{101}\) Wilhelm Liebknecht and German Social Democracy: A Documentary History, 295 – According to Kaiser Wilhelm II, an area of contention that further strained his relationship with Bismarck occurred over the question of renewing the Anti-Socialist Law. According to the Kaiser, “a certain paragraph therein was to be toned down, in order to save the law. There were sharp differences of opinion. I summoned a Crown Council. Bismarck spoke in the antechamber with my adjutant; he declared that His Majesty completely forgot that he was an officer and wore a sword-belt; that he must fall back upon the army and lead it against the Socialist in the event of the Socialists resorting to revolutionary measures; that the Emperor should leave him a free hand, and he would restore quiet once for all. At the Council meeting Bismarck stuck to his opinion. The individual ministers, when asked to express their views, were lukewarm. A vote was taken – the entire ministry voted against me.

“This vote showed me once again the absolute domination exerted by the chancellor over his ministers (Ex-Kaiser William II. My Memoirs: 1878-1918. London, England: Cassell and Company, Ltd.; 1922, 34-35).”

\(^{102}\) Waldman, 6.

\(^{103}\) Ibid.
the National Social Association, the Young Liberal Movement, the Evangelical league, the Zionists and “radical-nationalist organizations like the Pan-German and Navy League” also generated popular support throughout Germany. In order to maintain their national status and compete with the growing political parties, the SPD began to generate new platforms during the 1891 Party Congress held in Erfurt.

During this time, supporters of the SPD “developed a program which incorporated many more basic Marxist dogmas. . . . [and] asserted that the class-character of the state determined the political actions of the proletariat. The workers, it was emphasized, must seize political control of the state in order to transform the capitalist economy into a socialist one.” This move away from Lassallean ideals also embraced a more economic and revolutionary attitude, which some believed the SPD was lacking. According to the Erfurt Program, “the battle of the working class against capitalistic exploitation is necessarily a political battle. The working class cannot carry on its economic battles or develop its economic organization without political rights. It cannot effect the passing of the means of production into the ownership of the community without acquiring political power. To shape this battle of the working class into a conscious and united effort, and to show it its naturally necessary end, is the object of the Social Democratic party.”

Despite this declaration, the party’s new agenda did not fully commit to a revolutionary reaction that the younger members of the party had hoped to promote. With the death of Marx in 1883, Engels in 1895, and Wilhelm Liebknecht in 1900, however, Germany’s largest political party

---

104 Blackbourn, 314.
105 Waldman, 7-8.
106 Liddtke, 336-337 – The Erfurt Program also declared that “the Social Democratic party of Germany fights thus not for new class privileges and exceptional rights, but for the abolition of class domination and of the classes themselves, and for the equal rights and equal obligations of all, without distinction of sex and parentage. Setting out from these views, it combats in contemporary society not merely the exploitation and oppression of the wage-workers, but every kind of exploitation and oppression, whether directed against a class, a party, a sex, or a race.”
started to pull away from traditionalist philosophies and instead began the process of
deradicalization. According to Robert C. Tucker, the success of the SPD reflected the notion that
at “the turn of the century the German and other European social democratic movements were
settling down and coming to terms with the existing order.”¹⁰⁷ Between the party’s birth in 1875
and 1900, there were several statements put forth by party members that supported the goals of
defending the state. Surprisingly, some of these sentiments were expressed by party leaders, like
Bebel, who on 12 March 1880 “declared in the Reichstag that ‘if any power were to try to
conquer German territory, the SPD would oppose that enemy just as any other party’ and
reiterated these feelings during a party congress in 1907, stating that “if indeed we should have
to defend our Fatherland some day, we would defend it because it is our Fatherland, whose soil
we live upon, whose language we speak, whose customs we possess, because we wish to make
this, our Fatherland, a land unexcelled in this world for perfection and beauty.”¹⁰⁸ Consequently,
as the SPD moved closer to the state, they alienated younger members of the party who “had the
absolute conviction that only a proletarian revolution would end the existing order and bring
about socialism.”¹⁰⁹ By the turn of the twentieth century, individuals like Rosa Luxemburg, Karl
Liebknecht (Wilhelm’s son), Anton Pannekoek, Clara Zetkin and Franz Mehring, who
considered themselves to be on the radical left, started to move through the ranks of the party,
advocating a more radical program to the party’s platform. While Germany’s SPD was the
largest socialist organization in the world during the latter half of the nineteenth century, other
European nations were influenced and soon parties were started in Denmark and Norway during

Company, Inc.; 1969, 189.
¹⁰⁹ Waldman, 11-12.
the 1870s, Belgium in 1885, Austria in 1888 and in Sweden in 1889.110 As socialism moved throughout Europe, party ideology was eventually accepted in the United States especially during the global economic downturns of the 1870s and 1880s.

Similar to Europe, the Industrial Revolution in the United States brought about labor unions that encouraged workers to campaign for better wages and working conditions. As capital wealth grew, both domestically and globally, the core philosophies of socialism, communism, and anarchism served as a means of uniting the masses to overthrow the current economic system. In 1877, the Socialist Labor Party (SLP), which had been “organized in 1874 as the Social Democratic Workingmen’s party,” was formed in the United States.111 Heavily influenced by Marxist ideology, the party “claimed a membership of 10,000 in 100 locals in twenty-five states,” by the end of 1879.112 Despite this early success, the SLP was in direct competition with other labor organizations including the Knights of Labor, who became a public party in 1881 along with anarchist groups like Bakunin’s “International Working People’s Association [I. W. P. A.], the so-called “Black International.”113 While the SLP argued for the rights and protection of the worker – both blue and white collar – the party was mainly “composed of political refugees and foreign workmen,” meaning that “less than an eighth of its members were born Americans.”114 Not only was the party made up of mainly foreigners, but

110 Ishay, 126.
114 Macy, 61.
the ideals of socialism, communism, and anarchism were all eyed suspiciously as European exports by many native-born Americans. During the 1880s, at the same time these organizations were coming up, America was entering into a period of anti-immigration both in laws and public attitude. Exiled labor leaders were not the only ones seeking shelter within the borders of the United States. And as civil wars, famines, political persecution and rising ethnic strife ravished both Europe and Asia thousands were fleeing to the shores of New York and California. Although Emma Lazarus penned the poem “The New Colossus” as a means of raising funds for the Statue of Liberty’s pedestal in 1883, her words “Give me your tired, your poor, Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free, The wretched refuse of your teeming shore. Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me, I lift my lamp beside the golden door!” fell on deaf ears despite their poignant meaning.¹¹⁵

The tired and poor arriving on the shores of the United States between the 1840s and 1880s though represented a new kind of immigrant, who possessed distinctive features, cultures, customs, languages, and religions that set them apart from other American citizens. Even though the United States was looked upon as a melting pot of ethnicities, the arrival of individuals from Southern and Eastern Europe as well as China caused considerable backlash from individuals whose ancestors had arrived in the country from Northern and Western Europe during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Given the physical distinction of these new arrivals – an estimated 2.8 million between 1870 and 1880 – nativism increased and soon the United States government began to clamp down on these foreign intruders.¹¹⁶ David H. Bennett reveals that


by the mid-1880s, New Yorker Henry Baldwin “set up a clearinghouse for the proliferating
nativist associations” by forming the National League for the Protection of American
Institutions, which “organized conferences for “executive officers of the patriotic societies of the
United States,” including “the Patriotic Order of the Sons of America, the Junior Order of United
American Mechanics, the American Patriotic League, the American Protestant Association, the
Templars of Liberty of America, United Sons of America, United Order of Native Americans,
the Sons of Revolution, Loyal Women of America, the United Order of Pilgrim Fathers, the
National Association of Loyal Men of American Liberty.”117 Although these organizations, in
most instances, were stronger in opinions than numbers, they reflect the mentality of the United
States, which at the time called for the protection of the nation’s borders against the growing
influence of foreign corruption that was promoted by the daily arrival of New Immigrants. Well
before the establishment of these patriotic associations, the government of the United States had
already implemented laws geared at excluding various “undesirables” from immigrating, using
ethnicity as a means of barring these individuals. On 6 May 1882, Congress approved the
Chinese Exclusion Act, in which “for the first time, federal law proscribed entry of an ethnic
group on the premise that it endangered the peace and order in certain localities” and thereby
drastically reduced the number of Chinese immigrants.118 According to Savel Zimand, “between

---

117 Ibid., 170 – The Order of United Americans, the United American Mechanics, the Order of the
American Union, the Daughters of Liberty, the Loyal Orange Institute of the United States, the
Red, White and Blue Organization (“Red to protect Protestantism, White to Protect the Purity of
the Ballot Box, Blue Against the Domination of Dictation by Foreign Citizens”), the Patriotic
Daughters of America were among some of the other organizations that also took part in the
conferences organized by the National League for the Protection of American Institutions.

118 Our Documents:100 Milestone Documents from the National Archives. New York, New York:
Oxford University Press; 2003, 115 – In Section 15 of the Act, maintained “that the words
“Chinese laborers”, wherever used in this act shall be construed to mean both skilled and
unskilled laborers and Chinese employed in mining (117).” As a result, “very few Chinese could
enter the country (115).” Also, when the Act expired in 1892, “Congress extended it for ten years
1848-1890 the socialist movement was largely composed of the immigrant element,” reigniting political accusations that foreign influences were threatening the overall stability of the nation. As a result, principles based on nativism permitted the state to bar the advancement of immigrants who were already living in the United States, which granted the government the ability to continue to draft legislation that would inhibit the mass migration of foreigners from “less desirable areas of the world.” In 1887 the American Protective Association (APA), developed by Henry Bowers, was created in an effort to protect Protestant workingmen from losing their jobs to Catholics, while the 1894 Immigration Restriction League (IRL) required that immigrants pass literacy tests prior to gaining entry into the country. New migration, however, was not the only concern for the people and state in the latter half of the nineteenth century, but a renewed interest in socialist principles further divided the nation.

The economic downturn of 1883-1885 resulted in high unemployment rates, which in turn contributed to the growth of socialist organizations throughout the country. While both the SLP and the Knights of Labor made gains in 1885-1886, numbers for the latter “jumped from little more than 100,000 to 700,000,” and it was “the anarchist movement” that “gained in even greater proportion” with “about eighty organized groups and a total of 7,000 members” in 1885. Similar to European organizations, socialist parties in the United States were also divided between policies on reform or revolution. And as the economic conditions worsened, crowds of strikers were viewed by authorities as becoming increasing volatile. Although the

in the form of the Geary Act, which added restrictions by requiring all Chinese residents to register and obtain a certificate of residence. Without a certificate, they faced deportation. The Geary Act regulated Chinese immigration until the 1920s. With increased postwar immigration, Congress adopted new means for regulation: quotas and requirements pertaining to national origin. By this time, anti-Chinese agitation had quieted (115).”

120 Bell, 26.
SLP commanded a following, workers began to gravitate toward other groups, contributing to the growth of various labor unions, communist parties, and anarchist organizations. As the economic struggle continued and the debate regarding an eight-hour workday continued, the anarchists became increasingly vocal in regards to revolutionary actions. During the London Congress (14-20 July 1881), it was declared that “every possible effort must be made “to spread the idea of revolution and the spirit of revolt by deeds” among the great mass of the people not yet participating in the movement and still misled by illusions concerning the “morality and effectiveness of legal methods.” Constitutional (i.e., legal) action must be abandoned, and illegality must be made “the sole path leading to the revolution.”

In agreement with the idea of open revolution was Most, who had arrived in the United States in mid-December 1882 and toured the country advocating revolution. According to Daniel Bell, “in March, 1883, a portion of the Revolutionary Catechism was printed in the Freiheit under the heading “Revolutionary Principles,” which argued “for him [the revolutionist] . . . there is only one pleasure, one comfort, one recompense: the success of the revolution. Day and night he may cherish only one thought, only one purpose, viz., inexorable destruction. While he pursues this purpose without rest and in cold blood, he must be ready to die, and equally ready to kill everyone with his own hands, who hinders him in the attainment of this purpose.”

Encouraged by this revolutionary process, by the fall of 1885, I. W. P. A. leaders were considering the prospect of armed revolution as part of their campaign for an eight-hour work day and better wages.

During an 11 October 1885 meeting of the Central Labor Union of Chicago, “August Spies introduced several resolutions to the effect that it was too much to expect the employers to


122 Ibid., 88.
grant voluntarily the shorter day. They would do everything to prevent its inauguration, calling upon the police, militia and Pinkertons for assistance. The workers were, therefore, urged to procure arms before May 1, in order to meet force with force.” 123 Soon, calls for an eight-hour work day swept the country, igniting major strikes in various cities throughout the United States, especially during the early months of 1886. On 1 May, nearly 300,000 workers went on strike throughout the United States in demand of a shorter working day. 124 As anarchist organizations operated in cities from east to west, Chicago soon became the epicenter for the eight-hour work day argument with about 30,000 laborers protesting in the streets on May Day. 125 Even though violence was not a part of the day’s celebrations, Chicago did not survive 1886 completely unscathed. Still reacting against the 16 February 1886 lockout at the McCormick Harvester factory in Chicago, protesters and strikebreakers openly clashed on 3 May and four were killed when the police fired into the crowd in an attempt to restore order. 126 On 4 May, the I. W. P. A. issued a broadside, written in both English and German, calling for a public meeting at the Haymarket Square, during which time about 3,000 people gathered to hear leading anarchists, including Spies, denounce the earlier actions of the police. With the local police in attendance, the rally remained peaceful and as the weather turned the crowd had actually thinned down to only a few hundred. Even so, as the rally was ending a bomb was thrown at the police, killing one officer, M. J. Degan, and wounding seventy others. Morris Hillquit notes that right after the

123 Ibid., 169.
124 Butterworth, 207.
125 David, 188.
126 Prompted by this event, Spies composed a circular that afternoon for the German language radical newspaper Arbeiter-Zeitung and encouraged his fellow laborers to take up arms against their employers. Originally entitled “Revenge! Workingmen! To Arms!” he later claimed that the word “Revenge” was put in by “a compositor of the Arbeiter-Zeitung.” According to Spies, about 2,500 copies were printed and half distributed to laborers who attended various meetings on the night of 3 May. For a complete copy of this article, please refer to Appendix A.
bomb exploded, “indiscriminate firing was opened on both sides, which lasted about two minutes without interruption” culminating in the death of seven policemen and four workers and injuring 60 policemen and 50 workers.127 Immediately, the attack resulted in a massive witch-hunt against suspected anarchists.

Not knowing whether or not the United States was being confronted with an anarchist attack, and with massive hysteria sweeping the nation, the Chicago police wasted little time before they began rounding up local labor leaders. Henry David asserts that “within two days” of the attacks, “no less than fifty supposed “hang-outs” of socialists and anarchists had been raided” by the Chicago police.128 Although the identity of the bomb thrower was never revealed, the police settled on putting eight anarchist leaders on trial, including August Spies, Michael Schwab, Samuel Fielden, Albert R. Parsons, Adolph Fischer, George Engel, Louis Lingg, and Oscar E. Neebe, who were indicted on 17 May along with Rudolph Schnaubelt and William Seliger.129 Even though “the defendants were not charged with any personal participation in the act of killing Degan,” on 21 June 1886, the trial of the anarchist eight opened, with the prosecution arguing that the defendants had “by speech and print advised large classes of the people to commit murder, and that in consequence of that advice somebody not known had thrown the bomb that caused Degan’s death.”130 From the beginning, the trial was unlike any other. Presided over by Judge Joseph E. Gary, the jury was composed of men who had openly admitted “that they had a prejudice against anarchists and a preconceived opinion of the guilt of

128 David, 221.
129 Hillquit, 247 – Schnaubelt escaped before the trial could commence (248), while Seliger “betrayed his comrades for a promise of immunity (250).”
130 Ibid., 250.
the defendants.”

During the closing arguments, the prosecuting state attorney openly admitted that the defendants were not guilty of Degan’s death, but instead reminded the jury that the “law is on trial. Anarchy is on trial. These men have been selected, picked out by the grand jury, and indicted because they were leaders. They are no more guilty than the thousands who follow them. Gentlemen of the jury: convict these men, make examples of them, hang them and save our institutions, our society.”

On 20 August, forty-nine days after the trial began all eight men were found guilty of inciting the Haymarket bombing and condemned to death, except for Neebe, who was given a fifteen year sentence. While Lingg escaped the hangman’s noose by committing suicide on 10 November 1887, Spies, Parson, Fischer, and Engel were all hanged the following day, while Schwab and Fielden’s sentences were commuted to life in prison. Even though Illinois Governor John Peter Altgeld pardoned Schwab, Fielden, and Neebe in 1893, the fallout of the Haymarket bombing severely damaged the reputation of anarchism in the United States. Two years after the assassination of President William McKinley by accused anarchist Leon Czolgosz on 6 September 1901, the United States “marked a new era for the control of immigration” with the passage of the Immigration Law on 3 March 1903. Whereas racism still dictated who could and could not enter the country, this new law went a step further in granting the state the ability to deny entry based on mental capabilities, life-styles, economics and political beliefs. Not only were “all idiots, insane persons, epileptics . . . paupers, persons likely to become public charges . . . [and] polygamists,” listed, but “anarchists, or persons who believed in or advocated the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United

131 Ibid.
132 Butterworth, 209.
States or of all government or of all forms of law,” were also earmarked for exclusion.\(^{134}\)

Consequently, by the turn of the century, “the strongest support” for anarchism was “found in the Latin American countries; Spain, Italy, France and to some extent in Russia.”\(^{135}\) Although Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman continued to advocate on behalf of anarchism within the United States, the philosophy of the organization no longer maintained its initial allure.

Despite the Haymarket Bombing, the 1886 May Day strikes highlighted the discontent between industries and labor and also served as a means of inspiration to socialist leaders in Europe. Reacting to the growing labor movement in the United States, Engels wrote to Florence Kelley Wischnewetsky, an American social reformist, on 3 June 1886 that the “appearance of the Americans upon the scene I consider one of the greatest events of the year. . . . The way in which they have made their appearance on the scene is quite extraordinary: Six months ago nobody suspected anything, and now they appear all of a sudden in such organised masses as to strike terror into the whole capitalist class. I only wish Marx could have lived to see it!”\(^{136}\) As interest in anarchism dwindled toward the latter half of the nineteenth century, socialist organizations in the United States continued to thrive. According to Bell, “in 1886, with socialist support, the Central Labor Union of New York organized an independent labor party and nominated Henry George for mayor,” while that same year, “the United Labor Party of Chicago, organized by the

---

\(^{134}\) Ibid – While the 1903 law would be upheld under revisions on 20 February 1907 and on 5 February 1917 new legislation “extended the scope of the previous laws by making provision for the \textit{expulsion} of anarchists as well as for their exclusion (Constantine M. Panunzio. The Deportation Cases of 1919 – 1920. New York, New York: Da Capo Press; 1921, 13.” One year later, the law was further amended on 16 October 1918 “which provides for expulsion and exclusion not only of anarchists but of aliens teaching or advocating the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States (Panunzio, 13).”

\(^{135}\) Zimand, 255.

Central Labor Union, ran up 20,000 votes in the spring elections,” and “in eleven other states labor parties of one hue or another, with close cooperation between the labor movement and socialists, Knights, Greenbackers, and other reformers, were organized.”¹³⁷ Even so, the break of socialism into the political realm did not ensure the success of the party. The economic conditions of the early 1890s were met with increased violence as industry and labor once again clashed. Between the 1892 Homestead Strike and the Pullman Strike of 1894, Oliver Wendell Holmes is quoted as saying that “a vague terror went over the earth and the word socialism began to be heard.”¹³⁸ By 1898, however, the SLP was under the new leadership of Daniel De Leon and socialist “candidates received more than 80,000 votes.”¹³⁹ Nevertheless, tensions among the leading members of the party ultimately led to another split. In 1901 the Socialist Party of America was formed out of “a coalition of sections of the Socialist Labor Party and the Social Democratic Party” and was led by individuals like Hillquit, Job Harriman, Eugene Debs, Victor Berger, and Seymour Stedman.¹⁴⁰ Although the United States was making its own strides within the capital/labor struggle, socialist organizations around the world were also taking shape with parties extending from Canada to Australia and New Zealand as well as throughout Europe.

The growth of socialist organizations in the latter 1870s and 1880s created a new “demand” for the “revival of a socialist international,” especially from movements operating in Germany, France, and Great Britain.¹⁴¹ According to Harry Wellington Laidler, on 14 July 1889, “in response to this demand . . . . Some 391 representatives of working class groups from

---
¹³⁷ Bell, 27.
¹³⁸ Ibid., 30.
¹³⁹ Macy, 61.
¹⁴⁰ Zimand, 141-142 & Bell, 33-34.
twenty countries, including the United States, answered the call” and congregated in Paris on 14 July 1889. Commonly referred to as the Second International, the Paris Congress was intent on “securing the support of strong working class organizations in various parts of Europe.”

For the next fifteen years, the Second International “did much to advance labor and social legislation” and even lent support to the American Federation of Labor in the United States who “decided to hold, on May 1, 1890, an “international manifestation” in favor of the eight-hour day, thus laying the foundation for subsequent international socialist (and later communist) May Day celebrations.”

Despite the cohesion of the Second International, tensions between Marxism and Anarchism continued to threaten the overall stability of the organization. Differing opinions and a loss of public support throughout the 1880s further contributed to this divide, resulting in the exclusion of anarchists from the congress with a resolution passed in 1896. By the Paris Conference of 1900, the Socialists had created the International Socialist Bureau, declaring that

1. All associations which adhered to the essential principles of Socialism; socialization of means of production and distribution; international association of and action by the workers; conquest of public powers by the proletariat organized as a class party.

---

142 Ibid., 747-748 – In attendance at the Paris Congress were individuals like: Keir Hardie from Great Britain; Wilhelm Liebknecht and Eduard Bernstein from Germany; Émile Vandervelde and Edouard Anseele from Belgium; Jules Guesde, Paul Lafargue, and Jean Longuet, the grandson of Marx, from France; Victor Alder from Austria; George Plekhanov from Russia; Romela Nieuwenhuis from Holland; Pablo Iglesias from Spain, and Andrea Costa from Italy.

143 Harry Wellington Laidler. *Socialism in Thought and Action*. New York, New York: The MacMillian Company; 1925, 483 – There was a total of nine congresses, the first “International Socialist Congresses were held in Paris in 1889, in Brussels in 1891, in Zurich in 1893, in London in 1896, in Paris in 1900, in Amsterdam in 1904, in Stuttgart in 1907, in Copenhagen in 1910 and in Basel in 1912. Vienna was selected for 1914, but the war prevented the convocation of this gathering (483-484).”

144 Laidler, *History of Socialism: A Comparative Survey of Socialism, Communism, Trade Unionism, Cooperation, Utopianism, and Other Systems of Reform and Reconstruction*, 748.

145 Ibid.
2. All constituted organizations which accept the principle of a class struggle and recognize the necessity for political action (legislative and parliamentary), but do not participate directly in the political movement.

The last condition was adopted for the purpose of excluding anarchist and of admitting trade unionist and other labor organizations which, though not political in character, favored political action.146

Even so, with the exclusion of the anarchists, the Second International was still incapable of operating as a fully united organization. Although the International succeeded in passing a variety of resolutions, the overall structure of the congresses remained ineffective due to the International’s inability to implement permanent changes and the choice “was left to the discretion of each national organization.”147 This lack of cohesion eventually propelled the various international socialist organizations into various directions. At the heart of the International’s division was the debate regarding socialist takeover through reforms or revolution. James Joll argues that “by the end of the nineteenth century no Socialist party could escape the difficulties presented by its own existence as a mass party, forced, for the moment at least, to function within a political system which at the same time it was seeking to destroy.”148

This internal struggle was especially evident within Germany’s SPD, which caused the party to fracture several times before the end of the Great War in November 1918.

By the turn of the twentieth century, Germany’s SPD was by far the largest and most successful party in Europe, gaining an impressive eighty-one Reichstag seats and three million

---

146 Zimand, 125-126 – Also, Joll notes that “‘Anarchist’ came to be a name to be applied to anybody who rejected the Marxist ideas of a disciplined political party with a rationalist ‘scientific’ philosophy. It was a term that later was to become simply one of abuse. In a phrase foreshadowing subsequent Marxist invective, for example, Victor Adler, the Austrian Socialist leader, claimed proudly that the Austrian delegation at the International Congress of 1893 had excluded from its ranks a ‘Czech-Nationalist-Chauvinist-Anarchist’ (24).”

147 Ibid., 126.

148 Joll, 77.
votes in 1903. With a political presence that ranked second only behind the Catholic organization, the German Centre Party (*Deutsche Zentrumspartei* or *Zentrum*), the SPD was now under new leadership that drastically differed from the ideals of Marx and Engels. Robert C. Tucker reveals that not only were individuals like Eduard Bernstein and Karl Kautsky making names for themselves, but the “party’s radical orientation was tempered by its association with a decidedly unradical trade-union movement whose tendency was to work toward piecemeal economic reform. . . . deradicalization was fostered by the great growth of the movement – its wealth, organizational strength, widespread influence, and seeming prospects for further gradual increase of power under the prevailing social system.” The struggle between reformism and revolution not only set Bernstein and Kautsky on opposite ends, but it also highlighted a major schism within the ranks of the party. According to Bernstein, “in 1872 Marx and Engels announced in the preface to the new edition of the *Communist Manifesto* that the Paris Commune had exhibited a proof that “the working classes cannot simply take possession of the ready-made State machine and set it in motion for their own aims”. He goes on to argue that “no socialist capable of thinking, dreams to-day in England of an imminent victory for socialism by means of a violent revolution – none dreams of a quick conquest of Parliament by a revolutionary proletariat. But they rely more and more on work in the municipalities and other self-governing bodies.” As a result, socialist changes to the state itself could only be obtained by maintaining a steady presence within the political framework of society and thereby eliminating the

---

149 Ibid., 101.
150 Tucker, 189.
152 Ibid., 203.
possibility or even necessity of a revolutionary overthrow. In fact, Joll writes that Bernstein’s base of scientific socialism was centered around the understanding that “there was no absolute and rigid division between classes, and therefore it was false to interpret the political situation solely in terms of a class struggle; the standard of living of the working class was in fact rising and they were not being forced into the ever increasing misery which Marx had prophesied.”

Initially, however, Bernstein’s comments did not appear to have significantly altered his relationship with the SPD and even after his articles appeared in the *Neue Zeit*, in 1897-1898 Bernstein maintained a close professional relationship with other leaders of the SPD, including Bebel, Kautsky, W. Liebknecht and Ignaz Auer. Nevertheless, while Bernstein did not mark himself or his views as being or even advocating anti-Marxism, his opinions were heavily supported by others and eventually his ideals clashed with other members of the SPD, particularly those of Rosa Luxemburg.

153 According to Edwyn Bevan, “The Moderate Revisionists, led by Eduard Bernstein . . . was in favour of abandoning the class-war and co-operating with the non-Socialist Radicals in constitutional activity. “Revisionism” had abandoned the idea of overthrowing capitalist society by a violent revolution, and hoped rather to secure the ends of Social Democracy by a series of successive partial reforms (*German Social Democracy During the War*. London, England: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd.; 1918, 3).”

154 Joll, 93.

155 Rosa Luxemburg. *Reform or Revolution*. Mary-Alice Waters, Introduction. New York, New York: Pathfinder Press, Inc.; 1970, 5-6 – This information is specifically noted by Waters in her introduction to Luxemburg’s work. Waters also points out that “the attitude expressed by one of the SPD papers, *Leipziger Volkszeitung*, was quite indicative” of the party’s lenient attitude, stating that Bernstein had some “interesting observations which nonetheless terminate in a mistaken conclusion; something that is always liable to happen especially to lively and critical people, but there is no more to it than that (5-6).”

156 According to Peter Gay, Bernstein soon “found himself surrounded with supporters who called themselves, defiantly, “Bernsteinians” or “Revisionists.” . . . once we try to define a “Revisionist,” we run into considerable difficulty. If we wish to describe the group that rejoiced over the *Voraussetzungen*, it will be well to distinguish between all those German Social Democrats who inclined toward reformism and those who consciously identified themselves with Bernstein’s views and made an effort to propagate or refine them. In this fashion we establish a useful distinction between reformists and Revisionists (*The Dilemma of Democratic Socialism: Eduard Bernstein’s Challenge to Marx*. New York, New York: Collier Books; 1970, 257).”
While Kautsky responded to Bernstein’s writings, in a manner that Joll described as “a doctrinal duel worthy of the early Church,” it was Luxemburg who soon emerged as the biggest critic.157 A Jewish-Polish immigrant, Luxemburg emerged as a leading member of the SPD’s left wing following her publication of Reform or Revolution (Sozialreform oder Revolution), which challenged Bernstein’s philosophies. One point of contention between the two was Bernstein’s claims that “changes would come by evolution not by revolution,” which Luxemburg disputed, arguing that “between social reforms and revolution there exists for the social democracy an indissoluble tie. The struggle for reforms is its means; the social revolution, its aim.”158 Although Bernstein’s model initially seemed like nothing more than just the evolution of socialist ideals, Luxemburg’s writings highlighted a deeper division that was growing within the SPD. As Joll notes, one of Kautsky’s concerns was that “if, as Bernstein argued, capitalism was not about to collapse and the revolution therefore had to be postponed indefinitely, one of the great attractions of the Social Democratic Party programme would disappear, and it would be in danger of becoming a reformist party indistinguishable, it might seem, from some of its

157 Joll, 93 – According to Joll, “for Kautsky and the orthodox Marxists, the acceptance of Bernstein’s ideas would mean the abandonment of the essential elements in Marx’s teachings – the class struggle and the materialist conception of history, as well as much of Marx’s economic analysis of the capitalist system (93-94).”

158 Luxemburg, Reform or Revolution, 8 – Written in Berlin, Germany on 18 April 1899. Luxemburg goes on to point out that under Bernstein’s theory, “his theory tends to counsel us to renounce the social transformation, the final goal of the social democracy and, inversely, to make of social reforms, the means of the class struggle, its aim. Bernstein himself has very clearly and characteristically formulated this viewpoint when he wrote: ‘The final goal, no matter what it is, is nothing; the movement is everything.’ But since the final goal of socialism constitutes the only decisive factor distinguishing the social democratic movement from bourgeois democracy and from bourgeois radicalism, the only factor transforming the entire labor movement from a vain effort to repair the capitalist order into a class struggle against this order, for the suppression of this order – the question: “Reform or revolution?” as it is posed by Bernstein, equals for the social democracy the question: “To be or not to be?” In the controversy with Bernstein and his followers, everybody in the party ought to understand clearly it is not a question of this or that method of struggle, or the use of this or that set of tactics, but of the existence of the social democratic movement.”
bourgeois counterparts.”\textsuperscript{159} For an organization that was at its height by the turn of the century and viewed as the most powerful and influential party within the Second International, the threat of an internal dispute and challenge to the fundamentals of the party principle had to be put down and quickly. Consequently, Bernstein was publically reprimanded during the annual congresses of the Social Democratic Party in Hanover (1889) and again in Dresden (1903) in an effort to halt the growing support for reformist ideals.\textsuperscript{160} Even so, Bernstein still occupied a predominant position within the SPD, an organization that “condemn[ed] Revisionism; [while] it continued to preach revolution and practice reform.”\textsuperscript{161} Disagreements between the right and left, although never Bernstein’s intent, continued to divide the party even further especially as Europe steadily progressed closer to an all-out war in the summer of 1914. Contention within the ranks of the SPD was not uncharacteristic of the European socialist parties at the turn of the twentieth century. Germany’s ability to unite, however, was the party’s saving grace in regards to the SPD holding on to the most powerful position within the International. G. D. H. Cole writes that while the French were second in rank to Germany’s SPD, by “1889 the French Socialist and Labour movement was split up among a number of contending factions,” which meant that “in the Congresses of the Second International the French delegations were always sharply divided, whereas the Germans almost always presented a solid front.”\textsuperscript{162} Though other parties were involved in the International, they too presented their own internal struggles and in Cole’s assessment, the Russians, British, Austrians, Belgians, Italians, the Bulgarians, and even the Americans were all deeply fractured by ideals that also centered on the concept of reform or

\textsuperscript{159} Joll, 94.
\textsuperscript{160} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{161} Gay, \textit{The Dilemma of Democratic Socialism: Eduard Bernstein’s Challenge to Marx}, 270.
revolution. As competing ideologies and rising opposition within the varying socialist organizations meant that “between 1889 and 1914 Socialist thought and action developed chiefly along national lines,” which eventually caused the International to operate as “a loose federation of national groups, with only a very limited power to bind its constituent elements.”

Nevertheless, despite the growing splinters within the SPD, the organization continually maintained a united front on the international level, to the point of having “an almost unlimited veto, though not the power always to get their own view endorsed.” Germany’s success as a political party and the state’s growing interest in international matters demonstrated that the Germans were capable of competing with western empires like Britain and France. This new position caused additional strains to the delicate balance of power that the select European powers had maintained since the end of the Napoleonic Wars and the Congress of Vienna.

With the growing interest and struggles of socialism, communism, and anarchism, not to mention rising support for labor unions, the European states were also faced further competition as more nations came together under one centralized concept of authority. Shortly after both Italy and Germany achieved unification in 1871, the United States and Japan also started to assert international influence, as ideals linking imperialism and nationalism became popular models of foreign and domestic policy making. The early colonial achievements, which had long been dominated by Western European nations, were soon threatened as nations from Central and Eastern Europe, Asia, and North America looked to also advance in the era of empire building. According to Thomas Bender, “in 1883, the English historian John Seeley warned, if the United States and Russia hold together for another half century, they will at the end of that time completely dwarf such old European states as France and Germany and depress

163 Ibid., xiv-xv.
164 Ibid., xv.
them into a second class. They will do the same to England, if at the end of that time England still sees herself as simply a European state.\footnote{Bender, 184.} Not only was Britain fearful of this competition for political and economic supremacy, but France also weighed in, stating that should they “abstain from empire, it [the nation] would ‘descend from the first rank to the third or fourth.’”\footnote{Ibid.} By this point in time, colonial expansion was beginning to adopt a more racial component.

Utilizing the theory of evolution put forth by Charles Darwin, in his 1859 publication of On the Origins of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life, Herbert Spencer employed the phrase “survival of the fittest,” taking Darwin’s theory of natural selection and applying those principles toward the various ethnicities as a means of creating a social hierarchy.\footnote{Ibid., 210.} Practitioners of this inverted model, Social Darwinists, “argu[ed] that there was a human struggle similar to the natural struggle in which the fittest, that is the strongest and most capable, not only \textit{would} win but \textit{should} win.”\footnote{Briggs and Clavin, 200.} This daring new outlook toward humanity not only contributed to the eugenics movement of the twentieth century that later resulted in a number genocides including the Holocaust, but also these ideas were used as a means of justifying the continued expansion of global empires.\footnote{Ironically, one of Britain’s pioneers in the eugenics movement was Sir Francis Galton, a professor and cousin of Charles Darwin. In 1883, Galton first published Inquires into Human Faculty and its Development in which he introduced the term “eugenic.” He explained the term further in footnote writing “that is, with questions bearing on what is termed in Greek, \textit{eugenes}, namely, good in stock, hereditarily endowed with noble qualities. This, and the allied words, \textit{eugeneia}, etc., are equally applicable to men, brutes, and plants. We greatly want a brief word to express the science of improving stock, which is by no means confined to questions of judicious mating, but which, especially in the case of man, takes cognizance of all influences that tend in however remote a degree to give to the more suitable races on strains of blood a better chance of prevailing speedily over the less suitable than they otherwise would have had. The word \textit{eugenics} would sufficiently express the idea; it is at least a neater word and a more generalised one than}
made a necessity if a nation and people were expected to survive and compete successfully with the expanding industrial market.

Even before Portugal sought an alternate route to tap into the spice trade in 1430, Europe had been in contact with Africa. Enticed by the prospect of gold and other marketable items, but unable to penetrate into Africa’s interior trade was instead carried out by intermediaries. By the mid-nineteenth century, however, Europeans were starting to push beyond the African coastline. Nineteenth century explorers as well as missionaries like Francis Owen “remarked on the violence they witnessed, low levels of population in large areas, and the apparent (or at least to them) lack of an active internal economy other than that built around slavery.”\footnote{William W. Worger, Nancy L. Clark, and Edward A. Alpers. \textit{Africa and the West: A Documentary History from the Slave Trade to Independence}. Phoenix, Arizona: The Oryx Press; 2001, 5 – Worger, Clark, and Alpers finish this sentence by writing that “they [the European writers] did not consider how much of what they witnessed was a product of 400 years of trade with Europe.”} On 6 February 1838, Owen described an attack against Dutch settlers who had settled in the Zulu kingdom where Dingane (Dingaan) was the leader. According to Owen, Dingane “feared that they [the settlers] would undermine his authority, take his people’s land, and perhaps even threaten his own life,” and he openly attacked the settlers where there were “about nine or ten Zulus to each Boer . . . drag[ed] their helpless, unarmed victims to the fatal spot . . . many of the Boers had children with them, some under the age of eleven years of age, as I am informed – and these were all butchered.”\footnote{Ibid., 129-130 – From the \textit{Journal of Francis Owen}, printed in John Bird, Ed. \textit{The Annals of Natal, 1495 to 1845} (Pietermaritzburg: P. Davis and Sons, 1888), pp. 346-48, 351-52 – Journal entries for 6 & 7 February 1838.} Despite the violence and disease that plagued the “Dark Continent,” Europeans continued to pursue active trading and colonizing interests. With the slave trade coming to an end in many European nations, new modes of material gain were also being
exploited. Besides gold, the discovery of diamonds and other natural resources kept European nations interested in Africa, as did the prospect of colonization. Competition for empire drastically increased by the 1870s, especially as new nations like Italy and Germany began to push for imperial conquests. In an effort to decrease hostilities brewing among the various European nations who were all attempting to establish a foothold on Africa, Bismarck suggested a meeting “to resolve all disputes arising from the contest for colonial possession in Africa.”

Opening on 15 November 1884, the Berlin Conference was attended by those with “direct interest” in Africa – Britain, France and Germany – along with the United States, Belgium, Spain, the Netherlands, and Russia. The goals of the conference given by Bismarck included

\[\text{172 Olayemi Akinwumi. } \text{The Colonial Contest for the Nigerian Region, 1884-1900: A History of the German Participation. } \text{Hamburg, Germany: LIT; 2002, 16.}\]

\[\text{173 Bender, 182-183 – Bender stresses that although “the United States was invited to Berlin (probably because of its interest in Liberia, founded by the American Colonization Society in 1821), and it sent a representative but refused to be a signatory to the final agreement. The reasons derived in part from the legacy of Washington’s warning about entangling alliances, and also from a widely held belief, sometimes loudly broadcast, that America’s republican institutions were a standing rebuke to Europe’s corrupt politics and imperial pretensions. . . .}\]

\[\text{174 Akinwumi, 16.}\]

“An essential part of American national identity is based on difference, on a tendency to define America as distinct from, even separate from, all that is foreign, whether Europe or those parts of the world Americans unself-consciously called “uncivilized” or “savage.” American republicanism and Protestant Christianity, they thought, were the keynotes of their distinctiveness, as was their rejection of imperial ambitions. One could argue – and I will – that here they were indulging in a semantic sleight of hand. They obscured their actual empire by describing it’s a “the westward movement” or the “westward expansion” of their country. True, the Constitution had a unique provision that seemed anti-imperialist on the face of it: it allowed territories to become states on equal terms with the original states, which is why westward expansion was considered a fair description of the Euro-American settlement of the continent. But it was fair only to the degree that its prior possession by Indians and Mexicans was erased or denied. Empire, as William Appleman Williams long ago argued, has been an American way of life. Dispossession and colonial rule have been central if unacknowledged themes in American history (182-183).”
To regulate the conditions most favourable to the development of trade and civilisation in certain regions of Africa; to assure all nations of the advantage of free navigation on the two chief rivers of Africa flowing into the Atlantic (the Congo and the Niger); to obviate the misunderstanding and disputes which might in future arise from new acts of occupation on the coast of Africa; [and] to further the moral and material well-being of the native population.\textsuperscript{175}

This imperial quest, designed as a loose civilizing mission, actually set out only to increase the land holdings of Europe’s great powers at the expense of the Africans, of whom none were invited to attend. As European interests in Africa increased, colonization, although lucrative to the colonizers, further strained the Africans themselves who witnessed firsthand the growing division of their lands. Using civilizing missions as a means of obtaining wealth soon became the standard for continued imperialism, so much so that “even John Stuart Mill, the great philosopher of human freedom, had written, in \textit{On Liberty}, “Despotism is a legitimate mode of government in dealing with barbarians, provided the end be their improvement.”\textsuperscript{176} While carving out their spheres of influence, Mason emphasizes that “within fifteen years, by 1900, the entire continent had been divided up by the European powers,” save for Ethiopia and Liberia.\textsuperscript{177}

For Germany, however, interest in settling Europe’s insatiable quest for colonial dominance was not only to advance the nation’s position as a contending power, but for Bismarck, it was a means of pacifying growing domestic instability especially in light of the rising SPD.

Concerned with the power and prestige the Social Democrats were gathering, Bismarck understood that the time was right to implement some social reforms including “a social

\textsuperscript{175} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{177} Mason, 109 – Bender also mentions that “between the Berlin meetings and the world war, nearly a quarter million miles were added each year to empires worldwide. By the turn of the century it had become clear to many, including V. I. Lenin, that “the world is completely divided up” (182).”
insurance package in 1881” along with “sickness insurance in 1883” and “accident insurance a year later and disability insurance in 1889.”178 Shortly after social insurance was granted in 1881, German economist and social reformer Lujo Brentano commented that Bismarck’s intent was that “every individual will be inexorably caught up in the life and development of the state.”179 Even Bismarck made a similar statement in 1881, when he reasoned “whoever has a pension for his old age is far more content and far easier to handle than one who has no such prospect. Look at the difference between a private servant and a servant in the chancellery or at court; the latter will put up with much more, because he has a pension to look forward to’.”180 Germany, however, was not the only nation to respond with social programs in an attempt to placate the concerns of the masses. All across the world, industrial nations were also faced with the sudden rise of socialist parties and progressive reforms were viewed as a way of not only curbing the influence of socialism, but also as a way of bringing stability to the nation.

According to Bender,

The emergent industrial economies of first England and then the North Atlantic region, South America, and Asia transformed the international environment, affecting all nations and empires. Advanced and less advanced societies were incorporated into this new world and had to address the consequences. Prime Minister Taro Katsura of Japan, a conservative former army minister, made this point in 1908:

“We are now in an age of economic transition. Development of machine industry and intensification of competition widens the gap between rich

178 Lynn Abrams.  *Bismarck and the German Empire, 1871-1918*.  London, England: Routledge; 1995, 32 – Later reforms were implemented after Bismarck’s resignation, “Sunday working was abolished in 1891, accident insurance provisions were extended in 1900, in 1901 industrial tribunals were set up and some funds were directed towards the provision of workers’ housing. Children were protected by employment legislation in 1903-5 and in 1911 all salaried employees were covered by an insurance scheme (32).”

179 Bender, 269.

and poor and creates antagonisms that endanger social order. Judging by Western history this is an inevitable pattern. Socialism is today no more than a wisp of smoke, but if it is ignored it will someday have the force of wildfire and there will be nothing to stop it. Therefore it goes without saying that we must rely on education to nurture the people’s values; and we must devise a social policy that will assist their industry, provide them work, help the aged and infirm, and thereby prevent catastrophe”.

Although Katsura’s comments mirror domestic policy making for major industrial nations especially at the turn of the century, in the latter nineteenth century state leaders also began looking toward foreign exploits as a way of refocusing national attention and generate new economic opportunities. Though Germany did gain some territory, by 1884, Bismarck was “already too late to pursue a vigorous colonial policy.” Prior to the conference, both Belgium and Britain, among others, had already mounted several successful expeditions into Africa’s interior regions and built successful relationships with the various indigenous rulers.

Nearly a decade before the Berlin Conference, Belgium’s King Leopold II had already indicated his interest in establishing colonies and in 1875 declared that he “intend[ed] to find out discreetly if there’s anything to be done in Africa.” Over the next ten years, Leopold had explorers like Henry Morton Stanley canvass the continent and made it a point to carve out his own empire on the African continent, which could be accomplished by acquiring the Congo. Well before the meeting in Berlin, Leopold had obtained official recognition of Belgian’s presence in the Congo from the United States and Germany. As a result, at the end of the conference on 26 February 1885, Belgium gained a “new colony [that] was bigger than England,

---

181 Bender, 249.
182 Akinwumi, 1 – In Africa, Germany gained German Southwest Africa, German East Africa, Togoland, and Cameroon. According to Abrams, “between 1884 and 1886 a number of informal colonies or protectorates were established in Africa, as well as one or two in the Pacific. Kiao-Chow in China was added later (34).”
183 Hochschild, King Leopold’s Ghost: A Story of Greed, Terror, and Heroism in Colonial Africa, 42.
France, Germany, Spain, and Italy combined. It was one thirteenth of the African continent, more than seventy-six times the size of Belgium itself.”184 Not only did Belgium profit largely while at Berlin, but Britain, who maintained great interest in the Niger basin, continued to send “representatives of the National African Company Limited (founded 1882), and its successor, the Royal Niger Company (established by royal charter in 1886),” which “concluded 343 separate treaties between 1884 and 1892.”185 Although Germany also looked toward imperial conquest during the great age of imperial conquest, Bismarck’s own interest in African colonial expansion waned by 1885 and his attention refocused on domestic policy making. According to A. J. P. Taylor, although Bismarck “said repeatedly ‘I am no man for colonies’,” he “created a great colonial empire, each unit of it seeming designed to exasperate British feeling.”186 Despite Germany’s new territorial holdings, the state itself did not engage in an active practice of establishing economic relations in the areas which they now dominated. Ever conscious of Germany’s own borders, Bismarck started to refocus on domestic issues, commenting: “to a German explorer of Africa: ‘Here is Russia and here is France, with Germany in the middle. That is my map of Africa.”187 Still, as Germany looked toward maintaining authority on the continent of Europe, other foreign powers continued to compete for and extend their own empire. As a result, the powers of Europe “controlled 35 per cent” of the world by 1800 and at the start of the First World War, their dominance had grown to nearly 85 per cent.188

184 Ibid., 84 & 87.
185 Worger, Clark, and Alpers, 194.
186 Taylor, 215 – Taylor goes on to write that “the first,” of Bismarck’s colonies, “which grew into German South-West Africa, was at the backdoor of Cape Colony. The Cameroons broke into an area where the British had monopolized trade for many years. German East Africa threatened the British control of Zanzibar. And finally, German New Guinea encroached on the British colonies in Australia.”
187 Ibid., 221.
188 Mason, 113 – According to Felix Gilbert, “during the last quarter of the nineties and the first fourteen
By the turn of the twentieth century, Europe had already endured a number of significant changes that were weakening the structure of the old regimes. While the Congress of Vienna created an alliance among the Great Powers that ensured nearly a century of peace, during which time Europe did not undergo a drastic intra-continental war like the Napoleonic Wars, the congress failed to permanently guarantee that the regimes of the pre-revolutionary era would continue to thrive in the decades to come. Concepts set forth by the events of the French Revolution altered European society and while the ruling heads attempted to curb their appeal, the ideas of liberty, justice, and equality continued to take root both in and outside of Europe’s borders. In particular, it was the emergence of new political ideals that came out of the revolutionary period – liberalism, nationalism, socialism, and communism – that continually renewed hostilities between the state and its people, which came to a head in the aftermath of the Great War. Whereas social reforms were passed in an effort to appease the growing industrial world, industrialized states were seeking new lands and territories to claim in an effort to expand their imperial interests through the further consumption of land, peoples, and resources. Though Europe was still largely ruled by monarchs, save for France and Switzerland who considered themselves to be republics, and Britain, who was primarily ruled by a parliamentary government, by the turn of the century their power and prestige were coming under attack by a disgruntled mass led by industrial workers. Centuries of intermarriage not only ensured that power was kept within the hands of a few noble families, but it also served as a means of maintaining close alliances that were used to strengthened the position of the state against growing class conflict. With the socialists themselves divided between the ideals of reform or the action of revolution,

years of the twentieth century more than eleven million square miles were added to the colonial possessions of the great European powers (The End of the European Era, 1890 to the Present. Third Edition. New York, New York: W. W. Norton & Company; 1984, 15).”
the state was able to maintain the current status quo with little united protest from the people. This system, however, was by no means as stable as the Powers wanted it to be. In fact, by the start of the Great War, the Old World “was dying, and the courts of Europe had turned from energetic centres of patronage into stagnant ponds of tradition and conservatism,” in other words, already “the world was leaving them behind.” The great conflicts that were still to come and dominate the twentieth century were firmly rooted in nineteenth century foreign policies, which had the Great Powers continually reaching beyond their own borders for wealth and supremacy. Unfortunately, it was this single-minded pursuit of international dominance that fostered the great alliances and would ultimately lead to the downfall of the vast majority of European Powers within the first two decades of the twentieth century.

---

At the turn of the twentieth century, instability throughout Europe continued to foster wars and rebellions, which challenged the position and powers of the old regimes. Though the European monarchs had managed to maintain some semblance of peace throughout the nineteenth century, nationalist movements were still threatening the stability of both the Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman Empires. Prior to the assassination of Archduke Francis (Franz) Ferdinand von Österreich-Este on 28 June 1914 by nineteen-year-old Serbian national Gavrilo Princip, individuals committing acts of tyrannicide were already commonplace in the fight for self-determination causing states to further restrict civil liberties in an on-going effort to protect national security. Among the first to disrupt the peace was the Italian nationalist Giuseppe Mazzini, who in the mid-nineteenth century “urged his compatriots and the other subjugated nationalities within the Habsburg Empire to practice political assassination against their harsh masters, as a means of opening the way to national liberation through insurrection.”1 For Russia, Italy, Spain, France, and Ireland, the latter half of the nineteenth century was marked by an “era of assassination” as repeated acts of insurrection and violence aimed at breaking “feudal absolutism or national and social oppression” threatened Europe’s stability.2

---

2 Ibid., 169 – According to Dedijer, “In Russia the Tsar Alexander II was killed in 1881. In Italy between the first attempt against King Umberto in 1877 and his death at the hand of an assassin in 1900, there were repeated acts of individual terrorism. The same thing happened in Spain. In France from 1881 when a statue of Thiers, “the butcher of 35,000 Communards,” was blown up, until the assassination of President [Marie François Sadi] Carnot [the fourth President of the Third Republic, 1887-1894] in 1894, the country witnessed scores of acts of individual terrorism. In Ireland and in other countries where the Irish lived, the Fenians and other secret societies intensified their individual acts of violence against English rule.” – Ian F. W. Beckett also notes other assassinations such as “the Spanish prime minister Canovas del Castillo in 1897, Empress Elizabeth of Austria-Hungary in 1898, . . . and the chairman of the Council of Ministers in
twentieth century, the struggle between the crown and its multinational subjects increased especially as the Ottoman Empire started to falter. As Eric Dorn Brose notes, conflict among “industrializing nations – Japan and China (1894-1895), the United States and Spain (1898), Britain and the Boer Republics (1899-1902), and Japan and Russia (1904-1905),” occurred, Europe’s Great Powers – Britain, France, Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Russia had not fought “in forty years since 1871, although tensions had been ratcheting up for several decades.”

In a continent that had attempted to maintain the status quo, how did such a massive conflict erupt after nearly a century of peace? What were some of the factors that culminated in the assassination of the Archduke? How did the assassination ultimately culminate into the first major global crisis of the twentieth century? And how did leading socialist organizations like Germany’s Social Democratic Party respond to increasing calls for war by the start of August 1914?

During the last decades of the nineteenth century, the continent of Europe was still dominated by the power and authority of the Great Powers, which by 1900 also came to include Spain and Italy. Since the establishment of an independent Germany, however, the stability of the European Powers was seriously challenged especially in regards to a growing desire for nations to expand into new areas. Shortly after Germany unified, the nation entered into an alliance with both Austria and Russia and formed the League of the Three Emperors (1872) in an effort to stabilize their own borders, a move that quickly put them at odds with Western Europe.

---

3 Eric Dorn Brose. *A History of the Great War: World War One and the International Crisis of the Early Twentieth Century*. New York, New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.; 2010, ix – Brose also writes that “there had been no fighting on European soil since Turkey’s punitive expedition against Greece in 1897, and no major combat since the Russo-Turkish War of 1877.”

4 Martin Sicker. *The Islamic World in Decline: From the Treaty of Karlowitz to the Disintegration of the*
Seeing that France “was deliberately excluded from the League,” Martin Sicker notes that the French “retaliated by supporting self-determination movements in the territories of the three emperors as well as in the Ottoman Empire, which threatened to destabilize the entire region. To offset French troublemaking, the Russians began promoting Pan-Slavism, the idea that all Slavs should be united under the leadership of Russia.”⁵ Russia’s influence in the area of the Balkans encouraged the plight of those ethnic minorities, who had long been subjected to the will of either the Ottoman or Austrian Empires, to advocate for independence. Caught among the outer borders of the Russian, Austro-Hungarian, and Ottoman Empires, the Balkan States were an area that frequently underwent periods of eastern subjugation followed by intermittent moments of independence. In July 1875, for the first time in “more than three hundred years,” Bosnia and Hercegovina, provinces of the Ottoman Empire, began to rebel, and “sparked off [a] fierce controversy in the capitals of the great powers, who were keenly interested in anything affecting the gradual dissolution of the Ottoman Empire.”⁶ After “Montenegro and Serbia declared war on Istanbul,” in 1876, “Russia joined them six months later” a move that also brought in Great Britain and Austria-Hungary as well as Montenegro and Serbia.⁷ By 3 March 1878, the Russo-Turkish War (1877-1878) had come to end, with Russia drafting the Treaty of San Stefano, which “would have given the final blow to the Turkish empire in Europe by cutting the remaining Ottoman territory in two separate parts, and by imposing a Bulgarian barrier between the two chief cities of European Turkey. More than that, it would have aggrandized the Bulgarian at the expense of the Greek nationality in Macedonia and Thrace, and would have

⁵ Ibid.
⁶ Dedijer, 42.
sacrificed the Albanians to the aggrandizement of Montenegro and Bulgaria. From every part of
the ceded districts came protests against this flagrant violation of justice and ethnology.\footnote{8}{William Miller. \textit{The Ottoman Empire, 1801-1913}. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University; 1913, 384-385.} For
both Britain and Austria-Hungary, the terms of the 1878 Treaty of San Stefano that had been
“dictated” by Russia were understood to be “a threat to the balance of power” in the Balkan
States and so the stipulations were not implemented by the victors.\footnote{9}{Dedijer, 54 – According to Nicholas V. Riasanovsky, “The Treaty of San Stefano, signed in March 1878, reflected the thorough Ottoman defeat: Russia obtained important border areas in the Caucasus and southern Bessarabia; for the latter, Rumania, which had fought jointly with Russia at Plevna and elsewhere, was to be compensated with Dobrudja; Serbia and Montenegro gained territory and were to be recognized, along with Rumania, as fully independent, while Bosnia and Herzegovina were to receive some autonomy and reform; moreover, the treaty created a large autonomous Bulgaria reaching to the Aegean Sea, which was to be occupied for two years by Russian troops; Turkey was to pay a huge indemnity (A History of Russia. Fifth Edition. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press; 1993, 387).”} With many of the European
Powers already interested in the Balkans, before the Russo-Turkish War had come to a
conclusion, Austria-Hungary had already on 5 February 1878 proposed an international meeting
of the powers to discuss the ongoing problems over the eastern question.\footnote{10}{As Vladimir Dedijer writes, “the weakening of the Ottoman Empire sharpened the hunger of the great powers for its Balkan provinces. They formed a land bridge between Europe and Asia and their importance had increased with the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869. Moreover, the Balkans were rich in natural resources and provided a growing market for the goods of expanding European industries.

“Among the contenders for filling the vacuum caused by the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire were not only the great powers, Austria-Hungary, Russia, Britain and Italy, but also the small Balkan states – Serbia and Montenegro – which had achieved a degree of autonomy before the 1875 Bosnian uprising (43).”} Mounting tension
between Russia and Austria also threatened to start another European war, which looked to also include Great Britain.11 As a result, the Great Powers agreed to gather in Berlin during the early summer of 1878 in order to draft a new treaty.

Even though the Congress was set to open on 13 June 1878, many of the negotiations concerning the Balkan territories had already been agreed upon. While Russia was willing to attend “provided that she might select what clauses of the treaty she pleased for discussion at the Congress. The British Government . . . [however] demanded the examination of the treaty as a whole.”12 Over the next four weeks, Prime Ministers from Germany, Austria, France, Great Britain, Italy, Russia, and Turkey gathered under an invitation issued by the German Government “consenting . . . to admit the free discussion of the whole contents of the treaty of San Stefano.”13 Although the meetings were to take place in “the capital of the Power least interested in the eastern question, and the abode of the great statesman who had both the frankness to offer himself as ‘an honest broker’,” Bismarck’s motivations were clearly in favor of supporting his Austrian ally.14 In the end, Austria’s control over Bosnia and Herzegovina as

---

11 Sicker, 168.
12 Miller, 387.
14 Miller, 386-387 – Misha Glenny notes that “the Treaty of San Stefano from December 1877 had extended Russia’s influence deep into the Balkans and on to the Aegean coast. It enabled the Russians to dominate the Balkans and access to the Black Sea. This was unacceptable to both Austria-Hungary and Britain. In February 1878, Britain had sent warships to the Dardanelles and war had seemed a real possibility. An alliance of Austria-Hungary and Great Britain. Bismarck, loath as he was to interrupt his vacation, saw no alternative but to convene the Congress of Berlin in order to restore the balance between his two collaborators, the Dual Monarchy and Russia. With the principles of the Three Emperors’ League under threat, Bismarck had to offer his services as mediator (The Balkans: Nationalism, War and the Great Powers, 1804-1999. New York, New York: Viking Penguin; 1999, 143-144).

According to Dedijer, Bismarck’s ‘heart was on Austria-Hungary’s side. He thought that Vienna’s engagement in the Balkans would be compensation for the losses she had suffered on
promised by the Congress started as “an occupation,” but in the end “proved to be permanent.”

For the Balkan states, however, the transition from one imperial holder to another proved strenuous. According to Henry F. Munro, “in 1878, accurate information on the geographical, racial and social conditions of the Balkans was extremely meager” considering that late nineteenth century European policymaking occurred only within the framework established by the Five Great Powers. Consequently, European nations promulgated both domestic and foreign policy with an eye toward the actions and reactions of the dominant players in Metternich’s Concert of Europe. The combination of imperialism, nationalism, and the prospect of political and economic gain granted diplomats the opportunity to seize as much as they could without regarding the cares or concerns of those they sought to dominate. This kind of attitude had nineteenth century European powers “bound by the idea of their racial superiority and haunted by the fear that if they remained passive they might miss the last chance for participation in the division of the world . . . . Spurred on by popular enthusiasm, diplomacy was driven by events rather than by rational calculations.” And so the Berlin Congress became an opportune moment for the Great Powers to continue exerting influence instead of a time to concentrate on

_________________________________________________________________
her northern borders in 1866. Bismarck made this clear to the Habsburg heir apparent in the spring of 1878: “We should arm ourselves before the Congress in order to be able to help you with arms in the case of any resistance by Russia. Germany will help Austria-Hungary not only morally, but also with effective forces.” On May 5, 1878, he wrote to his ambassador in Vienna that he should urge Count [Gyula] Andrássy, the Austro-Hungarian foreign minister, to occupy Bosnia and Herzegovina immediately. On June 12 Prince [Alexander Mikhailovich] Gorchakov, the Russian foreign minister, informed Andrássy that Russia would vote for the Austro-Hungarian proposal on Bosnia and Herzegovina (55).”


16 Munro, 27-28 – In fact, “nationality as a principle found little, if any, sincere support from the great powers . . . . In Parliament, the opposition tried to secure from the British Government a pledge that the Balkan settlement should be made not on the basis of ‘dynastic arrangements or geographical puzzles,’ but on the just principle of nationalities; but the Government refused to make any definite engagement (30).”

17 Felix Gilbert, 109.
how best to deal with a struggling Ottoman Empire and granting independence to the surrounding Balkan States. By disregarding the concerns of the minor powers, many of the negotiations actually took place behind closed doors in meetings that were held before the actual Congress was ever officially opened by Bismarck. Of particular concern, especially to the British, was the expansion of Bulgaria, which the Treaty of San Stefano had granted. In order “to keep the Russian sphere of influence as far from the Straits and the Mediterranean as possible” Bulgaria’s lands would have to be reassigned. With this in mind, on 6 June 1878 Great Britain and Austria entered into a secret agreement where the British pledged to support “Austrian occupation of Bosnia-Herzegovina,” stating that this arrangement was deemed to be the “best means of preventing a chain of Slav states from stretching across the Balkan peninsula,” which would upset the status quo. While many of “the small[er] Balkan nations or those who meant to become nations – Greece, Albania, Bulgaria, Montenegro, Serbia, Rumania – who were openly anxious to be free of Ottoman rule, or to add to what independent territory they already held,” Bosnia-Herzegovina remained an open subject to the Habsburg crown.

Though Austria-Hungary was only to occupy Bosnia-Herzegovina, the Treaty of Berlin specifically maintained that the Austrians were not to annex the lands. Austria-Hungary’s

---

18 Sicker, 168 – According to Riasanovsky, “the large Bulgaria created at San Stefano underwent division into three parts: Bulgaria proper, north of the Balkan mountains, which was to be autonomous; Eastern Rumelia, south of the mountains, which was to receive a special organization under Turkish rule; and Macedonia, granted merely certain reforms (A History of Russia, 387-388).” While Glenny notes that “San Stefano Bulgaria was reduced from 176,000 square kilometers to just 96,000 square kilometers (147).”

19 Munro, 6 – Listed as #4 of the Chief Preliminary Agreements.

20 Miller, 390.

21 Joachim Remak. The Origins of World War I, 1871-1914. New York, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston: 1967, 6 – According to Beckett, independence was achieved by “Rumania in 1877, Bulgaria and Serbia in 1878, and Albania in 1912.” While globally, “Norway also split from Sweden in 1905. [And] European nationalism as a whole was also intimately connected with imperial expansion in the last two decades of the nineteenth century as the power rushed to partition Africa and to divide the decaying Manchu Empire in China into exclusive spheres of influence (9).”
possession of Bosnia-Herzegovina and the Sanjak of Novi Bazar still caused continual problems for those who were still being occupied by for foreign empire. Whereas Serbia and Montenegro achieved their independence in the 1870s, the Bosnian Serbs had simply been transferred from one empire to another. As Munro writes, “in 1878, accurate information on the geographical, racial and social conditions of the Balkans was extremely meager,” and while the smaller nations “tried to secure from the British Government a pledge that the Balkan settlement should be made not on the basis of ‘dynastic arrangements or geographical puzzles,’ but on the just principle of nationalities; but the Government refused to make any definite engagement.”

Ultimately, the 1878 Treaty of Berlin directly played a role in further tensions between the Habsburg Empire and the Balkan States especially as nationalist movements continued to recruit supporters. By the turn of the twentieth century, the Austro-Hungarian Empire already consisted of nine ethnic minorities, including representations of Czechs, Poles, Ukrainians, Slovaks, Rumanians, Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, and Italians, which contributed to a growing discord in an age of emerging arguments based on rights to self-determination.

Even though the Congress of Berlin had bypassed an international war in 1878, the weakened state of the Ottoman Empire continued to attract the attention of other imperial states that were intent on absorbing more territories including Austria-Hungary.

Despite growing tensions throughout the Balkan Peninsula, the Five Great Empires still maintain alliances with one another in an effort to further preserve their national security. Since 1873, the three empires had united under the Dreikaiserbund or Three Emperors’ League and “although the Three Emperors’ League had foundered in the Balkan crisis,” writes Nicholas V. Riasanovsky, “a new Alliance of the Three Emperors was concluded in June 1881 for three years

22 Munro, 27-28 & 30.
and renewed in 1884 for another three years. Its most essential provision declared that if one of
the contracting powers . . . engaged in war with a fourth power, except Turkey, the other two
were to maintain friendly neutrality.”\(^{24}\) Even though Germany and Austria entered into a
defense agreement in 1879, German officials also realized the importance of maintaining an
alliance with Russia “because of its proximity, its potential for causing chaos in eastern Europe,
and the absolute need to keep it from going anywhere near France, which Bismarck was
determined to keep isolated.”\(^{25}\) Tensions between Austria and Russia concerning the Balkans,
however, repeatedly hindered this partnership and strained the longevity of the league. While
Germany, Austria, and Italy entered into the Triple Alliance in 1883,\(^{26}\) four years later, Germany
also entered into a secret arrangement with the Russians. The Reinsurance Treaty signed in

\(^{24}\) Riasanovsky, A History of Russia, 398.
\(^{25}\) Carter, 82-83.
\(^{26}\) Signed on 22 May 1883, William Stearns Davis notes that in October of 1881, “Italy was only too
ready for an alliance provided she could henceforth feel secure against the insults of France. She
was so eager for the pact that she waived all question of Italia irredenta and even of the support
of her ambitions in the Mediterranean. The most that she really obtained was a pledge for the
defense of her territories against invasion. The actual terms of this treaty of the “Triple Alliance”
were secret. . . . the general impression is that Italy was promised very little except the integrity
of her own homeland and in return had to pledge herself to maintain a huge army, far beyond her
wealth, and to come to the rescue of Germany and Austria if they should be attacked by “two
foreign powers” (i.e., Russia and France) even if the quarrel was one that concerned Italy not the
slightest” – In the middle of this last sentence, footnote #1 is attached to the word “attacked,”
which the authors explain “it should be observed that Italy was only bound to aid in a defensive
war: not in an offensive war, as she considered the one begun by her nominal allies in 1914 (in
collaboration with William Anderson and Mason W. Tyler. The Roots of the War: A Non-
Technical History of Europe, 1870-1914 A.D. New York, New York: The Century Co.; 1918,
317-318).”

Also, even though Bismarck gave nothing during the negotiations of the Triple Alliance, “he
obtained “an important addition to the forces of the Austro-German alliance in case of a
conflict with France and Russia.” France was of course more isolated, helpless, and angry
at the European situation than ever. Russia likewise disliked the whole case. But for the
hour Bismarck seemed to have achieved another master-stroke in diplomacy. So long as
England remained neutral he had created one of the most powerful international
combinations conceivable, and “for better or for worse the Triple Alliance was destined to last for
a whole generation, during which it was to be one of the dominant forces in the European world”
(318).”
1887, declared that “each country was to remain neutral in case the other fought a war, with the exception of an aggressive war of Germany against France or of Russia against Austria-Hungary.” Unfortunately, when Bismarck resigned three years later, in 1890, the new German Chancellor Georg Leo von Caprivi (1890-1894) allowed the Reinsurance Treaty to expire “out of consideration for Austria.” Now isolated in the east, Russia looked to form an attachment with France, a relationship that Bismarck, prior to his departure, had been keen on avoiding, sentiments that the Kaiser and von Caprivi did not express. Essentially, the Franco-Russian

27 Riasanovsky, A History of Russia, 399 – According to William L. Langer, “Alexander III., who personally had very little sympathy for the Germans, had agreed to the so-called Reinsurance Treaty of 1887, though very likely he distrusted Bismarck and realised that the concessions made to Russia in that famous pact were largely illusory. He must have realised that Bismarck was exploiting the position of the Russians to the utmost, and he must have had some knowledge of the Mediterranean agreements between England, Austria, and Italy, engineered by Bismarck in 1887, to deprive Russia indirectly of the gains promised her in the Russo-German treaty. But Alexander and his foreign minister, [Nicholas] Giers, could see no way out. Their attention was focused on the Balkans, and especially on the Straits; and even if Bismarck had frequently enough refused to co-operate in fighting Russian battles in Bulgaria, he had declared his recognition of Russia’s right to preponderance there, and, above all, he had declared in writing his disinterestedness in the question of Constantinople and the Straits. The value of German neutrality was, for Russia, infinitely greater than a French alliance would have been; for the French could be of little assistance, and there was always the danger that Germany might openly identify herself with the group of Powers which felt their interests directly menaced by Russian ambitions on the Bosphorus [Straits]. Therefore Alexander, irritated though he may have been, staunchly resisted the pressure of the Pan-Slav group led by [Michael] Katkov, and turned a deaf ear to those who, even then, were preaching the anti-German crusade in company with France (“The Franco-Russian Alliance (1890-1894).” The Slavonic Review, Volume 3, No. 9 (March, 1925), 556).”

28 Ex-Kaiser William II. My Memoirs: 1878-1918, 52 – Kaiser Wilhelm II was in agreement with von Caprivi allowing the Reinsurance Treaty “to lapse” noting that “in his opinion it had already lost is main value from the fact that the Russians no longer stood whole-heartedly behind it (51).” The Kaiser goes on to write that “The much discussed non-renewal of the re-insurance treaty with Russia . . . is not to be considered as so decisive as to have influenced the question of whether there was to be war or peace. The re-insurance treaty, in my opinion would not have prevented the Russia of Nicholas II from taking the road to the Entente; under Alexander III it would have been superfluous (322).”

“I thought that not the old treaty, but an entirely new and different kind of treaty was possible, in the drawing up of which Austria must participate, as in the old Three-Emperor-relationship. But, as I said, treaties with Nicholas II would not have seemed absolutely durable to me, particularly after the sentiments of the very influential Russian general public had also turned against Germany (322).”
Alliance of 1892 was “a ‘marriage of interest,’ not of affection” and necessary given the climate of late nineteenth century Europe. ²⁹ With Germany’s power and prestige in brokering alliances with the Central European Powers, both France and Russia found themselves increasingly isolated. William Stearns Davis notes that at the time of Bismarck’s resignation, “French thrift had accumulated a great deal of loanable capital, and Russia needed the same for factories, railroads, new artillery and what-not else.”³⁰ Nevertheless, France’s connection to Russia was similar to that of the Triple Alliance, where the nations were pledged to one another, but only in defensive terms. Similar to the balance of power that was negotiated during the Congress of Vienna, the stability of Europe heading toward the twentieth century was dependent upon the correlation of various nation-states. According to Misha Glenny, at this time, “cooperation was replaced by competition; harmony by discord” as France, Britain, and Russia “acted in harmony

²⁹ Davis, 319 – Following Germany’s victory after the Franco-Prussian War in 1871, “France was bound to seek every possible opportunity to contain the new power on its eastern border. . . . From Paris’s perspective, the chief objective had to be to contain Germany by forming an anti-German alliance. The most attractive candidate for such a partnership was Russia. (Christopher Clark. Iron Kingdom: The Rise and Downfall of Prussia, 1600 – 1947. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press; 2006, 554).”

³⁰ Ibid – According to Riasanovsky, “France remained the only possible partner . . . . In particular, Paris alone provided a great market for Russian state loans – the Berlin financial market, it might be added, was closed to Russia in 1887 – and thus the main source of foreign financial support much needed by the imperial government. In fact, Frenchmen proved remarkable eager to subscribe to these loans as well as to invest directly in the Russian economy (A History of Russia, 399-400).”

These loans, writes Davis began “in December, 1888, [when] a great loan, subscribed to by over 100,000 personas and for 500,000,000 francs ($100,000,000) was thus placed in France for the benefit of the czar. This was only the beginning. There were more loans, and still great ones, in 1889, 1890, 1891, 1894, 1896, 1901, 1904 and 1906. By that time France had loaned Russia for one purpose or another (governmental, municipal and industrial) at least 12,000,000,000 francs ($2,400,000,000); . . . (319-320).”

The relationship between France and Russia “was consolidated in several stages, beginning with the diplomatic understanding of 1891 and ending with the military convention of December 1893-January 1894 (Riasanovsky , 400).”
with one another to protect their strategic interests.” As long as one power was not in a position to pose a direct threat toward the stability of the continent, the alliances were valid. In fact, Davis estimates that “the two alliances [the Dual (Franco-Russian) and Triple Alliances] provided excellent safety-valves for the occasional blasts of war-steam” that held “from 1891 to 1905.” Continual instability in Russia, however, pulled both time and attention away from events concerning Eastern Europe by the turn of the century. Monies received from French loans allowed Russia to industrialize at such a rate that led to domestic and international conflicts by the start of the 20th century. By 1905, the Russians had not only lost the Russo-Japanese War (1904-1905), but new economic wealth initiated a sudden “growth of capitalism” that eventually “led to the rise of two social groups, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.” Eventually this class division created a new labor movement that eventually culminated into the first major revolution of the twentieth century.

According to Davis, “the year 1905 marked the opening of nine years of intrigue, threats, ‘war scares,’ tension and growing national hatred leading steadily towards Armageddon” and not just for Russia. Since Germany’s unification in 1871, treaties and alliances had attempted to restrict various nations from accumulating so much power that they posed a threat to the surrounding nations. While these agreements held the European nations in check, peace was maintained by the continual build-up of national armies. In reality, the latter half of the nineteenth century centered on Europe’s “prepar[ation] for war,” which was occurring “on a

31 Glenny, 134.
32 Davis, 322-323.
33 Riasanovsky, A History of Russia, 405.
34 An overview of the 1905 Russian Revolution will be given in Chapter 4 as a lead in to the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution.
35 Davis, 324.
scale never before known in history.”36 Juxtaposed to this warring society was a strong push toward peacemaking and even pacifism. Two Hague Peace Conferences had been assembled, under Russia’s urging, in both 1899 and 1907. Attended by “representatives of twenty-six states” both large and small nations, the First Conference succeeded in “pass[ing] certain “laws of war” . . . and set up a permanent court of arbitration, the International Court of Justice at the Hague. More important, it became the first of a long series of international conferences on disarmament and peace.”37 While the Second Conference again brought the international community together, this time the invite list included representatives from 47 nations, but no major agreements were reached by the delegates.38 Competing ideals as well as foreign policies ensured that those attending the Hague Conferences would not be able to reach permanent settlements. Despite the willingness of the international community to convene in the

36 Ibid, 334-335 – Once Germany usurped power from France following the Franco-Prussian War (1870-1871), Davis writes that “Europe was to be ruled during the succeeding decades not by peaceful international agreements, but by fear. The alliance and the balance of power were in the making as long as Bismarck, the man of Blood and Iron, was dominant in Europe, – and his preëminence was admitted even after his fall from power. . . . In the face of the new situation to prate of peace was to be foolish. Then it was that the competition in armaments between the European nations began in earnest. . . . America, far removed from the danger, could get along with a few regiments, but France, Russia, Austria, and Italy . . . . Compulsory military service became the rule everywhere on the Continent. The nations of Europe transformed themselves into great armed camps. Army leaders, soldiers, and people watched the annual army manoeuvres of their neighbors with apprehension” – Italics in the original.

37 Riasanovsky, A History of Russia, 400.

38 Ibid. – According to Benjamin F. Trueblood, “the second Hague Conference, [was] called originally by President [Theodore] Roosevelt, but actually assembled by the Czar of Russia, met on the 15th June, 1907, and continued in session till the 18th of October. . . . The Conference will always be notable as the first general representative assembly of the world (The Two Hague Conferences and Their Results. Washington, D.C.: American Peace Society; January 1914, 9).” A. Pearce Higgins also notes that “invitations were finally issued by the Dutch Government in May, 1907, to 47 states, . . . Forty-four states were represented; those who were not represented, through invited, were Abyssinia, Costa Rica and Honduras. The delegates of Corea [Korea] sought to be included, but owing to the opposition of Japan were excluded (The Hague Peace Conference and Other International Conferences Concerning the Laws and Usages of War: Text of Conventions with Commentaries. Cambridge, England: The University Press; 1909, 56).”
Netherlands, political and economic crises continued to disrupt the continent. By July 1908, “a cabal of junior officers in the Ottoman army, led by Enver Pasha, seized control of the empire and announced a program of reform. They called themselves the Committee for Unity and Progress, but were popularly known as the Young Turks.”\(^3^9\) Once again Europe’s fear that an intra-continental war seemed possible as members of the Young Turks sought to restore prestige of the Ottoman Empire. With the Young Turk Revolt, the stability of the Balkan States was again called into question.\(^4^0\) Upon seizing power, the Young Turks quickly set out to reform Ottoman society. First the organization reinstated the 1876 constitution in an effort to “instill among all the various people of the Ottoman Empire a sense of Ottoman identity, and thus forestall its further disintegration.”\(^4^1\) They were also “determined to modernize the Ottoman armed forces” and did so by “invit[ing] Germany army and British naval advisors into the country to initiate the process of the development of a strong and viable military force.”\(^4^2\) This renewed interest in restoring the fragmented Ottoman Empire raised considerable red flags especially for nations like Austria and Russia, who remained heavily invested in the Balkan States. In the Report of the International Commission To Inquire into the Causes and Conduct of the Balkan Wars, the authors note that the reoccurring problem with the Balkan States was that:

There was hardly any part of the territory of Turkey in Europe which was not claimed by at least two competitors. These views on the inheritance of the “Sick Man” and for the realization of “great national ideas” in the shape of a “Great” Servia, a “Great” Greece, or a “Great” Bulgaria, made any united action on the part of these little States for their common ends impossible. In theory every one

\(^4^0\) According to Davis, members of the Young Turks “had been considered by the diplomats as rather harmless dreamers,” who “believed that [Sultan] Abdul Hamid’s [II] misrule was ruining the empire, and paving the way for a final conquest by Russia (284).”
\(^4^1\) Hall, 7.
\(^4^2\) Ibid.
accepted the opinion that they must act together, that the Balkans ought to belong to the Balkan peoples, and that the great neighboring Powers who might weaken or enslave the little Balkan States, must be kept off. In practice, however, the opposite course was adopted. Each courted Russia or Austria, in turn, sometimes even both at the same time, first one and then the other, with a view of opposing his neighbors and securing the prospect of this own country’s hegemony.

Russia and Austria for their part naturally pursued their own interests in the Balkans, – interests that were by no means identical. Geography and ethnography . . . divided the Balkans into two spheres of influence, the Eastern and the Western, the Servian and the Bulgarian spheres. Diplomatic history has made them into the Austrian and the Russian spheres of influence, hence two opposing pulls – the “German pull” from North to South, and the “Slav pull” from East to West.43

When the Young Turks replaced Sultan Abdul Hamid II on 12 April 1909, Austria and Russia moved quickly to protect their Balkan interests from coming under new Ottoman reforms. Now that the Ottoman Empire was under the control of the Young Turks, both Austria and Russia seized the opportunity to benefit from the Turkish uprising. On 12 September 1908, Alois Aehrenthal, the Austro-Hungarian Foreign Minister, and Aleksander Izvolsky [Izvol’sky], the Russian Foreign Minister, “met in Buchlau . . . where they agreed . . . that Russia would not oppose the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina by Austria and, in return, Austria would not oppose the opening of the Straits [linking the Black Sea to the Aegean Sea] to Russian warships.”44 While the Buchlau Agreement momentarily brought Austria and Russia together,

44 Stavrianos, 109 – According to D. C. B. Lieven when Izvolski “learned that Austria intended definitely to annex Bosnia and Herzegovina and deduced that Vienna would move in about three weeks’ time. This placed the Russian Foreign Minister in an extremely difficult position. The annexation by Austria of two Slav provinces liberated by Russian efforts in 1877 was bound to cause indignation in his own country. Even Nicholas II, who was no Panslav and understood the realities behind the annexation crisis, stated that Austria’s absorption of the two provinces ‘sickens one’s feelings’. Given Vienna’s determination to act, however, Russian protests would certainly prove fruitless and possibly dangerous. Russia was unfit for war, moreover it would
the one thing the accord failed to do was “set an exact date for the annexation of the two provinces,” an oversight that once again quickly put Europe on the brink of war.45

Using the terms set by the Buchlau settlement, Austria was the first of the two nations to act upon the terms of agreement and on 6 October 1908, in defiance of the 1878 Berlin Congress, it quickly annexed “as an additional province of [Austria’s] empire, the Slavonic States, Bosnia and Herzegovina,” citing the need to protect and maintain national security.46 Austria’s sudden move to take permanent possession of Bosnia and Herzegovina shocked not only Serbia, but also other members of the Russian government, many of whom “Izvolsky had not consulted . . . before concluding the Buchlau Agreement.”47 As D. C. B. Lieven notes, when Pyotr Arcadievich Stolypin, Chairman of the Russian Council of Ministers, heard the terms of the Buchlau

have been madness to unleash a European conflict as a result of the annexation of two provinces already in practice under Austrian rule. Since the Central Powers knew well that Russian protests would never be backed by deeds, opposition to Austrian policy would lead nowhere but to Russia’s humiliation and her exposure as a toothless power. To avoid such humiliation Izvol’sky was prepared to go along with Vienna’s schemes (Russia and the Origins of the First World War. New York, New York: St. Martin’s Press; 1983, 35).”

45 Ibid.
46 Francis Whiting Halsey. “Introduction: Why This War – The Outbreak and the Causes – The Invasion of Belgium, Luxemburg and Alsace-Lorraine (June 28, 1914 – October 15, 1914).” The Literary Digest: History of the World, Compiled from Original and Contemporary Sources: American, British, French, German and Others, Volume One. New York, New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company; 1919, 59 – Stavrianos explains that “Izvolsky assumed that nothing would be done immediately; [and] he therefore began a leisurely tour of European capitals in order to obtain the consent of the powers to changes in the Straits regulations. Meanwhile, Aehrenthal was making the necessary arrangements for the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina (109-110).”

47 Stavrianos, 110 – According to Jacob Gould Schurman, “the inhabitants of Bosnia and Herzegovina are Serb, and Serb also are the inhabitants of Dalmatia on the west and Croatia on the north, which the Dual Monarchy had already brought under its sceptre. The new annexation therefore seemed a fatal and a final blow to the national aspirations of the Serb race and it was bitterly resented by those who had already been gathered together and “redeemed” in the Kingdom of Servia. A second disastrous consequence of the annexation was that it left Servia hopelessly land-locked. The Serb population of Dalmatia and Herzegovina looked out on the Adriatic along a considerable section of its eastern coast, but Servia’s long-cherished hope of becoming a maritime state by the annexation of the Serb provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina was now definitively at an end. She protested, she appealed, she threatened; but . . . she was quickly compelled to submit to superior force (The Balkan Wars, 1912-1913. Princeton, Rhode Island: Princeton University Press; 1916, xxvi-xxv).”
Agreement he “was furious and . . . threatened to resign unless Russia refused to accept the annexation of Slav land by a Germanic power.” Without the support of the Russian people, government, or international allies like Britain and France, “Izvolsky was forced to change his tactics and demand that the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina be submitted to a conference.”

By this point, however, Aehrenthal already had gained the full support of Germany, who pledged to assist Austria in its bid to annex Bosnia and Herzegovina, and was able to refuse Russia’s request for an another conference that would change the terms of the Buchlau accord. Given Germany’s support, the international community was not yet willing to risk war and with some complaints, no government was able to force Austria to repeal its expansion into Bosnia and Herzegovina. Emboldened by this fact, at the end of February 1909, “Vienna presented notes in Belgrade and Petersburg demanding recognition of the annexation . . . making it clear that failure to comply would result in the invasion of Serbia,” a threat which Germany backed with a note issued on “21 March which demanded” Russia’s “immediate, unconditional and unequivocal acceptance of Austrian claims.” Amid pressure from Austria and Germany, along with the prospect of war hanging in the balance, the international community along with the Russian government allowed Bosnia and Herzegovina to be absorbed by the Habsburg Empire, and Serbia was forced to capitulate. And in March 1909, “under pressure,” Serbia “directed her minister at Vienna,” to “cease the attitude of protest and resistance . . . and to ‘change the direction of her present policies toward Austria-Hungary, and, in future to live with the latter in friendly and neighborly relations’.”

Ironically, the reaction to Austria’s demands in 1909 provided the Habsburg Empire with a false bravado that ultimately had an effect on the events

48 Lieven, 36.
49 Stavrianos, 110.
50 Lieven, 36.
51 Halsey, 59.
surrounding the July Crisis of 1914. Even so, before the events of 28 June 1914, two additional crises in the Balkans further strained the relations between Russia and Austria-Hungary.

After being humiliated along with Serbia during the events of 1908-1909, Russia was determined to regain some of its power by focusing on the Balkan States, especially in light of Austria’s successful takeover of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Focusing on nationalist ideals, Russia sought to bring about “a Balkan League that would serve as a barrier against Austria,” in an effort to maintain the presence of Pan-Slavism.52 On 13 March 1912, Serbia and Bulgaria entered into an alliance in which “the two states were to aid each other in case either was attacked and to take joint action against any great power which occupied any Balkan territory under Turkish suzerainty.”53 Similar to Russia and Austria’s Buchlau Agreement, unity among

52 Stavrianos, 112-113 – The Balkan League eventually expanded “on May 29, 1912, Greece and Bulgaria also concluded an alliance stipulating that if either of the signatories were attacked by Turkey, the other would give full aid. The last of these Balkan pacts were the alliances of Montenegro with Bulgaria and Serbia concluded in late September and on October 6, 1912, respectively (113).” – According to G. P. Gooch and Harold Temperley, “The League was founded upon a series of agreements. The Serbo-Bulgarian Alliance was concluded on February 29/March 13, 1912, and this was supplemented by a military convention of April 29/May 12. The Greco-Bulgarian treaty was signed on May 16/29, 1912, and the corresponding military convention on September 22/October 5. The relations between Greece and Servia in 1912 cannot be so certainly established, and the first treaty of which the text is available is that of April 22/May 5, 1913. No exact information is available as to the treaties binding Montenegro to the other Balkan Powers. An article in The Times of June 13, 1913, alleged that a treat between Servia and Montenegro was signed in Switzerland in September 1912. M. Guéșov says that there was no written treaty between Bulgaria and Montenegro, but that there was an oral agreement made shortly after August 28, 1912 (British Documents on the Origins of the War, 1898-1914: Volume IX: The Balkan Wars, Part II, The League and Turkey. London, England: His Majesty’s Stationary Office; 1934, 1006 – Appendix II. The Balkan Alliances, 1912-3).” – Gooch and Temperley, assisted by Lillian M. Penson, also note that on 14 March 1912, Sir. H. G. O. Bax-Ironside, British Minister at Sophia, sent word of the alliance to Sir Arthur Nicolson, Britain’s Permanent Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, labeled “Private and Most Confidential,” writing that “the foundation has now been laid of a Federation of the Balkan States, backed by Russia, to oppose a forward movement on the part of Austria in the Sandjak (British Documents on the Origins of the War, 1898-1914: Volume IX: The Balkan Wars, Part I, The Prelude; The Tripoli War. London, England: His Majesty’s Stationary Office; 1933, 557 – No. 559. “Sir H. Bax-Ironside to Sir A. Nicolson.” Sofia, 14 March 1912. Private and Most Confidential).”

53 Ibid, 113 – For a complete understanding of terms referred to in the treaty, please refer to Appendix B.
the Balkan States was hastened by the actions of the Young Turks.\footnote{According to Winston S. Churchill, “history reeked with the wrongs which Montenegro, Bulgaria and Greece had suffered at Turkish hands. By the desperate struggles of generations they had freed themselves from Turkish yoke. Now the old oppressor still in control of many Christian provinces was in the toils. This was the moment to settle old scores and acquire new possessions. It needed only the influence of a Great Power which had long warred with the Turks to unite them in an effective alliance. Indeed it may well be that Russian diplomacy was only encouraging the Balkan states to do what they had already resolved (Winston S. Churchill, The Rt. Hon. The Unknown War: The Eastern Front. New York, New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons; 1931, 43).”} Slavic sentiments toward Turkey continued to deteriorate and by 30 September Bulgaria and Serbia started to mobilize.\footnote{In a telegram sent to Sir Edward Grey from Ralph S. Paget, British Minister at Belgrade, he wrote “Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs told me this morning that reports of mobilisation from Turkey have had an unfortunate effect on the situation, and that Servian Government would have to mobilise. . . .

“Under-Secretary of State further said that Servian Government would probably recall their Minister from Constantinople, as the Turkish Government are obdurate over the war material question.

“Russian Minister informs me that two days ago Bulgarian Government sent a request to Servian Government to commence mobilisation in twenty-four hours, but that he was able to induce Servian Government to postpone giving order.

“There is, however, no doubt that everything is fully prepared for mobilisation here and order may be given at any moment (British Documents on the Origins of the War, 1898-1914: Volume IX: The Balkan Wars, Part I, The Prelude; The Tripoli War, 719-720 – No. 756. “Sir R. Paget to Sir Edward Grey.” Belgrade, 30 September 1912. F.O. 41064/33672/12/44. Tel. (No. 15) D. 2 P.M. R. 4.45 P.M. – [ED. NOTE. – General mobilization was ordered by the Kings of Servia and the Bulgarians on the 30th September, and by the King of Greece on the 1st October. General mobilization was decreed in Turkey in reply to Servia and Bulgaria on the 1st October].”)}

Although Russia had pushed to organize the Balkan States, it appeared to many that the new League was acting independently. Sensing another crisis with Turkey as well as the possible loss of influence in the area, Russia and Austria issued a joint warning on 8 October in an attempt to control the League, warning that “even if they [the Balkan League] defeated Turkey they would not be allowed to annex any territory.”\footnote{Stavrianos, 113.} Even so, the same day that the warning was issued, Montenegro declared war against Turkey and was quickly joined by Bulgaria, Greece and Serbia, sparking the First Balkan War. In a letter from Sir Arthur Nicolson, Britain’s Permanent
Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, to Lord Charles Hardinge, he faulted Russia for igniting the current crisis, writing,

To my mind the primary cause of all that has happened is the secret alliance which Russia encouraged the four States to conclude. I imagine that [Serge] Sazonoff [Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs] had in his mind in the first instance merely to gain a diplomatic success over Austria and to re-establish Russian prestige in the Balkan Peninsula. He should, however, have foreseen that by encouraging and promoting the close understanding between the four Powers he was practically raising hopes and aspirations which they had some grounds for thinking Russia would enable them to realise. Moreover, unless our information is quite erroneous, Bulgaria and Servia even went so far as to peg out between themselves districts in Macedonia which would fall to each other when the Turkish Empire broke up. He has now been compelled to throw as much cold water as anyone upon the measures which the Balkan States thought fit to take. Whatever may be the ultimate result of the conflict, which now seems inevitable, Russian prestige will have lost, rather than gained.  

Russia’s inability to reign in the Balkan League was not missed by other members of the Great Powers. French Premier Raymond Poincaré also commented on Russia’s ineffective warning, stating, “it is too late to wipe out the movement which she [Russia] has called forth . . . she is trying to put on the brakes, but it is she who started the motor.”

Despite Russia’s initial warning about the Balkan States, there was an urge to extend aid to the Balkan States as the press called for an intervention.

The Balkans, however, did not require any type of military aid from Russia and “within a month they [members of the Balkan League] had captured all [of] Turkey’s European territories. Serbia, in particular, had been extremely successful; it had virtually doubled in size and was

---

58 Stavrianos, 114.
59 Carter, 343.
threatening to annex part of the Adriatic coastline, all of which alarmed Austria."60 While Austria was quick to mobilize and Russia quick to counter, it was Vladimir Kokovtsov, Russia’s Chief Minister, who along with Sazonof, managed to persuade the Tsar not to engage Austria with a mobilization of his own forces. Kokovtsov and Sazonof reminded the Tsar that a war against Austria would not come with a guarantee that the other Great Powers would sit by idly. On 30 November 1912, Sir Ralph S. Paget, British Minister at Belgrade, messaged Britain’s Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs Sir Edward Grey (1862-1933) voicing his own concerns about a war with Austria. In the private letter he confided to Grey, “I am afraid the Servians are utterly obstinate and unreasonable. If one tells them they will provoke an European war they shrug their shoulders and say to Austria they will be responsible if there is war, that Austria is merely trying to oppress and prevent their economic development, and that, although they may suffer considerably in a war with Austria and may lose all they have gained, they will ‘die fighting.’ This phrase has become a sort of mania with them.”61 Victories achieved in quick succession by members of the Balkan League caused members of the Great Powers to take further notice as lands that were formerly under the control of the Ottoman Empire were now being divided between Serbia and Bulgaria. With Turkey on the verge of collapse, “a Peace Conference was summoned in December” with “delegates from the belligerent states and

60 Ibid.  
61 British Documents on the Origins of the War, 1898-1914: Volume IX: The Balkan Wars, Part II, The League and Turkey, 234 – No. 313. “Sir R. Paget to Sir Edward Grey.” Private. Belgrade, 30 November 1912. Gooch & Temperley also note that “this letter is endorsed as having been sent to the King and to the Prime Minister (334, Footnote #1).” – Sir Paget goes on to write that the Serbians “know quite well that they can and will get a commercial outlet, but that is no longer sufficient for them. They now have set their heart upon a Servian port – and whatever more they can get – and they have visions of blue seas and Servian ships in the offing bringing home the wealth of the Indies etc. In plain words, they are quite off their heads.”
ambassadors from the Great Powers coming together in London.”

Although Germany’s Chancellor Theobald (Theodore) von Bethmann-Hollweg’s (1856-1921) played a key role in the London Conference, Germany continued to encourage Austria’s bid for war against Serbia. Oddly enough, evidence of this support came on the same day that the armistice was brokered in London, on 3 December 1912, in a speech delivered by Bethmann-Hollweg to the Reichstag. When asked about his reaction to Bethmann-Hollweg’s speech, Grey, informed Sir F. Bertie, British Ambassador at Paris that “I replied that my first impression of the speech was that it was a pity, and I feared that the effect would not be good. . . . Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg’s speech was open to the construction that Germany would support Austria in anything which she demanded, whatever the merits might be.”

Following Germany’s declaration, tensions among the Powers continued to strain. Echoing Grey’s concerns was Sir Nicolson, who in a private letter to Sir George W. Buchanan, British Ambassador at St. Petersburg, wrote that Bethmann-Hollweg’s speech “almost partook of the character of a warning, and I doubt myself whether at

---

62 Schurman, 57.

63 British Documents on the Origins of the War, 1898-1914: Volume IX: The Balkan Wars, Part II, The League and Turkey, 238-239 – No. 321. “Sir Edward Grey to Sir F. Bertie.” Foreign Office, 3 December 1912. F.O. 52073/42842/12/44. (No. 590) – Sir Grey goes on to note that “M. [Paul] Cambon [French Ambassador at London] said that his opinion was the same. What Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg had said seemed menacing, and might give the impression that the events of 1909 were to be repeated. If they were repeated, neither the Emperor of Russia nor Russian public opinion would endure the situation, and it was a grave mistake to think otherwise. The speech was also contrary to what we had agreed upon: that the Power should all try to find a solution of difficult points after the war was over.

“I pointed out that it was possible that parts of the speech had not been quite correctly reported; it contained a sentence to the effect that, if difficulties existed or arose between one or more of the Great Powers and one or more of the belligerents it would be much easier for the Great Powers to give effect to their demands if they acted in common. I said that this sentence was all right. It expressed the view on which we had all been acting, that the Powers should keep in touch. . . .

“I observed that I could hardly believe that Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg had intended to convey the impression that he would support Austria under all circumstance, whatever her demands might be, though parts of his speech were open to this construction.”
the present moment such a warning was tactful or politic. He is, I am sure, under a grave
delusion if he imagines that Russia will again submit to what occurred in 1909.”64 Now that
Germany and Austria were secured in their alliance, other members of the Powers also started to
gravitate toward one another. Since Russia and France had forged a relationship in the latter
nineteenth century, of interest in 1912 was the alliance that Britain would make.

Nearly a week after the London armistice, King George V sent a private letter to Grey,
concerning a recent conversation with Prince Heinrich [Henry] of Prussia, Kaiser Wilhelm II’s
younger brother, writing “he [Prince Heinrich] asked me point blank, whether in the event of
Germany and Austria going to war with Russia and France, England would come to the
assistance of the two latter Powers. I answered undoubtedly yes under certain circumstances.
He professed surprise and regret but did not ask what the certain circumstances were. He said he
would tell the Emperor what I had told him. Of course Germany must know that we would not
allow either of our friends to be crippled.”65 Given that each nation was intent on forging

64 Ibid., 239 – No. 322. “Sir A. Nicolson to Sir G. Buchanan.” Private. Foreign Office, 3 December
1912.
65 G. P. Gooch and Harold Temperley, Eds., with the assistance of Lillian M. Penson. British Documents
on the Origins of the War, 1898-1914, Volume X, Part II: The Last Years of Peace. London,
England: Her Majesty’s Stationary Office; 1953, 658 – No. 452, “King George V to Sir Edward
Grey,” Private. York Cottage, Sandringham, 8 December 1912: This letter is endorsed as having
been sent to the Prime Minster. The next day, 9 December 1912, another private letter (No. 453)
is sent from Sir Edward Grey to King George V, which is again “endorsed as having been sent to
the Prime Minster,” stating “Sir Edward Grey thinks that it would be dangerous and misleading to
let the German Government be under the impression that under no circumstances would England
come to the assistance of France and Russia, if Germany and Austria went to war with them, and
he thinks it very fortunate that Your Majesty was able to give an answer to Prince Henry that will
prevent him from giving this impression at Berlin.

“Your Majesty’s Government is not committed in the event of war and the public opinion of this
country is, so far as Sir Edward Grey can judge, very averse to a war arising out of a quarrel
about Servia. But if Austria attacked Servia aggressively and Germany attacked Russia if she
came to the assistance of Servia and France were then involved, it might become necessary for
England to fight; as the German Chancellor said that Germany would fight, for the defence of her
position in Europe and for the protection of her own future and security.”
alliances, it appeared that the First Balkan War would inadvertently pull all of the European
Powers into an international crisis. Suddenly, priorities of Germany, Austria-Hungary, Russia,
France, and Britain shifted as each nation weighted the possibility of declaring war. The same
day that the King’s letter reached Grey, Germany’s top military generals gathered for a War
Council meeting on 8 December 1912 and agreed that war was on the horizon. For Helmuth von
Moltke (1848-1916), the Chief of the German General Staff, he was “convinced that Russia’s
military and economy were developing so fast that, by 1917, Russia would be too strong for
Germany to beat. [Admiral Alfred von] Tirpitz, on the other hand, wanted to delay; the navy
[would not] be ready to challenge Britain at least until 1917. Nothing specific was planned, but
the meeting agreed that the German people should be “prepared” for the possibility of war in the
future.”66 Even though the Germany’s General Staff seemed geared for war, Austria was
beginning to reconsider their willingness to war over the Balkans.67 With the continued success
of the Balkan States against the Ottoman Empire throughout the spring of 1913 and the threat of
a larger continental war, a new armistice was drawn up in an attempt to end the crisis.

Under the Treaty of London, signed on 30 May 1913, “the Ottomans ceded all lands east
of a straight line drawn across eastern Thrace from the Aegean port of Enos to the Black Sea port

---

66 Carter, 345.
67 In 1913, Archduke Franz Ferdinand “categorically rejected’ [Austrian Chief of Staff, General Franz
Konrad von] Hötzendörf’s urgings for war against Serbia,” stating “let us assume that no one
else will contest us, [that war] can settle accounts with Serbia in peace and quiet. [But what can
Vienna gain thereby?] Only a pack of thieves and a few more murderers and rascals and a few
plum trees. . . . [However], that most favorable case, that no one contests us, is more than
unlikely. . . . If we take the field against Serbia, Russia will stand behind her, and we will have
war with Russia. Should the Austrian emperor and the Russian tsar topple one another from the
throne and clear the war for revolution.

“War with Russia . . . means the end of us (Brose, 34 – Brackets appear in the original text).”
of Midia,” formally ending the empire’s dominance in Eastern Europe.\textsuperscript{68} In an effort to cut back on the territories Serbia gained from Turkey, the Great Powers “insist[ed] that an autonomous Albanian state be created,” which “meant that the Serbs would have to surrender to the new state some territory they had conquered.”\textsuperscript{69} Territorial divisions only ensured that lands would be continually debated by both the Balkan allies and the Great Powers. As Richard C. Hall notes, “the Treaty of London was a triumph for the Austrians and the Italians, and a setback for Russia,” further guaranteeing the probability of international interventions.\textsuperscript{70} While the Treaty of London briefly ended the conflict in the Balkans, internal disputes regarding former Turkish land holdings made all members of the Balkan League susceptible to further internal disagreements. The inability of the Balkan League to fully unite in a common cause against the external empires of Austria-Hungary and Turkey led to infighting, which ultimately resulted in another Balkan conflict. On the night of 29 June, Bulgaria “attacked the Greek and Serbian lines in Macedonia,” sparking a Second Balkan War.\textsuperscript{71} Taking a stand against Bulgaria was Montenegro, who quickly joined forces with Serbia and Greece along with Rumania, and by 12 July, Turkey had also issued a declaration of war. Against this force, Bulgaria was unable to produce any type of significant victory and by the end of July an armistice was concluded that effectively brought an end to the fighting. According to the Treaty of Bucharest signed on 10

\textsuperscript{68} Hall, 101.

\textsuperscript{69} Stavrianos, 114-115 – Stavrianos goes on to write that “as compensation, the Serbs demanded portions of Macedonia claimed by the Bulgars. The latter indignantly rejected the Serbian demands, particularly because they had faced the largest Turkish armies and had done the heaviest fighting. There was also the question of the strategic Saloniki area, which had been occupied by the Greeks but which was also coveted by the Bulgars. Moreover, Rumania, as recompense for her neutrality, demanded a part of the Dobruja which had remained in the hands of Bulgaria after the Congress of Berlin. This question was arbitrated by a conference of the great powers and a very small boundary rectification finally was granted. Rumanian statesmen blamed Austria for the failure to obtain greater compensation and continued their hostility to Bulgaria.

\textsuperscript{70} Hall, 102.

\textsuperscript{71} Stavrianos, 115.
August 1913, lands were redistributed among Greece, Rumania, Serbia, and Montenegro, including a vast amount of territory in Macedonia, an area which Bulgaria had initially desired to control. Although humiliated by the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina in 1908, Serbia, along with Greece, emerged from the Second Balkan War as the biggest winner.

Not only did the nation increase its population from 2.9 to 4.4 million, but it also was successful in “nearly doubl[ing] [its] territory.” This victory allowed Serbia to go “from being a despised and ineffectual nation,” to one that “had emerged as a real factor in European politics,” much to the detriment of Austria. As Bernadotte E. Schmitt notes, the argument between the two nations centered on “the principle of nationality and the doctrine of historic right.” For Serbia, their move toward independence in 1878 served as a means of uniting other ethnic Serbs living within the empires of Turkey and Austria-Hungary to break foreign domination and establish their own nation states. Serbia’s victories during the Balkan Wars perpetuated these ideas of unity and independence, which threatened to usurp Austria’s power which the empire had held throughout the previous four centuries. Unwilling to let the Balkans break away, Austria constantly sought to block Serbia’s attempts at expansion. One of the agreements to the Peace of Bucharest was that Serbia was to withdraw their forces from the territory of Albania. Throughout the months following the peace, the vulnerability of Albania became an increasing concern to other members of the Great Powers. On 7 September 1913,

---

72 Hall, 125.
74 Halsey, 59 – As Neil M. Heyman notes other “newly independent or newly expanded nations of the Balkans,” besides Serbia included “Bulgaria, Greece, and Rumania (World War I. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press; 1997, 4-5).”
76 Ibid., 105.
Grey sent a telegram to Bertie, writing “there seems to be a tendency at Vienna not to realize the risk of internal trouble in Albania and a reluctance to expedite anything that is proposed to prevent it, and I fear things may drift into difficulties in consequence.”\footnote{G. P. Gooch and Harold Temperley, Eds., with the assistance of Lillian M. Penson. \textit{British Documents on the Origins of the War, 1898-1914, Volume X, Part I: The Near and Middle East on the Eve of War}. London, England: His Majesty’s Stationary Office; 1936, 2 – No. 2, “Sir Edward Grey to Sir F. Bertie,” Very Confidential. Tel. (No. 328). Foreign Office, September 7, 1913: This telegram was repeated to Berlin (No. 326); to St. Petersburg (No. 652). F.O. 41257/14809/13/44.} Albania’s instability was preyed upon by the governments of both Serbia and Austria that again threatened open conflict by the end of September. A month later, when Serbian forces still refused to pull out of Albania, Austria – without the advice of their allies – took it upon themselves to force the issue with Serbia. To the rest of Europe, Austria’s actions came as an unwelcome surprise.

On 16 October 1913, Sir Edward Goschen, British Ambassador at Berlin sent a telegram to Grey, informing him that the “Austro-Hungarian Government had sent a strongly worded representation to the Servian Government pointing out that the decisions of the London Conference with regard to Albanian frontier must be respected and that Servian troops should be retired to beyond that frontier. Austrian Minister for Foreign Affairs’ message added that unless he received a speedy and satisfactory answer from the Servian Government he intended to follow up his representations by fixing a time for the retirement.”\footnote{Ibid., 32 – No. 38, “Sir E. Goschen to Sir Edward Grey,” Berlin, October 16, 1913. Tel. (No. 180): This telegram was sent to Paris (as No. 370); to Rome (as No. 312); to Vienna (as No. 295); to St. Petersburg (as No. 705); to Belgrade (as No. 133). F.O. 47129/30271/13/44.} As the Great Powers were attempting to prevent the conflict over Albania from turning into an all-out European war, Austria issued an ultimatum to Serbia on 17 October 1913, without the advice or support of their allies. According to the challenge, reported via telegram by Mr. Dayrell E. M. Crackanthorpe, Second Secretary at British Embassy at Belgrade to Grey, the “Austrian Legation [was] demanding complete evacuation of Albania within eight days, failing which Austria would take
necessary measures to enforce demand.” Immediately, Austria’s blunt actions toward Serbia sent shockwaves throughout Europe. In response to Goschen’s message, Grey replied, stating that “separate action by Austria before even consulting other Powers makes things very difficult. The usual course would be not to take separate action till after some attempt and failure to obtain co-operation of other Powers. For Austria to present an ultimatum to Serbia and then to demand the support of other Powers is in a sense to confront the Powers with an ultimatum.” Although Austria-Hungary and Germany were tied together based on the agreement of the 1878 Dual Alliance, the Kaiser had resisted any attempts to offer full support of Austria’s participation in the Balkans. While the efforts on the part of both Grey and Bethmann-Hollweg were instrumental in urging Serbia to negotiate a peaceful settlement with Austria in order to avoid total war, Germany’s attitude toward their ally started to change during the October 1913 crisis.

Two days after the ultimatum was given, Goschen informed Grey that Austria “had merely stated what she was going to do and had done it, but as the ultimatum had gone in it was now impossible for Germany to advise her to give way, both because advice would not be followed, and because it was not in Germany’s own interest that her ally should send in an ultimatum and then retreat from it.” British suspicions that Germany was indeed encouraging

79 Ibid., 39 – No. 45, “Mr. Crackanthorpe to Sir Edward Grey,” Belgrade, October 19, 1913. Tel. (No. 260): This telegram was sent to Paris (as No. 374); to Rome (as No. 316); to Berlin (as No. 369); to Vienna (as No. 300); to St. Petersburgh (as No. 709); “for information.” F.O. 47493/30271/13/44.

80 Ibid., 36-37 – No. 43, “Sir Edward Grey to Sir E. Goschen,” Foreign Office, October 18, 1913. Tel. (No. 367). F.O. 47129/30271/13/44 – Grey goes on to write that the current crisis in the Balkans is attributed to the lack of action from the Great Powers, writing, “I think Servia has some ground of complaint owing to delay of the Powers in establishing any settled Gov[ernmen]t in Albania. I am however prepared to support at Belgrade the decisions of the Ambassadors’ Conference in London respecting frontier between Albania and Servia, and to advise Servian Gov[ernmen]t to give an assurance that Servia will respect that frontier and that her troops have only crossed it as an emergency measure and will be withdrawn at the earliest practicable moment.”

81 The Triple Alliance, which brought Italy into the fray was struck in 1882 and would last until 1918.

82 British Documents on the Origins of the War, 1898-1914, Volume X, Part I: The Near and Middle East
Austria toward war were further revealed by Sir Fairfax Cartwright, British Ambassador at Vienna, when he sent a “Most Confidential” telegram to Grey in which he wrote:

I learn[ed] from a confidential source that, when the German Emperor was told by the German Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs that the recent Austrian ultimatum had been launched against Servia, he immediately sent telegrams to the Emperor and Heir Apparent [Franz Ferdinand] congratulating them on the step taken. When here, the German Emperor spoke very freely while driving with the Austrian general, attached to him, and expressed his satisfaction at the Austrian ultimatum and that for once Austria had shown her teeth and that he hoped she would continue to do so.83

Germany’s interest in the Balkans stemmed from a concern that went beyond loyalties to its nineteenth century alliance. The ongoing problems in the Balkan region had drawn the attention of Russia, who had long been seen as an enemy toward Germany. In effect, Germany’s need to intervene with Austria was not simply for the benefit of the Habsburgs, but also to prevent Russia’s mobilization along Germany’s eastern frontier. Although the Kaiser may have been quick to encourage the ultimatum issued by Austria-Hungary, it was a policy that some of his key advisors had also been advocating during the last few years. Both Bethmann-Hollweg and

---

83 Ibid., 49-50 – No. 57, “Sir F. Cartwright to Sir Edward Grey,” Most Confidential, Vienna, October 29, 1913. Tel. (No. 158). F.O. 49254/30271/13/44 – Cartwright goes on to write “I am informed that at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs it is regretted that the Emperor should have used such language to a general, as it is felt that such language is likely to encourage the military party to press for a forward policy in Balkan matters. Count Berchtold [Leopold Anton Johann Sigismund Joseph Korsinus Ferdinand, Count von Berchtold, Austro-Hungarian Foreign Minister] had over an hour’s conversation with the German Emperor and I am informed that he laid very frankly before His Majesty the grievances of Austria at lack of loyal support given to her by Germany during recent crisis.” – In the Minutes attached to this telegram, E. A. C. (Mr. (later Sir) Eyre Crowe), Assistant Under-Secretary of the State for Foreign Affairs in Britain noted on 29 October 1913 that “this confirms the impression that Germany pretending to us that she altogether disapproved and regretted Austrian attitude, had throughout encouraged her ally.” Sir Edward Grey also added “on the other hand if the statement in the penultimate paragraph is true it proved that there were times when Germany was disapproving of Austrian action. I am disposed to think that this is merely a personal outburst on the part of the Emperor, who always wants to be on the crest of every wave. None the less it may influence Austrian policy.”
von Moltke, who were “haunted by the thought that the future belonged to Russia, and that by the late teens of the century it would be so powerful Germany would be at its mercy.”\textsuperscript{84} Despite Germany’s change of views, the intervention of the Great Powers eventually resulted in Serbia agreeing to withdrawal from Albania, which allowed for another brief period of peace to return to the region.

Even though war had twice been avoided in the Balkans, tensions between Serbia and Austria remained elevated. Since the 1903 coup d’état when “the absolutist rule of King Alexander Obrenović was overthrown” and replaced by “the new king, Prince Petar Karadjordjević . . . . Serbia enjoyed a system of constitutional monarchy.”\textsuperscript{85} Under new leadership, the twentieth century brought new change to Serbia, in terms of economic and industrial expansion, while the “peasant population was granted more generous voting rights than the people of many Western countries enjoyed.”\textsuperscript{86} These new freedoms granted to Serbians, also granted workers the right to organize, allowing trade unionists, Social Democrats and Anarchosyndicalists to develop along with republicanism.\textsuperscript{87} The break from absolutist rule allowed Serbia to further distance themselves from the politics and policies of Austria by identifying instead with the West. And in doing so, Serbia continually denied Austria the opportunity to reassert their domination within the area. With the support of Russia and the new direction of King Petar, “all Serbian politicians after 1903 sought national unification.”\textsuperscript{88} Russia’s pledge of support came at a pivotal moment in European history when alliances among the powers still dominated the continent. Since 1897 relations between Russia and France forged

\textsuperscript{84} Carter, 346.
\textsuperscript{85} Dedijer, 367.
\textsuperscript{86} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{87} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{88} Hamilton and Herwig, 42.
a link that ultimately came to include England by 1907.\textsuperscript{89} As Serbia changed following the 1903 coup d’état, many Serbian nationals were keen to assert their independence from Austria as a new wave of patriotism gripped parts of the country, especially among the young academics.

Since the 1890s, the Habsburg Empire had strictly outlawed the organization of any type of student-led societies fearing that these groups would start to radicalize and publicly challenge the authority of the state. Despite being prohibited “schoolboys [had] formed secret societies, as far back as 1899” that ranged from literary societies like that led by Dimitrije Mitrinović to those that concentrated on either ethnic or political problems like \textit{Sloboda} or Freedom.\textsuperscript{90} In an empire as multiethnic as the Austrian-Hungarian Empire, calls for self-rule increased further after Bosnia and Herzegovina were annexed in October 1908. Austria’s occupation outraged Serbian nationalists who “felt that the potential prize of Bosnian territory had been snatched unfairly from their grasp.”\textsuperscript{91} Shortly thereafter, organizations advocating Pan-Serbian unification were formed. Union or Death (\textit{Ujedinjenie ili Smrt}) or more commonly the Black Hand (\textit{Crna Ruka}), was formed by Colonel Dragutin Dimitrijević (Colonel Apis), in 1911, was “formed in order to achieve the ideal of unification of Serbdom,” through means of “revolutionary action rather than cultural.”\textsuperscript{92} At times, membership with the Black Hand often coincided with other secret nationalist societies like Serbia’s Narodna Odbrana (National Defense) and the student led group \textit{Mlada Bosna} or Young Bosnia(ns), even though the purpose of each organization often

\textsuperscript{89} Dedijer, 368.
\textsuperscript{90} Ibid., 177.
\textsuperscript{92} Dedijer, 374 – “The constitution had 37 articles divided into five parts and the bylaws had 28 articles,” of which the above quote was taken from the first section, Articles 1 & 2, which “spoke about the goals of the society.”
differed. With the public support and member correspondence with individuals like Leon Trotsky, accusations that association with or in these secret nationalist societies was rooted in Bolshevism were attached soon after the distressing events of 28 June 1914. During his trial, however, Princip emphasized the idea of Pan-Slavism when he declared, “I am a Yugoslav nationalist, aiming for the unification of all Yugoslavs, and I do not care what form of state, but it must be free from Austria.” For those involved with these groups, the notion of assassination was not a new concept. Before the events of 28 June 1914, Bogdan Zerajić became “the first in a succession of hero-martyr-assassins” when he fired five shots at the military governor during the

---

93 Ibid., 377-378 & 175 – According to Dedijer, while Narodna Odbrana was formed in December 1908, “for the purpose of strengthening Serbian defenses and preparing adequate forcible means (revolutionary action, guerrilla volunteer units, etc.) to prevent the Habsburgs form carrying out the annexation of Bosnia and Hercegovina. . . . But after the Serbian government’s statement of March 1909 indicating Serbia’s formal acceptance of Austria-Hungary’s ultimatum, Narodna Odbrana had to modify its organization and conform to the change in policy. Instead of being a paramilitary society, an auxiliary force promoting revolutionary activity among the South Slavs under Habsburg rule in preparation for a defensive war, Narodna Odbrana henceforth concerned itself with cultural matters. It did, however, use its contacts among the subject South Slavs to establish a network of confidential agents who obtained information on any Austro-Hungarian military preparations which threatened Serbia.

“Colonel Apis’s Ujedinjenie ili Smrt was organized as a protested against what it described as “the treason of the government” in connection with the capitulation of 1909. The difference between Ujedinjenie ili Smrt and Narodna Odbrana (in the second period of its work after March 1909) is emphasized by Article 2 of the former’s constitution: “This organization prefers revolutionary action rather than cultural.”

Likewise, the Young Bosnians “were not a single, centralized, hierarchical organization with a written program. They were a part of the spontaneous revolutionary movement among South Slav youth, existing both within Austria-Hungary – especially in Croatia, Dalmatia and Slovenia – and in Serbia and Montenegro, and even among the South Slav emigrants in the United States. A common goal brought all of these groups together: the revolutionary destruction of the Habsburg empire.

“They were not exclusively nationalists. The hard core of the Young Bosnians was committed not only to throwing off foreign rule but also to overcoming the primitivism of their own society; they challenged the authority of existing institutions of state, school, church and family, and they believed in egalitarianism and the emancipation of women. For that reason ethics became a field of special interest for them. They were also engaged in other spiritual and intellectual activities. On the eve of the First World War, they were identified among South Slavs as the most active literary group opposing academism and advocating modernism.”

94 Malcolm, 153.
opening day of the new Bosnian parliament on 15 June 1910. Although Zerajić failed and used the sixth bullet on himself, his actions hinted at the mentality of student activists, foreshadowing the violent actions some nationalists were willing to embrace in the effort to break free of Austrian rule.95

Political assassinations were used throughout the world by the turn of the twentieth century. Between 1900 and 1913, there was an estimated 38 that were successfully carried out in countries like Bolivia, the United States of America, Serbia, Finland, Russia, Greece, Bengal, Japan, Egypt, India, Spain, and Mexico, where governors, prime ministers, statesmen, politicians, kings and a queen, a socialist leader and a president were among those targeted.96 Unsuccessful assassination attempts like that of Zerajić were common enough to cause concern among members of both the nobility and political officers. In Austria alone, there had been “five assassination attempts . . . against representatives of the Habsburg administration,” between 1910 and 1914.97 When it was announced in March 1914 that the Archduke, who was the Inspector General of the Armed Forces of the Empire, would be traveling to Bosnia and Herzegovina in June to oversee the Great Summer Maneuvers of the 15th and 16th Army Corps stationed in the mountains southwest of Sarajevo, the notice caught the attention of those who saw the Austrian Heir Apparent as one of their enemies. According to Dedijer, it was this public announcement of the Archduke’s visit that caught the attention of poet Jovan Varagić, who clipped the article and had it sent to Nedelijko Čabrinović at the Golden Sturgeon café in Belgrade. While Čabrinović made

95 Ibid – According to Dedijer, this was Zerajić’s second assassination attempt. On 3 June 1910, “Zerajić, who, in despair over the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, decided to kill the Emperor Franz Josef when he visited Mostar . . . . Zerajić changed his mind at the last moment, although he had been only a few steps from the Habsburg Emperor with a revolver in his pocket.” Following this, Zerajić returned to Sarajevo and opened fire on 15 June 1910 (Dedijer, 236).
96 Dedijer, 450-451 – For a complete listing of these assassinations, please refer to Appendix C.
no notice of the note, he later showed it to Princip while visiting another coffee house, the Acorn Garland. Armed with the knowledge of where and when the Archduke was visiting, they agreed to a plot aimed at a man who was widely “regarded as the most dangerous enemy of the Servian people.” Prior to his assassination, the Archduke was well aware that he had numerous enemies, having been subject to various schemes during the last fifteen years. This time, however, the Archduke was strongly cautioned against visiting Sarajevo. One advisor, “August Urbanski von Ostrymizecz, Chief of the Intelligence Department of the Austro-Hungarian General Staff, wrote that ‘the Archduke’s visit to Sarajevo should have been postponed absolutely,’ because he had received reports from Serbia that ‘indignation exploded at the news of the Archduke’s visit to Sarajevo.’” In spite of these warnings as well as own premonitions, the Archduke and his wife, Duchess Sofia, decided to commence with their plans and on 23 June 1914, and they left their children behind and departed their estate at Chlumetz.

For reasons unknown, the Archduke’s visit to Sarajevo was not only announced with a full itinerary in the Bosnische Post the day before his arrival, but he was scheduled to arrive in the city on 28 June, which coincided with “the anniversary of the Battle of Kosovo and therefore the most sacred day in the mystical calendar of Serb nationalism.” Security for the Archduke...
and the Duchess was lacking, despite the fact that the their visit had been publically announced; “on the . . . streets through which the imperial party had to pass, there were no lines of soldiers, as there had been during the Emperor’s visit in 1910.” As the crowds started to gather along the route, there were six men who were armed with revolvers and grenades, all ready to carry out a murderous plot that had long been discussed and debated. Čabrinović was the first of the assassins to act, when he lobbed a bomb at the car carrying the Archduke at about 10:10 AM.

Although the Archduke narrowly escaped the assassination attempt and continued on to his speaking engagement, he made a last minute decision to stop at the hospital where the wounded officers had earlier been taken. His wife, the Duchess Sofia, decided that she too would called on his neighbors and allies for help. Kink Tvrtko sent a large Bosnian force under Vlatko Vuković, which fought alongside Prince Lazar’s army at the battle of Kosovo Polje in June 1389. Though Serbian myth and poetry have presented this battle as a cataclysmic defeat in which the flower of Balkan chivalry perished on the field and the Turks swept on through the rest of Serbia, the truth is a little less dramatic. Losses were heavy on both sides, and Prince Lazar was captured and executed; but the remnants of both sides withdrew after the battle, and for a while the Serb and Bosnian forces believed that they had won. It was not the battle itself which brought about the fall of Serbia to the Turks, but the fact that while the Serbs had needed all the forces they could muster to hold the Turks to an expensive and temporary draw, the Turks were able to return, year after year, in ever increasing strength. By 1392 all the Serbian Orthodox lands, apart from Bosnian-ruled Hum [Hercegovina], had submitted to Ottoman suzerainty (20).” Despite its outcome, the Battle of Kosovo was hailed by all Serbs as a symbol of independence.

104 Dedijer, 317-318 – Dedijer notes that: “More than two weeks before June 28, both Princip and Čabrinović had registered with the Sarajevo police, according to regulations, giving their correct addresses, and no one bothered to keep an eye on them. When the Emperor Franz Josef visited Sarajevo in 1910, all newcomers were obliged to register within six hours of their arrival; [Bogdan] Zerajić from the start had two detectives shadowing every step he made. Princip and Čabrinović walked freely through Sarajevo, and Čabrinović actually went three times to Ilidže, where the Archduke and his wife were shopping.”

105 At that time, Dedijer explains that “the driver, a Czech named Leopold Sojka, seeing a black object flying toward him, accelerated, and the bomb fell on the folded roof. The Archduke threw up his left arm to protect the Duchess, and the missile bounced off into the street, exploding under the left rear wheel of the next car and making a hole 11 by 12½ inches wide and 6½ inches deep. . . . “Two officers, Lieutenant Colonel Erich von Merizzi (it was he who had spoken against postponement of the visit) and Lieutenant Colonel Count Alexander Boos-Waldeck, were bleeding. . . . Policemen and detectives were running around, arresting as many onlookers as they could. People on the pavement were shouting; about twenty of them had been wounded, some of them seriously. A woman watching the parade from the balcony of her bedroom had been hit in the face, and her eardrum had been shattered by the explosion (12-13).”
accompany her husband. While the Archduke and his convoy traveled down Appel Quay – which was supposed to be empty – just before 11 AM, Princip appeared on the sidewalk, drew his Browning pistol and fired at the motorcade, which had slowed. An hour after the assassination, Princip told investigators

\[\ldots\text{as I saw that a lady was sitting next to him [the Archduke] I reflected for a moment whether I should shoot or not. At the same moment I was filled with a peculiar feeling and I aimed at the Heir Apparent from the pavement – which was made easier because the car was proceeding slower at that moment. Where I aimed I do not know. But I know I aimed at the Heir Apparent. I believe that I fired twice, perhaps more, because I was so excited. Whether I hit the victims or not, I cannot tell, because instantly people started to hit me.}\]

Indeed, Princip’s shots found their intended and unintended victims. The bullet that killed the Duchess “penetrated the side of the car, her corset and her right side,” while the Archduke suffered from “a bullet [that] had pierced the right side of his coat collar, severed the jugular vein and come to a stop in the spine.”\textsuperscript{107} By 11.30 AM, both the Heir Apparent and his wife were dead. Almost immediately, news of the assassination spread throughout Sarajevo, the Austro-Hungarian Empire, as well as the continent. Among the first telegrams to reach Grey at the British Foreign Office in London was one from Mr. J. F. Jones, British Vice-Consul at Sarajevo, who messaged, “according to news received here heir apparent and his consort assassinated this morning by means of an explosive nature.”\textsuperscript{108} Two days after the assassination, \textit{The New York Times} printed an article from the Associated Press out of London in which they noted that “even before the bodies of the murdered pair have been interred the Austrian authorities are

\textsuperscript{106} Ibid., 321.
\textsuperscript{107} Ibid., 16.
contemplating severe measures against the Serbs among the inhabitants of Austria and Bosnia, and these are likely further to embitter the relations between the two countries, as well as those between Austria and Russia, the protector of all the Serbs.”109 With the sudden death of the Archduke, Austria now had the opportunity to finally strike out at Serbia.

Austria’s intent to go to war with Serbia had long been evident during the Balkan crises. In fact, “the Austrian military was quite . . . enthusiastic about the idea of war,” and in 1913, Franz Conrad von Hötzendorf, Austria’s Chief of Staff, had “alone . . . demanded war twenty-five times.”110 Although the struggle between Serbia and Austria was well-known throughout the international community, there was some concern that the assassination could ignite a larger conflict. British Ambassador at Vienna, Sir Maurice de Bunsen sent a confidential note to Grey, relaying the Russian Ambassador M. Schebeko’s concerns, noting that “he cannot believe that the country will allow itself to be rushed into war, for an isolated combat with Servia would be impossible and Russia would be compelled to take up arms in defence of Servia. Of this there could be no question. A Servian war meant a general European war.”111 Even in Britain, David Lloyd George, who was Chancellor of the Exchequer, noted that upon hearing of the assassination, he “felt that it was a grave matter, and that it might provoke serious consequences which only the firmest and most skillful handling could prevent from developing into an emergency that would involve nations.”112 Nevertheless, despite these initial fears expressed during the first week, it seemed that an eerie kind of peace had descended across Europe as

110 Carter, 358.
various national leaders continued their summer plans. As the week progressed, however, Austria entered into preliminary negotiations with Germany in an attempt to secure their alliance in the event of war. Initially these discussions were viewed with little trepidation. German Ambassador to London, Prince Karl Marx Lichnowsky, who was in Berlin on 4 July, recalled when he “learned that Austria intended to take action against Serbia in order to put an end to an intolerable state of things. Unfortunately I underestimated at the moment the importance of this news. I believed that it would again come to nothing and that, should Russia threaten, it would be easy to arrange matters.” On 5 July 1914, the same day that Austria’s Emperor Franz Joseph sent word “to the Austrian and Hungarian Premiers . . . declar[ing] that the murders [of the Archduke and Countess] were an outcome of “the fanaticism of a small band of misguided men,” and expressed “The resolve to follow to the last breath the way I know to be right for the welfare of my peoples,” the Austrian ambassador came to [Kaiser] Wilhelm with a confidential letter from Emperor Franz Joseph stating that the assassination had been traced to a plot organized by the Serbian government and Serbia must be “eliminated.” It asked for German support. The implication was that Austria would launch a quick war to punish Serbia while Europe was on its summer holiday. It would all be over before anyone could complain.”

Whereas this plan might have succeeded in the past, alliances were so tightly watched by the

113 According to Lloyd George “the Kaiser departed for his usual yachting holiday in the Norwegian fiords. His Chief Minister left for his usual shooting part on his estate in Silesia. The acting Head of the German Foreign Office went off on a honeymoon trip. A still more reassuring fact – the military head of the German Army, Von Moltke, left for his cure in a foreign spa. The President of the French Republic and his Prime Minister were on a ceremonal visit to Russia and only arrived back in Paris on July 29th. Our [British] Foreign Office preserved its ordinary tranquility of demeanour and thought it unnecessary to sound an alarm even in the Cabinet Chamber (War Memoirs of David Lloyd George, 1914-1915, 50).”
115 Ibid., 403.
116 Carter, 358.
international community that such a strike would by no means remain contained. Upon hearing Austria’s intention Lloyd George quickly surmised the large issue at stake, commenting “those who directed affairs amongst the Central Powers only felt that they must burn out that ‘wasps’ nest,’ as they called Serbia, and they never seemed to take cognizance of the fact that the grass on the plains of Europe at that time was all tinder.”

While the rest of Europe waited with bated breath to see what Austria would do, the arrests and investigation of the Sarajevo assassins was already underway.

As news of the deaths of the Archduke and Duchess broke internationally, the authorities had already taken the conspirators into custody. According to *The New York Times*, “after his unsuccessful attempt to blow up the imperial visitors Gabrinovics sprang into the River Miljachka in an effort to escape, but witnesses plunged after him and seized him.” Shortly thereafter, Princip “whose head was bleeding,” was brought to police headquarters with “a crowd following . . . some members . . . trying to hit” him “with their walking sticks.” In total, twenty-two conspirators were put on trial for their involvement in the assassination of the Heir Apparent and the Duchess of Hohenberg. Given the nature of the attack against the Archduke, speculation that the assassins were tied to anarchists groups quickly spread throughout Europe and the United States. On 29 June 1914, *The New York Times* reported that “Gabrinovics told the police that he had obtained the bomb from Anarchists at Belgrade whose names he did not know.”

---

117 George, 53.
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the assassins were operating within the realm of anarchy. A brief telegram was sent by Consul Jones of Sarajevo to Grey on 29 June stating “local paper speaks of Anarchist crime, but as was more likely that of Servian irredentists, preconcerted long ago.” Even the investigation judge of the Sarajevo District Court, Leo Pfeffer, held a similar view when he first saw Čabrinović at police headquarters shortly after the bomb exploded, noting that his “first impression was that he had committed the assassination because of anarchist principles.”

During his preliminary investigation, Čabrinović declared that he was

. . . an adherent of the radical anarchist idea, which aims at destroying the present system through terrorism in order to bring in the liberal system in its place. Therefore I hate all representatives of the constitutional system – of course, not this or that person as such but as the bearer of power which oppresses the people. I have educated myself in this spirit through the reading of socialist and anarchist writings and I can say that I have read through almost all the literature of this type that I could get in the Serbo-Croatian language. . . .

I aimed specifically at the Archduke, in order to kill him, because he – as far as I know from periodicals – is an enemy of the Slavs in general but especially of the Serbs.

Although Čabrinović and Princip had both attempted suicide following their attacks, their imprisonment eventually led to the capture of other friends and supporters of the assassination.

By the afternoon, one of the initial supporters of the plot, Danilo Ilić, was arrested because

“Princip made the initial mistake of stating that he lived in the house of Ilić’s mother.”

---

122 Dedijer, 324-325.
123 Ibid., 326.
124 Ibid., 327 – In 1907, thirteen-year-old Princip was sent to Sarajevo live as a border in the house of Stoya Ilić as 3 Oprkanj Street. While in Sarajevo, Princip shared a room with Ilić’s son, Danilo Ilić, who was four years older. Ilić, a teacher and writer, had maintained contact with Vladimir Gaćinović, had been one of the “chief leaders of the Young Bosnians,” until 1912, when “his influence began to fade (184).” Princip’s friendship with Ilić exposed him to new literary
Despite Ilić’s role in the plot, he reconsidered the idea shortly before the assault of 28 June, causing a struggle between him and Princip.

Ilić’s change of heart is reminiscent of the major move among revolutionaries in the pre-World War era. Though he was initially attracted to the idea of revolution through political assassination, Ilić soon converted to the idea of establishing a working political movement before resorting to a radical act of violence as a means of gaining independence from Austrian rule. According to Dedijer it was during Ilić’s interaction with Vladimir Gaćinović and other Russian Social Revolutionaries during a 1913 trip to Switzerland where the notion of a political party proceeding violent acts was first discussed. Before the assassination of the Archduke, Ilić and Princip had plotted an attempt on the life of Austrian General Oskar Potiorek, Governor of Bosnia and Hercegovina, which was later called off by Ilić himself. Already between October and November 1913, Ilić’s growing struggle with violence caused considerable concern especially for young idealists like Princip, who noted that his friend “was a little lightheaded; spoke of pan-Slav ideas, said that they should first form an organization. In all Bosnia and Croatia. Then, when all was ready, they should make the attempt. Therefore the plan was given up.”

Although Ilić was instrumental in assembling both weapons and manpower for the June assassination of the Archduke, he continued to question the success of such an attempt. During Princip’s investigation of 3 July 1914, he spoke openly to Judge Pfeffer of the on-going debate between Ilić and himself, explaining that “in the last ten days,” Ilić “repeatedly expressed the opinion that we should not attempt this assassination because the present time was not favorably chosen and we would have no profit from this assassination. But I was not in agreement with the concepts including revolutionary ideals and when Ilić “became the chief organizer of the Sarajevo assassination” in 1914, Princip also became involved (185 & 191).

125 Ibid., 307.
postponement of the assassination because a certain morbid yearning for it had been awakened in me.” 126 While Ilić also maintained during his investigation that he was against the idea of assassinating the Archduke, he nevertheless supported his close friend. To Princip, it seemed that Ilić was falling under the influences of socialism and he reportedly commented to Dr. Martin Pappenheim that Ilić “had no energy. Reading had – he confessed – made him quite slack. Ilić was under his influence, though he was five years older and already a teacher.” 127 Even though there were moments of doubt and even debate among the conspirators, the exchange between Ilić and Princip, although not confirmed socialists or anarchist, represents the ongoing struggle among many members of Europe’s social democratic parties during the pre-war era. For Ilić, however, his crisis in moral consciousness illuminates the ongoing struggle between the intellectual academics and the influential members of Bosnia’s secret societies. As Dedijer notes, while Ilić “questioned the rightness of the philosophy of political homicide and even the necessity of the Archduke’s murder,” the “younger elements among the Young Bosnians, headed by Gavrilo Princip, who had never left their homes for the universities in the great capitals of Europe, had a different opinion.” 128 Nevertheless, their actions on 28 June 1914 set off a string of events that soon extended far beyond the borders of Sarajevo and the political debates between Austria and Serbia.

Following the assassination of the Archduke, M. Yov. M. Yovanovitch, Minister at Vienna, sent a telegram to M. N. Pashitch, Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs in Serbia, warning the government that “the tendency at Vienna to represent, in the eyes of Europe, the outrage committed upon the Austro-Hungarian Crown Prince as the act of a conspiracy

126 Ibid., 309.
127 Ibid., 311.
128 Ibid., 235.
engineered in Serbia is becoming more and more apparent. The idea is to use this as a political weapon more and more apparent. The idea is to use this as a political weapon against us. The greatest attention ought, therefore, to be paid to the tone adopted by our press in its articles on the Serajevo outrage.”129 For Europe’s socialists, James Joll notes that “after the initial shock had passed . . . the members of the Socialist parties . . . sighed with relief, “ while “the Social Democratic press of Europe, though continuing to express a general anxiety about possible trouble in the Balkans, did not show any sign of expecting an immediate and disastrous crisis.”130 Although Europe attempted to appear calm in the weeks following the assassination, tensions between Austria and Serbia continued to mount. While the Serbian government was still investigating Princip, Čabrinović, and others who were connected to the assassination plot, fears of a coming war were also extending well beyond the Balkan states. In England, the “leading article” of The Times in London, on 22 July 1914, was “entitled “A Danger to Europe,” warning readers that “the growing tension between Austria-Hungary and Serbia has created a situation in European politics too serious to be ignored.”131 Similar concerns were also expressed by Sir Buchanan, who sent word from Russia to Grey informing him on 22 July that the “Servian Minister told me yesterday that he regarded present crisis as most dangerous one through which Servia had passed during the last two years.”132 Even so, as Britain’s Foreign Office attempted to derive some matter of avoiding war, by 20 July the Austrian government had

130 Joll, 161.
131 Steed, 410.
already drafted a list of grievances against Serbia. Two days later, on 22 July 1914, Count Leopold von Berchtold, the Austro-Hungarian Foreign Minister, informed Baron Wladimir von Giesl, the Austro-Hungarian Minister in Belgrade that he was “to hand” a “note to the Royal Government” of Serbia.\(^{133}\)

The note, as it turned out, was in fact a ten-point ultimatum claiming that the assassination of the Archduke and Duchess “had been planned in Belgrade” with the assistance of “arms and explosives” that “were given to them by Servian officers and functionaries belonging to the Narodna Odbrana.”\(^{134}\) Austria also insisted “the passage into Bosnia of the criminals and their arms was organized and carried out by the Chiefs of the Servian frontier service.”\(^{135}\) As a result, Austria’s ultimatum demanded that Serbia’s government “publish on the front page of its “journal official,” of the 13\(^{\text{th}}\) (26\(^{\text{th}}\)) July the following declaration:

The Royal Government of Servia condemns the propaganda directed against Austria-Hungary, of which the final aim is to detach from the Austro-Hungarian Monarch territories belonging to it, and it sincerely deplores the fatal consequences of these criminal proceedings.

The Royal Government regrets that Servian officers and functionaries have participated in the above-mentioned propaganda and thus compromised the good neighbourly relations to which the Royal Government was solemnly pledged by its declaration of the 31\(^{\text{st}}\) of March, 1909.

The Austro-Hungarian Government awaits the reply of the Royal Government at the latest by 6 o’clock on Saturday evening, the 25\(^{\text{th}}\) of July.\(^{136}\)


\(^{134}\) Ibid.

\(^{135}\) Ibid.

\(^{136}\) Ibid, 16.
Upon receiving Austria’s notice, Dr. Laza Patchou, Acting Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs, immediately sent word “to all the Serbian Legations abroad,” informing them that with absence of some Ministers from Belgrade, “the Serbian Government have not as yet come to any decision, but I am in a position to state now that the demands are such that no Serbian Government could accept them in their entirety.” Not only did the ultimatum come as a shock to Serbia, but it appeared as if Austria was taking an initial step toward declaring war. In reaction to Austria’s threat, His Royal Highness the Crown Prince Alexander of Serbia turned to his ally for council and sent a message to His Majesty the Emperor of Russia on 24 July 1914, in which he not only informed him of Austria’s ultimatum, but also noted that

The demands contained in the Austro-Hungarian note are, however, unnecessarily humiliating for Servia, and incompatible with her dignity as an independent State. . . . We are prepared to accept those of the Austro-Hungarian conditions which are compatible with the position of an independent State, as well as those to which your Majesty may advise us to agree, and all those persons whose complicity in the crime may be proved will be severely punished by us. . . . We have been allowed too short a time limit. We may be attacked at the expiration of the time limit by the Austro-Hungarian army which is concentrating upon our frontier. We are unable to defend ourselves and we beg your Majesty to come to our aid as soon as possible.

Tsar Nicholas II soon replied to Prince Alexander in the affirmative, promising that “so long as the slightest hope exists of avoiding bloodshed, all our efforts must be directed to that end; but if in spite of our earnest wish we are not successful, your Highness may rest assured that Russia

---

137 Collected Diplomatic Documents Relating to the Outbreak of the European War, 388 – The Serbian Blue Book. No. 33. “Dr. Laza Patchou, Acting Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs, to all the Serbian Legations abroad.” Belgrade, 10/23 July 1914. (Telegraphic.)

will in no case disinterest herself in the fate of Servia.”139 While Serbia and Austria both sought out assistance from their allies, other international diplomats were trying in earnest to prevent a total war from erupting.

Of particular concern regarding Austria’s ultimatum was the 48-hour time limit. One day after the ultimatum was delivered, Count Albert Mensdorff, the Austrian-Hungarian Ambassador at London, reported to Count Berchtold that Grey “regretted the brevity of the time-limit, which made it impossible to calm the first irritation and to induce Belgrade to give us a satisfactory reply.”140 After repeating his concerns regarding the time limit, Count Mensdorff wrote that Grey “would be quite willing to regard the whole affair as concerning solely Austria-Hungary and Servia. Yet he is very “apprehensive” of the possibility that several Great Powers might be involved in war.”141 In an effort to stave off another international event, Grey proposed an international conference, something similar to that organized as the Conference of Ambassadors in 1912-1913 where he hoped “if our respective governments would only use us and trust us and give us the chance, we could keep the peace of Europe in any crisis.”142 Despite the efforts of Great Britain, however, Grey’s conference proposal was soon rejected. According to Count Ladislaus Freiherr von Szögyény, the Austrian-Hungarian Ambassador at Berlin, “Germany could not bring her ally before a European tribunal for adjudication of Austria-Hungary’s

139 Ibid., 281 – The Russian Orange Book: Documents Respecting the Negotiations Preceding the War, Published by the Russian Government. No. 40. “Telegram from His Imperial Majesty the Emperor of Russia to His Royal Highness Prince Alexander of Servia.” 14 (27) July 1914.
141 Ibid.
With the international community unable to reach an agreement regarding the growing crisis in the Balkans, Serbia replied to Austria’s ultimatum. On 25 July, M. N. Pashitch, sent a message to all of the Serbian Legations abroad, writing:

I COMMUNICATED the reply to the Austro-Hungarian note to-day at 5.45 p.m. You will receive the full text of the reply to-night. From it you will see that we have gone as far as was possible. When I handed the note to the Austro-Hungarian Minister he stated that he would have to compare it with his instructions, and that he would then give and immediate answer. As soon as I returned to the Ministry, I was informed in a note from the Austrian-Hungarian Minister that he was not satisfied with our reply, and that he was leaving Belgrade the same evening, with the entire staff of the Legation. The protection of the Legation and its archives, and the care of the Austrian and Hungarian interests had been entrusted by him to the German Legation. He stated finally that on receipt of the note diplomatic relations between Serbia and Austria-Hungary must be considered as definitely broken off.

The Royal Serbian Government had summoned the Skupshtina [The Serbian Parliament] to meet on July 14/27 at Nish, whither all the Ministries with their staffs are proceeding this evening. The Crown Prince has issued, in the name of the King, an order for the mobilization of the army, while to-morrow or the day after a proclamation will be made in which it will be announced that civilians who are not liable to military service should remain peaceably at home, while soldiers should proceed to their appointed posts and defend the country to the best of their ability, in the event of Serbia being attacked.

Following Serbia’s rejection of Austria’s ultimatum, Count Berchtold immediately informed M. Yov. M. Yovanovitch, Serbian Minister at Vienna, not only that he had “been compelled to instruct Baron Giesl to leave the Serbian capital,” but that “relations . . . are thus terminated” and passports were being reissued for the entire staff of the Royal Legation to return to Serbia.

---


negotiations between Austria-Hungary and Serbia were terminated, Sir de Bunsen recalled that once the citizens of Vienna heard the news, “the flood-gates were opened, and the entire people and press clamoured impatiently for immediate and condign punishment of the hated Servian race. The country certainly believed that it had before it only the alternative of subduing Servia or of submitting sooner or later to mutilation at her hands. . . . So just was the cause of Austria held to be that it seemed to her people inconceivable that any country should place itself in her path, or that questions of mere policy or prestige should be regarded anywhere as superseding the necessity which had arisen to exact summary vengeance for the crime of Serajevo.”

While the Austrians celebrated Serbia’s rejection, the announcement produced mixed reactions from a variety of governments throughout the continent as well as from the SPD.

Although Austria censored socialist newspapers “as early as 22 July,” other organizations throughout Europe were free to continue to publish protests and warnings regarding the current crisis. Despite their alliance with Austria, the SPD was among the leading newspapers in Germany that consistently reminded readers what a new continental conflict would entail if Serbia refused to accept the ultimatum. Already when the ultimatum was first announced, “German Social Democracy denounced the action of the militarist Governments in Germany and Austria: – They want war . . . . They want war – the Austrian ultimatum makes it plain and

---


147 According to Joll, “articles against militarism had been cut out of the Socialist papers” in Austria (162).
declares it to the whole world.” In the hours just before the public was officially notified that Serbia had refused Austria’s proposal, the Executive Committee of Germany’s Social Democratic Party issued a “strongly worded protest condemn[ing] the action of the Austrian government as a ‘frivolous provocation’,” declaring that “a grave hour has come, graver than any in decades. Danger is on the march! World War threatens! The ruling classes, who in peacetime gag, despise and exploit you, want to use you as cannon fodder. Everywhere the ears of the autocrats must ring with the crises: We want no war! Down with war! Hurrah for the international brotherhood of peoples!” This written reprimand issued on the 25 July remained in direct correlation to the early ideologies of the SPD concerning the use of military efforts in cross-border struggle. As early as the 1870 Franco-Prussian War, leading members of the SPD “had taken a stand against militarism” by voting in opposition of issuing war credits deemed necessary to finance the conflict. By 1907, members of the Second International took a formal stance on the issue of war and declared at the Stuttgart Congress that “if war ever threatened to break out, the working classes and their representatives in Parliament in the countries affected should with the assistance of the International Bureau, strive to take every step possible in order to avoid the occurrence of war. They must use every effort which in their view, according to the political situation and the opposing class interest, will best contribute to the maintenance of peace.”

---

148 Bevan, 5.
149 Kenneth R. Calkins. *Hugo Haase: Democrat and Revolutionary*. Durham, North Carolina: Carolina Academic Press; 1979, 45 – The protest came on 25 July 1914, just before the announcement was made that Serbia had in fact declined to give into Austria’s demands.
International had already aided in establishing peaceful resolutions during the Agadir Incident of 1911 and the Balkan Crisis in 1912 to the point that “the apparent success of these efforts . . . gave Socialists renewed confidence, and the feeling was widespread in Socialist ranks that governments would not dare to make war against the solidly massed opposition of the international proletariat.”\(^\text{152}\) Even so, by the summer of 1914, many socialist organizations were split in regards to the effectiveness of mass strikes and public protests.\(^\text{153}\) When the ultimatum was given, not only was the SPD already dividing among various fractions – reformists and revolutionaries – but party leaders like Philipp Scheidemann, Friedrich Ebert and Hermann Molkenbuhr, “the most determined conservatives of the executive,” were also absent from Berlin.\(^\text{154}\) And in the face of growing demands for war the calls for peace put forth by organizations like the SPD were temporarily silenced by a minority of the German masses who favored the call to war and firmly supported the efforts of the state in their alliance with the government of Austria-Hungary.

\(^\text{152}\) Ibid., 19 – Fainsod writes that “when the Balkan war cloud hung menacingly over Europe, a special Congress of Socialists met at Basle, Switzerland, November 24-25, 1912, to protest against useless bloodshed and to prevent the spread of the conflict. The assembled delegates drew up a resolution calling upon Socialists to exert their influence on the governments to secure peace. Again the localization of the conflict was largely determined by considerations other than Socialist protests, chiefly the unwillingness of the Great Powers to precipitate an open conflict at that time.”

\(^\text{153}\) As G. D. H. Cole notes, “the Second International was throughout its career only a loose federation of national groups, with only a very limited power to bind its constituent elements. It could indeed lay down mandatory decisions on matters of policy only when there was a large measure of agreement; and it always took care so to shape its resolutions, where they called for positive action, as to secure the assent of at least leading delegations. In particular, it could venture nothing against the solid vote of the Germans, whose disciplined unity gave them in practice an almost unlimited veto, though not the power always to get their own view endorsed (A History of Socialist Thought: Volume III, Part I – The Second International, 1889-1914, xiv-xv).”

While the pedestrians filled the streets of Berlin in eager and curious anticipation of news on the evening of 25 July 1914, Vorwärts, the official newspaper of the SPD, accused German politicians of inciting the public, writing “they want the war – the Austrian ultimatum to Servia makes it plain and clear to the world. Because of the blood of Franz Ferdinand and his wife flowed under the shots of an insane fanatic, shall the blood of thousands of workers and farmers be shed? Shall one insane crime be purged by another even more insane? . . . The Austrian ultimatum may be the torch that will set Europe in flames at all four corners.”\textsuperscript{155} When word was finally confirmed that Austria and Serbia were heading toward a state of open war, Modris Eksteins notes that the “large crowds [that had] milled about in the streets” of Berlin shouted “\textit{Et jeht los!} – a Berliner’s way of saying, ‘It’s on!’ Serbia has turned down the Austrian ultimatum! \textit{Et jeht los!} That is everyone’s phrase in this hour. It cuts to the quick. And all of a sudden, before one is aware of its happening, a crowd has gathered. No one knows anyone else. But all are seized by one earnest emotion: War, war, and a sense of togetherness. And then a solemn and festive sound greets the evening: “Es braust ein Ruf wie Donnerhall [“A Roar Like Thunder Sounds”].”\textsuperscript{156} Word of Berlin’s impromptu celebrations were reported by Sir Horace Rumbold, British Counsellor of Embassy and \textit{Chargé d’Affaires} at Berlin, who messaged Grey on the 26\textsuperscript{th}, informing him that

\textsuperscript{155}Rosa Luxemburg. \textit{The Crisis in the German Social-Democracy (The “Junius” Pamphlet)}. New York, New York: The Socialist Publication Society; 1919, 24-25 – The article continues, explaining that “for this ultimatum, in its form and in its demands, is so shameless, that a Servian Government that should humbly retreat before this note, would have to reckon with the possibility of being driven out by the masses of the people between dinner and dessert. . . .

“It was a crime of the chauvinistic press of Germany to egg on our dear Ally to the utmost in its desire for war. And beyond a doubt, Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg promised Herr Berchtold our support. But Berlin is playing a game as dangerous as that being played by Vienna.”

There was a demonstration in front of the Austrian Embassy last night, and large crowds paraded principal streets signing patriotic songs and Austrian national anthem. German public opinion continues to support Austria-Hungary strongly. Up to the present public were so satisfied of the strength of the Austrian case that they were convinced that conflict with Servia would remain localised. There are now indications that German public and press are beginning to appreciate gravity of position. While not wanting war, they are nevertheless determined to see Austria-Hungary through.\(^{157}\)

Charles Sorley, an English student studying in Jena, Germany also sent a letter to his parents on 26 July writing “the haystack has caught fire. The drunken Verbindungen are parading the streets shouting ‘Down with the Serbs.’ Every half-hour, even in secluded Jena, comes a fresh edition of the papers, each time with wilder rumors: so that that one can almost hear the firing at Belgrade.”\(^{158}\) Not only were people celebrating throughout Germany, but also in Austria “there were scenes of tremendous patriotic enthusiasm. A crowd many thousands strong marched off to the Ministry of War where it entirely filled the broad Ringstrasse. From thousands of throats rose the strains of ‘Gott erhalte Prinz Eugen’ and ‘Die Wacht am Rhein,’ as in orderly procession the masses of people marched through the streets waving black and yellow flags.”\(^{159}\) Similarly, Mr. W. G. Max Müller, British Consul-General at Budapest, notified Grey that “Budapest was last night scene of popular demonstrations of wild enthusiasm for war with Servia. Early this morning notices were posted up ordering partial mobilisation of Budapest corps and of certain Honved regiments of reservists affected to report themselves within twenty-four hours. Persons


\(^{158}\) *The Letters of Charles Sorley with a Chapter of Biography*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press; 1919, 211-212 – Sorley goes on to note “perhaps this is only a German sabbatical liveliness. At any rate, it seems that Russia must to-night settle the question of a continental war, or no.”

belonging to Landsturm are to report themselves during following three days.”160 Even so, in the middle of the jubilation there were still some very loud voices of protest. As Jeffrey Verhey notes, “on 25 July Vorwärts published a proclamation painting war in the darkest terms: “unemployed men, widowed women, and orphaned children.” [Also,] the SPD blamed Austria for working “directly to provoke war,” and stated: the class-conscious proletariat protest in the name of humanity and culture against the criminal actions of those agitating for war (Kriegshetzer) . . . Not one drop of German blood should be sacrificed for the power-hungry Austrian rulers and the imperialistic profit interests.”161 Despite the later mythology that the “Spirit of 1914” overwhelmed both the populace and state of Germany, the last week of July filled Europeans with trepidation and fear as they again faced the daunting prospect of a new continental war.

Tensions between Russia and Germany continued to strain negotiations especially when Tsar Nicholas II issued a call for Russia’s armed forces to mobilize on 28 July. In a telegram written to the Tsar on 30 July, Kaiser Wilhelm II argued that “Austria had only mobilised against Servia and only a part of her army. If, as it is now the case, according to communication by you and your Government, Russia mobilises against Austria, my rôle as mediator you kindly entrusted me with, and which I accepted at your express prayer, will be endangered if not ruined. The whole weight of the decision lies solely on your shoulders now, which have to bear the responsibility for peace or war.”162 Replying later that afternoon, Tsar Nicholas II informed the

---

162 *Diplomatic Documents Relating to the Outbreak of the European War: Part II, Germany, Great*
Kaiser that “the military measures which have now come into force were decided five days ago for reasons of defence and on account of Austria’s preparations.” While Germany and Russia attempted to persuade the other to back down, France was also taking the necessary precautionary steps in the case that war should be declared beyond Austria and Serbia. Already France was making preparations in the event of an international war, which as Grey remarked to British Ambassador at Paris, Bertie, France “was bound to help Russia if Russia was attacked.” Facing the prospect of war and the notion that France would be drawn in against Germany if war was declared, Prince Henry of Prussia directly appealed to King George V to intervene or at the very least pledge support to Germany, writing

---

163 Ibid., 811 – The German White Book. No. 22. Telegrams Exchanged between His Majesty the German Emperor and the Czar. VI. “The Czar to His Majesty.” Peterhof, 30 July 1914. 1.20 P.M. – Upon receiving this information, Kaiser Wilhelm II made a hasty note on the margin of the telegram writing

“No! There is no thought of anything of that sort!!! Austria had only made a partial mobilisation against Serbia in the south. On the strength of that the Czar – as is openly admitted by him here – instituted ‘mil. Measures which have now come into force; against Austria and us and as a matter of fact five days ago. Thus it is almost a week ahead of us. And these measures are for defence against Austria, which is now in no way attacking him!!! I cannot agree to any more mediation, since the Czar who requested it has at the same time secretly mobilised behind my back. It is only a maneuver, in order to hold us back and to increase the start they have already got. My work is at an end (July 1914, The Outbreak of the First World War: Selected Documents. Imanuel Geiss, Ed. New York, New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons; 1967, 291 – Italics appear the original and denote the words and phrases that the Kaiser himself underlined)”

164 Diplomatic Documents Relating to the Outbreak of the European War: Part II, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Russia, Serbia, 949 – The British Blue Book (No. 1). “Sir Edward Grey to Sir F. Bertie, British Ambassador at Paris.” Foreign Office, 29 July 1914 – The pledge of French support to Russia was made by M. Paul Cambon, French Ambassador in London, in a comment to Grey where he explained that “he understood it [the current conflict] to be that in a Balkan quarrel, and in a struggle for supremacy between Teuton and Slav we should not feel called to intervene; should other issues be raised, and Germany and France become involved, so that the question became one of the hegemony of Europe, we should then decide what it was necessary for us to do.”
If you seriously and earnestly desire to prevent this terrible misfortune, may I propose to you to use your influence on France and also on Russia that they should remain neutral? In my view this would be of the greatest use. I consider that this is a certain and, perhaps, the only possible way of maintaining the peace of Europe. I might add that Germany and England should now more than ever give each other mutual support in order to prevent a terrible disaster, which otherwise appears inevitable.\footnote{Ibid., 1023 – The British Blue Book (No. 1). Telegrams Exchanged Between London and Berlin, 30th July – 2nd August, 1914. (Published in the Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung of the 20th August, 1914). No. 1. “His Royal Highness Prince Henry of Prussia to His Majesty King George, dated 30th July, 1914.”}

Although the mobilization of Russian military was deemed by Germany as a growing threat that would lead to war, Richard F. Hamilton and Holger H. Herwig point out that a call to arms in Russia was estimated between “twelve to sixteen weeks” before the troops were battle ready in comparison to Germany’s ability to quickly assemble their own defense force.\footnote{Hamilton and Herwig, 110 – Given this time lapse, some of Tsar Nicholas II’s advisors – Foreign Minister Sergei Dmitrievich Sazonov, Minister of War General Vladimir Aleksandrovich Sukhomlinov, and Chief of General Staff General Nikolai N. Yanushkevich – advocated for a general mobilization as early as 29 July. Although the Tsar had given his consent toward full conscription, he “rescind[ed]” his decision “in response to a telegram from William II” and agreed only to partial mobilization (Lieven, 146).}

Th. von Bethmann-Hollweg also confirms this, writing the Kaiser’s “words did make a deep impression on the Tsar. They actually caused him to order the suspension of the general mobilisation that was already in progress – as we now known form the Sukhomlinow trial. But the military authorities did not obey, but told the Tsar lies to the effect that his orders had been carried out. Then, on the morning of the 31st of July, Generals Sukhomlinow and Yanuschkewitsch, with the help of Sassonow, finally convinced the Tsar himself of the necessity of mobilisation (\textit{Reflections on World War, Part I}. George Young, Tr. London, England: Thornton Butterworth, Ltd.; 1920, 130).”

Even so, “on 29 and 30 July Sazonov and Yanushkevich, back by [Minister of Agriculture Apollon V.] Krivoshein urged general mobilisation . . . on the grounds that the Central Powers were bent on war and that if Russia delayed or, still worse, threw her plans into disarray through partial mobilisation, she would lose the war before it had even begun.” Though the Chairman of Council of Ministers I. L. Goremykin encouraged the Tsar to only activate part of the military and push for peace, the arguments for mobilization proved more persuasive and on 30 July, Russia fully mobilized their forces (Lieven, 146).

In \textit{July 1914}. \textit{The Outbreak of the First World War: Selected Documents}, Russia’s inability to quickly mobilize is attributed to the fact that “The [Russian] military held that war with Austria-
military buildup occurring on both sides of their borders, Germany now the necessary excuse to activate their own war machine.

Before diplomatic negotiations broke down, however, Germany’s Social Democrats also worked to uphold their anti-war position by calling on both politicians and labors to continue to stand in opposition to the state’s willingness to readily resort to war. With party members still absent from Germany, Hugo Haase, was considered to be “the strongest of the remaining members, unquestionably exercised a dominant influence in framing the policy.” Utilizing the practices agreed to at the 1907 Stuttgart Congress, the German Social Democratic press called for direction action and urged the public to take part in nation-wide strikes beginning on 28 July. On 26 July, Haase along with Otto Braun were invited to meet with “the Prussian Ministry of the Interior for a discussion of the situation. . . . were they were informed that the peace demonstrations planned by the party would not be suppressed, but that the government was afraid that these might be conducted in such a way as to encourage the Russian panslavists in their agitation for Russian support of Serbia. The two men were also told that the government would honor its commitment to support Austria if the Russians gave the Serbians military aid. Haase replied that the S.P.D. rejected such and interpretation of the German-Austrian alliance, which in its view was purely defensive in character and therefore would in no sense be binding if the Austrians chose to initiate a conflict with Serbia. The spokesmen for the government retorted that neither the foreign office nor the other parties in the Reichstag could accept the Social Democratic interpretation of the alliance. 168

---

167 Schorske, 286 – Initially invitations to the meeting were extended to Haase and Ebert, but since Ebert had yet to return to Berlin, Haase instead “asked Otto Braun to accompany him.”

168 Calkins, 45.
Whereas, pro-war gatherings were tolerated by the state, German authorities quickly reversed their acceptance of anti-war protestors, especially in the wake of socialist calls for a general strike. Berlin’s Chief of Police, Traugott von Jagow attempted to further prohibit radical behavior by issuing a public directive, on 28 July 1914, declaring that “because of the special conditions of the last three days nothing has been done to stop the patriotic parades on Unter den Linden, the Wilhelmstrasse, etc., although many traffic disturbances were caused by the parades. Beginning tonight, however, the needs of traffic come first; no more parades will be allowed.”

Despite the mandate, the German Social Democrats succeeded in “stag[ing] thirty-two anti-war demonstrations (thirteen within Berlin itself),” which were attended by “as many as 100,000 working-class people.” While Jagow’s edict did nothing to prevent a small group of “students and young salesmen,” or against “Young Germany,” who staged a “counter-demonstration” on the evening of the 28th, rallies supported by the German Social Democrats were targeted by the police. Nevertheless, German Social Democrats continued to organize public protests between 28 and 30 July, even though the meetings were carried out with little success. As Verhey points out, even though “over 75,000 people throughout Germany participated” in socialist sponsored demonstrations, “rarely did the speakers attack or blame the German

---

169 Verhey, 52.
170 Ibid., 53.
172 Verhey, 55 – According to Verhey, “around 9.00 p. m. between ten and thirty “parades” – generally about 1,000 to 3,000 people, but sometimes as many as 10,000 people (that is, as large as the largest parade on Saturday evening) – advanced from the working-class suburbs to the center of Berlin. These Social Democratic . . . paraders staged a counter-demonstration at exactly those “national” sites where the pro-war crowds had staged theirs. Along the way, instead of singing patriotic songs and yeling patriotic phrases, the participants sang working-class songs, such as the “Arbeitermarseillaise,” and yelled “down with war” and “long live Social Democracy.”

“The police, out in full force, attempted to prevent the paraders from reaching the city center by setting up blockades. In the course of dispersing the paraders as they approached the blockade the policemen rode into the crowd on horseback, sometimes even drawing their swords and, in at least two cases, using them (53-54).”
government. Nor did the speakers mention what could or should be done in case of war (a mass strike, for example, or how the parliamentary faction should vote).”\textsuperscript{173} German Social Democrats, however, were not alone in their efforts to persuade state officials to maintain negotiations. The day before German Social Democratic rallied, “\textit{La Bataille Syndicaliste}, the trade-union publication, and \textit{La Guerre Socialiste}, the Socialist paper edited by Gustave Hervé,” in France, both “joined an appeal for mass boulevard demonstrations against the war.”\textsuperscript{174} In Brussels also, “the trade-union of congress in session . . . added its protest against the danger of a general conflagration and called upon the Trade-Union International to exert all efforts to prevent “this crime against humanity”.\textsuperscript{175} Even with the backlash against socialist rallies, Kenneth R. Calkins calls attention to the fact that “when Hasse left with Kautsky on July 28 to represent the S.P.D. at an emergency meeting of the International Bureau at Brussels, he was apparently still optimistic regarding the ability of international socialism to deliver the world from the impending catastrophe. . . . [And] Like most participants in the Brussels meeting, Haase obviously was still operating on the assumption that, as in 1912, preventive measures would be successful.”\textsuperscript{176} Considering the breakdown in negotiations between Germany and Russia, Haase along with the rest of the socialist party leaders soon discovered that their earlier successes in demonstrating for peace quickly proved ineffective during those final days of July 1914.

\textsuperscript{173} Ibid., 55-56.
\textsuperscript{174} Fainsod, 21 – Similar to the strikes in Germany, “on July 27, from 8,000 to 10,000 persons rallied in front of \textit{Le Matin}, sang the “Internationale,” and shouted “Down with war,” until they were dispersed by the police and by opposing groups shouting “On to Berlin” and “Vive la guerre.”
\textsuperscript{175} Ibid., 20-21 – Fainsod notes that “the trade-union congress in session at Brussels” took place between 25-27 July 1914, and included “a number of foreign delegates in attendance, including Karl Legien of Germany.”
\textsuperscript{176} Calkins, 46.
Although King George V made one last attempt to avoid war, writing to Prince Heinrich on 30 July, “my Government is doing the utmost possible in order to induce Russia and France to postpone further military preparations . . . . I rely on William applying his great influence in order to induce Austria to accept this proposal. In this way he will prove that Germany and England are working together to prevent what would be an international catastrophe,” negotiations, however, were already at a standstill. Russia’s mobilization provide Germany with the opportunity to justify activating their own military troops. Sensing that war was now inevitable, the executive members of the SPD “met to draft a second manifesto which reflected a mood neither of defiance nor of chauvinism, but one of failure and anxiety which no idealistic rhetoric could disguise:

Until the last minute, the international proletariat did its duty, here and beyond our borders, and harnessed all its power to maintain peace and make war impossible. If our earnest protests, our repeated efforts were unsuccessful, if the conditions under which we live were once again stronger than our will and that of our fellow-workers, we must nevertheless look with resolution at what the future may bring. . . .

The strict prescriptions of military law strike the labor movement with dreadful severity. Ill-considered actions, needless and falsely understood sacrifices at this moment [can] harm not only the individual but our cause. Party comrades! We call upon you to hold out in the unshakeable confidence that, in spite of all, the future belongs to international socialism, justice and humanity.

According to Churchill, “shortly before noon on July 31 the news of the Russian general mobilization reached Berlin. At 3.30 p.m. an ultimatum was sent to Russia declaring that if Russia did not ‘within twelve hours cease every war measure against us and Austria-Hungary

---

177 *Diplomatic Documents Relating to the Outbreak of the European War: Part II, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Russia, Serbia*, 1024 – The British Blue Book (No. 1). No. 2. “His Majesty King George to His Royal Highness Prince Henry of Prussia, dated 30th July, 1914.”

178 Schorske, 287.
and make to us a definite declaration to that effect,’ the German mobilization would be ordered.”

When the deadline passed without word from Russia, Kaiser Wilhelm II wrote to Tsar Nicholas II and informed him that since Russia had failed to withdraw their forces from the border, Germany was “forced to mobilise.”

Two hours later, at 7:10 p.m., on 31 July, Count F. de Pourtalès, German Ambassador at Petrograd (St. Petersburgh) presented a note to Russian authorities explaining that

In consequence of this threatening step [Russia’s mobilization], which was not justified by any military proceedings on the part of Germany, the German Empire was faced by a grave and imminent danger. If the German Government had failed to guard against this peril [of Russia’s mobilization], they would have compromised the safety and the very existence of Germany. . . . I have the honour, on the instructions of my Government, to inform your Excellency as follows: –

His Majesty the Emperor, my august Sovereign, in the name of the German Empire, accepts the challenge, and considers himself at war with Russia.

---

179 Churchill, 109 – This information is in accordance to a telegram included in Diplomatic Documents Relating to the Outbreak of the European War: Part II, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Russia, Serbia. The German White Book. No. 23. “Telegram of the Imperial Chancellor to the Imperial Ambassador in St. Petersburgh on July 31”, 1914.” (Urgent.) –“In spite of negotiations still pending and although we have up to this hour made no preparations for mobilisation, Russia has mobilised her entire army and navy, that is to say, also against us. On account of these Russian measures we have been forced, for the safety of the country, to proclaim the threatening state of war, which, however, does not imply mobilisation. But mobilisation is bound to follow, unless Russia stops every measure of war against us and Austria-Hungary within twelve hours and notifies us definitely to this effect (811).”

180 Diplomatic Documents Relating to the Outbreak of the European War: Part I, Austria-Hungary, Belgium, France, 763 – The French Yellow Book. Appendix V. Telegrams Exchanged between the Emperor William II and the Emperor Nicholas II. (Extracts from the German “White Book”). IX. “The Emperor William to the Emperor Nicholas.” Berlin, 1 August 1914 – According to Mombauer, “at 5 p.m. on 1 August, the Kaiser signed the mobilization order in the presence of the Chancellor, Moltke, Falkenhayn, [Alfred von] Tirpitz [German Admiral and State Secretary of the Reich Navy Office], [Moriz Freiher von] Lyncker [Chief of the Military Cabinet] and [Hans von] Plessen [Prussian Officer and Commandant of the Kaiser’s Headquarters] (219).”

181 Ibid., 763-764 – The French Yellow Book. Appendix VI. Extracts from the “Orange Book” Relating to Germany’s Declaration of War on Russia. No. 76. “Note presented by the German Ambassador at St. Petersburgh. 19 July (1 August) 1914. 7.10 P.M.
Following this declaration, the German advisors left Russia, while Sir de Bunsen notified Grey from Vienna that Austria had also issued a “general mobilisation of army and fleet.”¹⁸² Not only had Serbia, Austria, Russia and Germany mobilized, but also on 1 August, Sir Bertie in Paris messaged London that the “Minister of War informed military attaché this afternoon that orders had been given at 3.40 for general mobilisation of the French Army. . . . the Minister of War is anxious that it should be explained that this act of mobilisation is one for purely defensive purposes.”¹⁸³ France’s mobilization gave Germany cause to fear an attack against their western border. The advancement of German troops toward the west was not only in direct threat to France, but also to Belgium, who had previously declared themselves to be a neutral state. Given the turn of events, the possibility of war became increasingly probable.

As diplomats traded telegrams in an attempt to avoid an international war, members of the SPD’s Executive Committee were coming under increased pressured to vote either for or against issuing war credits that would allow Germany to fully take part in the coming conflict. With the absence of core members like Haase and Ebert, however, participating members of SPD’s central authority were divided in regards to either accept or reject the proposed credits. Faced with the belief that the Social Democrats might hold steadfast to earlier ideologies of non-intervention and call for nationwide strikes in an attempt to boycott the war, Bethmann-Hollweg quickly set out to gain reassurance that the SPD would in fact side with the government’s request for credits. Since Haase in Brussels¹⁸⁴ and Ebert still away from Berlin, the Chancellor instead

¹⁸² Diplomatic Documents Relating to the Outbreak of the European War: Part II, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Russia, Serbia, 986 – The British Blue Book (No. 1). No. 127. “Sir M. de Bunsen, British Ambassador at Vienna, to Sir Edward Grey. – (Received 1 August). Vienna, 1 August 1914. (Telegraphic).
¹⁸³ Ibid., 991-992 – The British Blue Book (No. 1). No. 136. “Sir F. Bertie, British Ambassador at Paris, to Sir Edward Grey. – (Received 1 August). Paris, 1 August 1914. (Telegraphic.)
¹⁸⁴ Laidler. History of Socialism: A Comparative Survey of Socialism, Communism, Trade Unionism,
invited “right-wing leader Albert Südekum to act as an intermediary between himself and the S.P.D. executive committee.” Although Südekum did not have the fully support or corporation of the SPD, Calkins points out that as a result of these conversations, Bethmann-Hollweg still

---

_Cooperation, Utopianism, and Other Systems of Reform and Reconstruction, 750 – According to Laidler, “when the war clouds governed over Europe during the summer of 1914, following the assassination of Archduke Ferdinand of Austria, the Bureau of the International, then a representative of twenty-seven Socialist and Labor parties in twenty-two countries, called a meeting in Brussels at the Maison du Peuple on July 29._

“The Bureau appealed to socialists everywhere to help stem the tide of war. It advanced the date of its 1914 congress to August 9 from August 22 and changed the place of the meeting from Vienna to Paris. It was planned at the Vienna Congress to bring up again for discussion the question of whether the International should urge socialists to call general strikes as a means of preventing a threatened conflict.

“The night its delegates attended a great guerre à la guerre meeting in Brussels and were addressed, among others, by Émile Vandervelde, Keir Hardie, Jean Jaurès, of France, Agnini of Italy, Pieter Troelstra of Holland, and Hugo Haase of Germany.

“The next day the socialist leaders hurried back to their respective countries to use their influence to stop the threatened conflagration. Jaurès, socialism’s most powerful orator, was assassinated on reaching Paris. Nation after nation, despite the socialists’ appeal, soon called their people to arms.”

According to Calkins, “Bethmann talked with Südekum for several hours, impressing upon him the fact that he was doing everything in his power to prevent war, but that the danger of a world conflict was both real and immediate. Südekum reported the results of the discussion to Ebert, who had in the meantime returned from his vacation, and to a number of other leaders who had gathered at the party headquarters. On the strength of these conferences he told the Chancellor that the government need fear no direct action by the S.P.D. in the form of strikes or sabotage which might endanger efficient mobilization (47).”

Also, Helmut Trotnow notes that “immediately after the outbreak of war the government proclaimed, simultaneously with the “state of war,” the Burgfrieden. As far as the SPD was concerned, its most important stipulations were as follows: “The Burgfrieden finds expression in the endeavor to maintain the spirit of solidarity and devotion to the great national aims, to avoid anything that might threaten the unity of the German people, and never to give the impression that the resolute desire of the people for victory is wavering . . . Every suggestion of selfish or base motives in the pursuit of political goals, every unnecessary act of troublemaking, every act that incites trouble between the classes of the nation, the employed classes, or within the press, must cease (Karl Liebknecht (1871-1919): A Political Biography. Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books; 1984, 143).”
felt able to assure the Prussian cabinet on July 30 that “nothing special need be feared from the Social Democratic executive committee. . . . Either a general strike, a partial strike or sabotage is out of the question.” On the following day the war ministry issued the following statement to its commanders: “According to reliable information, the Social Democratic Party firmly intends to act as all Germans should under the present circumstances.” Long before the world was shocked by the news of the S.P.D.’s acquiescence in Germany’s war policy, the basis of what was to become a formal Burgfrieden (domestic peace) had already been established.186

Even so, despite the Chancellor’s words, the Executive Committee was still unable to settle on any kind of response that would or even could effectively challenge the current state of affairs. What Bethmann-Hollweg perceived as Burgfrieden instead further exposed deep fractures within the ranks of the Social Democratic party, which threatened to disrupt the political unity of the party. While an Executive Committee meeting on 31 July ended without any decision regarding the issue of credits, Germany’s declaration of war against Russia on 1 August followed by a state of emergency, necessitated the SPD to quickly come to a formal agreement, especially since “Reichstag deputies throughout the Reich received telegrams summoning them to an emergency secession on August 4.”187 Since it was not feasible “for the Party to abstain from voting on the question was held to be impossible,” debates continued to occupy the time and attention of the SPD.188 Given that the prospect of war was already generating support from the state, the SPD

186 Ibid., 48 – Helmut Trotnow writes that “immediately after the outbreak of war the government proclaimed, simultaneously with the “state of war,” the Burgfrieden. As far as the SPD was concerned, its most important stipulations were as follows: “The Burgfrieden finds expression in the endeavor to maintain the spirit of solidarity and devotion to the great national aims, to avoid anything that might threaten the unity of the German people, and never to give the impression that the resolute desire of the people for victory is waver[ing] . . . Every suggestion of selfish or base motives in the pursuit of political goals, every unnecessary act of troublemaking, every act that incites trouble between the classes of the nation, the employed classes, or within the press, must cease (Karl Liebknecht (1871-1919): A Political Biography. Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books; 1984, 143).”

187 Ibid., 50.
188 Fainsod, 28.
was informed by the Reichstag that so long as the socialists supported the war the government would leave the organization intact. Taking the government upon its word, on 1 August, “a conference of union leaders . . . vot[ed] to break off all movements for higher wages for the duration of the war” while the very next day “non-Socialist papers . . . predict[ed] that the S.P.D. would support the war.”

Still, despite the government and press’s insistence that Burgfrieden had been achieved, affiliates of the Executive Committee remained fractured over the idea of granting war credits. According to Calkins,

After lunch [on 3 August] the decisive debate began under Scheidemann’s chairmanship. [Eduard] David insisted that the time had come for the S.P.D. to rid itself of its traditional prejudices. Germany was being invaded from East and West. The defeat of Russia would mean the destruction of the Czarist autocracy. The S.P.D. could not allow itself to be eliminated from consideration at such a moment. A negative vote would bring the destruction of the Social Democratic organizations, while a positive vote would immeasurably strengthen the position of the party. The government would then no long be able to treat the Social Democrats as outsiders, and the end of the war would bring a wave of democratization.

At the time of David’s speech, Germany’s message to Belgium on 2 August had yet to be revealed to the public at large, even members of the Executive Committee were unaware of what had transpired. When Belgium replied to Germany’s notice at 7 A.M on the morning of 3 August, “the majority” of the SPD’s Executive Committee that was in agreement with

---

189 Calkins, 50 & 51.
190 Ibid., 51.
191 For further information regarding Germany’s message of 2 August to Belgium, please refer to Appendix D.
192 After summarizing Germany’s message, Davignon informed Herr von Below Saleske, German Minister at Brussels that

“This note had made a deep and painful impression upon the Belgian Government.”
granting war credits continued to push their agenda in an attempt to sway the minority by “stress[ing] the horror of a Russian invasion, and argu[ing] that the Social-Democrats could not abandon their country and allow it to be overrun by hordes of barbaric Cossacks.” In spite of efforts of the minority to prevent the issuing of war credits, “the delegation voted by a margin of seventy-eight to fourteen to support the government’s demand for war credits.” Though there had been stark differences of opinion among the Executive Committee, Fainsod notes that “the fourteen in opposition surrendered to the demands of Party discipline and allowed the votes to be recorded as unanimous,” which in turn gave Germany and the international community the brief notion that the home front was indeed united.

“The intentions attributed to France by Germany are in contradiction to the formal declarations made to us on August 1, in the name of the French Government.

“Moreover, if, contrary to our expectation, Belgian neutrality should be violated by France, Belgium intends to fulfil her international obligations and the Belgian army would offer the most vigorous resistance to the invader.

“The treaties of 1839, confirmed by the treaties of 1870, vouch for the independence and neutrality of Belgium under the guarantee of the Powers, and notably of the Government of His Majesty the King of Prussia.

“Belgium has always been faithful to her international obligations, she has carried out her duties in a spirit of loyal impartiality, and she has left nothing undone to maintain and enforce respect for her neutrality.

“The attack upon her independence with which the German Government threaten her constitutes a flagrant violation of international law. No strategic interest justifies such a violation of law.

“The Belgian Government, if they were to accept the proposals submitted to them, would sacrifice the honour of the nation and betray their duty towards Europe.

“Conscious of the part which Belgium has played for more than eighty years in the civilisation of the war, they refuse to believe that the independence of Belgium can only be preserved at the price of the violation of her neutrality.

“If this hope is disappointed the Belgium Government are firmly resolved to repel, by all the means in their power, every attack upon their rights (Diplomatic Documents Relating to the Outbreak of the European War: Part I, Austria-Hungary, Belgium, France, 373-374 – The Belgian Grey Book (No.1). No. 22. “Note communicated by M. Davignon, Belgian Minister for Foreign Affairs, to Herr von Below Saleske, German Minister.” Brussels, 3 August 1914. (7 A.M.).”

193 Fainsod, 28-29.
194 Calkins, 52.
The SPD, however, was not the only socialist organization in Europe that capitulated when confronted with the prospect of war. Despite an array of labor strikes that occurred in June (two million workers led a general strike in Italy), July (strikes were put down in St. Petersburg from 17 to 27 July 1914), and August (the 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} brought about “Stop the War” meetings across England – in London alone 15,000 workers and supporters participated), opinions and attitudes soon shifted as the probability of war became evident.\textsuperscript{195} With socialist organizations faltering across Europe, the fate of the Second International was also at stake. Although the International succeeded in making “tremendous progress” between 1889 and 1907 in regards to “the forming of political parties throughout Europe. Almost everywhere there were splits.”\textsuperscript{196} By the July Crisis of 1914, these divisions became even more apparent when “the most notable” socialist organizations, save for Italy, started to “put patriotism first,” which changed the entire dynamic of the party’s central ideals and to a “temporary disruption o the Second International.”\textsuperscript{197} As nation after nation succumbed to sustaining the war, the International turned national, as socialist parties focused on attending to growing matters of the state. For Germany as well, the prospect of war forced members of the opposition to prove their patriotism through unwavering support. Adding to the concept of the “Spirit of 1914,” on 1 August, Kaiser Wilhelm II “made the declaration . . . [that] during the forthcoming struggle he would recognize no parties, only Germans,” which the majority of the SPD now embraced.\textsuperscript{198} Even so, while the Executive Committee had previously agreed to grant the government’s request for war credits, there were still small pockets of doubt coming from the minority, which ultimately led to several breaks throughout the duration of the war.

\textsuperscript{195} Fainsod, 36, 35, & 32.
\textsuperscript{196} Ibid., 54-55.
\textsuperscript{197} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{198} Calkins, 50.
Shortly after the vote that “united” the SPD’s Executive Committee, Germany issued a declaration of war against France and proceeded to march into Belgium. With German troops marching west, the Reichstag convened to cast their final votes in support of the requested war credits. As “the German vanguards broke into the Duchy of Luxembourg,” in blatant violation of Belgium’s impartiality, the Reichstag gathered to formally vote for the passage of war credits on 4 August.\(^{199}\) Prior to voting, however, Bethmann-Hollweg spoke before the members and while he urged them to grant the credits, he also acknowledged the infringement of Belgium’s neutrality, explaining that

> We are now acting in self-defense, and necessity knows no law. Our troops have occupied Luxemburg and perhaps have already been obliged to cross the Belgian frontier. This action violates international law. The French government, it is true, had declared in Brussels that it would respect the neutrality of Belgium as long as the enemy would respect it. But we knew that France stood ready to invade. France could afford to wait, not we. A French attack upon our flank in the district of the lower Rhine might have become disastrous. Thus we have been forced to disregard the protests of the governments of Luxemburg and Belgium. The wrong which we thus commit we shall try to make good as soon as our military aim is attained. Whoever, like us, is fighting a supreme fight, must think only of forcing his way through. . . .\(^{200}\)

---

\(^{199}\) Churchill, 111. According to Baron Beyens, Belgian Minister at Berlin, on 4 August, the Imperial Chancellor Bethmann-Hollweg informed members of the Reichstag that even though he “recognise[d], without the slightest disguise, that Germany is violating international law by her invasion of Belgian territory and that she is committing a wrong against us (Diplomatic Documents Relating to the Outbreak of the European War: Part I, Austria-Hungary, Belgium, France, 382 – The Belgian Grey Book (No. 1). No. 35. “Baron Beyens, Belgian Minister at Berlin, to M. Davignon, Belgian Minister for Foreign Affairs.” Berlin, 4 August 1914).” That evening German diplomatic officials in Brussels were asked to withdraw from the country, while Belgium officials were simultaneously recalled from Berlin. Reacting to the violation of Belgium’s neutrality, Count de Lalain, Belgian Minister at London wired Davignon on 5 August, stating, “Germany, having rejected the British proposals, Great Britain has informed her that a state of war existed between the two countries as from 11 o’clock” p. m. the night before (Diplomatic Documents Relating to the Outbreak of the European War: Part I, Austria-Hungary, Belgium, France, 387 – The Belgian Grey Book (No. 1). No. 41. “Count de Lalain, Belgian Minister at London, to M. Davignon, Belgian Minister for Foreign Affairs.” London, 5 August 1914. (Telegram).”

\(^{200}\) The Session of the German Reichstag on August the Fourth 1914: Speeches of the Imperial Chancellor
Following the Chancellor, Dr. Johannes Kaempf, President of the Reichstag, echoed similar words, arguing that while “heavy burdens must be placed upon the entire people, heavy sacrifices must be demanded of the individual. . . . The enthusiasm which sweeps like a storm through all the land is our witness that the entire German people are resolved to sacrifice life and property for the honor of their country. Never have our people stood together more unitedly than to-day. Even those who on principle are declared opponents of war hasten the colors. . . . The strength of our people in arms, the excellent leadership of our army and navy assure us of victory in this war which we are waging in the consciousness of a just cause for the defense of the honor and greatness of our fatherland.”201 Faced with the prospect that the Reichstag was going to approve both the credits and general support of the war, of all those in attendance, only Haase spoke up.

Still advocating the underlying anti-war sentiment of the socialist minority, Haase justified the party’s position as one that was now willing to recognize the necessity of rendering support to the state, stating that even though the Reichstag had not been assembled to decide the for war itself, but rather

. . . on the means necessary for the defense of the country. To-day we must think of the millions of our fellow-countrymen who, without guilt of their own, have been drawn into this doom. They will be hardest hit by the devastation of the war. Our fervent wishes accompany our brothers who have been called to the colors, without difference of party. We also think of the mothers who must surrender their sons, and of the women and children who are deprived of husband and father and who, in addition to the anxiety for their beloved ones, are threatened by the terrors of hunger. Furthermore, there will soon be tens of thousands of wounded

---

and mutilated soldiers. To help all of these, to lighten their lot, to alleviate all this untold distress – this we consider a compelling duty.  

In the end, however, “without debate and in less than an hour, the war credits asked and the special legislative measures proposed by the government were passed en bloc and without one dissenting vote.” As Bethmann-Hollweg closed the assembly, he told those present that “it is not the great importance of your decisions which gives this session its significance, but the spirit which prompted you to make them – the spirit of a united Germany, the spirit of unconditioned and unreserved mutual confidence, even unto death.” Ironically, by midnight, “Great Britain, in full unity with all the Dominions and dependencies of the British Empire, declared war upon Germany.” Great Britain’s declaration of war meant that by the morning of 5 August, eight European nations had officially announced war and therefore launched Europe into the first major continental conflict of the twentieth century. Unfortunately, Germany’s idea of Burgfrieden reached on 4 August was soon challenged by the hardships of the World War. And while the SPD further fractured over the next four years, so too did a vast majority of European nations. Although the assassination of the Archduke was one in a long line of acts of tyrannicide, the timing and place of the murders served as a moment in time, which altered the modern world. Using the death of the Archduke and his wife as political means to achieving more territory, Austria forced their hand with the belief that Serbia would again capitulate to

---

202 Ibid., 13-14 – For a complete transcript of Haase’s speech to the Reichstag on 4 August, please refer to Appendix E.
203 Ibid., 4 – In total, “the war measures proposed by the government, consisted[ed] in credits for the expenses of the war to the amount of 5,300,000,000 marks, and in sixteen separate contingency bills designed to provide the needed financial, industrial and humanitarian relief during the period of the war.”
204 Ibid., 15 – Following the declaration of war, the Reichstag did not meet again until 24 November, well over three months after the start of the conflict.
205 Churchill, 111.
their demands as they had following the Balkan Wars. Instead of the originally anticipated six week war aimed at safeguarding national borders, the next four years drastically altered the terms of the Congress of Vienna as well as Europe’s monarchies. Indeed, by the first winter of the war, opposition toward the conflict was not only coming from displaced radical members of the SPD’s minority wing, but civil discontent was also advocating for a change of the central government, which soon gave way to calls for revolution from newly formed Communist parties. Ultimately, Austria’s desire to expand would foster an array of challenges never before experienced in modern European history. Suddenly the ideals of the French Revolution – liberty, equality, and freedom – that the Five Great Powers had attempted to suppress throughout the nineteenth century became even more dominant with the start of the Great War, creating even more security threats to monarchical rule.
CHAPTER III.
THE WAR YEARS:
PRELUDE TO REVOLUTION

With the collapse of the Second International on 4 August, socialist groups throughout Europe were finding it difficult to fully commit to a party platform that would successfully see their organizations through the war. Belief that “the resolutions passed by the pre-war International Socialist Congresses of Stuttgart (1907) and Copenhagen (1910) which declared that: if war breaks out, then it becomes their [the working classes] primary duty to bring about its conclusion as quickly as possible,” became ineffective as the parties struggled to maintain political unity in the wake of a growing intercontinental conflict.¹ When the SPD capitulated to

¹Fainsod, 42 – Accordingly, Fainsod notes that “as opinion among Socialists crystallized, at least three important currents of thought emerged from the chaos. At the Right were those who believed that the cause of international Socialism would be best advanced through a whole-hearted support of the Fatherland and an identification of the interests of the party with that of the nation. The group which took this point of view commanded the support of the largest portion of the socialist movement. It embraced in its ranks such outstanding leaders of international Socialism as [Eduard] Vaillant, [Jules] Guesde and [Marcel] Sembat in France, [Phillipp] Scheidemann, [Karl] Legien and [Albert] Südekum in Germany, [Emile] Vandervelde in Belgium, [J. V.] Plekhanoff in Russia, [Henry Mayers] Hyndman in England and [Leonida] Bissolati in Italy. . . .

“The Center was much more outspoken in its opposition to the war. It included among its adherents such personalities as [Hugo] Haase, [Eduard] Bernstein, and [Karl] Kautsky in Germany, [J. Ramsay] MacDonald and Keir Hardie in England, [A.] Merrheim and [A.] Bourderon in France. As resentment against the war mounted, the opposition of this group expressed itself in a refusal to vote war credits or to support the war affirmatively in any way. Although this group lent its support to all international efforts to end the war, it preferred to operate within the existing framework of the Second International. . . .

“The Left wing had as its most extreme spokesman [Vladimir I.] Lenin, the leader of the Russian Bolsheviks. It also claimed the allegiance of the more revolutionary Social-Democrats such as Franz Mehring, Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg and others. In the early months of the war Lenin already heralded the collapse of the Second International, condemned the chauvinism of the majority Socialists and called for the organization of a Third International to rally those militant elements which hoped to produce and immediate socialist revolution by transforming the imperialist war between nations into a civil war between classes. This small but intensely active group formed a nucleus around which the Third International was later constructed. In the early years of the war it was relatively insignificant numerically thought it increased in prestige and influence as the war dragged on . . . . (42-43)”
the pressures of the government and granted war credits, the action took the international
socialist community by surprise. Within Germany, the SPD was not only the embodiment of
“the party of Marx and Engels,” but “since the turn of the century they had been ‘the leading and
inspiring . . . model party of the Socialist International. With its 110 Reichstag Deputies, its over
a million members, its million and a half readers of the socialist press, its almost two and one-
half million trade union followers, its specific gravity was so great that one soldier out of three
who answered the call to arms was a voter for the socialist party – this was the party on which all
hopes were laid, toward which all eyes were turned’.” ² The influence of German Socialism also
extended well beyond the borders of Europe. As John Albert Macy observed, “the profoundest
philosophers and most stalwart men of action in Socialist history were Germans or born to the
German language; German immigrants were the first teachers of Socialism in America,” and so
“the German brand of Socialism is the original, pure article; all other kinds are imitation and owe
their virtue to their success in imitation.” ³ Consequently, when the SPD rendered a unanimous
vote for credits, it “was viewed by much of the world as a gross betrayal of its traditional
principles.” ⁴ Among those who denounced the actions of the SPD were members of the Russian
Social-Democratic Labour Party led by Vladimir I. Lenin, who according to Bertram David
Wolfe, upon “read[ing] the news that the Social Democrats had voted war credits in the
Reichstag, he simply refused to believe it.” ⁵ By the end of August, this fraction of Russian
socialism chastised the SPD even further, writing

³ Macy, 7.
⁴ Calkins, 55.
⁵ Wolfe, 634.
The conduct of the leaders of the German Social-Democratic Party, the strongest and the most influential party belonging to the Second International (1889-1914), which voted for the military appropriations and which repeated the bourgeois chauvinist phrases of the Prussian Junkers and the bourgeoisie, is a direct betrayal of Socialism. Under no circumstances, even assuming the absolute weakness of that party and the necessity of its submitting to the will of the bourgeois majority of the nation, can the conduct of the leaders of the German Social-Democratic Party be justified. This party has in fact adopted a national-liberal policy.  

Still, in spite of Russia’s condemnation of the SPD, the vast majority of socialists both in and outside of Germany still maintained that the approval of war credits was necessary in order to protect the state.

According to A. W. Humphrey, the SPD’s approval of war credits was in fact in line with the traditional ideology of the Second International, considering that “the International has always justified the taking up of arms in national self-defence, and in the case of the German Socialists the act of self-defence was rendered all the more imperative by the character of the aggressor.” Support also came from M. Vandervelde, Chairman of the International and the leader of the Socialists of Belgium, when he proclaimed in an October copy of The American Socialist:

> With our whole hearts we render this testimony to our German comrades, that in

---

6 Vladimir I. Lenin. *Collected Works of V. I. Lenin: Lenin, Volume XVIII, The Imperialist War – The Struggle Against Social-Chauvinism and Social-Pacifism, 1914-1915*. New York, New York: International Publishers Co., Inc.; 1930, 61 – This is point 2 of a statement issued by a “Group of Social-Democrats, Members of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party,” entitled “The Tasks of Revolutionary Social-Democracy in the European War: Resolution of a Group of Social-Democrats,” which also denounced other European organizations including under point 3 that “the same condemnation is deserved by the conduct of the leaders of the Belgian and French Social-Democratic parties, who have betrayed Socialism by entering bourgeois cabinets.” – A full transcript of this track was “published for the first time” in 1930 “from a manuscript copied by N. K. Krupskaya (Lenin’s widow) (64).”

their efforts for the maintenance of peace they did their duty, their whole duty, and more than their duty. . . .

If they had refused to vote the credits for the war, they would have given over their country to Cossack invasion. In voting them, they have furnished to the Kaiser arms against Republican France and against the democracies of Western Europe.

Between these two evils they chose the one they considered the lesser. Again, I repeat, we do not blame them. . . . We dare to hope that on the day that our German comrades are informed in regard to the horrors that have been committed in Belgium they will join us in denouncing and scouring them.8

Still, what Vandervelde and other members of the Second International failed to realize is that while the credits of 4 August had passed before Germany’s breach of Belgium’s neutrality became public knowledge, already internal disputes were straining the organization. Germany’s claim at self-preservation from Russian despotism9 momentarily blinded the SPD’s majority and created a sense of self-sacrifice that briefly united the masses. Additionally, “martial law, censorship, the full pressure of conformity or silence all helped to make the misunderstanding complete” and furthered the belief that Burgfrieden had indeed been achieved.10 Unwilling to

8 Ibid., 62-63 – Vandervelde’s statement was published in Justice on 15 October 1914.
9 According to The “Junius” Pamphlet, socialist newspapers throughout Germany “made a fight for European culture. . . . The Muenchener Post of August 1st: ‘When it comes to defending our country against the bloody Czardom we will not be made citizens of the second class.’ The Halle Volksblatt wrote on August 5th: ‘If this is so, if we have been attacked by Russia, and everything seems to corroborate this statement – then the Social-Democracy, as a matter of course, must vote in favor of all means of defense. With all our strength we must fight to drive Czarism from our country!’ And on August 18th: ‘Now that the die is cast in favor of the sword, it is not only the duty of national defense and national existence that puts the weapon into our hands as into the hands of every German, but also the realization that in the enemy whom we are fighting in the east we are striking a blow at the foe of all culture and all progress. . . . The overthrow of Russia is synonymous with the victory of freedom in Europe. . . .’ The Essener Arbeiterzeitung cried out on August 3rd: ‘If this country is threatened by Russia’s determination, then the Social-Democrats, since the fight is against Russian Blood-Czarism, against the perpetrator of a million crimes against freedom and culture, will allow none to excel them in the fulfillment of their duty, in their willingness to sacrifice. Down with Czarism! Down with the home of Barbarism! Let that be our slogan!’ (Luxemburg, 66-67).”
allow the ideals of the party to be soiled by the onset of “war psychosis,”\textsuperscript{11} the fractured politics of the SPD were soon made public as members of the minority began speaking out. Six weeks after the Reichstag’s unanimous vote, and well before M. Vandervelde’s statement, Karl Liebknecht, a supporter of the minority position, published a letter in the \textit{Bürger Zeitung} in Bremen on 18 September that publicly revealed the rising discontent of the minority explaining that there were debates regarding the state’s request for money and that it was “entirely untrue to say that assent to the war credits was given unanimously.”\textsuperscript{12} Unfortunately for the SPD’s majority, Liebknecht’s outspokenness toward the war and credits did not end there. In October, he submitted a letter to the editor of the \textit{Berliner Tageblatt} on the 24\textsuperscript{th}, clarifying a recent publication that claimed that the entire house of the Prussian Assembly stood “during the reading by Dr. Delbrück of the greetings of the Kaiser” when in fact “the Social Democratic members of the Assembly, who were in their places, remained seated.”\textsuperscript{13} Liebknecht also went on to write that despite the claim that at the end of the President’s speech “the whole House applauded and took part in the cheers for the Kaiser. That also is not true. Five members ([Adolf] Hofer, Adolf Hoffman, Paul Hoffmann, Liebknecht and [Heinrich] Ströbel – S. Z.) of the Social-Democratic representation in the \textit{Landtag} left the room when this speech of the President was delivered.”\textsuperscript{14} Backlash from Liebknecht as well as disgruntled minority members continued to create divisions for the party.

On 17 October 1914, Scheidemann sent word to Liebknecht, reminding him that “we

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Liebknecht, \textit{“The Future Belongs to the People”: Speeches Made Since the Beginning of the War}, 25-26.
\item Ibid., 29.
\item Ibid.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
practical policy or party principles into the ranks of party comrades, as a free exchange of opinions is not possible under the state of siege”.

While Scheidemann’s words echoed those of Kaiser Wilhelm’s speech on 4 August, when he declared “from this day on, I recognise no parties, but only Germans,” it was not enough to sway Liebknecht or other members of the vocal minority who all remained persistent in denying the notion that there was full party support for the war to continue especially in light of the government request for additional funds.

Between 29 November and 2 December, members of the SPD deliberated whether they would grant the government’s request for additional credits, this time totaling about five billion marks. Still maintaining resistance against party policy, Liebknecht “began his bombardment of the SPD Reichstag delegates for a negative vote in the next budget debate.” Despite the progression of the war, members of the majority “remained adamant” that funding should be approved “because German frontiers were still menaced by hostile forces, all Germans were still “bound to put forth their whole strength for the defense of the country . . . and Social Democracy grants the credits asked for.”

Even though there were still about fifteen members of the minority who did not approve, they again submitted to the position of the majority. For Liebknecht, however, the vote on 2 December was beyond the possibility of remaining silent yet again. Although the SPD had

---

15 Trotnow, 143-144.
16 David Welch. Germany, Propaganda and Total War, 1914-1918: The Sins of Omission. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press; 2000, 17 – During the 2 December meeting of Reichstag, the Imperial Chancellor Bethmann-Hollweg also used the Kaiser’s words, stating “when the war is past the parties will return. For without parties, without political battles, there is no political life, even for the freest and most united folk. But we will battle – and for myself I promise you this – we will battle with the aim that in these battles there may henceforth be only Germans (Theobald von Bethmann Hollweg. Speech made by the Imperial Chancellor von Bethmann Hollweg in the Reichstag on December 2nd, 1914. 1914, 6-7).”
18 Nettl, 616-617.
19 Meyer, 60-61.
already agreed to support the credits, Liebknecht instead took a more radical stance and even without the support of his closest collaborators, he became the only party member to openly vote against the war credits during the parliamentary meeting on 2 December.

With this vote Liebknecht effectively “brok[e] the party rule which forbids a member of the Parliamentary group from casting a vote contrary to the decision of the majority.”20 In an effort to defend his position, Liebknecht drafted a statement of explanation, but he was denied the opportunity to address the members of parliament by Reichstag President Dr. Johannes Kämpf, who also would not allow it to be recorded in the official parliamentary report.21 According to Karl W. Meyer, “on December 3 Liebknecht communicated with party leaders and

20 Humphrey, 157.
21 Unable to express his views during the meeting and barred from making an announcement through the German press, Liebknecht was finally able to share his views, saying, in a Swiss newspaper:

“My vote against the War Credit Bill of to-day is based on the following considerations. This War, desired by none of the people concerned, has not broken out in behalf of the welfare of the German people or any other. It is an Imperialist War, a war over important territories of exploitation for capitalists and financiers. From the point of view of rivalry in armaments, it is a war provoked by the German and Austrian war parties together, in the obscurity of semi-feudalism and of secret diplomacy, to gain an advantage over their opponents. At the same time the war is a Bonapartist effort to disrupt and split the growing movement of the working class. . . .

“A speedy peace, a peace without conquests, this is what we must demand. Every effort in this direction must be supported. Only by strengthening jointly and continuously the currents in all the belligerent countries which have such a peace as their object can this bloody slaughter be brought to an end.

“Only a peace based upon the international solidarity of the working class and on the liberty of all the peoples can be a lasting peace. Therefore, it is the duty of the proletariats of all countries to carry on during the war a common Socialistic work in favor of peace.

“I support the relief credits with this reservation: I vote willingly for everything which may relieve the hard fate of our brothers on the battlefield as well as that of the wounded and sick, for whom I feel the deepest compassion. But as a protest against the war, against those who are responsible for it and who have caused it, against those who direct it, against the capitalist purposes for which it is being used, against plans of annexation, against the violation of the neutrality of Belgium and Luxemburg, against unlimited rule of material law, against the total oblivion of social and political duties of which the Government and classes are still guilty, I vote against the war credits demanded (Liebknecht, “The Future Belongs to the People”: Speeches Made Since the Beginning of the War, 31-33).”
explained his ‘embarrassing situation’ to them,” clarifying that “his vote against the credits was determined by his belief in the validity of the party program and the resolutions of the international congresses. For him it was a case of conscience to subordinate the duty toward party unity to the duty of representing the true program of the party. In other words, it was a greater wrong to violate what he thought was the party’s true gospel than to sin against the ideal of party unity.” While Liebknecht’s actions attracted considerable attention within the party, his stance on 2 December was hardly the symbolic rise of the radical left. Rather, this event

---

22 Meyer, 62.
23 According to Trotnow “Liebknecht’s refusal to vote for the war credits has generally been interpreted as an indication that the outbreak of the First World War led to his political radicalization. The Marxist-Leninist school of historiography sees in this a positive development and believes Liebknecht’s actions were in keeping with Marxist-Leninist principles of struggle against the capitalist-imperialist war. Furthermore, it is argued that his stand set in motion the formation of the “Left” within the SPD which led to the formation of the Spartakus group and ultimately to the foundation of the KPD. Noncommunist historians maintains that, with his December vote, Liebknecht began to move away from the SPD and in so doing made the first step towards the later division of the party. Neither of these positions explain sufficiently Liebknecht’s political development for they are based far too much on hindsight, on what was still to happen in Liebknecht’s political career, rather than what had already happened.

“If one compares Liebknecht’s December vote with that of August, it is easy to get the impression of a process of radicalization, for Liebknecht was no longer prepared to bow to party discipline. This impression is reinforced by the fact that Liebknecht’s action left him completely isolated in the SPD, even the circle of left-radical party members around Rosa Luxemburg, had advised him, albeit on tactical grounds, against a separate vote because it might isolate him. This reason for Liebknecht’s behavior must be seen in view of the fact that he was surprised by the outbreak of war and because of that he had acted cautiously, even anxiously at the beginning. This, incidentally, indicates that he was more levelheaded than radical. Because he was surprised by the outbreak of war, he never regarded the Reichstag faction’s decision on 3 August as final. In his view the attitude of social democracy in times of war depended solely on the nature of the war itself. When he realized that the German government was fighting not a defensive but rather a capitalist-imperialistic war, Liebknecht began his campaign against it (153-154).”

Calkins also echoes a similar rational, points out that while Liebknecht’s actions of 2 December “must be considered an important turning point in the history of German socialism, to many contemporaries it did not seem particularly significant. It was, to be sure, the occasion of considerable excitement in the Reichstag, including a number of outraged catcalls from right-wing Social Democrats, but it was so much less than what had been anticipated during the critical days that preceded the session that it came as something of an anticlimax (68-69).” Even more,
demonstrates Liebknecht’s willingness to go beyond basic party loyalty and attempt to solidify his own thoughts and opinions regarding the war. To the majority, though, they were still faced with the idea that party unity was being threatened and so the executive started to clamp down on any actions or reactions that put the policies of the SPD into question. Nearly three weeks after Liebknecht’s vote on 2 December, members of the Executive Committee and Reichstag delegation convened on the 22nd in an effort to address grievances directed at “Georg Weill, an Alsatian Reichstag deputy who had joined the French army” and “Albert Südekum, who had recently engaged in various activities at the behest of the government without first obtaining the permission of the party executive committee.”

For an organization like the SPD, which had already underwent strict censorship with the 1878 Anti-Socialist Laws, the division between loyalty to the state or party blurred even further in the wake of nationalistic fervor. Considering the current strength of the organization, the executive was unwilling to regress back to a period when their power could again be suppressed by the state so they made a diligent effort to restrain individuals who posed a threat to the stability of the party as a whole. Given the fact that the war was quickly progressing from a claim of self-defense to that of imperial domination, the question for the SPD was whether the party could maintain loyalty to the state without breaking from the standard principles of a traditional socialist organization. Intent on maintaining party discipline, the actions of members from both the majority and minority were intently scrutinized by the executive.

“at the beginning of 1915 . . . it was only the extremists who had given up all hope of keeping the party intact (72).”

24 Calkins, 73 – In question concerning Weill was whether or not the SPD was “obligated to sever its connections with an enemy soldier” despite the fact that Weill was performing a civic duty like so many other socialist members. Judgment against Südekum ultimately “led to the resignation of [Georg] Ledebour from the executive committee of the Reichstag delegation.”

Shortly after the New Year, “Haase angrily attacked” the more conservative party leader Philipp Scheidemann “for having published a highly patriotic new year’s greeting to the voters in his electoral district. The message, which praised the nation’s military heroes in glowing terms and emphasized the necessity of maintaining a determination to achieve victory, aroused widespread misgivings among party members unaccustomed to such enthusiastically nationalistic statements on the part of their leaders.”

Even though support for the war from the socialist fraction was not completely unheard of, Scheidemann was forced to defend his position arguing that “everyone, whatever he was and whatever the nature of the conflict, whether in social questions, personal disputes or legal questions, must be out to win, should the opposing side be unwilling to come to an understanding.”

Nevertheless, to Haase and other members of

25 Ibid., 74 – According to Scheidemann, after he was unable to publish his greeting in the Vorwärts, his notice was finally picked up by the Bergische Arbeiterstimme and read:

“The Best Wishes for the New Year.

“Heavy anxieties press upon us. Excruciating are the sleepless nights when we think of our dear ones in the field. Cruelly does pain rack the hearts of those who have had to sacrifice what they loved most.

“Hats off to those heroes who have fallen for the Fatherland. Stronger than pain and worry must our unbending will be and our unshakable determination. We will not only live through the terrible time with our wits about us and our eyes open; we will also bring to naught the plans of our enemies: we will win!

“And so I wish that all at the change of the year may have strength to conquer trouble and pain. I desire for all the unconquerable will to hold on – right on to victory! . . .

“To our sick and wounded soldiers I wish quick and complete recovery, and to you and our comrades in the trenches, on the sea or on watch in the service of your Fatherland, the best of luck. I press your hand warmly. Hold on! On you depends the fate of our country and the German workers.


the executive, “Scheidemann’s increasing intimacy with the representatives of the government” was still a subject of complaint, considering that he “was increasingly consulted [by government officials] individually, and indeed, many of his meeting with the Chancellor were kept secret even from his closest associates.”

Though it appeared that Scheidemann was developing a closer relationship with leaders of the state, the Executive Committee continued to reprimand wayward members for infractions that began well before the start of the war. Rosa Luxemburg had been arrested in 1913 and sentenced to a year in prison on 20 February 1914 for allegedly inciting public disobedience during a party meeting in Frankfurt.

Although Luxemburg appealed her conviction, the court dismissed her plea and ruled on 20 October that her sentencing would stand. While Calkins notes that “her case had aroused immense sympathy among the masses of party members. Now . . . her deeds smacked of treason, and the moderates were little

---


27 Calkins, 74.

28 Luxemburg had been arrested in 1913 and “charge[d] . . . under paragraphs 110 and 111 of the Criminal Code, in that she called for public disobedience of the laws” during a meeting at Bockenheim at which time she “touched on the question whether we would permit ourselves to be dragged helplessly into a war. After shouts of “Never” in the body of the hall, she is supposed to have said, “If they think we are going to lift the weapons of murder against our French and other brethren, then we shall shout: ‘We will not do it’,” which eventually became the bases for her arrest (Nettl, 481). Tried on 20 February 1914, Luxemburg addressed the Judges in Frankfurt am Main, explaining

“What I did try to do at those meetings at Frankfurt, and what we Social Democrats always try to do in all our written and spoken words, is to spread enlightenment, to make clear to the working mass their class interests and their historical duty. What we do is to lay open for them the main tendencies of history, of the economic, political, and social upheavals to which our present society gives birth and which with iron necessity lead to the fact that at a certain stage of development any existing social order must be removed and replaced by the higher Socialist order of society. . . . From this same point of view stems all our agitation against war and militarism – simply because we Social Democrats aim for a harmonious, complete, and scientifically based vision of the world. For the prosecution and its miserable witnesses to see all this as mere incitement shows a coarse and unrefined conception, and above all demonstrates their inability even to conceive of the nature of our way of thinking. . . . (Nettl, 489 – “Rosa Luxemburg’s own Address to the judges at the Second Criminal Court, Frankfurt (Main), 20 February 1914. Reprinted from Vorwärts, 22 February 1914.”) Shortly after her address she was sentenced.
inclined to endanger the party for the sake of the acid-tongued extremist who had branded them “social patriots.”"\textsuperscript{29} Despite “the suggestion . . . that demonstrations be organized on her behalf” the idea was immediately struck down.\textsuperscript{30} Further members of the SPD were also singled out when “the social democratic Reichstag faction met from 2 to 4 February 1915 to deal with the “breach of discipline” of their oppositional colleague.”\textsuperscript{31} Despite the Executive’s lack of condemnation toward Liebknecht, it was during the February meeting that attention was redirected toward his previous infraction on the 2\textsuperscript{nd} of December as members of the majority expressed their desire for some form of punishment to be meted out against him, including the possibility of dismissal from the SPD.\textsuperscript{32}

In the end, Liebknecht retained his position within the party, but the majority handed down a “resolution provid[ing] . . . ‘if any deputy is unable conscientiously to participate in the voting, he may abstain, but he must not give his abstention the character of a demonstration.’ According to this, Liebknecht was entitled to his opinions, but he must not express them publicly.”\textsuperscript{33} Shortly after the SPD passed judgment on Liebknecht, “the government took

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{29} Calkins, 73-74.
\item \textsuperscript{30} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{31} Trotnow, 156.
\item \textsuperscript{32} According to Meyer, “[Karl Egon] Frohme proposed that Liebknecht be deprived of his parliamentary privileges in the Reichstag. [While] The trade union leader, [Karl] Legien, went so far as to propose that he should be expelled from the party, or Legien and other “for whom he spoke, might consider whether they could continue to belong to it.” Both Frohme and Legien, however, were persuaded that such extreme measures should be reserved for a party congress where they could be discussed publicly (62-63).” On the other hand, Calkins goes on to mention that “on the second day of the meeting, the deputies finally grappled with the case of Südekum. The result stood in stark contrast to the action taken against Liebknecht. A resolution was passed which merely confirmed and earlier statement by the combined executive committees of the delegation and the party which rather mildly criticized Südekum’s activities on behalf of the government and then went on to instruct party members to obtain the permission of the executive committee of either the party or the delegation or of the delegation as a whole before undertaking similar projects in the future (77).
\item \textsuperscript{33} Meyer, 63 – Furthermore, “the resolution further condemned “in the sharpest way the Liebknecht
action” by “calling him up for military service on 7 February 1915. This move made Liebknecht subject to military regulations and thus made any political activity outside the Reichstag an offence.”34 A week and a half after Liebknecht was drafted into service, Luxemburg was “suddenly arrested” at her home on 18 February and immediately “taken to the women’s prison in the Barnimstrasse” to fulfill her sentencing from 20 February 1914.35 Although Liebknecht and Luxemburg were only beginning to develop their professional relationship, the SPD’s attempt, along with the government’s, to silence this outspoken minority failed to radically change either of them. While Liebknecht complied with the idea of military regulations, Helmut Trotnow notes that “as a member of the Prussian House of Deputies and of the Reichstag, the meetings of which he was allowed to attend according to the rules, he had at least two platforms

breach of discipline” (this clause was approved by a vote of 82 to 15) and rejected the motives for his negation of the credits as incompatible with the interests of the SPD (passed 58 to 33). It denounced him for broadcasting in the previous year the fact that the SPD was divided and then denied “the misleading information as to occurrences inside the party which has been spread in foreign countries by Liebknecht” (passed 51 to 39). The entire resolution was passed 65 to 26, representing perhaps the general distinction between Liebknecht’s opponents and friends in the Socialist faction (63).”

For a more complete analysis of the voting, including an analysis of the numbers, please refer to The Socialists and The War: A Documentary Statement of the Position of the Socialists of All Countries; with Special Reference to Their Peace Policy, Including a Summary of the Revolutionary State Socialist Measures Adopted by the Governments at War. William English Walling, Ed. New York, New York: Henry Holt and Company; 1915, 290-291.

34 Trotnow, 156 – According to Trotnow, “Liebknecht reported to the part chairman, Hugo Haase, on 9 February: “In a solemn hearing between the district commander and myself (in the presence of another officer and the district sergeant), the former made it clear to me that from that moment I was a soldier and subject to military regulations . . . He then read out to me the regulations relating to the prohibition of participation in assemblies and meetings (except those of the Landtag) and the prohibition of verbal or written agitation ‘at home and abroad,’ the shouting of ‘revolutionary slogans,’ in accordance with the relevant statue of the book of military regulations and with the Reich military law. He explained that he was doing all this because of my great involvement at the center of political affairs and that he wanted to warn me to ‘desist.’”

35 Nettl, 618 – Regarding the delay, Nettl explains that since Luxemburg’s appeal was denied after the start of the war, “execution of sentence under war-time conditions was due at any moment and without warning. Notice to serve the sentence was in the discretion of the authorities. . . . [Although] Rosa Luxemburg tired to put it off as long as possible, partly for health reasons, but in the end she was seized and taken off to prison without any warning . . . (481-482).”
from which he could expound his view of the war without fear of prosecution because of parliamentary immunity.”36 Similarly, Luxemburg’s time in prison allowed her the opportunity to further express herself through writing. By April 1915, she completed an analysis of the war, entitled The Crisis of Social Democracy or the Juniussbrochüre (Junius Pamphlet),37 which “reflected the atmosphere of early 1915, when revolutionary Socialists were in a vacuum of despair and self-abasement, as yet unfilled by any alternative policy. . . . But apart from her historical stalking of the origins of the war – [Luxemburg] carefully dissected the claim that Germany was fighting a defensive war – she also examined the causes of Socialist failure.”38 Despite the fact that the Junius pamphlet was the last thing Luxemburg succeeded at having smuggled out of prison, her opinions echoed similar sentiments put forth by Liebknecht in his “November Theses,” which “attempt[ed] to explain the causes of the war in a broader context . . . beginning with the affirmation that, as a consequence of its struggle for world power in the prewar period, the German Empire had been the “principal actor” in the race for economic and political expansion on the European continent. Liebknecht identified the driving forces behind

36 Trotnow, 156-157.
37 According to Dick Howard, “Rosa Luxemburg probably adopted the pseudonym “Junius” in reference to the series of letters in the Public Advertiser from November 21, 1768, to May 12, 1772, which was signed “Junius,” and which are considered to be the “predecessors of the political lead article,” and “path-breaker of modern journalism (See Harbermas, Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit, pp. 72-73). These original “Junius Letters” attacked the established government, revealing its corruption and the significance of certain of its actions. The original author, never identified, probably took his pseudonym from Lucius Junius Brutus, a legendary Roman patriot who is said to have led a republican revolution in early Rome (Selected Political Writings of Rosa Luxemburg. Dick Howard, Ed. New York, New York: Monthly Review Press; 1971, 322).”
38 Nettl, 630-631 – Unable to publish as a result of her imprisonment, the Junius pamphlet was eventually smuggled out and was finally published in 1916 after her release. As Nettl notes, “having exposed the lie of the defensive war, Rosa Luxemburg went on to state a general proposition: ‘In the era of imperialism there can be no more [justified] national wars’ since ‘there is complete harmony between the patriotic interests and the class interests of the proletarian International, in war as well as in peace; both demand the most energetic development of the class struggle and the most emphatic pursuit of the Social-Democratic programme.’ In the last resort it was a matter of personal commitment to the world around her (632).”
this German effort to expand as heavy industry, financial capital, and “those interested in colonies”. As Clara Zetkin writes, the danger of the Junius pamphlet was that Luxemburg “recognized imperialism as the involuntary catalyst of world revolution and pointed out to the proletarians of all countries their great historical task: To unite on an international basis in order to make use of the existing opportunities to carry out the liberating act of pushing capitalism into the pit and to establish Socialism.” For a nation and party intent on maintaining some semblance of unity, the writings and actions of Liebknecht and Luxemburg served as two primary examples of those who were intent on using the war as a means of highlighting the renewed struggle between the state and labor. Even so, with the war progressing longer than initially predicted governments both in and outside of Europe were attempting to suppress radicalism as a means of maintaining the stability of the state threatened by war.

Laws, Neutrality, and the United States

The ability of the national government to continue to expand upon emergency decrees was directly related to the nature of the war. Since the Napoleonic Wars, mass migrations had drastically altered various European states as wars, famines, political uprisings, and the Second Industrial Revolution forced people to relocate. As a result, nationalism continued to increase as naturalized citizens competed with migrants for land and labor. This in turn granted local governments the ability to use measures aimed at protecting the state above the individual as a means of reestablishing central authority. Since Germany already had a history of targeting

39 Trotnow, 150-151 – Initially the these were written at the beginning of November 1914 shortly after “the next session of the [Reichstag] fraction to discuss its stance on the credits was scheduled for 29 and 30 November.” Once written, Liebknecht “sent [them] to “the other 13 members of the minority in the faction of August 1914 and a few other faction members”. In an accompanying note, dated 23 November, he explained, “If, as is to be expected, the majority of the faction decides to vote for the credits, then I am fully decided in favor of a separate minority vote in the sense of the enclosed declaration” (150).”

minority groups – the *Kulturkampf* and the 1878 Anti-Socialist laws – the government was not alone in issuing emergency decrees as a means of retaining some semblance of domestic security seeing that across Europe similar laws were being redrafted. While the German government reinstated “the Prussian law of Siege of 1851, which provided for the suspension of all those sections of the German constitution guaranteeing civil liberties,” Ian F. W. Beckett maintains that

Similar siege laws dating from 1849 and 1878 were revived in France on 2 August 1914, with both Chamber of Deputies and Senate adjourning indefinitely, although parliamentary scrutiny was resumed in December 1914. In Austria parliament – the Reichsrat – had been prorogued in March 1914 owing to obstructionist tactics by Czech deputies and it was not recalled until May 1917. The Hungarian parliament sat throughout the war, albeit postponing the elections due in 1915 for the duration. Two imperial decrees based on a law of 1869 also suspended civil rights and handed much of civil jurisdiction to a new Kreigsüberwachungsamt (War Supervisory Office). While not applying to Hungary, the emergency regulations continued in operation in Austria until July 1917. In Italy, where support for the war was slight, the conservative instincts of [Prime Minister Antonio] Salandra and [his successor Sidney] Sonnino made the Italian response to war more akin to that of the Central Powers than the Entente. A series of decrees in May 1915 severely limited civil liberties...41

Although the United States was still removed from the fighting itself, the government had also started to adopt subtle policies that would ultimately involve the country in European affairs. Following the outbreak of war in Europe, President Woodrow Wilson publicly confirmed on 4 August that the United States would remain neutral stating that not only was he enacting the 1909 Penal Code for violations, but also he gave “notice that all citizens of the United States and others who may claim the protection of this government, who may misconduct themselves in the premises, will do so at their peril, and that they can in no wise obtain any protection from the

41 Beckett, 244-245.
Government of the United states against the consequences of their misconduct.” 42 On 18 August 1914, President Wilson further justified his position of neutrality by publishing a notice entitled “An Appeal to the American People,” in which he declared that “the spirit of the nation in this critical matter will be determined largely by what individuals and societies and those gathered in public meetings do and say, upon what newspapers and magazines contain, upon what ministers utter in their pulpits, and men proclaim as their opinions on the street.” 43 Although he later supported participation in the war, at the time, even Theodore Roosevelt applauded President Wilson on his bid for neutrality in a letter dated 23 September 1914, writing “it is certainly eminently desirable that we should remain entirely neutral and nothing but urgent need would warrant breaking our neutrality and taking sides one way or the other.” 44 Nevertheless, there were those closest to the President who advocated that the United States had to become involved in international politics. Presidential Advisor, “Colonel” Edward Mandell House, accused the President of “singularly lacking in appreciation of the importance of this European crisis,” and commented that “Congress will adjourn now within a few days, and when it is out of the way it is my purpose to make a drive at the President and try to get him absorbed in the greatest


For a complete copy of Wilson notice of 18 August 1914, please refer to Appendix F.

problem of world-wide interest that has ever come, or may ever come, before a President of the United States.”

Despite the President’s unwillingness to get involved in European affairs, as the weeks progressed, policy changes were beginning to highlight the fact that perhaps the claim of neutrality by the United States might simply be one in name alone.

One problem was that the economy of the United States was still very much tied to European markets. In the interest of sustaining the nation’s finances, the United States would have to continue to engage in the exchange of goods with ports throughout the world, including those at war. Although trade agreements during periods of war had been attempted with the 1909 Declaration of London, no proper mandate was ever fully agreed upon by any of the participating nations. With the threat that European markets could close as a result of the war, the United States quickly enacted new legislation in an effort to maintain open

---

45 Ibid., 296 – Marked entry dated 28 September 1914. Throughout the first months of war, House persisted in making the case that the United States needed to prepare for war in Europe an opinion he held well before war was even declared (The Papers of Woodrow Wilson, Volume 30: May 6 – September 5, 1914, 95 – “From the Diary of Colonel House.” 28 September 1914). According to Charles Seymour, House appeared “to have been on terms of intimacy with the outstanding apostle of the [preparedness] movement, Leonard Wood” and on 16 April 1914, House wrote that he “had a long talk with General Wood about the army’s preparedness. We discussed the international situation, particularly regarding Japan and the possibility of trouble there, and what would be necessary to be done. He said that Manila was now so fortified that we could hold it for a year at the minimum, and that within a short while Hawaii would be in a similarly impregnable position. He thought the Panama Canal was so near completion that it could be used in twenty days in the event of an emergency. We promised to keep in close touch with one another from now on (The Intimate Papers of Colonel House: Behind the Political Curtain, 1912-1915. Volume I, 296-297).”

trade with all foreign economies. Using “section 5” of the Panama Canal Act of 24 August 1912 as a point of reference, on 18 August 1914 the United States modified the 1912 Act, stating

That the President of the United States is hereby authorized, whenever in his discretion the needs of foreign commerce may require, to suspend by order, so far and for such length of time as he may deem desirable, the provisions of law prescribing that all the watch officers of vessels of the United States registered for foreign trade shall be citizens of the United States.

Under like conditions, in like manner, and to like extent the President of the United States is also hereby authorized to suspend the provisions of the law requiring survey, inspection, and measurement by officers of the United States of foreign-built vessels admitted to American registry under this Act. 47

Less than a month later, President Wilson, using powers granted to him on 18 August, passed Executive Order 2039: Admitting Foreign-Built Ships to American Registry on 4 September, under which “several vessels belonging to the Deutsche-Amerikanische Petroleum Gesellschaft and sailing under the German flag were transferred to the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey.” 48 Despite declaring neutrality, by October, the United States lifted restrictions against lending to belligerent nations and finally permitted “American bankers, individually or collectively, may make loans, large or small, to the nations of Europe now at war. There is no law on the statute books which prohibits it, and there is no ruling of international law by which

47 “The Change in the Shipping Law.” The Americas, Volume I, No. 1 (October, 1914). Prepared in the U.S. Bureau of Navigation, by courtesy of Hon. Eugene F. Chamberlain, Commissioner of Navigation, Department of Commerce. New York, New York: National City Bank of New York, 33 – The 1912 Act initially “admitted to American registry ‘seagoing vessels, whether steam or sail, which have been certified by the Steamboat-Inspection Service as safe to carry dry and perishable cargo, not more than five years old at the time they apply for registry, wherever built, which are to engage only in trade with foreign countries . . . being wholly owned by citizens of the United States or corporations organized and chartered under the laws of the United States or of any State thereof, the president and managing directions of which shall be citizens of the United States.’ [Even so,] Under the Panama Act no applications for American registry of foreign-built vessels were made.”

they can be prevented from doing so.”49 While permitting the use of loans, the US State Department maintained that the nation was still impartial claiming that “a neutral government is not compelled by international law, by treaty, or by statute to prevent these sales to a belligerent. Such sales, therefore, by American citizens do not in the least affect the neutrality of the United States.”50 With legislation now permitting the United States to purchase foreign ships and loans to be granted abroad, the federal government was now faced with probing questions regarding the probability of the nation joining the war. Still insisting that the United States needed a policy of preparedness, House again broached the subject with Wilson during a conference on 4 November, noting “we passed to the question of a reserve army. He baulked somewhat at first and said he thought the labor people would object because they felt that a large army was against

49 The Papers of Woodrow Wilson, Volume 31: September 6 – December 31, 1914, 153 – According to “A News Report,” entitled “American Bankers May Make Loans To War Nations.” 15 October 1914. Printed in the New York World on 16 October 1914. The article goes on to note that “the flat statement of the Administration yesterday, issued through the State Department, that contraband and conditional contraband, including guns and ammunition, could be sold by American citizens to citizens of the Government at war or to the Governments themselves without violating the neutrality of the United States, led to inquiry to-day as to the making of loans, and the right of bankers and banks to do so. The statement was based on an article of the second Hague convention of 1907, which said: ‘A neutral power is not required to prevent the exportation or transit, for the account of either belligerent, of arms, munitions and, in general, of anything which may be useful to any army of fleet’.”

On 16 August 1914, Colville Barclay, British Diplomat and Counsellor to the Embassy at Washington, informed Grey that “inquiry having been made as to the attitude of this Government in case of American bankers being asked to make loans to foreign Governments during the war in Europe the following announcement is made: ‘There is no reason why loans should not be made to the neutral Government, but in the judgment of this Government, loans by American bankers to any foreign nation which is at war is inconsistent with the true spirit of neutrality (The Papers of Woodrow Wilson, Volume 30: May 6 – September 5, 1914, 386 – “Colville Barclay to Sir Edward Grey.” Washington, 16 August 1914. According to Barclay, not only was the “statement . . . in reply to a direct enquiry made by the Swiss Legation here. . . . It is also a reply to enquiries made by Messrs. J. P. Morgan and Co. who, it is understood, had been approached, through private sources, for a loan, rumored at £20,000,000, for the French Government’.”

their interests. He did not believe there was any necessity for immediate action; he was afraid it would shock the country.” The slow change in government policy, while disconcerting, is a mirror reflection of the times. Already, the war was manifesting into a conflict never before experienced in the modern era and the casualties in both manpower and firepower was steadily climbing on both sides. As Beckett points out, “the winter campaign of November and December 1914 cost the Germans 100,000 casualties and the Russians 530,000. There had been heavy losses in the west as well, the French alone suffering 385,000 in the first six weeks and 995,000 by the end of the first five months. The Germans had suffered 750,000 casualties in the west in the same period.” Along with a drastic loss in manpower on the front lines, industries operating under conditions of war were also experiencing difficulties in maintaining maximum output of necessary war materials. Hew Strachan explains that “by 10 September 1914, after little more than three weeks of active operations, the French army had lost a tenth of its field artillery, 410 75 mm guns, and 750 limbers” and “by January 1915 its holdings of the 1886 Lebel rifle had fallen from 2,880,000 to 2,370,000, a loss of over half-a-million.” Unable to fully carry out Alfred von Schlieffen’s military plan, by Christmas of 1914, troops stationed along

52 Beckett, 59.
53 Strachan, 1049 – Not only were front-line nations suffering a loss of goods, but even Great Britain’s war industry was struggling to maintain output production to the point that, war industries were steadily brought under direct control of the state. Similar to agreements reached between the German state and trade unions – when the unions agreed not to strike – in March 1915, Great Britain passed the Treasury Agreement, which “succeeded in persuading the trade union leaders in the munitions industries that the unions should abandon their restrictive practices for the duration of the war, in order to permit the maximum output of munitions. In particular, it was hoped that by following a policy of dilution of labour, lesser skilled and female labour would be recruited on work formerly undertaken by skilled labour (Gerry. R. Rubin. “Law as a Bargaining Weapon: British Labour and the Restoration of Pre-War Practices Act 1919.” The Historical Journal, Vol. 32. No. 4 (December, 1989), 927).”
54 Since the late 19th century, “the re-emergence of the French army” necessitated that in the event of an intercontinental conflict involving Germany and Russia, “France must be defeated first (Beckett, 47-48).” Beckett goes on to explain that the 1905 von Schlieffen Plan stipulated that “no less
the Western Front and their respected governments were beginning to prepare for a long and drawn out war.

While the United States continued to foster relationships with the Allied Governments, criticisms were made against a policy of intervention. On 8 January 1915, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, William J. Stone messaged Bryan stating “as you are aware, frequent complains or charges are made in one form or another through the press that this Government has shown partiality to Great Britain, France, and Russia as against Germany and Austria during the present war between those powers; in addition to which I have received numerous letter to the same effect from sympathizers with Germany and Austria.”

Clearly the question of neutrality was becoming a larger political concern and at the moment the United States was starting to push well beyond their initial claims of neutrality. Now faced with

than seven German armies would be committed to the west and of these, five were to advance through Belgium, Luxemburg and the Netherlands . . . . The remaining two armies allocated to the west would hold an expected French advance into Alsace-Lorraine. The German First and Second Armies on the extreme right of advance would swing around Paris to pin the French armies on their own frontier, ensuring the climatic and decisive Kesselschlacht (cauldron battle). All this would be accomplished in just 42 days and, as Schlieffen put it, the ‘last grenadier on the right wing should brush the Channel with his sleeve.’ Schlieffen’s response to the fact that the First Army would have a considerable distance to cover in the allotted time was merely to remark that the men would have to make ‘very great exertions.’ The plan did not take account of the logistical problems involved in supplying such an advance on the assumption that sufficient supplies could be captured en route through the Low Countries. Nor did it take any account of French counter-moves or what the German military theorist Carl von Clausewitz had termed ‘friction’. It was also the case that the divisions committed to the plan at this stage largely existed only on paper (48).

55 “Questions Relating to Neutrality.” The American Journal of International Law, Volume 9, No. 3, Supplement: Diplomatic Correspondence Between the United States and Belligerent Governments Relating to Neutral Rights and Commerce (June, 1915), 253 – As Stone points out “complaints” received by his office included “submission to censorship of mails and in some cases to the repeated destruction of American letters found on neutral vessels. . . . Submission without protest to interruption of trade in conditional contraband consigned to private persons in Germany and Austria, thereby supporting the policy of Great Britain to cut off all supplies from Germany and Austria. . . . British warships are permitted to lie off American ports and intercept neutral vessels. . . . Submission without protest to disregard by Great Britain and her allies of – (a) American naturalization certificates. (b) American passports. . . . Change of policy in regard to loans to belligerents: (a) General loans. (b) Credit loans. . . . Submission to arrest of native-born Americans on neutral vessels and in British ports, and their imprisonment (253-254).
growing pressures from within his own administration as well as public opinion, President Wilson started to move, albeit behind closed doors, into a position of preparedness. According to Ray Standard Baker not only did Wilson discuss “with [Secretary of War, Lindley M.] Garrison proposals for increasing the “militia” on 8 February, but nearly a month later “he signed the Naval Appropriation bill carrying $45,053,801 for the increase of the navy” on 3 March.\textsuperscript{56} President Wilson’s willingness to submit to proposals advocating for military preparation were further justified by the sudden turn of events in the late spring of 1915. With Germany’s declaration on 18 February “that the waters around Britain were a war zone, in which enemy shipping was to be sunk on sight rather than being stopped and identified first,” caused Great Britain to retaliate with the passage of “another Order in Council on 11 March, which made all neutral trade subject to confiscation.”\textsuperscript{57} Regardless of being forewarned by warring nations that all ships traveling through the North Atlantic were subject to attack, the United States still maintained a steady transport of both goods and individuals to Europe. Consequently, on 1 May 1915, the Counselor of the German Embassy in Washington submitted notices to be printed in newspapers discouraging Americans from traveling to Europe, now that all ships were suspected as enemies and could be openly fired upon.\textsuperscript{58} Despite the warning through, \textit{The New York Times}

\textsuperscript{56} Baker, 8.

\textsuperscript{57} Beckett, 90 – Along with Germany’s declaration of 18 February, “the Germans warned that, since Allied merchantmen might fly neutral flags, neutral shipping should avoid the designated zone altogether.”

\textsuperscript{58} In \textit{The New York Times}, the notice ran as follows: “NOTICE! Travelers intending to embark on the Atlantic voyage are reminded that a state of war exists between Germany and her allies and Great Britain and her allies; that the zone of war includes the waters adjacent to the British Isles: that, in accordance with formal notice given by the Imperial German Government, vessels flying the flag of Great Britain, or any of her allies, are liable to destruction in those waters and that travelers sailing in the war zone on ships of Great Britain or her allies do so at their own risk (\textit{The New York Times}. “German Embassy Issues Warning. Advertises Notice of Danger to Travelers in the War Zone. Building Up a Defense? Suggestion that Notice may be Cited Against Possible Claims for Damages – Cunard Agent Says Travel is Safe.” 1 May 1915. According to the article, the message was written from the Imperial German Government on 22 April 1915).”
reports that the announcement “did not cause any of them [the travelers] to cancel,” their passage onboard the Lusitania and “the big liner left at 12.30 o’clock with 1,388 passengers which was the largest number carried eastbound by one ship this year. When the attention of Captain W. T. Tuner, commander of the Lusitania, was called to the warning, he laughed and said: “I wonder what the Germans will do next. Well, it doesn’t seem as if they had scared many people from going on the ship by the look of the pier and the passenger list’.”59 Even though Captain Turner and passengers expressed every confidence of a safe journey across the Atlantic, on 7 May the ship was seen by “the German submarine U20,” which under the command of “Walter Schwieger . . . torpedoed the Cunard Line steamship . . . in the Irish Sea without warning near Old Head of Kinsale . . . . The ship sank in only eighteen minutes. The dead numbered 785 passengers and 413 members of the crew, a total of 1,198, including 270 women, 94 children, and 124 American citizens.”60 Immediately the sinking of the Lusitania caused considerable backlash. A day after the incident, Walter Hines Page, American Ambassador at London, cabled a confidential coded message to President Wilson and Secretary of State informing them that “the sinking of the LUSITANIA . . . and the torpedoing of the GULFLIGHT and other plainly marked neutral ships the English regard as the complete abandonment of war regulations and of humanity in its conduct as well as of any consideration for neutrals.”61 House, who was also in

59 The New York Times. “Sails, Undisturbed by German Warning. Lusitania Off with Her Passenger List of 1,388 Undiminished. NO BOOKINGS CANCELED. Liner Delayed to Take Passengers of Cameronia, which was Suddenly Chartered by England.” 2 May 1915.


London sent a letter to President Wilson on 9 May, writing in light of the loss of the *Lusitania*, “an immediate demand should be made upon Germany for assurance that this shall not occur again. If she fails to give such assurances, I should inform her that our government expected to take whatever measures were necessary to insure the safety of American citizens” and should war result, “our intervention will save rather than increase the loss of life. America has come to the parting for civilized or uncivilized warfare. . . . we can no longer remain neutral spectators. Our action in this crisis will determine the part we will play when peace is made, and how far we may influence the settlement for the lasting good of humanity. We are being weighed in the balance, and our position amongst the nations is being assessed by mankind."62 Fallout over how to proceed following the events of 7 May, not only weighed heavily on President Wilson, but also members of his cabinet. Like any other national event, politicians divided themselves in terms of how to address the German government.

By 11 May, a preliminary note was drafted and circulated among President Wilson’s top officials. As James Watson Gerard, Genevieve Forbes Herrick and John Origen Herrick write, the letter addressed to the American Ambassador at Berlin “was polite and almost friendly . . . [however] it insisted on the right of American citizens to travel the high seas in safety, and it demanded that ships carrying citizens of non-combatant nations must be hailed and the safety of such citizens assured, before action was taken to capture or sink the ship.”63 Despite signing off

---


on the message, Bryan continued to express concerns over both the terms of the letter and the 
war-like attitude being adopted by his fellow officials, including the President himself. At the 
core of the tensions was the fact that some advisors were speculating that if the United States 
remained silent in regards to the *Lusitania*, the nation would lose all creditability to participate in 
peace negotiations in Europe once the war had ended. Count Johann Heinrich von Bernstorff, 
German Ambassador at Washington, also expressed a similar concern in a letter dated 29 May 
and addressed to Bethmann-Hollweg, reporting “President Wilson is again entertaining the idea 
of a mediation that is intended to put an end to the European war. As I hear from the most 
reliable source, Mr. Wilson believes that the *Lusitania* affair has focused the eyes of the entire 
world on the conduct of the war at sea and on its consequences for international commerce.”64 

Five days after Bernstorff’s sent his note, President Wilson along with advisors like Lansing, 
drafted a second notice to German officials regarding the *Lusitania*. This time though, Bryan’s 

---

64 The Papers of Woodrow Wilson, Volume 33: April 17 – July 21, 1915, 283-284 – “Count Johann 
Translation. Washington, 29 May 1915. (Embassy) – According to Link and other editors of 
Wilson’s Papers, while “Bernstorff’s message has been treated variously by the historians who 
have taken note of it. . . . we come to the conclusion that Bernstorff’s report of May 29, 
confirmed by his report of June 2, embodied Wilson’s overtures to Bethmann. 

“Much as been revealed in the documents about Wilson’s search for an alternative to war . . . . 
The efforts to which he went to persuade Germany to join hands with the American government 
in establishing freedom of the seas for neutral vessels and non-contraband cargoes . . . . 

“Nothing came of Bethmann’s and Wilson’s efforts. The Chancellor’s control over German 
foreign policy was so tenuous at this time, because the power of the army and navy were so great, 
that Bethmann did not dare to respond positively to Wilson. Indeed, only through heroic efforts 
was he able to obtain the minimal concessions necessary to prevent war with the United States. 
In addition, as [Gerhard] Ritter [in Staatskunst und Kriegshandwerk (4 vols., Munich, 1954-68)] 
points out (p. 523) [Volume III], [Gottlieb von] Jagow [Germany’s Foreign Minister] (and 
presumably Bethmann as well) had concluded by the time that Bernstorff’s letter arrived in Berlin 
that Italy’s entry into the war precluded a peace based upon the *status quo ante bellum*. . . . by 
late the German leaders had good reason to believe that the British would never consent to even 
partial freedom of the seas unless defeated (280-282).” For a full statement of inquiries and 
historical interpretation regarding Bernstorff’s note refer to pages 280-282 in Wilson’s Papers 
Volume 33.
disapproval with the President Wilson’s tactics toward the European war was becoming increasingly evident. During a “cabinet meeting of June 4 to consider the second note, it was evident that there was about to be a break between these two determined men [Bryan and President Wilson]. Bryan still counseled soft words and arbitration, but he was disappointed to find that his arguments made no impression.”65 While Bryan proposed changes to President Wilson, stating “the fact that the note to Germany has not yet been completed encourages me to trespass upon your time for a moment to present again three matters which, to my mind, are necessary to insure us against war with Germany,” his opinions were quickly disregarded by the President who, explained “I am sorry to say that, study as I may the way to do it without hopelessly weakening our protest, I cannot find a way to embody in our note the principle of long discussion of a very simple state of facts; and I think that our object with England can be gained better by not sending a note in connection with this one than by sending it; and, after all, it is our object and the relief of our trade that we wish to accomplish.”66 The rift between the

65 Herrick and Herrick, 291 – Bryan was not the only one to voice opposition to a firm policy against Germany. there were other members of national government who were encouraging the President to proceed with caution, including Senator Robert Latham Owen of Oklahoma (D), who informed Wilson that I believe it my duty to say to you that I profoundly believe that the United States can be of much greater service to humanity by keeping at peace than by taking preliminary steps which may lead inevitably to war, and therefore I wish to endorse your attitude as explained in the public press.

Everybody agrees to the enormity of the Lusitania incident but every one may not see the extremity of the military necessity with which the German government is confronted, and while the military necessity does not excuse the conduct in destroying this vessel without notice and the neutrals on board, we should seek in every way possible to get satisfaction without going to the extremity of war or to the steps which must eventuate in war.

The entire country will look to you with confidence to solve this extremely difficult problem, and we believe that you will receive Divine guidance in its wise solution (The Papers of Woodrow Wilson, Volume 33: April 17 – July 21, 1915, 188 – “From Robert Latham Owen.” Muskogee, Oklahoma, 13 May 1915).”

President of the United States and his Secretary of State had indeed reached an impasse by early June. Unable to secure a compromise and maintaining a steadfast pacifist opinion to the role of the United States in the European conflict, Bryan submitted a letter of resignation to President Wilson on 9 June 1915.\(^{67}\)

In an effort to clarify his decision, Bryan explained that “obedient to your sense of duty, and actuated by the highest motives, you have prepared for transmission to the German Government a note in which I can not join without violating what I deem to be an obligation to my country, and the issue involved is of such moment that to remain a member of the cabinet would be as unfair to you as it would be to the cause which is nearest my heart, namely, the prevention of war.”\(^{68}\) Although the tone of the second letter was revised before it was sent to Germany, the change “was not sufficient, in his judgment to justify him in asking permission to withdraw his resignation.”\(^{69}\) After receiving Bryan’s notice, President Wilson replied, “I accept

\(^{67}\) As early as 5 June there was speculation that the division between Bryan and President Wilson was reaching a breaking point when, Edith Bolling Galt, President Wilson’s companion and later second wife, commented “I did want to ask you more about the resignation of “W.J.B.” but saw the subject troubled you so would not let myself discuss it. I think it will be a blessing to get rid of him . . . (\textit{The Papers of Woodrow Wilson, Volume 33: April 17 – July 21, 1915}, 346 – “From Edith Bolling Galt.” Washington, May [June] 5\(^{\text{th}}\) & 6\(^{\text{th}},\) 1915).”


\(^{69}\) William Jennings Bryan and Mary Baird Bryan. \textit{The Memoirs of William Jennings Bryan, Volume II}. Port Washington, New York: Kennikat Press; 1971, 409 – In a letter issued by Bryan on 12 June, he explained that “he had no knowledge of this change [to the second letter] at the time his resignation was tendered and accepted. The clause inserted follows:

“\textit{If the Imperial German Government should deem itself to be in possession of convincing evidence that the officials of the Government of the United States did not perform these duties\textit{}}
it [your resignation] with much more than deep regret, with a feeling of personal sorrow. . . . your support of the work and purposes of the administration has been generous and loyal beyond praise; your devotion to the duties of your great office . . . you have earned our affectionate admiration and friendship. . . . Our objects are the same and we ought to pursue them together. I yield to your desire only because I must and wish to bid you Godspeed in the parting. We shall continue to work for the same causes even when we do not work in the same way.” President Wilson’s personal sentiment toward the loss of his colleague, however, did not last very long. On the same day that President Wilson accepted Bryan’s withdrawal as Secretary of State, he sent word to Edith Bolling Galt, writing in plain terms

The impression upon my mind of Mr. Bryan’s retirement is a very painful one now. It is always painful to feel that any thinking man of disinterested motive, who has been your comrade and confident, has turned away from you and set his hand against you; and it is hard to be fair and not think that the motive is something sinister. . . . I have been deserted before. The wound does not heal, with me, but neither does it cripple. My thought this morning, therefore, is that there is now a chance to do a great deal of constructive work in the State Department for which Mr. Bryan had no gift or aptitude, – if only I can find the right man for the place, or rather, if only I am free to take the best man for the

with thoroughness the Government of the United States sincerely hopes that it will submit that evidence for consideration.” . . .

“As Germany had suggested arbitration, he felt that American could not do less than reply to this offer by expressing a willingness to apply in this case the principle contained in his peace treaties.

“As Secretary Bryan refused to discuss the change which had been made in the note, preserving an attitude of loyalty to the Administration, although when the altered note was made public it called down the most violent abuse upon the ex-Secretary. The public failed to find in the altered note “an ultimatum to Germany” and Mr. Bryan was vilified for leaving his post and for claiming the note was harsher than, in its final form, it proved to be.

“A frank statement from the White House would have given the facts which Mr. Bryan in loyalty withheld, and would have made his position clear to the public, but that statement was not forthcoming and Mr. Bryan was subjected to the harshest criticism (408-409)."

place. . . . Mr. B. can do a lot of mischief, but he cannot alter anything essential, and my personal fortunes are neither here nor there.71

Shortly after Bryan’s resignation he was subjected to both criticisms and support beyond the White House as newspapers throughout the country either “condemned him for deserting when the ship was weathering a gale” while ”others, realizing his sincerity and knowing the strict bounds of conscience by which he limited his acts, were more lenient. Many felt that he had acted not only honestly, but wisely, by quitting in time, when he learned that not only was he in opposition to the sentiments of the President, but to the sentiments of the nation as a whole, as well.”72 As the war progressed, though, the government’s reactions to various European events quickly demonstrated that the United States was more than willing to engage in activities that could ultimately threaten war.

While Baker argues that President Wilson “moved with profound hesitation and a tormenting sense not only of the futility of war but the hazards of victory,” he continued to explore the question of war and ultimately “on July 21\textsuperscript{18} he took his first great step, writing to Garrison and [Secretary of the Navy, Josephus] Daniels to draw up programmes for the

---

71 Ibid., 377-378 – “To Edith Bolling Galt.” The White House, Wednesday, 9 June 1915 – On the morning of 9 June, Ms. Galt also sent word to President Wilson, saying of Bryan’s resignation, “Hurrah! old Bryan is out! . . . . I know it is going to be the greatest possible relief to you to be rid of him. Your letter is much too nice, and I see why I was not allowed to see it before publication. I could shout and sing that at last the world will know just what he is (“Two Letters from Edith Bolling Galt.” Washington, Wednesday, A.M. 9 June 1915, 378).”

72 Herrick and Herrick, 294 – In a letter from Ambassador Page in London to House he wrote “Mr. Bryan would not feel complimented if he knew that for these two days we’ve all gone about our work in the Embassy without more than some slight passing allusion to his resignation,, as one might speak of the weather. It hasn’t occurred to any of the men that it is an event of any importance.

“But one American wrote me at letter saying he now wanted another passport; he had never cared for the one he has because it bore the signature of W. J. B., and know he knows that that passport’s no good (The Intimate Papers of Colonel House: From Neutrality to War, 1915-1917. Volume II, 9).”
development and equipment of the two arms of the service.” Beyond this, President Wilson also took measures to ensure that he would have the necessary support from Congress when it came to uniting the government in the event of war that he began “writing on August 2nd to the outstanding leaders of the military and naval affairs committees of both Houses. The letter to Congressman [James] Hay [of Virginia (D)] is representative:

I am sure you have had as much in mind as I have the whole matter of what it is wise and necessary to do in the matter of national defense. I have been taking steps to get full recommendations from the War and Navy Departments and I am hoping that after I get back to Washington it may be convenient for you to come up and have a talk with me as to the best way in which the whole thing can be handled, so that we shall all have a single judgment in the matter and a single programme of action. I shall value your advice in the matter very much indeed.

With the one year anniversary of the war drawing closer, the government of the United States, like those of war torn Europe, found itself at a political crossroads. How can a nation, which declared neutrality, participate in international trade and maintain economic stability at a time when rules of war granted belligerent nations the opportunity to sink, capture, or claim goods on the open waters? For President Wilson, the debate went even further as he contemplated how the United States could become a leading example of democratic rule, participate in the rebuilding of

---

73 Baker, 8-9 – To Garrison the President wrote: “I have been giving scarcely less thought than you yourself have to the question of adequate preparation for national defense, and I am anxious, as you know, to incorporate in my next message to Congress a programme regarding the development and equipment of the Army and a proper training of our citizens to arms which, while in every way consistent with our traditions and our national policy, will be of such a character as to commend itself to every patriotic and practical mind.”

“The two Secretaries were to confer with their professional associates, draw their plans, and then the President would discuss the proposals with them.”

Baker goes on to note that “in each letter he [Wilson] was careful to say: “Whether we can reasonably propose the whole of it to the Congress immediately or not we can determine when we have studied it. The Important thing now is to know and know fully what we need. Congress will certainly welcome such advice and follow it to the limit of its opportunity (9).”

74 Ibid., 9-10.
the European continent, and establish a lasting peace proposal, if it did not become an active participant in the war itself? Incidentally, it was events like those of 13 October 1914 and 7 May 1915 that continuously permitted the United States government to enter into European affairs without the risk of disturbing national public opinion. In a letter to President Wilson, House speculated “I think we will find ourselves drifting into war with Germany,” writing “regrettable as this would be, there would be compensations. The war would be more speedily ended and we would be in a strong position to aid the other great democracies in turning the world into the right paths. It is something that we have to face with fortitude being consoled by the thought that no matter what sacrifices we make, the end will justify them.” Even though President Wilson’s 1916 re-election campaign slogan boasted “He Kept Us Out of War,” in actuality, by mid-summer 1915, the United States was clearly headed in the direction of approving a policy of military preparation. Despite political rifts between war hawks and doves, as a nation that was still maintaining neutrality in regards to the war, the United States could not legally suppress the rights of individuals who advocated a policy that would keep the country out of European conflicts. As the United States continued to grapple with the war situation, socialists throughout Europe were struggling to unite under one platform that would bring about an end to the conflict.

**The Impasse of Socialism in Europe**

According to William English Walling, “the first Socialist peace proposals came from the American Party, and from the Swiss Party, demanding mediation by the United States and by the Swiss Governments respectively; there was no discussion at the time as to just which peace terms the Socialists considered practicable or desirable.” Even though the United States

---


76 *The Socialists and The War: A Documentary Statement of the Position of the Socialists of All*
Socialist Party was the first to issue a call for an international conference, their appeal “had very little practical result, for the reason that its success depended upon the participation of the Socialists of the warring nations,” especially among the European organizations who remained divided in terms of whether or not to permit belligerent nations from participating in any international meetings. As Fainsod points out, while representatives from the three Scandinavian countries met on 11 October 1914 and “decided to convocate a general conference to which all Socialists,” declaring that “belligerents as well as neutrals, should be invited,” another meeting was taking place in Italy, involving “delegates of the French and Swiss Socialists,” where “the French declared that under the present conditions they could not think of taking part in any conference.” Nevertheless, an International Socialist Conference, “was

---

_Countries; with Special Reference to Their Peace Policy, Including a Summary of the Revolutionary State Socialist Measures Adopted by the Governments at War_. William English Walling, Ed. New York, New York: Henry Holt and Company; 1915, 405 – Walling notes that the first call for an international peace conference was extended by the American Socialist Party, who a month after the war began messaged “one or more [of the] leading Socialists in Great Britain, France, Germany, Austria, Belgium, Italy, Holland, Switzerland, Denmark, and Sweden:

“In present crisis before any nation is completely crushed, Socialist representatives should exert every influence on their respective governments to have warring countries accept mediation by the United States. This can still be done without loss of prestige. Conference would be held at The Hague or Washington. Have cabled Socialist parties of ten nations urging this action. Wire reply.”

77 Ibid., 407 – As the United States extended an invitation to European Socialists regarding a meeting, Fainsod notes that the “the first international socialist conference after the outbreak of war took place between Italian and Swiss Socialists at Lugano, Switzerland, on September 27, 1914. According to a report in the _Golos_ [Voice], the daily paper of the international wing of the Mensheviks, the conference was “called at the initiative of some prominent Russian Socialists.” Lenin took an active part in the conference preliminaries. . . . Although condemning the war as “the result of the imperialist policy of the Great Powers,” the signers confined their efforts to calling upon Socialists “to uphold the old principles of the international of the proletariat,” to fight against the extension on the war, and to exert pressure on their governments “with a view toward a speedy close of this mass murder of the European people.” The conference did not accept the theses of Lenin that the war between nations ought to be transformed into a civil war between classes, but it did mark a step forward toward the restoration of international proletarian unity (45-46).”

78 Fainsod, 46.

79 Walling, 407-408 – France’s sentiments were repeated by delegates from Switzerland who commented
called [for] by the Danish section of the International Socialist Bureau” and slated to take place in Copenhagen on 16 and 17 January 1915. Since the Copenhagen Conference called for the participation of only neutral nations, many of the delegates, however, declined the invitation, including Morris Hillquit of the United States who reasoned that given the strained relationship among the impartial countries of Europe the meeting would not be able to make a significant impact on socialism or the war. Regardless of the withdrawals, through, the Copenhagen Conference did commence with “the sixteen delegates of the countries which had issued the invitation,” who declared that they “considered it the duty of all Socialistic Parties to work in the direction of an early peace” and “protesting against the violation of the law of nations committed against Belgium.” Although the delegation vowed three times to bring about an early peace, they too failed to provide an adequate proposal that dictated any kind of conflict

---

“in the present situation it seems to us also that the Socialists of those countries which are not taking a direct part in the bloody struggle which is now laying Europe waste may easily come to an agreement, not only upon steps for an early peace, but also upon the rebuilding of the International. The participation of representatives of the countries at war would naturally bring questions into the discussion upon which, in view of the ruling national animosities, it would be impossible to secure an agreement.

“A conference of representatives of the neutral countries alone promises success. And the discussion to admit delegates of the neutral states alone to the proposed conference has our undivided support (407-408).”


81 The Socialists and The War: A Documentary Statement of the Position of the Socialists of All Countries; with Special Reference to Their Peace Policy, Including a Summary of the Revolutionary State Socialist Measures Adopted by the Governments at War, 417-419 – For a full copy of Hillquit’s letter, please refer to Appendix G.

Regarding Hillquit’s letter, Walling notes that “it may be pointed out that the Socialists of the Allied Countries take a position which denies the neutrality of this letter, and that they are supported in this stand not only by the Socialists of Spain, by part of the Socialists of Russia and Italy, and by American Socialist leaders such as Eugene V. Debs and Charles Edward Russell. For none of these Socialists agree with Hillquit that the Socialists of the world or of America have “no interest in the war except its speed termination. On the contrary, they do not want to see it end as long as Germany holds her present conquests – at least on the west front (419).”

82 Ibid., 419-420.
resolution. Inactivity from the Bureau of the Second International and the continued progression of the war ultimately prompted further calls for an intercontinental conference this time led by members of the center and radical left. Undaunted by the inability to form a cohesive platform for the international socialists, there were some national organizations that maintained a steady effort to bring about a conference that would unite the parties. And so,

In April 1915 the Italians with the concurrence of the Swiss Social Democrats sent Deputy Odino Morgari to France and England, where he proposed to Vandervelde, the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the International Socialist Bureau, and to other party leaders that an international conference of neutrals be held and that a full session of the International Socialist Bureau be called. Representatives of the party majorities, i.e., the patriotic socialists, turned down both proposals; but Morgari found considerable support for an international conference among the minority groups in both France and England. On hearing Morgari’s report at a meeting held at Bologna, May 15-16, the Executive of the Italian Socialist party decided to ignore the opposition of the majority groups and to take the initiative in calling an international conference to which were to be invited all parties and workers’ organizations which were ready to come out against civil peace, to stand for united and simultaneous action of socialists in various countries against war on the basis of the proletarian class struggle.

By 11 July, the Italian and Swiss socialists arranged for “a number of left-wing socialists and syndicalists from France, Germany, Italy, Switzerland, Holland, Sweden, Norway, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Russia [to gather] secretly in a peasant’s house in the village of

---

83 Walling points out that “at the time of this Conference [in Copenhagen], immediate peace would, beyond doubt, have been favored by the Germans and Austro-Hungarians, as well as those who voted for it at the Conference: Sweden, Denmark, Norway, and Holland. . . . documents show it would also have been favored by the United States and Switzerland. Outside of the Allies, then, only Spain would have opposed it, while in Great Britain one of the three parties admitted to the International Socialist Congresses had made it clear that it would probably favor peace at any time (The Socialists and The War: A Documentary Statement of the Position of the Socialists of All Countries; with Special Reference to Their Peace Policy, Including a Summary of the Revolutionary State Socialist Measures Adopted by the Governments at War, 421).”

Zimmerwald near Bern, Switzerland, on September 5, 1915."\(^85\) The Zimmerwald Conference, as it came to be known, marked a particular turning point for socialist organizations especially in regards to the formation of the latter Third International. For four days, “thirty-eight delegates, some of whom were observers without votes, from eleven countries attended” the meeting including ten from Germany alone.\(^86\) Absent from Zimmerwald was Liebknecht who instead sent a letter of encouragement reminding his fellow socialist leaders that “it is our duty to promote mutual understanding, encouragement, and inspiration among those who remain true to the flag, who are determined not to give way one inch before international imperialism, even if they fall victims to it, and to create order in the ranks of those who are determined to hold out – to hold out and to fight, with their feet firmly planted on the basis of international socialism.”\(^87\) While Liebknecht’s words gave support to some in attendance, the conference, which was opposed by the Bureau of the Second International, soon “became a battlefield in which the Centrists and revolutionary Socialists fought for supremacy.”\(^88\) Many of the debates at Zimmerwald, centered on policies put forward by the Bolsheviks, who were initially sidelined during the Copenhagen Conference in January.

\(^85\) History of Socialism: A Comparative Survey of Socialism, Communism, Trade Unionism, Cooperation, Utopianism, and Other Systems of Reform and Reconstruction, 751 – According to Gankin and Fisher, “seven persons attended the preliminary Conference at Berne on July 11: Robert Grimm of the Swiss Social Democratic Party; G. Zinoviev of the Central Committee of the R.S.D.L. [Russian Social-Democratic Labour Fraction] party; P. B. Axelrod of the Organization Committee of the R.S.D.L. party; Angelica Balabanoff and O. Morgari of the Italian Socialist party; A. S. Warski of the Main Presidium of the Social Democracy of Poland and Lithuania; and M. G. Walecki of the Polish Socialist party (Levitsa). Contrary to the wishes of [G.] Zinoviev, a majority of those present favored inviting to the general Conference not only those who were know to be Lefts but such moderates as Haase, [Hjalmar] Branting, and [Pieter] Troelstra. It was also decided that the forthcoming Conference should not attempt to form a new International but should limit its function to calling the proletariat to common action for peace (310).”

\(^86\) Gankin and Fisher, 320.

\(^87\) Ibid., 326-328 – For a copy of Liebknecht’s letter, please refer to Appendix H.

\(^88\) Fainsod, 65.
Fainsod notes that “the fundamental conflict began with the discussion of the manifesto and resolution to be issued by the conference,” concerned “the draft resolution proposed by the Left wing,” which was “shot through with the ideas of Lenin,” and based on the program’s call for social revolution, the decree was immediately questioned by representatives from France, Germany, and Italy and ultimately voted down. Shortly thereafter, Trotsky was given the task of drafting a new statement which the nations in attendance could agree upon as the platform for the conference. While the declaration finally adopted by the delegates possessed some of revolutionary principles initially noted in the first draft and “signif[ied] a step toward an ideological and practical break with opportunism and social chauvinism. At the same time,” argued Lenin, “the manifesto . . . suffers from inconsistency and is not comprehensive.”

Whereas the September meeting served as a momentary “bridge” between the Left and Center, Fainsod argues that “it is clear that the majority [of the] delegations in the Zimmerwald Conference were not yet ready for an organizational break with their own Socialist parties,” particularly “members of the Zimmerwald majority . . . [who] hesitated to break with the Second International and their own Socialist parties.”

---

89 Ibid., 68.
90 The original draft, entitled “Draft Resolution of the Left Wing Delegates at the International Socialist Conference at Zimmerwald, “was signed by two representatives of the Central Committee of the R.S.-D.L.P. (Zinoviev and Lenin), a representative of the Opposition of the Polish Social-Democracy (Radek), a representative of the Latvian province (Winter), a representative each of the Left Social-Democrats of Sweden (Höglund) and Norway (Nerman), a Swiss delegate (Platten), and a German delegate. On the question of submitting the draft to the commission, 12 delegates voted for (the eight mentioned above, two Socialists-Revolutionists, Trotsky and Roland-Holst) and 19 against (Collected Works of V. I. Lenin: Lenin, Volume XVIII, The Imperialist War – The Struggle Against Social-Chauvinism and Social-Pacifism, 1914-1915, 478).”

For a copy of Lenin’s original proposal, please refer to Appendix I.
91 Gankin and Fisher, 353 – For a full text of the new draft, please refer to Appendix J.
92 Fainsod, 71-74 – Fainsod goes on to note that among the majority members, “dissatisfaction with the
strides toward reconciling the international, Gankin and Fisher point out that “the Zimmerwald Conference created very little stir in the world. . . . censorship in Russia, Germany, and France prevented the open and legal publication of the manifesto and the proceedings, and the organs of the patriotic socialist and labor parties, when they referred to the Conference at all, disclaimed all connection with it or denounced it as a factional move of self-appointed trouble makers.”

Lacking the assistance of the International, however, any agreements or proposals drafted at Zimmerwald were unable to be completely fulfilled without the full support of all of the local socialist organizations in Europe. In the end, the conference succeeded at creating an atmosphere where varying socialist ideals could attempt to unite behind one another and established a future precedent for more conferences to take place in an attempt to bring about an end to the war and a revival of the failed International.

While the socialists tried to unite around a central platform, the war continued to exhaust time, resources, and Europe’s manpower, which further strained the belligerent nations. Already in Germany, Fritzsche argues,

the war belonged to everyone, and it worked itself into the personal fabric of 66 million individual lives. The war also changed the way Germans looked at one another and though about the nation. There was no adult German who did not have an intimate connection to the conflagration. Between August 1914 and July 1918, 13,123,011 men served in the German army. Nearly 20 percent of the total population and 85 percent of all eligible males had been mobilized to fight. Of those mobilized, one in three were at the front at any given time. “Willingly or not,” writes Richard Bessel, “millions of soldiers had been uprooted from civilian existence and after a relatively short training period, sent to war. From a world which had been characterized by peace and stability they were catapulted into a world characterized by death and destruction”.

---

93 Gankin and Fisher, 356-357.
Amid the elation of August came the reality of war as local newspapers took to publishing casualty list on a daily bases to the point that by Christmas 1914, it was estimated that Germany had already lost nearly one million men. The sudden loss of so many men was not only felt within the home, but their absences also created hardships in regards to the labor industry. Although women and children attempted to fill the void in industry shortly after the war began, by the autumn of 1914 “in some [German] cities unemployment rates . . . reached 40 per cent.”

Not only was there a loss in industry, but the demands of war also created food shortages, as the bulk of necessary dietary staples were transported to the front. To offset food demands, Germany started “to impose a more systematic rationing system, bread being the first commodity rationed in January 1915, followed by fats, milk, meat and butter.” Nearly a month after the restrictions were implemented, *The Argus*, an Australian newspaper out of Melbourne, commented that “there are reports of a growing discontent in Germany over the restriction of the bread supply. . . . The women and children endeavoured to loot the shops, but were dispersed by the police.” Food riots were further noted on 8 March 1915, by New Zealand newspapers *Poverty Bay Herald*, that “there are serious riots in the western cities of Germany owing to the scarcity of potatoes. Crowds besieged the markets at Cologne, and looted the shops. The police and military used their swords and rifle-butts, and hundreds of women and children were injured.” In an effort to better facilitate the needs of the general population, private charities noted an increase in public assistance, by May, “170 *Kriegsküchen* were serving 50,000

---

95 Ibid., 53.
96 Ibid., 32 – According to Beckett, “in Germany, the female labour force rose from 1.5 million in 1914 to 2.3 million in 1918, or from 22 per cent to 35 per cent of the total industrial labour force in enterprises with over ten employees (329).”
99 *Poverty Bay Herald*. “Food Riots in Germany.” Volume XLII, Issue 13628. 8 March 1915.
Berliners” and throughout the summer of 1915, there were “58 soup kitchens” in Hamburg “serving 30,000 portions every day. A year later 70 kitchens prepared more than 100,000 meals.”\textsuperscript{100} Even so, civil disturbances continued to occur as “serious riots, due to the high prices of potatoes . . . occurred at Breslau and other German cities,” in early August resulted in “indignant housewives beat[ing] the tradesmen as a protest against the high prices they were charging for their goods.”\textsuperscript{101} And by 15 October, food riots also erupted “outside Assmann’s [dairy] in the Berlin neighborhood of Lichtenberg . . . when angry consumers attacked the dairy for price-gouging.”\textsuperscript{102} With civilians struggling on the home front to obtain necessary food items becoming increasingly disruptive, “it was not long before the calls for “bread” were accompanied by demands for “peace’.”\textsuperscript{103} Mirroring these sentiments, James W. Gerard, U.S. Ambassador at Berlin noted in a 7 December 1915 letter sent to Secretary of State Lansing that while

> All of a sudden the people are beginning to talk peace. The Reichstag members, all now in town, are bolder, and many non Socialists are talking peace. These joining with the Socialists (but not openly) will force the Chancellor to make some statement about peace and as to what Germany is fighting for. The Chancellor will follow the sentiment of the Reichstag whatever it is on the day he makes his speech. That will be before this reaches you. Quiet meetings of Reichstag members are being held.

> Butter is scarce; women rush the shops.

> The copper roof on a new building near here is being taken off . . .

\textsuperscript{100} Fritzche, *Germans into Nazis*, 45 & 33 – Beckett notes that “already by the end of 1915, it is estimated that one-quarter of all German households were in receipt of war-related family-support (323).”

\textsuperscript{101} *The Argus*. “Food Riots in Germany. Housewives Beat Tradesmen.” Tuesday, 3 August 1915.

\textsuperscript{102} Fritzche, *Germans into Nazis*, 72.

\textsuperscript{103} Ibid., 72-73.
Hindenburg is out with an interview saying it is not yet time to make peace – that France wants Alsace-Lorraine and England will not make peace. This is Government order to try to stop peace movements in Reichstag and elsewhere.\(^{104}\)

As Germany demanded peace, rationing and rioting concerned other belligerent nations who were also struggling to maintain an adequate supply of food in their own cities.\(^{105}\) Vienna also underwent a food run in May 1915 and on 15 June it was reported that “serious rioting has occurred at Buda Pest owing to the dearness of food. Beef is costing 3/4 per lb., and the mob attacked the shops of the butchers and provision merchants.”\(^{106}\) Whereas continual food riots and shortages added additional strains to the national government, the war’s progression furthered ideological differences initially expressed by the minority of the SPD resulting into several fractures that would eventually result in an ideological break by 1917.

Originally, when hostilities broke out in August, the German state succeeded in forging a working relationship with socialists organizations in an effort to implement public programs


\(^{105}\) According to the *Maoriland Worker*, in Petrograd, hording result in a food riots on 19 April, “when many butchers closed their shops as a protest against the government’s order that all retailers must sell their goods at prices set by the authorities and not, as has been the case, at higher prices. Customers who went to their shops to make the usual purchases found them empty, and were told by the butchers that there was no telling when a supply of meat would be available.

“Disorders followed in many cases, and at some shops the customers broke in and insisted that they be served. Several shops were partially wrecked and the trouble was not stopped until the police interfered.

“In some cases it was found that the butchers had their cellars well stocked with meat. In such cases the police have started grounds for court procedure against the proprietors (*Maoriland Worker*. “Food Riots in Russia As Meat Prices Rise.” Volume 6. Issue 225. Report from Petrograd, 19 April 1915. 9 June 1915 – The article goes on to note that “a fine or imprisonment will probably be the reward for the butchers who concealed their meat”),”

\(^{106}\) *The Argus*. “Food Riots in Hungary.” Tuesday, 15 June 1915 – Reference to Vienna’s food riot can be found in Beckett page 266.
aimed at alleviating the burden of war on the general public. The attachment between the two was made in the wake of Germany’s loss during the Battle of the Marne in September 1914 when it was realized “that the nation could successfully wage the war only by reconstituting the roles of citizens and the responsibilities of the state,” which “revealed glaring deficiencies in the mobilization of the homefront and thereby justified federal leadership in a more rationally organized war economy.” Since city officials were resigned to consider the advice put forth from their local branches of the socialist party and the fact that the SPD granted war credits twice before the start of 1915, it seemed that the entire organization was indeed in line with the actions of the government and willing to participate in the war. Fritzsche points out that “well into 1916 triumphant headlines screamed: “Victory from the North Sea to Switzerland. The Army is Unbeatable,” and “on the second and third pages articles appeared commending “The Trade Unionists as Soldiers,” “Social Democrats as Defenders of the Reich,” and “Germany’s Bebel Uniform”. Even so, by the first summer of the war, the façade of full socialist support was in fact evident. Despite Liebknecht’s conscription and Luxemburg’s imprisonment, the two of them continued to stand outside of the mainstay of the SPD. According to Paul Frölich, in order

---

107 Fritzsche, Germans into Nazis, 55 – According to Bernadotte E. Schmitt and Harold C. Vedeler, “the German defeat,” at the Battle of the Marne, 5-10 September 1914, “disturbed the confidence of the army in the military command, and some of the more perceptive military and civil leaders soon realized that Germany was condemned to a hopeless struggle. The victory of the Allies saved the greater part of France with its manpower and economic resources for the Entente coalition and prevented the catastrophe of division such as existed in the Second World War between Free and Vichy France. The outcome collapsed the myth of German invincibility that had prevailed since 1871, brought the Allies the first intimations that the Central Powers could not win the war, and deeply impressed Italy favorably toward the Entente. By insuring that the war would last a long time, the Marne created an opportunity for command of the seas to exert its slow, strangling effect. The campaign of the Marne represented par excellence the war of movement with great masses of men rapidly advancing and falling back as many sanguinary battles were waged. Its conclusion presaged a new shape of war on the Western Front – a radically different kind from the war of movement (The World in the Crucible, 1914-1919. New York, New York: Harper & Row, Publishers; 1984, 51).”

108 Ibid., 53.
for the radical minority to gain influence among the masses, “some sort of mouthpiece was necessary” and so in April “1915 the Internationale [Die Internationale] appeared under the joint editorship” of Luxemburg and Mehring. Although the journal was immediately banned by the German government after its first and only edition, “the aim . . . was to open up a systematic examination of all the problems of working-class policy raised by the war.”110 Two articles written by Luxemburg, offer a critical analysis of Social Democracy’s role in the current war, in which she concludes in her first critique, entitled “The Reconstruction of the International” that

> When the great historic testing time arrived, a time which it had foreseen and prophesied in all important points with the certainty of exact science, Social Democracy proved to have nothing of the second vital element of the working-class movement; the vigorous will not only to understand and interpret history, but to play a part in shaping it. Despite its clear recognition of coming events and despite its organisational power, Social Democracy was seized helplessly in the current of events, whirled around like a rudderless hulk and driven before the storm of imperialism instead of setting course through the storm to the saving island of Socialism. The international can be born again and a peace in the interests of the proletariat obtained only from the self-criticism of the proletariat remembering its own power. . . . The way to this power is at the same time the way to peace and the rebuilding of the International.111

Throughout the spring and summer of 1915, the minority formed a nucleus based on the idea of advocating for a reestablishment of the failed international, in an attempt to bring about the war’s end.

Spurred on by Italy’s declaration of war and still retaining his right to speak in parliamentary sessions, on 20 August 1915, Liebknecht proceeded with a new assault against the


110 Ibid., 240.

111 Ibid., 239.
policies of the Reichstag majority in the form of supplementary questions aimed at holding the government responsible for Germany’s involvement in the current war, directly inquiring if “the Government, in case of corresponding readiness of the other belligerents, ready, on the basis of renunciation of annexations of every kind, to enter into immediate peace negotiations?”

While Liebknecht’s inquest on 20 August was the first, he persisted with his verbal assault through questioning during Reichstag meetings on both 15 December and 11 January 1916. Additionally, Liebknecht’s willingness to continually defy party protocol also came at a time when the minority members were starting to gain more followers who were ready to demonstrate their loyalty by openly casting opposing votes concerning the question of war credits. Without a doubt, Liebknecht’s continual opposition resulted in some support seeing that “the ratio of supports to opponents of the credits in the faction had been 78–14 in the vote of 3 August 1914, it sank to 68–31 on 17 August 1915, and stood at 58–38 on 14 December 1915,” his tactics while in session were still not enough to fully bring the minority together.

112 Liebknecht, “The Future Belongs to the People”: Speeches Made Since the Beginning of the War, 62 – According to Liebknecht’s editor, Zimand, “in England this form of parliamentary control of the Government is very common. In Germany [however] this form is very seldom used. The possibility of putting supplementary questions gives this method a particularly great usefulness where there is so little parliamentary criticism as in Germany.”

In regards to Liebknecht’s inquiry, Secretary of State, G. von Jagow responded stating:

“I believe I shall meet the wishes of the great majority of the House if I decline to answer the question of the member, Dr. Liebknecht, at the present time as inopportune.” (Great applause, especially at the right side of the House.)

“To which Liebknecht remarked: “That is concealing the capitalistic policy of conquest (great uproar). The answer of the Secretary of State is a confession of the policy of annexation (repeated great uproar). The people want peace” (continual uproar and laughter). (62-63)”

113 Details concerning the nature of Liebknecht’s questions and answers from various Reichstag Ministers can be found in Liebknecht, “The Future Belongs to the People”: Speeches Made Since the Beginning of the War pages 63-73.

114 Trotnow, 169 – According to Trotnow, “by the time of the split on 24 March 1916 the situation was approaching parity with a vote of 44–36.”
voted in opposition to parliament’s request for more war credits on 21 December, Liebknecht remarked “however pleasing and valuable today’s vote . . . it will . . . only gain real significance through the further policies of these comrades. Only when it is identified by their further policies as a demonstration of a decisive will to take up the class struggle and to destroy the parliamentary Burgfrieden in its fundamentals will it be more than a ‘fine gesture’.”115 Still, Liebknecht’s tactics during sessions of parliament continued to alienate members of the SPD to the point that “on January 13, 1916 by a vote of 60 to 25, the Socialist Central Committee expelled Dr. Karl Liebknecht from membership in the Socialist Party for continuous “gross infractions of party discipline”,” citing that Liebknecht had “greatly embarrassed the Government with his questions two days before in the Reichstag.116 Expulsion from the party, however, did not completely silence or even curb Liebknecht’s opinions or the actions of other members of the minority.

By the New Year, the minority was starting to subdivide between revolutionaries and pacifists. On 1 January 1916, at the urging of Luxemburg, “delegates from around Germany met secretly in . . . [Liebknecht’s] law offices . . . [in order] to establish the Gruppe Internationale,” a radical sector of the minority.117 Already subject to persecution by the state, before Luxemburg

115 Ibid., 172.
116 Liebknecht, “The Future Belongs to the People”: Speeches Made Since the Beginning of the War, 74 – Six days later, “Liebknecht was unable to obtain the floor at the general discussion” meeting of the Reichstag on 19 January and so “in a personal remark after the discussion was closed he made the following characteristic remarks:

“Repeatedly members of this House told me that I work in the service of the enemy, that I am a traitor. (‘Very true,’ from the left side of the House.) I wish to answer this by saying that I prefer being insulted by you as a traitor or anything else, to being praised for speaking according to your taste, as some members of the Social-Democratic group of this House have done lately (merriment). Gentlemen, by your attitude you show me that you wish to suppress truth and right (75).”

117 Clara Zetkin: Selected Writings, 38 – According to Trotnow, “in addition to Liebknecht and the other
was released from prison on 22 January 1916, Mehring, Julian Marchlewski and Zetkin had already been arrested along with Ernst Meyer, Hugo Eberlein, F. Westmeyer, and Wilhelm Pieck were also subjected to either imprisonment or drafted into the armed forces, because of their involvement with the extreme Left. Nevertheless, beginning on 27 January, “the first of a series of open political letters, signed Spartacus, appeared in Germany. They were addressed to the leaders of the Social Democracy and advocated the reorganization of all socialistic groups upon an international basis. Spartacus declared that the establishment of a permanent socialistic society was only possible in the case the entire European continent was revolutionized.”119 Even though the Spartacist [Spartacus] League (Spartakusbund) were starting to operated outside the mainstay of the minority, members did not initially desire to formerly separate from the SPD, but instead chose to advocate for change within the party first and foremost. In fact, even though Luxemburg openly criticized the SPD, she was “adamantly opposed to a formal split,” arguing that “a splintering of Marxists (not to be confused with differences of opinion) is fatal.”120

members of the Berlin group – Franz Mehring, Ernst Meyer, Käte Duncker, Hugo Eberlein, and Wilhelm Pieck – the meeting was also attended by representatives from the rest of the Reich: Johann Kneif (Bremen), Rudolf Lindau (Hamburg), Karl Minster (Duisburg), Fritz Rück (Stuttgart), Otto Rühle (Dresden), Georg Schumann (Leipzig), August Thalheimer (Brunswick), Bertha Thalheimer (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt), and Heinrich Brandler (Chemnitz). Representatives from Jena, Frankfurt on Main, and Erfurt were also there . . . . In view of such widespread participation from all parts of the Reich the meeting was later known as the “First Reich Conference” of the Gruppe Internationale (169-170).”

118 Nettl, 639.
119 Ralph Haswell Lutz. The German Revolution, 1918-1919. Stanford University, California: Stanford University Press; 1922, 64 – Lutz goes on to explain that the name Spartacus was derived from “the Roman gladiator who had lead his companions and slaves in the great uprising . . . . [and used in Germany] as early as 1849 [when] the poet and revolutionist, Gottfried Kinkel, had chosen the name Spartacus as the title of a weekly paper. . . . [and] in 1877 Johann Most, publisher of the Freiheit, before his flight to the United States, declared to the Berlin workmen that Spartacus was the only great man in Roman history (65).”

120 Elżbieta Ettinger. Rosa Luxemburg: A Life. Boston, Massachusetts: Beacon Press; 1986, 204 – According to Waldman, “there were also impatient Spartacists who believed that remaining in the SPD had become intolerable. They wanted to form a new revolutionary party. Rosa Luxemburg was strongly opposed to this. She admitted that the aim must be a revolutionary party, but she
Moreover, it was this point that separated the Internationale from the Bolsheviks and is why those in attendance at the Zimmerwald Conference disagreed with Lenin’s initial proposal to formally separate the parties at the local level. Still, internal debates and differences of opinions soon pushed other members of the minority to develop their own organizations like that of the Sozialdemokratische Arbeitsgemeinschaft (SAG – Social Democratic Working Group), which formed, “in order to protect their rights to sit in committees of the Reichstag,” after Haase and twenty other members of the minority rejected a financial plan backed by the majority during an emergency budget meeting on 24 March 1916. According to Susanne Miller and Heinrich Potthoff, “since this group had kept secret its intention of voting against the decision of the parliamentary party in the plenary Reichstag the majority saw their action not merely as a ‘breach of party discipline’ but as a ‘breach of faith’,,” and so “by 58 votes to 33 they expelled the twenty dissidents form the parliamentary party.” While the Spartacists “agreed to emphasize that the Social Democratic masses must not be abandoned and left to the treacherous leaders. Her organizational aim was not the creation of a revolutionary sect separated from the masses but the maintenance of a strong faction comprised of the revolutionary elements working for their aims from within the party (52 – Footnote #50).”

121 Berlau, 145.
122 Susanne Miller and Heinrich Potthoff. A History of German Social Democracy: From 1848 to the Present. J. A. Underwood, Tr. Leamington Spa, United Kingdom: Berg Publishers Limited; 1983, 58 – Regarding this matter, Berlau writes that Haase “motivated [his opposition to the budget] . . . by pointing to the state of siege, the food situation, and annexationism. He accused the government of being unable and unwilling to end the war. He denied that Germany would win a victory, or that the war would produce anything but losers. The continuation of the war benefitted only imperialism, he charged. Amidst shouts of “we don’t want to hear you!” Haase stated: “You won’t deny that [many] capitalists . . . in all countries agree . . . that the war was a miscalculation.” Yet, he charged, Germany was becoming more and more annexationist. In a party caucus immediately following this tumultuous scene, Haase and his friends were read out of the party (145).”

According to Calkins, “Those who had thus been expelled from the delegation met immediately thereafter to organize a new delegation, which they called the “Social Democratic Working Group . . . in an obvious attempt to avoid giving the impression that a new party was being formed. Haase and Ledebour were elected co-chairmen of the new parliamentary group, and [Wilhelm] Dittmann was named secretary. A public statement was formulated explaining that
maintain a nucleus of opposition to the party executive,” when they adopted the “Guiding Principles” in January and pledged “to work within the party for as long as possible,” they were coming under severe criticism by both the SPD and the government.¹²³

By the spring of 1916, Liebknecht had already established himself as a radical. And given his unceasing inquiries during parliamentary sessions in 1915 and although he was expelled from the party, he still retained his position as a member of the Reichstag. As a result, beginning on 5 April, he again resumed his tactics of interruptions during sessions when he “made sharp comments on certain passages of the Imperial Chancellor’s speech. Asserting that Germany’s aims were peaceful, the Chancellor said that Germany wanted the ‘strength of quiet development’ before the war. ‘We could have had all we wanted by peaceful labor. Our enemies chose war.’ Liebknecht retorted: ‘Lies, it was you who chose war.’ (Uproar followed, with cries of “Scoundrel!” ‘Blackguard!” ‘Out with him!’ The President at once called Liebknecht to order).”¹²⁴ Two days later, Liebknecht again disrupted another meeting when he

¹²³ Nettl, 639 – For a full report of the “Guiding Principles,” refer to pages 640-642 – As Eric Waldman points out that “the “Guiding Principles” . . . actually “apply the principles of the Erfurt Program to the present problems confronted by international socialism”. Thus, the international proletariat must base its revolutionary fight upon the class struggle within each country regardless of peace or war. It must fight against imperialism through parliamentary means and labor union action. In fact, all activities of the labor movement must be synchronized with the international class struggle against imperialism (The Spartacist Uprising of 1919 and the Crisis of the German Socialist Movement: A Study of the Relation of Political Theory and Party Practice. Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Marquette University Press; 1958, 56).”

¹²⁴ Liebknecht, “The Future Belongs to the People”: Speeches Made Since the Beginning of the War, 116-117 – “Later Bethmann-Hollweg made reference to the necessity of guarantees against Belgium becoming again a vassal of France and England. ‘Here also Germany cannot give over to Latinization the long-oppressed Flemish race.’ Liebknecht interjected, ‘Hypocrisy!’ ‘We desire to have neighbors who will not again unite against
“declared . . . that he had documents showing an agreement between Herr [Arthur] Zimmermann, the Under Foreign Secretary, and Sir Roger Casement, by which British prisons were to be drilled to fight against England. After some further remarks about Mohammedan prisoners of war being pressed into service for Germany, Liebknecht was prevented from speaking amid shouts of “Traitor!” from all parts of the Chamber.” On 8 April, while Liebknecht addressed the Reichstag regarding the use of war loans, his remarks almost resulted in a physical altercation when another member of the Reichstag knocked away his lecture notes. By this point, however, Liebknecht’s repeated assaults aimed at the state were becoming increasingly dangerous both on the floor and off. According to Trotnow, “the government particularly

us in order to throttle us, but with whom we can work to our mutual advantage,” said the Chancellor. ‘Whereupon you suddenly fall upon them and strangle them – the invasion of Belgium,’ said Liebknecht coolly. This sally caused another uproar, Liebknecht shouting out ‘Invasion’ whenever he got the chance.

Towards the close of his speech the Imperial Chancellor declared that the peace which ends this war must be a lasting peace. It must not contain in it the seeds of new wars, but the seeds of a final peaceful regulation of European affairs. ‘Begin by making the German people free!’ shouted Liebknecht. ‘Germany is only fighting in self-defense,’ remarked the Chancellor. ‘Can anyone believe that Germany is thirsting for territory?’ ‘Yes, certainly,’ roared Liebknecht as loudly as possible. Thereupon the uproar redoubled. The President had to call the Reichstag to order to prevent personal violence to Liebknecht.”

125 Ibid., 118.
126 The incident was recorded as follows:

“Member Hubrich goes to Dr. Liebknecht and snatches Liebknecht’s notes from his hands, and throws them on the floor. Stormy applause in the House in which the galleries join. Liebknecht raises his clenched fists and shouts. He then addresses himself to the President in an agitate tone. He is twice called to order by the President. Around the speakers’ tribune are small and excited groups gesticulating. Member Dr. Müller Meiningen goes to the tribune and in a violent tone hurls indignant reproaches at Liebknecht. The minority Social-Democrats of the Reichstag – [Alfred] Henke, [Wilhelm] Dittmann and Zubeil – rush to the tribune and put themselves in front of Liebknecht, other members of the House try to calm down the excited ones. The majority Social-Democrat [Wilhelm] Keil shouts: “Put the fellow out and then all will be finished.” The whole House is in great excitement and uproar, notwithstanding the continual clang of the presidential bell. Finally the President is able to restore order, and declares that the chair finds that there is not quorum. The meeting is adjourned (Liebknecht, “The Future Belongs to the People”: Speeches Made Since the Beginning of the War, 124-125).”
welcomed Liebknecht’s arrest; as late as 8 April Chancellor Bethmann Hollweg had been forced
to report to the Kaiser’s secret cabinet with regret that “as long as the Reichstag is not dissolved”
nothing could be undertaken against the oppositional politician.”127 While members of the
Reichstag “denounced” Liebknecht “as a traitor, anti-German, and [claimed that he was] ready
for the insane asylum,” he started to turn his attention to building support for the anti-war
message by “reorganize[ing] the radical youth of Germany along revolutionary lines for future
activity.”128 At the same time that Liebknecht was coming under scrutiny, J. P. Nettl notes that
“the police reports of the time [were also] bristl[ing] with material about *Spartakus*, predicting
the perpetual imminence of a revolutionary outbreak; though based on real information, it is
clear that that the conclusions the agents wrote up were those which their superiors wanted to
hear. To the authorities *Spartakus* looked much more menacing than it really was, and it was
good politics to keep it so.”129 Indeed, to other members of the SPD, the tactics of Spartacist
League was beginning to also alienate the organization as internal strife threatened to break the
solidarity of the anti-war movement.

According to Nettl, by the spring of 1916, “the irreconcilable hatred of *Spartakus* for the
SPD was self-evident; . . . . There were not only the old enemies – [Wolfgang] Heine, [Dr. A. O.
officials, the heart of the party organization – Ebert, Scheidemann, [Otto] Braun, [E.] Ernst, [R.]
Wissell. . . . [but] the real struggle, the close in-fighting, was with the centrists, themselves by
now in opposition to the majority in the party. The *Spartakusbriefe* contained one warning after
another against mistaking centrist opposition for ‘real’ opposition, and against confusing tactical

127 Trotnow, 176.
128 Meyer, 97.
129 Nettl, 644.
manoeuvres with struggle.”130 Despite their disagreements, especially with members of the Sozialdemokratische Arbeitsgemeinschaft, the Spartacist League were still reluctant to completely break away from the SPD. Therefore, writes Nettl, “it was decided to make a real, visible, tangible gesture: to call a demonstration for 1 May in the centre of Berlin.”131 In preparation for the May Day demonstrations, the Spartacist League looked to gather support for their cause and in a manifesto, drafted by Liebknecht, and published well ahead of time, he urged the public to unite against the war declaring, “Workers, comrades, and you, women of the people, let not this festival of May, the second during the war, pass without protest against the Imperialist Slaughter. On the first of May let millions of voices cry, ‘Down with the shameful crime of the extermination of peoples!’ Down with those responsible for the War’!”132

Although the protests in Berlin were set to occur in the Potsdamer Platz, in the end members of the Sozialdemokratische Arbeitsgemeinschaft declined to participate, citing that “there was insufficient evidence of revolutionary feeling among the masses, no evidence at all of a desire for patent suicide; failure could only make the opposition ridiculous.”133 With leaflets already distributed calling on the masses to demonstrate, the Spartacus, including Liebknecht and Luxemburg decided to go ahead with the protests, even though their plans had already caught the

---

130 Ibid., 645-646.
131 Ibid., 468.
132 Liebknecht, “The Future Belongs to the People”: Speeches Made Since the Beginning of the War, 127 – For a full copy of Liebknecht’s May Day Manifesto, please refer to Appendix K.

As Meyer notes, “the solicitation, circulated illegally, bore the caption: “Out for the May Day Celebration!” Sub-titles, consisting of the third and fourth “Guiding Principles”, called the masses to pledge their allegiance to the International, their center of gravity, about all other institutions. The broadcast warned that “the German war-mongerers are pushing with energy for a war with the United States” and invoked the workers to “make an end to the vile crime of nation murdering.” The Germans’ enemies were not the French and Russian people, but the German Junkers and capitalists and their executive committee: the German government (Meyer, 97-98).”

133 Nettl, 648.
attention of the local authorities. And though Liebknecht was not the only leader of the opposition present at the demonstration, he was the only one that was immediately taken into custody as soon as he finished speaking.

134 According to one witness, “very early in the morning [of 1 May], with three other comrades, I reached Hortensienstrasse, where Comrade Liebknecht lives. . . . [he] opens the door himself. . . . No one has spoken a word, yet we all feel that we are in the presence of a supreme moment. From Comrade Liebknecht’s grim silence we judge that he is about to hurl prudence to the four winds and defy the Government.

“He hands out, one to each of us, a copy of the speech which he will deliver. So far not one word has been spoken. While we are hurriedly reading his speech, which is to be delivered within a few hours, he remarks, ‘I have several thousand of these printed’ (Liebknecht, ‘The Future Belongs to the People’: Speeches Made Since the Beginning of the War, 128).”

By 2 P.M. the crowds had already amassed in the Potsdamer Platz, where Liebknecht, dressed in his uniform, “raise[d] his hand and at once proceed[ed] to speak. . . . Some years ago a witty Socialist observed that in Prussia we Germans have three cardinal rights, which are: we can be soldiers, we can pay taxes and we can keep our tongues between our teeth. The Socialist who made this observation made it with a grim humor, but to-day the humor of it must be disconnected from it – it is all too grim. Especially in these days this observation is too true. To-day we are sharing these three great Prussian State privileges in full. Every German citizen is given the full privilege to carry a rifle in any manner. Even the Boy Scout has been incited to play the ridiculous role of a soldier. They have thus planted the spirit of hate deep in his youthful soul. Meanwhile the old Landsturmer is forced to perform forced labor in invaded countries, in spite of the fact that under the laws of the Imperial Constitution he cannot be called out for any other purpose than for the defense of the Fatherland. . . .

“In a recent issue the mouthpiece of the Pharisees, the “Muenchener Neueste Nachrichten,” complains thus: ‘Our soldiers do not always receive from their dear ones at home the best encouragement to hold on. A soldier on furlough who, before obtaining leave, had performed for his Fatherland unflinchingly, when through many hardships with good humor, but after a visit home returned to the front with a sad face, worrying day and night about his dear ones and the pretended scarcity at home’.

‘Pretended’ scarcity certainly is palatable, especially when one is reminded of the fact that our police is weighing the bread, that butter is out of the market, that fat, meat and margarine have reached a price that is beyond the probable reach of the workingman!

“Another well-nourished Pharisee exhorts in the columns of the Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung by asking, ‘Where is scarcity to be found?’ and no doubt after having partaken of a good dinner he preaches with these words: ‘We must teach ourselves at home how to manage to get along in our homes with as little as possible. But of course in large families with children the small earnings of the breadwinner being now totally absent, this sum must be replaced by the creation of a relief fund so that there may not be any serious want.’ Exactly, but under no circumstances must the people complain of hunger. It annoys the soldier terribly and cripples his
The government’s desire to silence Liebknecht was evidenced by the fact that although he was initially arrested under the allegation of a “strong suspicion of military disobedience and resistance to the authority of the state,” he was indicted and charged with committing “high treason and treason in war,” so that “a year’s prison sentence was immediately guaranteed.”

Following his imprisonment, Liebknecht “sent two letters to the military court handling his case,” on 3 May, “in which he explained his position,” with the “hope that these letters would be read to the Reichstag and in that way reach the German people.”

According to Meyer,

On May 11 the Reichstag discussed the status of its wayward deputy. . . . The fighting power. Therefore do not write complaining letters to the front. In other words, you wives of solider, hide the truth from your husbands; in fact, lie to them. . . .

‘We will have no more war. We will have peace – now’ (Liebknecht, “The Future Belongs to the People”: Speeches Made Since the Beginning of the War, 130-135)!”

Trotnow, 176-177 – Meyer notes that “in the preliminary proceedings Liebknecht fully admitted his responsibility for the preparations leading up to the May Day demonstrations; but he refused to divulge the names of comrades who participated in the affair. He also acknowledged that he offered resistance to the arresting officers. He regarded his public declarations as a service which he owed to the people of Germany and other belligerent states; therefore his act was not punishable. On May 3 two official warrants were issued for his arrest. One was for inciting the masses against the government, for inciting the army to revolt, and for resisting officials who were acting under orders in line of duty. The other warrant charged him with comforting and abetting the enemy (99).”

Liebknecht, “The Future Belongs to the People”: Speeches Made Since the Beginning of the War, 137 – In the letter dated 3 May, Liebknecht made several points regarding the war, including an statement which read:

“The present war is not a war for the defense of the national integrity, not for the liberation of oppressed peoples, not for the welfare of the masses.

“From the standpoint of the proletariat this war only signifies the most extreme concentration and extension of political suppression, of economic exploitation, and of military slaughtering of the working-class body and soul for the benefit of capitalism and of absolutism. . . .

“The cry of “Down with war” signifies that I thoroughly condemn and oppose the present war because of its historical nature, because of its general social causes and specific way in which it originated (developed), and because of the way it is being carried on and the objects for which it is being waged. That cry signifies that it is the duty of every representative of proletarian interests to take part in the international class struggle for the purpose of ending the war (140-141 – For a full copy of Liebknecht’s letter refer to pages 137-143).”
Socialist deputies, on a motion of [Karl] Albrecht, [Eduard] Bernstein, and comrades, moved in the interest of parliamentary privilege to suspend the criminal proceedings against him and to remove him from arrest. Moreover, although they did not condone his actions, they argued that it would be bad policy to make a martyr out of him. Haase, who spoke for the parliamentary Labor Association, defended him against the charge of treason. Liebknecht, he said, wanted the German people to bring pressure on the government to end the war, just as he desired other belligerent peoples to move their respective governments for the same end.  

Still, not all socialists were keen to fight on behalf of Liebknecht and so when Otto Landsberg, a member of the SPD’s majority, addressed the Reichstag, he urged his fellow socialists to remember that

in Liebknecht we are dealing with a man who wanted, through an appeal to the masses, to force the government to make peace, a government moreover which has repeatedly expressed its sincere desire for peace before the whole world. . . . This war is a war for our very homes . . . how grotesque was this enterprise . . . how can anyone imagine that [Liebknecht] could influence the fate of the world, play at high policy [hohe Politik machen] by shoving handbills at people, by creating a demonstration in the Potsdamerplatz. . . . Contrast this pathological instability with our [party’s official] clear-headed and sensible calm.  

And so, when the question of Liebknecht was raised during a session of the Reichstag, concerns of the minority were overridden by the larger sitting body and members “refused to ask for his release” by a vote of “229 to 111.” As a result, Liebknecht’s case was set for 28 June 1916 at which time the court pronounced a sentenced of “two years and six months” the court also “discharged him from the army with dishonor – his punishment “for attempted treason in war,

---

137 Meyer, 99-100.
138 Nettl, 649 – Footnote #2, “Reichslagseverhandlungen,” loc. Cit., Cols. 1027/1028, speech by Landsberg. The remarks about ‘high policy’ are an interesting example of the official SPD’s ‘deference’ attitude to government.”
139 Liebknecht, “The Future Belongs to the People”: Speeches Made Since the Beginning of the War, 137.
aggravated disobedience and contumacy to the authority of the state”. When the public was made aware of Liebknecht’s punishment, they responded with “the first unambiguously political mass strike in various large towns in the Reich, including Berlin itself,” proving that members of the civilian population were in fact ready becoming supportive of the anti-war movement.

Despite the protests, though, Liebknecht’s sentence appeared light, especially concerning the state’s long-held desire to rid him from politics, to which Meyer reasons that in the summer of 1916 the Battle of Verdun “brought the German masses news of additional casualties and hardships; it did not bring them victory, not even peace. And the government at this time was not eager to test the extent of discontent by throwing the full weight of the law at Liebknecht, the national symbol of the will for peace. If the government had deprived him of his citizenship rights, he would have forfeited membership in the Reichstag and Prussian Assembly. New elections to fill the vacancies, the government may have concluded, would produce other anti-war Socialists who would have to be dealt with.” All the same, the government did not fully acquiesce to calls for immediate peace or play a passive role in regards to the activities of radical groups. In response to the demonstrations on 1 May, throughout the summer, Spartacist leaders were investigated by local authorities and periodically taken into “protective custody,” which happened to leaders like Marchlewski who was arrested on 22 May, Luxemburg on 10 July, and Mehring – who at the time was seventy-years-old on 16 August. Also, opinions of

---

141 Trotnow, 176.
143 Trotnow, 176 – For Luxemburg, following her “sudden” arrest in July, “she spent the first weeks at the women’s prison in the Barnimstrasse where she had been before, but was then transferred to the interrogation cells at police headquarters in the Alexanderplatz – the famous ‘Alex’ of Berlin satire and of grimmer memory under the Third Reich. . . . In October she was at last transferred to the old fortress at Wronke (Wronki) in Posen (Poznań) . . . . She knew that it would be a long while before she would be released . . . . She continued her output of illegal material but, shut off
Liebknecht had not softened and so when he appealed his sentence on 23 August 1916 it was denied and “the high military court (Aberkriegsgericht) increased the sentence to four years one month,” hard labor which Nettl points out that “in Germany sentence to hard labour or penitentiary – as opposed to prison – involved the loss of civil rights, in Karl Liebknecht’s case for six years. This meant disbarment from legal practice . . . from voting and of course he could not stand as a candidate for Reich or provincial legislatures.” Even though the Sozialdemokratische Arbeitsgemeinschaft failed to participate in the May Day demonstrations, their support of Liebknecht in the wake of his imprisonment briefly renewed their relationship with the Spartacus. While Liebknecht’s imprisonment led to the persecution of other members of the Spartacus, besides the public protests on 28 June, there was little ongoing interest in his story, especially in light of the war. With the second anniversary now come and gone without a prospect of soon ending, indeed the Battle of the Somme was still being fought, the slow reality that “the war was bound to be a long and costly one . . . . brought the first stirring, not yet of opposition, but at least of self-consciousness among the SPD leaders.”

According to Calkins, “despite the rapid growth of opposition sentiment at this time, the majority leaders still controlled most of the S.P.D.’s imposing organizational structure, and it was undoubtedly with the intention of making maximum use of this advantage that they decided to convene a “national conference” for 21-23 September 1916, but the meeting ended with little

---

144 Nettl, 649 – Also refer to Footnote #1. Liebknecht’s sentence began “on 6 December 1916 at Luckau in Saxony.”
145 According to Nettl, “in July Haase reported to his wife that there was ‘full understanding with the Rosa group.’ The arrest of Liebknecht had ‘pushed all problems of personality into the background’ (649-650).”
146 Nettl, 653.
being accomplished and tensions still persistent.\textsuperscript{147} Political in-fighting continued throughout the fall and winter, during which time turnips became Germany’s main dietary staple during the height of the food shortage, to the point that “the Reichstag was again summoned under extraordinary circumstances to consider a matter of considerable importance for the conflict of the S.P.D.,” on 12 December.\textsuperscript{148} The necessity of the meeting was due to a change in Germany’s military circumstances, which Calkins explains that “during the latter part of the autumn . . . had improved substantially. Romania had been defeated, the allies had been unable to force a breakthrough on the Somme, and the German armies elsewhere had either hel[d] their own or been able to advance still further into enemy territory.”\textsuperscript{149} Considering this improvement, “Bethmann decided that the time had come for a formal peace offensive by this government,” only the terms of the peace settlement were not included in the Kaiser’s speech and so the session “was then immediately terminated.”\textsuperscript{150} Since the majority had been quick to support a motion to adjourn without debate, it further alienated members of the minority to the point that “Haase and Ledebour called a conference of the opposition, including the Spartacists, to consolidate it against the high-handed measures of the majority Socialists.”\textsuperscript{151} On 6 January 1917, the day before the meeting was to take place, Meyer writes that

\begin{quote}
Spartacist representatives met in Berlin in order to discuss the pending question of
\end{quote}

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{Calkins114} Calkins, 114 – For a full account of the Reich’s conference, please refer to pages 114-117. Nearly two months after the conference, Nettl points out that “the courtesies of the SPD executive at the Reich Conference were more apparent than real. On 7 October 1916 a successful coup against Vorwärts was finally carried out . . . . On 5 December the Bremer Bürgerzeitung and on 30 March 1917 the Brunswick Volksfreund went the same way. Among the major papers, only the Leipziger Volkszeitung remained under centrist control while the Left was confined solely to Der Kampf, which they had started in Duisburg on 1 July 1916 as their legal paper (655).”
\bibitem{Ibid120} Ibid., 120.
\bibitem{Ibid} Ibid.
\bibitem{Ibid120-121} Ibid., 120-121 – “The Reichstag did not meet again until late in February (121).”
\bibitem{Meyer109} Meyer, 109.
\end{thebibliography}
organizational unification with other oppositional groups. At the general session of the opposition the next day, neither the Spartacists, compromising 35 of the 135 delegates, nor the Haase-Ledebour group [SAG], wanted a break with the party. The Spartacist spokesman, Ernst Meyer, advocated a complete party break for practical purposes, but would nominally remain with the SPD in order to weaken it step by step and to use the party as a recruiting ground for the opposition. The Spartacists wanted the same freedom of action vis à vis the left-centrists.

The opposition’s decision to maintain party connections proved to be ephemeral. SPD leaders met on January 18 and declared that the opposition, by the very act of calling an independent conference, “had separated itself from the party.” The opposition was expelled, and the formation of a new party became inevitable.152

Circumstances by the end of January 1917, however, were not only having an adverse effect on Germany, but the increase of food shortages and the duration of the war quickly brought about the revolutionary state that many members of the socialist minority had hoped for, only instead of the public rising against the German state, it was Russian government that quickly came under attack.

_The Russian Revolution, 1917_

Conditions in Russia at the start of the Great War were drastically different in comparison to those in Western Europe. While the nation initially missed out on the advances attributed by participation in the Second Industrial Revolution, Russia’s largely agrarian economy underwent rapid reforms during the latter half of the nineteenth century, leading to the rise of capitalism and the division of “two social groups, a bourgeoisie and a working class.”153 Despite the advent of industrialization and reforms, struggles between the emerging castes meant that “as the twentieth century opened, Russia was in turmoil. Workers’ demonstrations and strikes spread throughout the country. Student protests and disturbances became more frequent, constituting an almost

152 Ibid., 110.
continuous series from 1898 on. Sporadic peasant disturbances kept the tension high in rural areas and offered increased opportunities to the Socialist Revolutionaries, just as the growth of the labor movement encouraged the Social Democrats.” Under an autocratic regime, many of these revolutionists operated as an illegal faction of the labor movement, however, shortly after the turn of the twentieth century, the organizations further united as the Socialist Revolutionaries (SRs) in 1901 and the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party (Social Democrats or SDs) in 1903. Although the principle ideology of the SDs was based on Marx, the radical left soon split, into the Bolsheviks (majority) and Mensheviks (minority), over the issue concerning “how open or disciplined the revolutionary party should be.” At the same time the SRs and SDs were coming together and dividing among themselves, Rex A. Wade points out that

a liberal and reformist political movement also developed. . . . Drawing upon the ideas of West European liberalism and the emergence of a larger urban middle class, liberalism belatedly took hold in Russia. It emphasized constitutionalism, parliamentary government, the rule of law and civil rights, within either a constitutional monarchy or a republic. It also stressed the importance of major social and economic reform programs, but rejected both socialism and sweeping revolution. Liberalism took its main political form in 1905 as the Constitutional Democratic Party (Kadets [Cadets]), the main liberal party down through the revolution of 1917 and civil war.156

154 Ibid., 379.
155 Ibid., 434 – Accordingly, “there were deeper divisions” between the two organizations. The leader of the Mensheviks, Julius Martov, for example, was attracted to Marxism, not only by its “scientific” arguments about the natural progress of history toward socialism, but also by its compelling moral arguments about the justice of ending inequality and suffering. By contrast, the Bolshevik leader Lenin repeatedly voiced his contempt for the political moralizing so common to Russian socialism. . . . whereas Marxists like Martov viewed the socialist goal of democracy as an inherent value, Marxists like Lenin saw democracy as mainly a means to facilitate the struggle for socialism (434-435).”
Divisions that derived at the start of the twentieth century were further exacerbated by the loss of the 1904-1905 Russo-Japanese War, during which time, Russia’s “unexpected defeat . . . unleashed massive protests on the home front” that quickly evolved into the Revolution of 1905. Labors sudden and continued assault against the state demonstrated a further break in the monarchy’s hold over the empire. In an effort to pacify the strikers, Tsar Nicholas II capitulated to their demands and “issued the October Manifesto,” which “guaranteed civil liberties to the Russians, announced a Duma with the true legislative function of passing or rejecting all proposed laws, and promised a further expansion of the new order in Russia. In short, the October Manifesto made the empire of the Romanovs a constitutional monarchy.”

The Tsar’s willingness to negotiate with laborers placated them for the time being, however, underlying hostilities between the state and workers still existed.

---

157 Michael Adas, Peter N. Stearns, Stuart B. Schwartz. *Turbulent Passage: A Global History of the Twentieth Century*. New York, New York: HarperCollins College Publishers; 1994, 56 – Abraham Ascher writes that the 1905 Russian Revolution came out of a series of strikes that resulted from the dismissal of four members of the Assembly of Russian Factory and Mill Workers from their jobs at the Putilov plant in December 1904 by Director S. I. Smirnov, “who had displayed strong hostility toward Gapon’s organization.” When arbitration broke down and the workers were not rehired strikes were called for by Father Georgii Apollonovich Gapon, founder of the Assembly, and set for 3 January 1905. By 7 January support strikes spread to other factories to include “about two-thirds of St. Petersburg’s factory force – some one hundred thousand people at 382 enterprises.” Two days later, “between fifty and one hundred thousand people [including women and children] in their Sunday best” to take part in a “peaceful procession,” which had been called for by Gapon. When bugles were sounded informing the marchers to disperse, the signal was not heard and the police opened fire resulting in the death or injury of 40 people. As Ascher notes, “shooting [also] erupted at other places where marchers refused to retreat, and when the carnage ended some 130 people had been killed and 229 had been seriously wounded.” In support for workers involved in the events of 9 January or Bloody Sunday, “some 160,000 workers stayed away from the their jobs in St. Petersburg” on 10 January, soon followed by workers in Moscow, Riga, Warsaw, Vilna, Kovno, Tiflis, Baku, Batum, and the Baltic provinces. . . . All told, some 414,000 people within the empire participated in the work stoppage during the month of January 1905. Bloody Sunday activated the working class to a degree unprecedented in Russian history (*The Revolution of 1905: A Short History*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press; 2004, 21-28).”

158 Riasanovsky and Steinberg, 381.
Although the advent of the Great War had temporarily united the Russian population, the duration of the conflict ultimately revived earlier calls for revolution as the general public continued to endure the burden of war. Nearly a year after the war began, “intense suffering and increasingly fanned the flame of discontent” against “the manner of living of the Czar’s family; the inefficiency and corruption in military and governmental circles; the imperialistic aims of the government; the terrible loss of human life on the western front; the breakdown of the economic machinery – all steadily increased the spirit of revolt among the masses” throughout the empire.\(^{159}\) From the war’s inception, Russia struggled to maintain an adequate supply of war materials for their armed forces including basic necessities like “weapons and ammunition,” which Nicholas V. Riasanovsky and Mark D. Steinberg note effected the military “for a period of time in 1915 [when] up to 25 percent of Russian soldiers were sent to the front unarmed, with instructions to pick up what they could from the dead.”\(^{160}\) At the same time that the army was struggling to maintain a united front against the advancements of both the German and Austrian

\(^{159}\) Laidler, *History of Socialism: A Comparative Survey of Socialism, Communism, Trade Unionism, Cooperation, Utopianism, and Other Systems of Reform and Reconstruction*, 355.

\(^{160}\) Riasanovsky and Steinberg, 392 – According to Princess Chaterine Radziwill, when the Tsar’s “decision to assume supreme command became generally known it caused universal consternation, notwithstanding the fact that public confidence in the military talents of the Grand Duke Nicholas was beginning to waver. But between him and the Tsar lay all the difference that exists between an intelligent man and a moron, and bad as he might be, the public preferred the intelligent man.

“The Ministers addressed a letter of protest to the Sovereign, imploring him to reconsider his decision. ‘We venture once more to tell you,’ they said, ‘that to the best of our judgment, your decision threatens with serious consequences, Russia, your dynasty, and your person.’ Nicholas did not even deign to reply. The President of the Duma was then asked to interfere and do his best to open the eyes of the Monarch to the peril he was putting himself in. ‘Sire,’ said he, ‘against whom are you raising your hand? You are the supreme arbiter, and who is to judge you in the event of a failure? How can you place yourself in such a position and forsake the capital at such a time? In case of misfortune, you yourself, and the whole dynasty may be in danger.’

war machines, the state faced an additional crisis when Tsar Nicholas II decided to assume control of the military on 20 August 1915, thereby relieving Grand Duke Nicholas of his command. While the Tsar perceived his actions as noble, his absence resulted in “the total estrangement of the throne from the country,” which further affected the state in a negative manner as “all the ministers who had opposed this step [the Tsar taking command of the armed forces] resigned one after the other, and were replaced by the nominees of the Tsaritsa.”

Demands from the current intercontinental conflict and the lack of sufficient leadership from the monarchy and state, exasperated the home front, who were now bearing the full weight of the war. Constant warfare demanded that a steady supply of food and war materials be sent to the frontlines, which meant that there was little left for the general public to purchase including a lack of such basic necessities like bread, meat, fruits, and vegetables. Inflated prices throughout the market did little to alleviate the public’s grievances and less than six weeks after Tsar Nicholas II took control of the armed forces, “a rebellion broke out in the town of Bogorodsk. [An area] Located in Moscow’s hinterlands in Bogorodskii county,” on 1 October when “thirty women workers” from the cotton mills protested against the local merchants when they were unable to purchase sugar. The riots in Bogorodsk were soon coupled with strikes, when

---


162 Barbara Alpern Engel. “Not by Bread Alone: Subsistence Riots in Russia during World War I.” The Journal of Modern History, Vol. 69, No. 4 (December, 1997); 696 – Engel notes that the women accused “local merchants of trading underhandedly (nedobrosovestnost’) and engaging in speculation” and although the police were called in the number of demonstrators quickly swelled to “several thousand people – primarily women and children, but also workers as well as peasants who had come to the market from nearby villages” who “moved off to the shops to vent their anger. . . . [where they] hurled stones through a shop window, then broke into the shop and threw its goods into the street where others carried them off. Clearly outnumbered and unwilling to use weapons against women and youths, the local police proved helpless to stop them. In the following days the disorders spread as rioters targeted local grocery shops and purveyors of clothing and other manufactured goods, but the unrest came to a bloody halt on October 4 when
“workers employed at the Morozov weaving mill left their stations,” on 2 October 1915 “and over the next few days thousands of their workmates joined them, as did tens of thousands of other workers in the neighboring factory settlements of Pavlovsk, Obukhov, and Orekhovo.”

According to Wade, “after 1912, a number of “violent strikes spread across the country, many [of which] were linked to the view that the overthrow of the monarchy was essential to attaining the goal of bettering workers’ conditions” and so “a closer link was forged between the revolutionary socialist parties and the industrial workers.” This relationship was fostered throughout the war and as tensions between the state and the general public were further exacerbated to the point that “by the end of 1916, about 5,700,000 [Russian soldiers] were casualties: dead, wounded, or captured,” at the start of 1917 the state was on the brink of an internal rebellion poised to be even more significant than that endured in 1905. While 1917 became a defining moment in the progress of the war, the year also served as a pivotal point in time for the Russian Empire and its people.

The struggles between the state and labor that had disrupted the nation on occasion since before the war were not only carried over into 1917, but they quickly signaled the start of an even more severe crisis. Already within the first two months of the New Year, “some 675,000 workers apparently left their benches . . . in some 1300 separate strikes, 1100 of which were labeled “political” by the factory inspectorate. In Petrograd . . . some 320,000 workers participated in over 280 strikes. . . . In Moscow, just about 100,000 workers

---

163 Ibid., 697 – According to Engel, “at the height of the unrest a total of approximately eighty thousand workers were out on strike . . . . [Their] primary demand was for higher wages to compensate for the increasing cost of living,” which “in the first two years of the war, the prices of essential goods rose 131 percent in Moscow and more than 150 percent in Petrograd (697-698),”

164 Wade, 8.

165 Ibid., 9.
stoppages during these two months . . . . Of these strikers, some 60 percent were metalists, suggesting that almost 130 percent of the labor force in metals saw strike action in early 1917.”  Of these strikers, some 60 percent were metalists, suggesting that almost 130 percent of the labor force in metals saw strike action in early 1917.” 166  Worker’s demands for industrial reforms were soon coupled with the outcries of women who “angered by the food shortages . . . as well as by general discontents over issues such as the war, marched out from their factories demanding bread” on 23 February 1917. 167  According to American Ambassador to Russia, David R. Francis, at the time of the demonstration Russia’s food situation had become increasingly worse explaining that “long bread lines were constantly seen, one of them being just across the street from the Embassy; the women formed these at four or five o’clock in the morning and sometimes waited for hours with the thermometer at 8 or 10 degrees below zero, and then on reaching the point of distribution, after enduring such hardships for so long, they were told there was no more bread and no sugar.” 168  Similar to the role played by females at the start of France’s eighteenth-century revolution, once the Russia women resorted to a public walkout from their factory jobs in Petrograd, other disgruntled workers quickly followed suit and by the 25th “students and broad sections of the urban lower and middle classes” had attached themselves to the growing public movement. 169  Facing a growing crisis the state resorted to calling on members of the armed forces to restore order, however, Francis noted in his report to the State Department that on “Sunday, there were soldiers in the streets and perhaps 50 people were killed or wounded, but most of the firing was with blank cartridges. Yesterday evening the order was given that no persons or vehicles should go on the streets to-day. About 10 o’clock this morning a regiment of

167 Wade, 10.
169 Wade, 10.
1,000 to 1,200 men stationed in barracks about two blocks from the Embassy mutinied and, according to reports, killed their commanding officer because he would not join them. With the loss of the soldiers and more people joining the revolution, the government was at once threatened with the prospect of being overrun. At the time, Francis observed that by the 27th conditions were steadily worsening in Petrograd, writing that not only had “the Embassy was informed by telephone that the Duma had been dissolved or prorogued until about the middle of April,” but

at about 6 p.m., Captain [Newton A.] McCully, the Naval Attaché of the Embassy, who had left for his apartment about 5, telephoned that in his walk from the Embassy to his apartment, a distance of over a mile, he had seen neither police nor soldiers who acknowledged fealty to the Government, but had passed a thousand or more cavalymen riding quietly toward the Neva and abandoning the streets of the city to the mutineers and revolutionists. About 6:30 p.m. the telephone connection of the Embassy was severed. . . . The city seems entirely quiet but absolutely under the control of the soldiers who have mutinied, and of the revolutionists. It is reported that six regiments have joined the revolutionists and the Government seems to have abandoned all effort to curb the revolution.  

As soldiers continued to ally themselves to the plight of the workers and having disbanded the Duma, Tsar Nicholas II was again forced to acquiesce to the demands of the Russian populace. This time, however, a manifesto would not be enough to pacify the situation and instead the Tsar was forced to abdicate his right to the throne on 2 March. Although Russia’s newly instituted

170 Francis, 59-60 – In regards to the information given by Francis, Wade notes that “soldiers called out to help break up demonstrations acted with reluctance. When the government ordered troops to fire into the crowds on February 26, this broke the fragile bonds of discipline among the soldiers, who were mostly recent draftees who shared the same grievances as the demonstrators. Dismayed by this shooting, one detachment of the Volynskii Guard Regiment, when ordered to form up again on the morning of February 27, revolted. This quickly spread to other regiments (10).”

171 Ibid., 61.

172 According to Laidler, after Tsar Nicholas II abdicated the throne on behalf of himself and his only son, Alexis and named his brother, Grand Duke Michael, as successor, “the Grand Duke, however, agreed to accept this honor only if this “be the will of our great people, who, by plebiscite
Provisional Government (2 March – 25 October 1917) “promoted democracy and liberty,” in the wake of the Tsar relinquishing his crown, the new liberal regime failed “to check inflation, restore transportation, or increase industrial production. In fact, the Russian economy continued to run rapidly downhill.”\(^{173}\) By October, the Bolsheviks having already seized the majority vote in the government overran the Provisional Government during the October Revolution and on the 29\(^{th}\); they succeeded in establishing a Soviet government in Russia for the first time in history under the direction of “the Council of People’s Commissars. Headed by Lenin as chairman, the Council contained such prominent members of the Bolshevik Party as Trotsky, who became commissar for foreign affairs, Alexis Rykov, who became commissar of the interior, and Joseph Dzhugashvili, better known as Stalin, who assumed charge of the national minorities. Lenin thus led the government as well as the party and was recognized as by far the most important figure of the new regime in Russia.”\(^{174}\) While Wade points out that the conditions for a Russian Revolution were evident in 1917 – “incompetent government, a discredited and obstinate monarch, alienation of educated society, deteriorating economic conditions, a revival of social-economic tensions and industrial strikes, an extreme war-weariness, resentful soldiers, and a revival of activity by revolutionary parties” – the events in Russia demonstrated the first of several permanent breaks between the old world and a rising new.\(^{175}\) Whereas the state had previously succeeded in swaying the public and pacifying calls for revolution, the conditions of the war and the continual strain on the state and general public, which forged new relationships

\(^{173}\) Riasanovsky and Steinberg, 443.
\(^{174}\) Ibid., 461.
\(^{175}\) Wade, 10.
among fractured labor organizations and proved that there was a willingness on behalf of the populace to revolt.

Even though the First and Second International had often speculated where and when a socialist revolution would occur, few of those contemplating an uprising gave little thought to the idea that the first notable revolt would come from Russia. Since the nineteenth century, it was believed by many leading socialists that the first major strike against the state by members of the laboring parties would indeed take place within an industrialized nation, like Germany. Russia’s sudden backlash against the Tsar in February and the Bolshevik takeover in October represented a new break on the revolutionary front, and although shocking at the time, the 1917 Revolution did not signal an initial step for other socialist and laboring parties to ensue. In fact, for many nations occupied by the day to day struggles of the war, 1917 represented a major turning point not just in Russia, but across the international community as well. As Calkins notes, already “in February, 1917, unrestricted submarine warfare was initiated, and as Haase had feared, the result was a break in relations between the United States and Germany,” a situation that ultimately led to President Wilson’s request that Congress declare war against Germany. Now faced with the prospect of the United States entering the war with fresh troops and supplies, the struggles on the home front became even more pronounced. The international revolution that was supposed to come in the wake of that in Russia stalled well before the Bolsheviks took power in October, and Germany, where the uprising was supposed to have originated, stalled as members of SPD’s right, left, and center continued to break apart. On 6 April 1917, the same day that Congress committed the United States to war on the Allied side, “143 participants include[ing] elected representatives from ninety-one electoral districts as well

176 Calkins, 126 – For further details regarding President Wilson’s decision to ask Congress for a declaration of war against Germany, please refer to Baker pages 412-517.
as the opposition Reichstag deputies and few other members of the S.P.D. national hierarchy,”

gathered at a socialist convention held in Gotha and “formed the Independent Social Democratic
Party of Germany (Unabhaengige Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands or USPD).”

Similar to Russia, the 1917 split between the SPD and the USPD was not solely a byproduct of
the war, but rather the end result of “pre-war ideological controversies” that finally reached a
“climax.” Divisions within Germany’s socialist party regarding the state and the progress of
the war soon filtered beyond the political arena. Rising food prices and stagnant wages also
rallied workers who were quick to take to the streets in protest throughout 1917. Although not
related, shortly after the formation of the USPD, “workers, numbering between 200,000 and
300,000, struck in Berlin as well as in such other important industrial centers as Leipzig, Halle,
and Brunswick” on 16 April 1917. While the local authorities were quick to press laborers to
return to the factories with the “promise that rations would be increased,” it was the strikers in
Leipzig who started to emphasis “a political side” to their walkout by advocating for “the
abolition of martial law and censorship and a declaration from the government that it would be
prepared to conclude peace immediately on the basis of no annexations. The strikers even

177 Ibid.
179 Waldman, 40 – According to Waldman, “the Independent Socialists were not a monolithic party but
were composed of several groups of various political shadings, and personalities with such
different political backgrounds as Haase, Bernstein, and Kautsky.

“Even though the break between the Haase groups and the SPD was primarily over the war issue,
as soon as the USPD developed a program of its own, it expressed not only strong opposition to
the government’s war policy but also the existing autocratic regime (41).”

Ralph Haswell Lutz also notes that the Independent Socialists “reaffirmed the fundamental
principles of Marxian socialism, denounced all compromises and opportunism, and secretly
adopted a revolutionary policy (The German Revolution, 1918-1919, 63).”

180 Meyer, 111.
demanded the establishment of a workers’ council.” Still, as Diane Koenker and William G. Rosenberg indicate, out of the 904 strikes that took place in Germany in 1917, only 32 carried strong political grievances, while 572 were based on demands relating strictly to the economy. The fusion between the radical left and the labor industry was a matter of chance circumstances considering the current state of the war. Political, economic, and social tensions, which arose during the last three years of conflict forged partnerships that prior to the war, would not have existed in such blatant terms. By 1917, however, these circumstances appear to have implicated only the nations of Europe where grievances toward the state of the Old World Rule fueled multiple states of discontent that lead to calls of government overthrows and revolutions. Viewing this from abroad, leaders in the United States were naturally apprehensive when the nation entered into an open state of war especially since relations had already been strained by pre-war discontent that centered on workers, rising socialist organizations, and the influx of New Immigrants.

The United States and the Great War, 1917

For a nation that entered the war nearly three years after the assassination of the Archduke, solidifying the unity of the state became the main priority for leaders in Washington. While the governments of both England and France rejoiced at the prospect of fresh troops and supplies aiding in the struggle against Germany, the United States as a whole was ill prepared to fully enter into the nearly three year conflict. Lacking in proper troop training, arms and ammunition, as well as based necessities to feed and clothe an army, “American entry into the European war . . . created a sense of crisis, a “war emergency,” that heightened emphasis on

---

181 Ibid., 111-112.
182 Koenker and Rosenberg, 616 – Regarding the 1917 strikes, Koenker and Rosenberg divided the “Goals of Striking Workers by Skill Level,” into five categories based on demands: Economic (572 or 63 per cent), Conditions (174 or 19 per cent), Organization (157 or 17 per cent), Dignity (71 or 8 per cent), and Political (32 or 3.5 per cent).
production and social cohesion.” Though the Bureau of Investigation, maintained by the Department of Justice, had been the major organization in the United States that was charged with identifying and suppressing citizens or political associations that threatened the stability of the national government since 1908, by the outbreak of war and particularly at the start of 1917, they were lacking in both funds and agents. Recognizing that should the United States declare war on Germany, the Bureau would need additional support, Albert M. Briggs, Vice-President of Outdoor Advertising Incorporated, who had previously volunteered for the Justice Department in Chicago under Superintendent Hinton D. Clabaugh, sent word to Clabaugh on 14 March 1917 and proposed a “plan to build his local volunteer regiment into a nationwide army which would work directly under the Bureau of Investigation,” which would be “composed of citizens of good moral character who shall volunteer their service and who may be acceptable to your Department.” On 22 March, the same day “that Wilson had called Congress back into session two weeks early. . . . [which] meant war,” Bureau Chief A. Bruce Bielaski, accepted Briggs’s plan for a nationwide organization exactly as originally proposed to Clabaugh and asked him to establish units immediately in cities with high alien populations. Notices went out the same day to Bureau agents across the country announcing that Briggs was forming “a volunteer committee or organization of citizens for the purpose of co-operating with the department in securing information of activities of agents of foreign governments or persons unfriendly to this Government, for the protection of public property etc.” The organization was to supply information and to assist in securing information, but it was to be kept “as confidential as practicable.” Bielaski informed his agents, as Clabaugh had warned Briggs, that no arrests were to be caused by these volunteers “except after consultation with the Federal authorities.” Bielaski’s notices officially launched the new experiment in internal security.185

185 Ibid., 24-25 – According to Athan G. Theoharis, Bielaski’s decision to accept Briggs’s proposal for volunteer agents was not made on his own, but rather “with Attorney General Thomas Gregory’s consent (“A Brief History of the FBI’s Role and Powers,” in The FBI: A Comprehensive
Essentially, the authorization of the American Protective League (APL), further propelled  
Washington’s message that peace and security in the United States had to be protected from  
foreign attacks based outside of and within the national borders. Despite initial concerns  
regarding the APL and the potential for “having very harmful possibilities” like previous  
organizations such as the “Sons of Liberty,” President Wilson realized the necessity of the  
volunteers seeing that by 15 June 1917, Congress would approve the Espionage Act, which

---

Reference Guide. Athan G. Theoharis, Ed. with Tony G. Poveda, Susan Rosenfeld, and Richard  

As Joan M. Jensen notes, “although the Justice Department alerted the public to the danger of spies, it  
did not publicly voice concern about attacks on innocent people. Unfortunately, too, it was only  
Wilson’s alarm over spies, not his concern for peaceable enemy aliens, that found expression in  
his war message to Congress on April 2. Instead of making an effort to dissipate the growing  
national hysteria, he added to the people’s fears. To justify the United States’ involvement in the  
war, the President marshaled the legal argument that German submarine warfare violated the  
nation’s freedom of the seas and threatened its security; the moral argument that Americans must  
made the world safe for democracy; and then appended a third justification, that Germans posed a  
threat to internal security through espionage and sabotage. Americans of the progressive age,  
nourished on the accusations of reformers that conspiracies abounded among “malefactors of  
great wealth,” found this fear of subversion easier to understand that either the legal or moral  
arguments. Espionage was the fruit of autocracy, Wilson told the hushed audience.

‘Self-governed nations do not fill their neighbor states with spies or set the course of intrigue to  
bring about some critical posture of affairs which will give them an opportunity to strike and  
make conquest . . . from the very start of the present war [the German government] has filled our  
unsuspecting communities and even our offices of government with spies and set criminal  
intrigues everywhere afoot against our national unity of counsel, our peace within and without,  
our industries, and our commerce . . . it is now evident that its spies were here even before the  
war began . . . that the intrigues which have more than once come perilously near to disturbing  
the peace and dislocating the industries of the country have been carried on at the instigation,  
with the support, and even under the personal direction of official agents of the Imperial  
Government accredited to the Government of the United States . . . that it meant to stir up  
enemies against us at our very doors the intercepted note of the German Minister to Mexico City  
is eloquent evidence.’

“As Wilson stood there accusing Imperial Germany, he little realized that he himself, at the  
Cabinet meeting of March 30, had tacitly endorsed an organization which could field a legion of  
spies larger than any autocrat had ever dreamed of. By the time Congress responded to his  
speech with the Declaration of War against Germany, almost a hundred branches of the American  
Protective League were in process of being formed; Briggs predicted he would have over six  
thousand units by the end of April. When Wilson signed the Declaration of War at 1:00 P.M. on  
April 6, the volunteer home front army was already in arms (Jensen, 30-31).”
would surely amount to further inquiries made by the already limited agents in Bureau of Investigation.\footnote{187}

Intent on maintaining and preserving the security of the United States, the \textit{Espionage Act}, modeled after the 1798 \textit{Alien and Sedition Acts}, “made it a crime to convey false reports about the war promote the success of enemies of the United States, attempt to cause insubordination within the U.S. military, and obstruct recruitment or enlistment.”\footnote{188} At the time, the act was deemed as a necessary wartime measure by the United States government, however, Howard Zinn points out that the \textit{Espionage Act} “had a clause that provided penalties up to twenty years in prison,” which effectively “allowed the government “to imprison Americans who spoke or wrote against the war.”\footnote{189} By the summer of 1917, loyalty to the state was demonstrated by a person’s

\footnote{187} The Papers of Woodrow Wilson, Volume 42: April 7 – June 23, 1917, 440 – “From William Gibbs McAdoo [to President Woodrow Wilson], with Enclosure.” Washington, 2 June 1917 – According to Thomas Watt Gregory by early June the APL was already deemed to be “the largest, best organized, and most effective . . . [organized] body,” with “branches in almost six hundred cities and towns, and a membership of between eighty and one hundred thousand (The Papers of Woodrow Wilson, Volume 42: April 7 – June 23, 1917, 511 – “From Thomas Watt Gregory to William Gibbs McAdoo.” Washington, 12 June 1917).”

\footnote{188} Michael S. Foley and Brendan P. O’Malley, Eds. \textit{Home Fronts: A Wartime Reader}. New York, New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.; 2008, 86 – \textit{The Espionage Act, 1917} – In 1798, nearly two decades after achieving Independence, the United States “passed four laws that collectively became known as the [first] Alien and Sedition Acts (Our Documents: 100 Milestone Documents from the National Archives. New York, New York: Oxford University Press; 2003; 49).” Fearing a renewed war with France, the Federalist controlled government sought to prevent Democratic-Republican loyalties from aligning with Europe. In essence, these laws specified under “An Act Concerning Aliens,” Section one “that it shall be lawful for the President of the United States at any time during the continuance of this act, to order all such aliens as he shall judge dangerous to the peace and safety of the United States … to depart out of the territory of the United States (Our Documents: 100 Milestone Documents from the National Archives. New York, New York: Oxford University Press; 2003; 49).” Attached to this law was a listing of offenses like insurrection, rioting, unlawful assembly, printing, uttering, publishing or any combination against the government or President would carry punishments of both fines and imprisonment (Our Documents: 100 Milestone Documents from the National Archives. New York, New York: Oxford University Press; 2003; 49-50). Throughout the early struggles of the young Republic, especially against the Empire of Great Britain, the necessity of the 1798 Alien and Sedition Act became increasingly important. Once the threat of war and foreign domination subsided by the mid-19th century, these laws were allowed to expire.

\footnote{189} Howard Zinn. \textit{A People’s History of the United States, 1492 – Present}. New York, New York: Harper
support for the war effort, which meant buying and selling liberty bonds, rationing food, and working in industries aimed at mass producing supplies to be sent to the frontlines. As more and more men left for military training, Eric J. Karolak notes that “the threat of social disruption seemed more imminent as workers, split on the war issue and riled by rising prices, rents, and profits in the face of deteriorating working conditions, demonstrated their frustrations in a soaring number of work stoppages and other disturbances.” In fact, labor disputes dating well before crisis of 1914, were revisited as the United States became further involved in the war, to the point that “in the first six months of the war, more than 3,000 strikes occurred – almost as many as in all of 1916 – and cost more than six million days of production. Workers flexed their economic muscle, aided by wartime pressures on the labor market, and registered their demands primarily for union recognition and higher wages.” Since many of the manufactures throughout the United States had been converted into procuring materials necessary for the war effort, walkouts were seen as an offense against the state and the thought of a strike was now viewed as an act which participants could be charged with committing treason. Consequently, industries which bore the brunt of war production, those that were responsible for gathering the raw materials necessary for the advancement of manufacturing necessary items like arms and ammunition, often faced extreme working conditions since the bulk of these companies often operated independent of federal law.

Christopher Capozzola notes that during the summer of 1917, businesses like the nation’s mining companies operated not only with their own “private police forces and citizens’ groups

---

190 Karolak, 112.
191 Ibid., 100-101 – Even so, “not all workers struck for better pay, increased job control, or even for union recognition. The superintendent of one of the largest shipyards in the nation reported that workers threatened to strike if he did not fire an employee who spoke disparagingly of Liberty Bonds. A kind of strike fever spread through the United States.”
on hand,” but also with the understanding that “state and local officials [would] regularly side with the corporations against the workers [which] left the day-to-day governance of much of the state almost entirely in the hands of the mine bosses.” While industrial output increased with the war, seeing that “military demand for copper sent the mineral’s price skyrocketing, along with corporate profits,” laborers soon demanded wage increases that would reflect the earnings received by their work. As a result, workers at the Copper Queen mine in Bisbee, Arizona, who were in line with the “radical unionism of the Metal Mine Workers Industrial Union No. 800, affiliated with the I.W.W. [Industrial Workers of the World] . . . more than half the 4,700 workers . . . walked off the job. Their bitter strike dragged on for weeks; copper production reached a near-standstill. Mine owners, town leaders, and the national press interpreted the strikers’ actions as disloyal and outrageous.” On 12 July 1917, residents of Bisbee took matters into their own hands and under the leadership of Cochise County Sheriff Harry Wheeler, they set out to deport the striking mine workers. Louis Bernard Whitney, Assistant Attorney General of Arizona, messaged President Wilson on the same day the attacks took place, informing him that

Fifteen hundred armed members [of the] citizens protective league . . . made house to house canvas and deported in cattle cars. Those who refused to work in mines eleven hundred ninety three including three women [were] deported. State officials absolutely powerless to act because State troops [are] in Federal service. I implore you to send Federal troops to Bisbee so men will get protection when they return to families. Fear bloodshed if this wrong not redressed by

---

193 Ibid., 126 – According to Frederick Watson, the copper miners in Bisbee, Arizona asked “that the State law be enforced underground for the safety of the miners, and or a 10% increase in wages to support our families based on the increase in the price of copper and the cost of living (Rob E. Hanson. *The Great Bisbee I.W.W. Deportation of July 12, 1917*. Bisbee, Arizona: Signature Press; 1987, 10).”
194 Ibid.
At the end of July, William Dudley Haywood, “principal founder, secretary-treasurer, and de facto head of the Industrial Workers of the World,” sent word to President Wilson notifying him that a “general strike of metal miners of Michigan has been declared; Minnesota next. Harvest workers of North and South Dakota will follow unless miners at Columbus, New Mexico, are returned to their homes and families at Bisbee, Arizona.” Ultimately the miners did make their way back to Arizona, however, the cost of the matter was severe in demonstrating not only the nation’s willingness to resort to violence in the name of protecting the state, but also the compliance of the federal government to allow citizens to openly target and persecute their neighbors. By the spring of 1918, maltreatment of those deemed unfaithful toward the state, was taken a step further with the introduction of The Sedition Act, which declared that “it [was] illegal to criticize or show disrespect for the government of the United States, its Constitution, its armed forces, its flag, and even the uniforms of its military personnel.” Although this law was enacted late in the war, it set the foundation, along with the Espionage Act, for the open harassment of “untrustworthy” citizens and eventually resulted in the “the federal government prosecut[ing] 2,000 people for merely speaking out against the war. About half were convicted and sentenced to prison terms of up to twenty years.” Already conscience of these laws

during the war years, the public and the federal government simply continued to use them for the duration of 1918 and well beyond the war’s armistice.

For both the nations of Europe and the United States the final year of the war was marked by rising food prices, general walkouts, and mounting casualties all of which continued to cause concern for the central governments’ who were struggling to maintain order and unity. As evident in the United States, while war time production drastically increased capitalist gains for investment heads, their returns did not necessarily transfer to their workers. An increase in better wages and working conditions quickly became the hallmark of the labor movement toward the end of the Great War as unions in Great Britain, the United States, France, Hungary, and Australia continued to increase in numbers and demands.\textsuperscript{199} Even so, political infighting and the state’s inability to peacefully withdraw from the present conflict left national leaders and the government at large vulnerable to attacks and critiques by the disgruntled masses. For many foreign leaders, the Bolshevik takeover in Russia and the subsequent downfall of the Romanov family raised fears and suspicions toward anything and everything that advocated a change at the national level.\textsuperscript{200} This internal crisis was all the more evident as the Allied Powers faced another

\textsuperscript{199} Beckett notes that “in Britain the numbers in trade unions increased from about 4.1 million in 1913 to 8.3 million by 1920. . . . Moreover, the number of trade unionists formally affiliated to the Trades Union Council increased from 2.2 million in 1913 to 4.5 million by 1918. . . . United States trade union membership grew from 3.1 million in 1917 to 4.2 million in 1919, although it was the stronger unions within the American Federation of Labor (AFL) that most improved their position. . . in France . . . the CGT [General labour Confederation] had represented only some 6 per cent of French labour in 1914, with some 237,000 members. Its membership declined initially, but, through the recruitment of younger entrants to employment, it had 576,000 members by 1918 and 1.2 million by 1920. In Hungary, there was a sevenfold increase in union membership during the war. In Australia, too, union membership increased from 523,271 to 581,755, with the proportion of the labour force that was unionized rising from 27.9 per cent in 1911 to 51.6 per cent by 1921 (320-321).”

\textsuperscript{200} In April 1918, Tsar Nicholas II and his family was moved “to Ekaterinburg, the centre of Bolshevik militancy in the Urals . . . . They were met by an angry crowd, and imprisoned in a large house which was swiftly enclosed with a high wooden fence. . . . The top brass in Ekaterinburg wanted an execution, but the order for their murder came from Lenin in Moscow, who decided – as the
possible turning point in the war. Already, by the end of 1917 the Allied forces were in the midst of a “double disaster: the collapse of the Italian army at Caporetto and the advent to power of the Bolsheviks in Russia. The situation was perhaps the gravest which the Allies had faced since 1914. No longer was it a question, as it had been in the spring, how best to defeat Germany; the problem was now, how to escape defeat.”

Of particular concern was the possible withdrawal of Russian forces as terms of negotiations for an immediate ceasefire were becoming public knowledge, which “meant that Germany would be free to withdraw her troops in great masses from the East and resume the position of numerical superiority on the Western Front which she had not held since the first days of the war.”

According to John Bach counter-revolutionary White troops, representing an uneasy coalition of anti-Bolshevik groups, and a Czech regiment closed in on Ekaterinburg in July 1918 – that they could not afford the tsar to be a “live banner.”

“On 3 July in the Old Style calendar (16 July by the Western one), at 1:30 in the morning, the prisoners – the tsar, his family and all that remained of his servants, his doctor, valet, cook and Alix’s maid – were woken and led down to the basement. They were told there had been shooting in the town and they would be safer there. . . . After several minutes the local secret police chief, Yakov Yurovsky, came into the room with an eleven-man squad, one to shoot each victim. . . . Their bodies were taken fourteen miles from Ekaterinburg and burned, the remains thrown down a mine shaft, their faces deliberately disfigured to prevent identification if they were found. Eight days later the town fell to the Whites (Carter, 408-409).”

This concern was later addressed via a memorandum entitled “Russian Policy” from Basil Miles, Head of the State Department’s Russian Division sent to the Secretary of State on 8 January.
McMaster, when the terms of the Brest-Litovsk negotiations were first made public, Trotsky “called on the embassies and legations of the Allies in Petrograd to define, within one week, the attitude of their Governments “toward the peace negotiations,” and state their willingness or refusal to join in negotiations for an armistice and peace. In case their ‘refusal they must declare clearly and finally before all mankind the aims for which the peoples of Europe may be called to shed their blood during the fourth year of war’.”

Well before Trotsky issued his demand for Allied war aims, however, representatives from the various Allied powers had already attempted to formulate a united war aims plan, first at the Interallied Conference in Paris on 29 November 1917 and then at the Supreme War Council on 1 December in Versailles.

The purpose of the meetings were twofold, but at the heart of the matter was that the Allies needed formulate a “war-plan” that addressed “what steps should be taken to meet the threatened German offensive on the Western Front; how much effort should be expended in assistance to Italy and Greece; how much emphasis should be laid upon Allenby’s operations against the Turks; what could be done to bring Russia back into the alliance?”

Despite the conferences, the delegations in France failed to procure “an effective diplomatic offensive against the Central Powers” within the necessary timeframe effectively allowing the Bolsheviks and Germany to enter into their own negotiations.

Two days after the Bolsheviks and Germany entered into a truce, President Wilson stood before members of Congress, for the first time since receiving the declaration of war against Germany, to deliver his “Annual Message on 1918, which claimed that “the armistice will enable Germany and Austria to throw to the western front more troops than the United States can put in France for the next eight months (The Papers of Woodrow Wilson, Volume 45: November 11, 1917 – January 15, 1918, 544.”
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Ibid., 316.
the State of the Union.” At the core of his message was “not to go back and debate the causes of the war,” but to “ask you [members of Congress] to consider again and with a very grave scrutiny our objectives and the measures by which we mean to attain them,” stating

Let there be no misunderstanding. Our present and immediate task is to win the war, and nothing shall turn us aside from it until it is accomplished. Every power and resource we possess, whether of men, of money, or of materials, is being devoted and will continue to be devoted to that purpose until it is achieved. Those who desire to bring peace about before that purpose is achieved I counsel to carry their advice elsewhere. We will not entertain it. We shall regard the war as won only when the German people say to us, through properly accredited representatives, that they are ready to agree to a settlement based upon justice and the reparation of the wrongs their rulers have done.\textsuperscript{206}

For all intents and purposes, the United States was fully committed to entering into the mainstay of the war in Europe and with the war now entering a fourth year the Allied forces were going to redouble their efforts to establish war platforms. Even so, the final year of the war would prove once again to be more than any nation could bear and despite the efforts of all the competing armies trying to gain the advantage, it was the costly burden of the four-year fight that caused the people to rebel during the last two years of the war, granting the states the ability again use the safety of the national government as a means of restricting civil liberties. In the end, the final year of the war witnessed the final collapse of states and empires as Allied leaders spoke of freedoms, which all members of the general public took to heart.

CHAPTER IV.
A CONTINUAL STATE OF CRISIS:
WAR, PEACE AND THE FIRST RED SCARE

By the start of the 1918, the war’s progression further exasperated the laypeople of Europe and triggered additional public protests and strikes aimed at bringing about a quick conclusion to the war. As the Bolsheviks and Germany continued to debate over terms of agreement, David Lloyd George, Prime Minister of Great Britain, and President Wilson both seized the opportunity to present their own nations’ war aims. Whereas Lloyd George informed “the delegates of the trade unions” on 5 January 1918 that Britain “was fighting for [the] complete restoration of Belgium, with full indemnity for the devastation of her towns and provinces; for the restoration of Serbia, Montenegro, and the occupied parts of France, Italy, Roumania; for an independent Poland; for the recognition of the great wrong of 1871 when, regardless of the wishes of the general public, two provinces were torn from the side of France and incorporated in the German Empire; self-government must be granted [to] those Austro-Hungarian nationalities who have so long desired it; the claims of the Italians for union with those of their race and tongue must be satisfied; and justice must be done to men of Roumanian blood and speech.”1 Three days later, during his 14-Point Speech to a Joint Session of Congress President Wilson expressed similar goals claiming that the United States “entered this war because violations of right had occurred which touched us to the quick and made the life or our own people impossible unless they were corrected and the world secured once for all against their recurrence. What we demand in this war, therefore, is nothing peculiar to ourselves. It is that the world be made fit and safe to live in; and particularly that it be made safe for every

---
1 McMaster, 444-445.
peace-loving nation which, like our own, wishes to live its own life, determine its own institutions, be assured of justice and fair dealings by the other peoples of the world as against force and selfish aggression.”² Besides setting a national platform for the United States in regards to war aims, President Wilson’s lofty ideals regarding the formation of new states, redrawing old borders, and notions of self-determination gave hope not only to those nations that had struggled as subjects to the imperial houses of the Central Powers, but also to those who had been colonized by the empires of France and Great Britain. Unbeknownst to Trotsky, his insistence that the Allies declare their reasons for fighting set a precedent for idealists’ peace terms that would create the bases for an armistice agreement that was nearly unattainable by the nations who agreed to it. Before the Allies’ peace plans would be implemented, they would first have to bring about an end to the war. Germany’s agreement with Bolshevik Russia was now set to place them in a position “to acquire, through the legal niceties of a negotiated treaty, the territorial gains, and much more, that she had been unable to acquire by more than three years of war” should the treaty go forward.³ Not only was Germany going to expand their land holdings, but the withdrawal of Russia from the war would allow German forces to be transferred to the western front, which meant that the Central Powers would actually gain an upper hand with 191 divisions, including “137,000 officers, three and a half million men,” against the 178 divisions

² The Papers of Woodrow Wilson, Volume 45: November 11, 1917 – January 15, 1918, 534-539 – “An Address to a Joint Session of Congress.” 8 January 1918 – Two of the fourteen points President Wilson made declared: “I. Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view. . . . V. A free, open-minded, and absolutely impartial adjustment of all colonial claims, based upon a strict observance of the principle that in determining all such questions of sovereignty the interest of the populations concerned must have equal weight with the equitable claims of the government whose title is to be determined (536-537).”

provided by the Allied forces. For those nations at war, 1918 appeared to be the time in which
the fate of the war and quite possibly the future of the world would be decided. And regardless
of the effort, all manner of resources would be fully committed by those on all fronts in an effort
to guarantee that their army would emerge from the war victorious. The prospect of another year
of war, however, overwhelmed both civilians and soldiers alike who were already struggling to
survive and now looked at the Bolshevik Revolution as one possible means of bringing this war
to an end.

Prior to 1918, all states participating in the war had ready dealt with moments of civil and
military disobedience. With the prospect of yet another year of war, strikes and public protests
broke out in the first two weeks of the New Year, beginning in Vienna on 14 January 1918 and
on the 28th workers from the Berlin armament industry started a demonstration that ultimately
came to include over 500,000 protestors. Following the strike of 28 January, Frölich points out

---

According to Martin Gilbert in signing the Brest-Litovsk Treaty on 3 March, “the Bolsheviks
accepted the harsh reality of the battlefield, giving up all claims to the Baltic provinces, Poland,
White Russia (later known as Byelorussia, now Belarus), Finland, Bessarabia, the Ukraine and
the Caucasus. This constituted a third of her pre-war population, a third of her arable land, and
nine-tenths of her coalfields: almost all the territory, in fact, that had been added to the Tsarist
dominions since the reign of Peter the Great more than two hundred years earlier,” also, “under
the Treaty . . . all Russian naval bases in the Baltic except Kronstadt were taken away. The
Russian Black Sea Fleet warships in Odessa and Nikolayev were to be disarmed and detained.
The Bolsheviks also agreed to the immediate return of 630,000 Austrian prisoners-of-war. The
permitted the Armenian areas conquered by Russia in 1916 to be transferred to Turkey (*The First
World War: A Complete History*, 401-402).”

5 Waldman 62-63 – According to Meyer, the demands of Germany’s strikers “were mostly political and
pacifist, not social and revolutionary in character” seeing that “the workers called for an
immediate peace without annexations and indemnifications on the basis of self-determination of
peoples, as formulated by the Bolshevik representatives in their current peace negotiations with
the Germans. In addition they demanded more bread and the introduction of a democratic
government. The Spartacists were not permitted to participate in the planning of the strike. The
shop stewards feared that they would blatantly anticipate the strike and upset carefully laid plans.
The Spartacus Union nevertheless had knowledge of the plans to strike on January 28 and to the
consternation of the stewards issued the broadsheet, “The Mass Strike Begins on Monday,
January 28!”
that “the authorities struck out furiously, and once again ‘the hydra-headed revolution’ was decapitated. Military jurisdiction was introduced for political offenses committed by civilians, severe sentences were imposed up and down the country, and the prison gates clanged to behind a new batch of Spartakists. In March the authorities managed to arrest the leaders of the military organisation Spartakus League, including Leo Jogiches. The leadership now consisted of two or three individuals only, and they had to work under most trying and difficult conditions.” At the same time, other members of the Central Powers were also experiencing moments of insurrection especially as “discontent was growing in more and more armies.” Although Germany had already experienced its first display of military insubordination in 1917 when “a serious mutiny” among their battleships threatened the stability of their navy and resulted in the deaths of “several officers,” uprisings were starting to occur more frequently by 1918. By this point,

“In the course of the strike, majority Socialist leaders Ebert, Scheidemann, and Braun joined the action committee headed by Richard Müller. Many of the strikers belong to the SPD; and they demanded that their leaders make common cause with the revolutionary shop stewards and the latter’s organizational base, the USPD. The historical function of the SPD’s participation in this strike movement, Liebknecht noted, was to prevent it from becoming too radical. On February 3 the action committee terminated the strike. . . . Thousands of strikers, including Müller and virtually all of the other revolutionary shop stewards, were enrolled in the army, and many others were imprisoned (Meyer, 117).”

6 Frölich, 283.
8 Lutz, 28 – Eventually, the naval revolt “was suppressed promptly with an iron hand” at which time “forty sailors were condemned by general courts martial, and of this number sixteen were shot.”
9 As Martin Gilbert notes, “on February 1, Greek troops in the town of Lamia, who were about to be sent to the Salonica Front, mutinied. Two of their leaders were executed. On the day of the Lamia mutiny, Austro-Hungarian sailors on board ship in the Gulf of Cattaro (Kotor) also mutinied. Led by two Czech socialists, the 6,000 sailors raised the red flag and announced their adherence to Bolshevism. But . . . their demands were closer to President Wilson’s Fourteen Points than to Lenin’s decrees: national autonomy (as already being demanded by the Slav groups in the Vienna Parliament, not independence), immediate peace, no annexation of territory, demobilization, and better living conditions. The mutineers appealed for support to the Austrian troops in the Cattaro garrison, and to the crews of German submarines alongside them in the bay, but this attempt to widen the mutiny was rebuffed. On learning of what had happened, the Austrian naval authorities dispatched three battleships from the Istrian port of Pola: eight hundred of the mutineers were taken off their ships, forty were brought to trial, and four were executed.
though, the first American division had already landed in France on 18 January and was put into action at the Butte de Mesnil in Champagne on 13 February. Anticipating that the forces from the United States would be fully committed to the war by 1919, Germany realized that if they were going to try for an all-out victory over the Allies, this was the time in which to strike.

With the Brest-Litovsk Treaty signed on 3 March 1918, Germany’s battle plan was fairly straightforward; utilizing reinforcements from the east they launched five spring offensives between 21 March and 15 July. As Germany’s military forces were redirected westward, circumstances on the home front were becoming increasingly difficult as a result of the war. According to Marshall Dill Jr.,

by 1918 living conditions . . . particularly in the large cities, had become almost unbearable; the prospect of living through another winter of wartime stringency seemed beyond human endurance. During the summer the world-wide epidemic of influenza reached Germany, and before long thousands, especially children, were stricken. The supply of food and clothing was daily becoming more meager. A potato famine had cut that staple to a fraction of the usual supply. Animals were being slaughtered for lack of fodder. The flour ration was cut, and the prospect of meatless weeks was in sight. To make things worse the Austrian ally, equally deprived, was pleading for shipments of food from Germany. The occupation of the Ukraine, which the Germans had hoped would be their granary, was an almost complete disappointment.10

In spite of this environment, however, Frölich argues that Germany’s “working class seemed to be in a torpor, and it caused Rosa Luxemburg to write bitterly in the Sparkatusbriefe of June 1918: ‘The German proletariat failed to bring the chariot of imperialism to a halt, and it is now being dragged behind it helplessly to crush Socialism and democracy all over Europe. The

“In France, bread shortages led to the protest, on February 5, by 3,000 people in Roanne, on the Loire, followed by looting (The First World War: A Complete History, 397).”

German workers are now wading through blood, over the bodies of Russian, Ukrainian, Finn, and Baltic revolutionary workers, destroying the national existence of Belgians, Poles, Lithuanians, and Roumanians, trampling down France and planting the victorious banner of German imperialism everywhere. . . . Even now, in the midst of war, the German working class is being scourged with whips and scorpions as it thoroughly deserves’.11 At the core of Luxemburg’s comments was that fear that “the German Revolution would come too late to save the Russian Revolution,” which was supposed to have led to a larger international socialist movement, but was suspended when the Russian Bolsheviks entered into negotiations in 1917.12 Less than a month after Luxemburg’s remarks were published, Germany’s western advance was already beginning to slow. By the beginning of July “a million American troops and military personnel were in France . . . . [and] Their supplies were entering French ports at a rate of 20,000 tons a day.”13 For Germany, the influx of the American support and the response of the Allied forces were so overwhelming that by the 18th of July General Erich von Ludendorff realized that “the attempt to make the nations of the Entente inclined to peace before the arrival of the American reinforcements by means of German victories had failed. The energy of the army had not sufficed to deal the enemy a decisive blow before the Americans were on the spot in considerable force. It was quite clear to me that our general situation had thus become very serious.”14 Under these strained circumstances, the Allies mounted one more offensive against the German forces on the morning of 8 August and pushed the German army back to the Hindenburg line. To von Ludendorff, the events of that day marked the “black day of the

11 Frölich, 284.
12 Ibid.
German Army in the history of this war.”15 Unable to repel the three day onslaught, von Ludendorff later recalled that on that morning “everything I had feared, and of which I had so often given warning, had here, in one place, become a reality. Our war machine was no longer efficient. Our fighting power had suffered, even though the great majority of divisions still fought heroically.”16 On 13 and 14 August, a delegation of German officials and members of the military gathered in Spa, where von Ludendorff made “recommend[ation]” to his staff as well as Imperial Chancellor Count Georg von Hertling and Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs Admiral Paul von Hintze that Germany “immediate[ly] enter into peace negotiations;” a sentiment that was echoed on the 15th by “Crown Prince Rupprecht of Bavaria, who wrote from Flanders to Prince Max of Baden,” informing him that “our military situation had deteriorated so rapidly that I no longer believe we can hold out over the winter; it is even possible that a catastrophe will come earlier.”17 This turn of events on Germany’s frontlines quickly reverberated back home where the government, instead of preparing the general population for the inevitable end, continued to openly persecute any individual or group that spoke out against current situation of the war.

According to Calkins, in “late September, Haase reported to a friend that a secret prohibition had obviously been issued against his speaking in public” and went on to “describe a recent meeting which was brutally broken up by the police just as he was given the floor. . . . He predicted that the persecution would increase as the rulers began to feel more clearly “the knife at their throats.” . . . . A few days later he wrote again, describing in vivid terms the atmosphere

15 Ibid., 326.
16 Ibid., 332.
17 Martin Gilbert. The First World War: A Complete History, 451-452 – To Crown Prince Rupprecht, “his greatest worry was the Allies’ greatest asset: ‘The Americans are multiplying in a way never dreamed of,’ he wrote. ‘At the present time there are already thirty-one American divisions in France’ (452).”
of tension which had developed. “The ruling system,” he declared, “is creaking in all its joints.”

Even Kaiser Wilhelm II sensed that the end was near, writing: “at this critical time a strong movement began at home in favor of setting up a new government for the now necessary termination of the war. I could not ignore this movement, since the old government, during the seven weeks from August 8th to the end of September, had not managed to initiate peace negotiations offering any hope of success.” Indeed “German rulers began in September to move toward thorough-going political reforms which, it was hoped, would both restore confidence in the regime and placate the Entente” and on the 23rd, “the Social Democratic Reichstag delegation and party council agreed . . . that if certain conditions were met, the party would participate in a new government under someone other than Hertling.” With the Empire struggling to maintain some semblance of power and authority, all was rendered lost by the 29th of September. Not only was the Hindenburg line breached by Allied forces, on that date, but “in the south, Bulgaria collapsed and asked for an armistice; in Vienna the hopes of Emperor Charles and his government were limited to preserving what could be salvaged of Austria-Hungary, even at the expense of a separate peace; in Berlin a group representing several parties in the Reichstag drew up a demand for the dismissal of the conservative Hertling, whom they considered to be simply the mouthpiece for Ludendorff; at Headquarters in Spa on the evening of the twenty-eighth Hindenburg and Ludendorff had a melancholy conversation in which they agreed to the immediate necessity of negotiations leading to an armistice.”

By 2 October, argues Gilbert, the German Revolution was already underway,
but not in the streets, as Ludendorff had feared, but in the council chamber, where Prince Max of Baden, the Kaiser’s second cousin, became Chancellor. . . . only after the Kaiser accepted two conditions: that henceforth Parliament alone would have the right to declare war and make pace, and that any remaining control that the Kaiser might have over the army and navy cease at once. . . .

During October 3 he [Prince Max of Baden] brought two Socialist deputies into his government, one of whom, Philip Scheidemann, told him, with much wisdom, ‘Better an end to terror than terror without end.’ To avert terror, an armistice was essential. On October 4, having informed the Reichstag of the need for peace, and having obtained Austrian support for what he now realised could not be delayed, Prince Max telegraphed to Washington requesting an armistice.22

While Germany and the United States attempted to come to some terms of agreement, Prince Max of Baden was attempting to quickly reform the government in an effort to avoid a further uprising. Divisions between the SPD and USPD, however, highlighted that fact that the general discord among those on the home front went much further than simply a general disillusionment caused by the current war. On 5 October, a manifesto was published by members of the USPD which was “devoted to severe criticism of the SPD, whose policy, it claimed, collapsed as completely as that of the ruling class. It condemned the S.P.D. for making no effort to use the present crisis to replace capitalism with socialism as so many resolutions of the International had urged,” including political amnesty, the state of siege or even social and economic reforms.23 As the USPD openly attacked the Socialists in government, the fervor of the revolutionary spirit was also taking shape when on 7 October members gathered for “the Reich Conference of the Spartacists and Left Radicals,”24 while members of the Spartacus League issued an appeal to the workers of Berlin that further encouraged the workers to awake and take up arms against the

23 Calkins, 148.
24 Waldman, 75 – For a complete review of the terms established by the 7 October 1918 symposium, Reich Conference of the Spartacists and Left Radicals, please refer to Appendix L.
state. Threatened with the serious possibility of a socialist uprising and in an effort to suppress the growing radicalism the Executive Committee of the SPD “issued a declaration against revolution” claiming that

All this agitation by confused, irresponsible persons, using Bolsheviki revolutionary phrases, who are trying to rouse the workers to strikes and demonstrations against the Government that would have no sense nor object at present, make it more difficult to bring about peace and democratize Germany . . . as the authorized representatives of the Social Democratic Party have always declared, we wish to transform our political structure into a democracy and out economic life into Socialism by means of a peaceful change. We are one the road to peace and democracy. All agitation for an attempted revolt runs counter to this road and serves the cause of the counter-revolution.

In an attempt to pacify the growing rebellion, on the 20th, “amnesty was issued for convicted political prisoners,” including Liebknecht, who was “freed and escorted home in triumph by the Berlin workers” on the 23rd. Despite these measures, though damage from the last four years was at the point of being irreversible and the revolution that was feared among Germany’s top leaders, including the Kaiser who was still refusing to acknowledge that the end was really at hand, was now spreading throughout the nation.

Von Ludendorff’s resignation on the 26th had already signified that the armistice was nearing its conclusion, yet on the 28th the “admiralty issued order to Admiral [Franz] von Hipper

---

25 For a copy of the Spartacus League’s appeal to the workers of Berlin, please refer to Appendix M.
27 Frölich, 286 – Although Liebknecht was freed, “the amnesty did not apply to Rosa Luxemburg . . . as she was not serving a sentence: she was “merely under preventive arrest”, and there she stayed. In fact, the preventive-arrest warrant against her was renewed as usual. Whether the reason was that despite the general collapse the militarists were still more powerful than the Government, or whether the Government thought Liebknecht alone would be quite enough trouble, the fact remains that for another three weeks Rosa Luxemburg was kept cooped up, whilst all around the old order was toppling.”
to proceed with the fleet to the Belgian coast in order to protect the right flank of the retreating
German army;” recognizing the futility of the command, the sailors refused to proceed.\footnote{Lutz, 29-30 – According to Martin Gilbert, “a thousand mutineers were arrested, immobilizing the fleet. ‘Our men have rebelled’,” Admiral von Hipper, “wrote in his diary, ‘I could not have carried out the operation even if weather conditions had permitted it’ (\textit{The First World War: A Complete History}, 485).”}

Almost immediately, word regarding the naval insurrection quickly spread and when “the mutiny of sailors in Kiel turned into a general uprising after six hundred sailors were imprisoned on 4 November,” the spirit of revolution was prevalent by the 6\textsuperscript{th} as “red flags were [already] flying in the Hansa cities, Lübeck, Hamburg, and Bremen . . . . [And] In Munich, the most stolid of the German cities, the Bavarian Republic was proclaimed, and councils of workers, peasants, and soldiers were formed” under the jurisdiction of the Socialist party in Munich\footnote{Ettinger, 229.} Once the state lost control over Bavaria to the socialists, this inadvertently became the “signal for the German Revolution.”\footnote{Lutz, 37 – A week later, social uprisings threatened the kingdom of Bavaria on 7-8 November eventually resulted in Kurt Eisner, a Jew and USPD leader, taking “control of the city of Munich, [and proclaiming] a Bavarian Republic” along “with his followers (\textit{Ruth Henig. \textit{The Weimar Republic, 1919-1933.} London, England: Routledge; 1998, 9).”}

On the morning of 9 November, general strikes erupted throughout Berlin starting with “spontaneous” walkouts “from the General Electric Works, the German Arms and Munition Factory, and the Schwartzkopf and the Loewe Works, the strike spread to almost all the Berlin industrial plants.”\footnote{Ibid., 49.} To Prince Max of Baden, the possibility that Germany could succumb to a revolution was not a reality. As Lutz points out, “at 9:15 a. m. the Chancellor was informed that the German Field Armies would no longer recognize the Kaiser as commander-in-chief” and “at 10 a. m. reports reached the chancellery of the mutiny of the Alexander Regiment, Fourth Naumberger Jaeger Regiment, and Jueterbogker Artillery. In despair, [Captain] Wahnschaff exclaimed to the Prince that only the abdication of the Emperor could save the
monarchy. Prince Max spent the morning in frantic efforts to secure the Kaiser’s abdication.”

Although the Kaiser’s abdication had been called for by various individuals from the Reichstag to the military over the last few weeks of the war, when it was finally announced by Prince Max of Baden, the now ex-Kaiser, who was not in Berlin at the time, recalled

> I wished to spare my people civil war. If my abdication was indeed the only way to prevent bloodshed, I was willing to renounce the Imperial throne, but not to abdicate as King of Prussia; I would remain, as such, with my troops, since the military leaders had declared that the officers would leave in crowds if I abdicated entirely, and the army would then pour back, without leaders, into the fatherland, damage it, and place it in peril.

A delay in the Kaiser’s response, however, resulted in Prince Max of Baden not only relinquishing the crown on behalf of Kaiser Wilhelm II, but also for “his eldest son” and then he too resigned, “handing over power to the leader of the Reichstag Socialists, Friedrich Ebert.”

The loss of the Kaiser, Crown Prince, and the Imperial Chancellor created a political power vacuum that also threatened the German state. Despite the appointment of Ebert there was a still

---

32 Lutz, 50.
33 Wilhelm II. *The Kaiser’s Memoirs*, 285-287 – According to Nicholas Best, on the morning of the 9th, “the demonstration itself was still in the early stages, thousands of factory workers gathering in the northern suburbs and forming up for a march on the city centre. Some were Bolshevists and some were Social Democrats, but most were just fed up with the war, determined that the Kaiser must go if that was the only way to bring it to an end. An ultimatum for his abdication had already expired with no word from Spa. If the Kaiser would [not] step down of his own accord, then the workers would take matters into their own hands and force him to go. . . . At his desk in the chancellery, Prince Max learned of the soldiers’ defection with dismay. . . . Max had to have the Kaiser’s decision at once if he was to save Berlin from revolution (109-110). . . . When no word came from Spa, Max took matters into his own hands. He issued a press release to the Wolff telegraph agency announcing the Kaiser’s immediate abdication, as both emperor of Germany and king of Prussia. Max added that the crown prince would relinquish all rights to the succession, and that he himself would resign the chancellorship in favor of the populist Friedrich Ebert of the Social Democratic Party as soon as the abdication had been effected (*The Greatest Day in History: How, on the Eleventh Hour of the Eleventh Day of the Eleventh Month, the First World War Finally Came to an End*. New York, New York: Public Affairs; 2008, 117).”
34 Carter, 413.
a revolutionary mob that was gathering in the streets of Berlin as news of the Kaiser’s abdication continued to spread.

For the members of the SPD’s Executive Committee, this is precisely the moment they feared most, the possibility that in Germany’s weakened state – “despite Max’s press release, Germany was not yet a republic” – the Bolsheviks would seize the moment to declare a revolution.\(^{35}\) And as William Maehl points out, three days before the Kaiser abdicated, “Philipp Scheidemann told his colleagues in the cabinet that he considered Bolshevism a greater danger than the Entente, and Friedrich Ebert declared that he hated the revolution “like sin”.”\(^{36}\)

Although the general public had been informed of the abdication of the Kaiser and the resignation of Prince Max, the masses continued to gather in the streets of Berlin, still consumed in a spirit of revolution. As Sebastian Haffner later recalled, “though November 1918 meant the end of the war, husbands restored to wives, and life restored to men, it recalls no sense of joy, only a bad mood, defeat, anxiety, senseless gunfights, confusion, and bad weather.”\(^{37}\) In an effort to calm the masses and thwart the Bolsheviks’ intentions of taking control over Germany’s revolution it seemed that the SPD would have to be the first to act and so “the very birth of the Republic . . . [which] was proclaimed in the early afternoon of November 9, 1918, by the Socialist Philipp Scheidemann, not from pure republican enthusiasm, but from an anxious desire to forestall the proclamation of a Soviet Republic by Karl Liebknecht.”\(^{38}\) Scheidemann, who

---

\(^{35}\) Nicholas Best. *The Greatest Day in History: How, on the Eleventh Hour of the Eleventh Day of the Eleventh Month, the First World War Finally Came to an End.* New York, New York: Public Affairs; 2008, 121.


was then acting as Secretary of State, admitted that when he was informed that Liebknecht

“intend[ed] to proclaim the Soviet Republic,” he

clearly saw what was afoot. I knew his [Liebknecht’s] slogan – supreme authority for the Workers’ and Soldiers’ Councils. Germany to be therefore a Russian province, a branch of the Soviet? No, no, a thousand times no!
There was no doubt at all. The man who could bring along the “Bolshies” from the Schloss to the Reichstag or the Social Democrats from the Reichstag to the Schloss had won the day.

I saw the Russian folly staring me in the face – the Bolshevist tyranny, the substitute for the tyranny of the Czars! No, no, Germany should not have that on the top of all her other miseries. . . .

I was already standing at the widow [of the Reichstag]. Many thousands of poor folk were trying to wave their hats and caps. Then there was silence. I only said a few words . . . .

---

39 Philip Scheidemann. Memoirs of a Social Democrat: In Two Volumes. Volume Two, 581-582 – The “Schloss” Liebknecht was speaking from was the Berliner Stadtschloss or Berlin City Palace.

Scheidemann’s words were as follows: “WORKERS and soldiers, frightful were those four years of war, ghastly the sacrifices the people made in blood and treasure. The cursed War is at an end. Murder had ceased. The fruits of war, want and misery, will burden us for years. The catastrophe we tried our best to avoid had not been spared us, because our proposals for peace by consent were rejected and we ourselves scorned and despised. The foes of an industrious people, the real foes in our midst, that have caused Germany’s downfall, are silent and invisible. . . . These foes of ours are, it is to be hoped, gone for good. The Emperor has abdicated. He and his friends had decamped. Prince Max of Baden had handed over his office as Chancellor to Ebert. Our friend will form a Labour Government to which all Socialist Parties will belong. The new Government must not be hampered in their work for peace or their efforts for supplying food and work.

“WORKMEN and soldiers, realize the historic importance of to-day. Miracles have happened. Long and incessant toil is before us. Everything for the people; everything by the people! Nothing must be done that brings dishonor to the Labour movement. Stand united and loyal, and be conscious of your duty. The old and the rotten – the monarchy – has broken down. Long live the new! Long live the German Republic!”

“ENDLESS cheering broke out. Then the crowds began to move towards the Schloss. The Bolshevik wave that threatened to engulf Germany had spent its force. The German Republic had become a thing of life in the brains and heart of the masses.”
Despite Scheidemann’s enthusiasm that the Republic was something to be embraced by all Germans, upon hearing the announcement he faced considerable backlash from members of his own SPD Executive Committee, including Ebert. Once Scheidemann left the cheering people and retreated back inside, he noted that “Ebert’s face turned livid with wrath when he heard what I had done. He banged his fist on the table and yelled at me, ‘Is it true?’ On my replying it was not only true but a matter of course, he made a scene which passed my understanding. ‘You have no right to proclaim the Republic. What becomes of Germany – whether she becomes a Republic or something else – a Constituent Assembly must decide’.40 While Scheidemann later acknowledged his mistake, writing that there were “private conversations about monarch, republic, a substitute for the Kaiser, about which I then knew nothing, [that] actually took place. Ebert to a certain extent was not a free agent. Social Democrats and myself were not thus hampered.”41 The damage from his announcement, however, was already done and the Republic for all intents and purposes was proclaimed.

Although Scheidemann believed that the revolution would come to end with the change in government, Trotnow points out that other socialists had the opposite reaction, including Liebknecht, who, at the same time that the Republic was announced, “shouted to the masses from the balcony of the Hohenzollern palace” that “even if the old order has been torn down, we must not believe that our job is finished. We must use all our strength to build a government of workers and soldiers and create a new proletarian state system, a system of peace, of happiness and freedom, of our German brothers and our brothers in the whole world.”42 His words sparked immediate reaction among those that had gathered who saw that

---

40 Ibid., 583.
41 Ibid.
42 Trotnow, 182-183.
councils were elected in the factories and in the barracks, and an Executive Committee of Workers’ and Soldiers’ Councils was formed which claimed full power throughout the Reich. All government buildings were occupied by workers. The prisons were stormed and hundreds of political prisoners released, including Leo Jogiches. Once the revolution was victorious in Berlin it spread automatically to all other big towns: in Breslau the masses forced the opening of the prisons on November 9th, and Rosa Luxemburg was free at last. She went straight from prison to the cathedral Square, where she addressed great masses of cheering workers.43

Still threatened with the possibility that the revolution would soon adopt characteristics similar to those in Russia, the SPD’s Executive Committee quickly decided to invited leaders of all the minority branches to aid in creating a platform that would briefly unite the socialist organizations and form a new government. After a series of discussions at which time the concerns of the minority were addressed by members of the majority, the parties agreed to finally work together on 10 November.44 And so it was under a coalition of socialist principles led by Six Commissioners: Ebert, Haase, Schiedemann, Landsberg, Dittmann, and Barth that granted Germany the ability to formulate a socialist government that could formally accept the Allies terms for a peace agreement, which became effective at the eleventh hour, on the eleventh day, of the eleventh month. For a war that was supposed to have been over by Christmas 1914, the Great War ultimately resulted in the mobilization of nearly “sixty-five million men” of which “over eight million” were killed and “another twenty-one million wounded.”45 According to

43 Frölich, 288.
44 For a full account of the conditions, please refer to Appendix N.
45 Mark Mazower. *Dark Continent: Europe’s Twentieth Century*. New York, New York: Alfred A. Knopf; 1999, ix-x – Certainty there are disputes regarding the number of those mobilized during the Great War. According to calculations put forth by Michael Howard, lowers the number of men from 65 million to an estimate of 62 million men based on statistics based on the fact that from the Central Powers: Austria-Hungary, Germany, Turkey and Bulgaria totaled 22.8 million, with the death total of 3,410,000 dead, while Allied numbers, including men from France, Britain, the British Empire, Russia, Italy and the United States of America, totaled 39.2 million mobilized and a death total of 4,585,000. Nations reporting over death tolls of over one million included
Martin Gilbert, “on average . . . more than 5,600 soldiers [were] killed on each day of the war. The fact that 20,000 British soldiers were killed on the first day of the Battle of the Somme is often recalled with horror. On average, a similar number of soldiers were killed in every four-day period of the First World War.”\(^{46}\) Beyond the destruction of the battlefields, statistics are also high considering that “in the case of Serbia, more civilians died (82,000) than the soldiers (45,000) . . . . In the United States army, more soldiers died of influenza (62,000) than were killed in battle (48,000). The number of Armenians massacred between 1914 and 1919 was more than one million. The number of German civilians dying as a result of the Allied blockade has been estimated at more than three quarters of a million.”\(^{47}\) Not only had the war cost the states involved countless of lives, but the four year conflict extended into the very state itself to the point that the Europe of 1914 had been rendered nearly unrecognizable by 1918 as across the Continent the monarchies that had ruled for countless centuries lay in ruins.\(^{48}\) Even so, for those who had survived the onslaught of the last four years, peace was soon to prove nearly as equally troubling as the war as calls for self-determination, labor strikes, and revolutions all came

---


\(^{47}\) Ibid., 540-541.

\(^{48}\) As Carter notes, “within Germany, the kings of Bavaria and Württemberg had been deposed; the ruling grand dukes of Coburg, Hesse and Mecklenburg-Strelitz had all abdicated, and the latter had then shot himself. Emperor Karl of Austria-Hungary, who had inherited after the death of his great-uncle Franz Joseph in 1916, had abdicated on Armistice Day. Ferdinand, self-styled “tsar” of Bulgaria, who had cast his lot in with Germany at the height of its successes, also went that month. George’s cousin “Tino,” King of Greece, had abdicated in 1917 in favour of his younger son, who would be little more than a puppet and would die of infection from monkey bites in 1920. In Turkey, Sultan Mehmed V had died in May; his brother and successor, Mehmed IV, would be disposed in 1922.

“As the Armistice Day crowds came to Buckingham Palace to cheer, George [V] was the only emperor still standing on his balcony (414).”
synonymous to the advent of a worldwide Bolshevik takeover, of which the Spartacus Groups was at the spearhead.

Despite Liebknecht’s willingness to work with both the SPD and the USPD on the evening of the 9th, his view of an international socialist revolution had not been placated by the creation of a new Socialist government. To him and other members of the Spartacus League the German Revolution was the only way in which to “ensure that the spark of revolution would leap from Russia, through Germany, to the countries of the Entente, and with the aid of the world revolution thereby set in motion the process of humanity’s progress.”49 Although the party had yet to formally break away from the USPD there were still visible signs that a break was going to eventually occur particularly regarding the concept of a Constituent Assembly of which “the only ideologically coherent opposition to the programme . . . came from the Spartacists;” a position Luxemburg explained in a article published in *Die Rote Fahne* on 20 November, writing

> The choice today is not between democracy and dictatorship. The question which history has placed on the agenda is: *bourgeois* democracy or *socialist* democracy. For the dictatorship of the proletariat is democracy in the socialist sense of the term. The dictatorship of the proletariat does not mean bombs, putsches, riots or ‘anarchy’, as the agents of capitalism claim. It means using every means of political power to construct socialism, to expropriate the capitalist class, in agreement with and by the will of the revolutionary majority of the proletariat, in the spirit of socialist democracy. Without the conscious will and the conscious activity of the majority of the proletariat, there can be no socialism. A class organisation is needed to sharpen this consciousness, to organise this activity: the parliament of the proletarians of town and country.50

By December, circumstances continued to push the Spartacus to formally declare themselves a fully independent group from the USPD. On the 6th, in “an action called *Rotes Herz*, an armed rising of right-wing groups” shot “eighteen people at a properly announced and unarmed

---

49 Trotnow, 188.
50 Broué, 166.
With violence against the left becoming more pronounced, Luxemburg declared on 14 December 1918 that

In all bourgeois revolutions bloodshed, terrorism, and political murder have always been weapons in the hands of the rising classes, but the proletarian revolution needs no terrorism to attain its ends, and its supporters abominate murder. It need none of these weapons because if fights against institutions, not against individuals. Because it does not enter the struggle with naïve illusions, it needs no bloody terror to avenge its disappointments. The proletarian revolution is not the desperate attempt of a minority to shape the world by violence according to its own ideals. It is the action of the overwhelming majority of the working people called upon to fulfil a historic mission and to make historical necessity into a historical reality.

In an attempt to pull the branches of the SPD together, an All-German Congress of Workers’ and Soldiers’ Councils convened in Berlin between 16–21 December 1919 and on the 19th, the council decided that public elections for the National Assembly would take place in four weeks, on 19 January 1919 rather than 16 February, as the USPD executive had originally decided. Moving up the election date placed the USPD at an obvious disadvantage, as its organization was much weaker than the MSPD and hence required more time to prepare for the elections. The representatives of the Revolutionary Shop Stewards, therefore, publicly protested this “course of action which is dangerous for the party” and demanded the calling of a party conference on 21 December to discuss whether the USPD representatives should remain in the Council of People’s Commissars.

As long as general power remained with Ebert’s government, clashes between revolutionists and government supporters would continue. In an effort to protect the provisional government, on 20 December 1918, Major Kurt von Schleicher suggested that returning veterans should be recruited
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51 Trotnow, 191.
52 Carl E. Shorske, 324 – Typo in the original.
53 Trotnow, 191.
into armed forces to defend the city from striking workers.\footnote{Waldman, 124.} Von Schleicher’s early call for the Freikorps (Free Corps) demonstrated the new government’s willingness to rely on militant forces to maintain peace and for the time keep Bolshevism at bay.\footnote{According to Otis C. Mitchell, “Freikorps units were until recent paramilitary arrivals on the scene. They formed at the end of the war when armistice and treaty negotiations were forcing men out of the military. They were assigned the task of defending German territory in the east against Poland. These fierce fighters, most of whom would have liked to see World War I continue, believed that the more they controlled militarily the more Germany would receive in a peace settlement. The new German government believed the same thing, but the authorities in Berlin could not rely on regular army units to carry out the tasks necessary to achieve such a goal. . . . Free Corps were usually led by men who had been wartime junior officers or noncommissioned officers. These Freikorps never employed regular army restraint. They were brutal fighters with brutal instincts. One indication of just how badly the times were . . . was seen in the socialist government in Berlin being forced, as in Munich, to call in regular army troops reinforce with Freikorps to suppress rebellions. This practice led to a split on the Left between moderate and more radical socialists (Hitler’s Stormtroopers and the Attack on the German Republic, 1919-1933. Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers; 2008, 17-18).”} While attempting to put down an uprising on 24 December after “sailors of the People’s Naval Division seized Otto Wels, the town commandant and MSPD member, when he refused to pay the wages they were owed,” a violent clash erupted between the sailors and government troops that resulted in the deaths “of sixty-eight people.”\footnote{Trotnow, 191.}

Since the vast majority of the German civilian population had been far removed from the trenches and frontlines, the sudden onslaught of street clashes between supporters of Bolshevik socialism and the Freikorps units was disconcerting. Haffner later recalled that “during the whole of the war I had not heard a single shot. Yet now, when it [the war] was over, they began shooting in Berlin.”\footnote{Haffner, 24.} With fighting still erupting throughout Berlin and in the wake of the upcoming Paris Peace Conference, the Spartacus League seized the opportunity once more to sway public opinion by publishing an appeal at Christmas that was aimed directly at “the Workers of All Countries,” in which they continued to encourage a general uprising arguing,
“what is being prepared by the ruling classes as peace and justice is only a new work of brutal force form which the hydra of oppression, hatred, and fresh, bloody wars raises its thousand heads. Socialism alone is in a position to complete the great work of permanent peace, to heal the thousand wounds from which humanity is bleeding.”58 As the relationship between the SPD and USPD was further strained throughout the final weeks of December 1918, “Liebknecht and the other Spartacist leaders sought to profit from the division . . . by calling a Reich conference in Berlin on 27 December.”59 Refusing to commit to Ebert’s leadership and keen to address the question of revolution, Lutz notes that at the meeting “the delegates … proceeded to draw up a party program and to formulate twenty-four military, political, social, and economic reforms,” with the party preamble declaring

The sanguinary hallucination of the world empire of Prussian militarism, vanished on the battlefields of France, and the band of criminals who had started the world war, plunged Germany into a sea of blood, and deceived her for four years, were decisively defeated. Society was thus placed before the alternative either of continuing the capitalistic system with new wars, chaos, and anarchy, or of establishing complete socialism as the only salvation of humanity.60

By the 30th, the 127 delegates who had attended the conference decided to sever ties with the SPD and formally established themselves as the Communist Party of Germany (KPD – Kommunistische Partei Deutschlands), “with the suffix Spartakusbund.”61 Despite the willingness to organize, there were differing opinions that including the more radical

58 Revolutionary Radicalism, 385- 387.
59 Trotnow, 192.
60 Lutz, The German Revolution, 1918-1919, 91.
61 Trotnow, 192 – Although Trotnow writes that there were about 100 delegates who attended the meeting on the 20th, Conan Fischer notes that there were 127 of whom “the majority . . . were from the Spartacus, with 29 delegates from the Bremen radicals (by then reconstituted as the International Communists of German (IKD) making up the largest minority grouping (The German Communists and the Rise of Nazism. New York, New York: St. Martin’s Press; 1991, 4).”
revolutionary opinions of Liebknecht and Luxemburg, to which Conan Fischer notes

“Luxemburg believed unflinchingly in the principle of a democratic mass revolution and remained bitterly opposed to the élitist revolutionary strategy developed and applied by the Russian Bolsheviks,” while “the more sanguine Liebknecht asked of the delegates: ‘Was our parliamentary activity, even in the Reichstag, completely worthless’?”62 To the members of the SPD’s Executive Committee the formal split of the radical left into a communist organization that was still adamant on starting a revolution was particularly worrisome.63 For the citizens of Germany, in the weeks that followed the armistice were nearly as harrowing as the war itself as cities across the nation erupted in sudden pockets of violent revolution that not only further divided the state, but ultimately gave rise to a full-fledged communist party. On Tuesday, 31 December, Count Harry Kessler, a diplomat, encapsulated the mood in Germany when he wrote in his diary that “the last day of this dreadful year 1918 is likely to remain the most frightful date in German history.”64 Unfortunately though for Kessler and the rest of the German population, the opening weeks of 1919 would bring about an open rebellion that would further threaten the fragile Republic.

63 According to Waldman, there was a “great antagonism existing between the “government” socialists and their opposition on the left. The attitude of the SPD leadership toward the left wing radicals was expressed in a candid article in *Vorwärts*:

“The despicable actions of Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg soil the revolution and endanger all of its achievements. The masses must not sit by quietly for one minute longer while these brutal beasts and their followers paralyze the activities of the republican governmental offices, incite the people more and more to a civil war, and strangle with their dirty fists the right of free expression.

“They want to demolish and destroy with lies, slander, and violence everything which dares oppose them. They pose with boundless insolence as the masters of Berlin, in spite of the fact that at least nine-tenths of the population hate and despite their actions from the bottom of their souls (161).”

When the armistice ending the Great War went into effect on 11 November 1918, the world was immediately thrown into a vast array of uncertainties. After four years of war, mass hysteria produced during the conflict and aimed again enemies of the state was redirected in an effort to maintain public loyalty in Germany and the United States. Although the war interrupted the pre-war debate between capital and labor, the economic strain of the war and the sudden influx of returning veterans reignited old flames. Instead of peace, 1919 was tainted by uprisings and assassinations, labor strikes and domestic terrorism which engulfed nations on both sides of the Atlantic. Throughout the Great War, human conscience and compassion were constantly assaulted by state-mandated depictions of the notion that the “enemy was within.” Defined by ethnic and political concepts, the war mentality of “us versus them” suddenly became “protect the state from foreign influence and corruption” in the wake of the armistice. While 1919 should have served as a moment for the world to collect itself after the devastation of the Great War, what history instead reveals is that it would be impossible for any state to retain its former 1914 opinions regarding foreign and domestic policies. In the weeks following the armistice, Germany’s revolution and subsequent Spartacist Uprising increased fears that Bolshevism could potentially become an international event that would further erode the stability of the Old World empires. As borders were redrawn and governments were toppled, nativism became the driving force behind new state policies aimed at keeping radicalism at bay.

Tensions in Germany, especially among the fractured socialist parties, were further exacerbated by “the decision of the majority socialist Prime Minister of Prussia, Paul Hirsch, to replace the left Independent head of the Berlin police presidium, Emil Eichhorn,”65 with “Eugen

65 Calkins, 187.
Ernst, of the MSPD” on 3 January 1919. Although Eichhorn had held the post since 9 November 1918, “this move” by the majority “was certainly both technically completely legal and politically fully understandable, for Eichhorn clearly did not represent a reliable source of support for the Cabinet.”

Unlike the USPD members who relinquished their positions after the third party split, his sympathies with the socialist minority to the calls for a socialist revolution, Eichhorn refusal to relinquish his office, however, inadvertently became “the signal for the first uprising of the German communist.” Despite reservations that Germany was not yet ready for a revolution, when the Revolutionary Shop Stewards called for a protest on Sunday, 5 January 1919, Liebknecht “representing [without authority] the KPD” along with Paul Scholze “representing the shop stewards” and Georg Ledebour “representing the left-wing of the USPD,” issued a “joint proclamation” on the 5th that supported the general strike. In an act of solidarity, workers across Berlin, heeding the call from Liebknecht, Scholze and Ledebour, quickly took to the streets to demonstrate on behalf of Eichhorn. As Waldman notes they “formed into marching columns” and motivated “by fiery speeches from Liebknecht and other leaders,” they eventually “moved into police headquarters at Alexanderplatz to bring their ovations to Eichhorn.” With the massive support for the revolution, Waldman points out that “later in the evening, about seventy Revolutionary Shop Stewards, the Central Committee of the Berlin USPD, and Liebknecht and Pieck from the Central Committee of the KPD gathered in police headquarters to resume their discussion on further action.”
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66 Trotnow, 196.
67 Calkins, 187.
68 Lutz, The German Revolution, 1918-1919, 94.
69 Trotnow, 197.
70 For a copy of the proclamation, please refer to Appendix O.
71 Waldman, 171-172.
72 Ibid., 172.
Revolutionary Committee contemplated the next steps, that night, the masses successfully overran the *Vorwaerts* as well as “the Brandenburg Gate, the government printing offices, the provision office, several barracks, and railway stations. . . . Liebknecht, [Georg] Ledebour, and Scholze formed a provisional communist government and sent a detachment of Spartacans to occupy the Ministry of War.”\(^7^3\) The following morning, revolutionary leaders further encouraged the masses to demonstrate through a public notice printed in the recently reclaimed *Vorwaerts* morning edition that “demand[ed]: the disarming of all counter revolutionists; the arming of the proletariat; the formation of a red army; the union of all revolutionary troops with the workers for joint action; the seizure of power by the councils; and finally the overthrow of the traitors: Ebert and Scheidemann. In conclusion this Spartacan manifesto announced: “You have now reconquered the *Vorwaerts*. Hold it and fight for it with tooth and nail. Do not let it be snatched from you. Make it the paper which it should be: a pioneer on the road to freedom. Finally show your bravery in further battles and victories.”\(^7^4\) Though the laypeople had successfully demonstrated their willingness to support the revolution not just with the takeover on the 5\(^{th}\), but by turning up in mass on the 6\(^{th}\), it soon became evident that the leaders who urged them on the day before were now having some difficulty deciding how exactly the uprising should proceed.

Particularly problematic notes Waldman was the fact that “the attitude of the Communists toward the uprising was not uniform. [And so] Their views toward an expansion of the mass protest demonstration on behalf of Eichhorn into a full-scale fight for the seizure of political power were divided as follows:

\(^{7^3}\) Lutz, *The German Revolution, 1918-1919*, 95.
\(^{7^4}\) Ibid., 94-95.
(1) Liebknecht and Wilhelm Pieck, the two Central Committee members who participated in the January 5 meeting of the functionaries of the Revolutionary Show Steward and of the Berlin USPD, strongly endorsed the uprising. (2) Luxemburg, Leo Jogiches, and the rest of the Central Committee of the KPD were opposed but believed that, regardless of their views, the new KPD had the moral obligation to support the revolutionary workers in their life and death struggle. (3) Karl Radek was strictly opposed to the uprising and urgently advocated discontinuing the hopeless fight before the revolutionary organizations suffered severe defeats which would affect their work for a long time to come.75

This lack of unity ultimately brought the revolution to a near standstill on the 6th as the masses gathered and waited the entire day without any further instructions from the members of the Revolutionary Committee who were meeting behind closed doors in an attempt to agree upon a policy concerning the direction of the uprising. Their silence, however, not only influenced the momentum of the revolution, but the failure of the leadership to union indicated that there were significant problems with the movement itself. Since “Liebknecht and Pieck, in siding with the advocates of the uprising, had acted without the knowledge and approval of the Central Committee of the KPD. Liebknecht was severely criticized by Rosa Luxemburg for his unilateral action,”76 which is evident “in an article pointedly entitled “Neglected Duties,” Luxemburg reprimanded her colleagues writing, “Don’t talk! Don’t consult! Don’t negotiate! Act! . . . . Germany has been the classic country of organization, even of organizational fanaticism, of organizational arrogance . . . . And what are we witnessing today? In the most significant moments of the revolution this renowned ‘organizational talent’ is the first to fail in the most deplorable way.”77 Taking advantage of the momentary pause in the uprising was

75 Waldman, 185-186.
76 Ibid., 186.
77 Ettinger, 243 – According to Frölich, Liebknecht “and Pieck acted on their own initiative in voting for the action, and they did so without the knowledge of their party, whose leadership was vigorously opposed to staking the whole existence of the revolution in such a way. Rosa Luxemburg overwhelmed Liebknecht with reproaches for his arbitrary action, pointing out with indignation
Ebert, who had already entered into negotiations with the military and granted permission to Gustav Noske to begin recruiting volunteer units on behalf of the government and put down the rebellion. In regards to this new arrangement, *The New York Times Current History* reported that Ebert justified his decision stating that “the Government was determined to maintain security, freedom and right, and would stand or fall by the National Assembly, which was the way to freedom and a happy future for Germany,” while Scheidemann added “you know what the stake is. If these machinations are continued our women and children will be abandoned to worse famine than during the four years of the war. If you men who have had military training will join us, you will get arms. We want you for defense, but we will not be defeated by these people. Be true and hold out. Promise that and we shall do our duty.”

At the time the military was called upon to defend Berlin, there were already “reports from other parts of Germany [which] indicated efforts to produce a condition of civil war. Strikes and demonstrations in sympathy with Liebknecht took place in Dresden, Düsseldorf, Eisen, Dortmund, Brunswick, and Munich.” According to an article in *Current History*, on 8 January “Noske gradually drew into the city the skeleton regiments of the old Imperial Army, which were stationed at Potsdam and neighboring camps” and explained the necessity of the military to the general public of Berlin that

—and astonishment that he had thrown all the tactical principles of the Spartakus Programme overboard (321-322).”


79 Ibid. – Apparently, in regards to Munch, when “a mob of several thousand attempted to storm one of the largest banks. Premier Eisner threatened to make war on the Berlin Government unless order was restored.”
Spartacus fights now to secure control of the State. The Government, which will bring about within ten days the free decision of the people concerning their own fate, is to be overthrown by force. The people shall not be allowed to speak. Their voices shall be suppressed. You have seen the results. Where Spartacus rules, all personal security and freedom are abolished. * * * The Government is, therefore, taking the necessary measures to end the reign of terror and prevent its recurrence once and for all.  

Ebert’s decision, however, to call upon the military to end the uprising in Berlin was problematic and as Otis C. Mitchell explains, the “unintended outcome of this bargain was the creation of an essentially unreformed, unrepublican army. . . . and hard on the heels of the army came the far less disciplined and more violent Free Corps.” Now backed by both army and Freikorps units, members of the Reich Government including Ebert, Scheidemann, Landsberg, Gustav Noske, and Rudolf Wissel published an offensive against the Spartacists on 8 January stating

Fellow-Citizens! Spartakus is now fighting for complete power. . . . Where Spartakus rules, all personal freedom and security is suspended. The newspapers are suppressed; traffic is paralyzed. Sections of Berlin are scenes of bloody fighting. Others are already without water and light. Food depots are stormed. The food supply for the soldiers and civilian population is interrupted.

The government is taking all measures necessary to destroy this rule of terror and to prevent its recurrence once and for all. Decisive action will be forthcoming soon. . . . Be confident, as we are, and resolutely take your place with those who will bring you freedom and order! Force can be fought only with force. The organized power of the people will end oppression and anarchy. Individual successes of the enemies of freedom, which are magnified by them in a ridiculous fashion, are of only temporary significance.

The hour of reckoning is near!  

81 Mitchell, 17-18.
82 Waldman, 182 – Italics are part of the original.
With the aid of the military, buildings and offices occupied by Spartacists forces as well as “the Government Printing office, the Main Railroad Office and a railroad station, and most of the newspaper printing plants,” were all quickly reclaimed over the next two days. By the 11th, the Vorwaerts building was recaptured by forces loyal to the state, followed by “the police headquarters, the last of the strongholds of the insurgents, [which] fell during the night of January 11-12.” Clearly the revolution was at a near loss and with the advancement of military forces “both regular troops and free corps volunteers [violently] attacked the strongholds of the Communists.” Although the arrival of the Freikorps granted the state the ability to quickly restore order the price came at an enormous loss.

Conditions during the uprising had deteriorated so quickly that “a Munich dispatch of January 11 announced the arrival there of many wealthy Berliners in hasty flight from the Spartacus terror. Premier [Kurt] Eisner telegraphed to the Berlin Government an appeal for peace,” which read “with growing terror we follow the murderous civil war. It must end, unless all Germany is slowly to perish. Berlin’s example is having a demoralizing effect everywhere, and is producing an epidemic of insanity. The only means of salvation appears to be a Government sustained by the confidence of the general population, comprising all Socialist

83 Ibid.
84 Ibid., 183.
85 Dill, 259 – Of these assaults, Haase commented “you cannot imagine the conditions in Berlin. White terror rages exactly as it did under the tsarist regime. Even under the Anti-Socialist Law, at least an attempt was made to make it appear that the law was followed. At present, however, brutal force rules in the open. Disregarding any legal restrictions, soldiers – government troops – with loaded rifles break into apartments at night, make arrests without warrants, and search the apartments without court orders. In the apartment of Oskar Cohn [a leading member of the USPD] a house search was made the day before yesterday. He escaped being arrested only because he was out of town. His property was confiscated. Landsberg, Ebert, and Scheidemann, who try to pose as the guardians of the law, let the hordes of brutal soldiers (Soldateska) do as they like (Waldman, 193 – Footnote #60: Hugo Haase. Hugo Haase, sein Leben und Wirken. Published by Ernst Hasse. Berlin: E. Laubsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1929, 173-174; letter dated January 16, 1919, addressed to “Else”).”
parties and resolved to bring democracy and socialism to victory.”86 Once the police reclaimed police headquarters, “government troops seized without a struggle the Silesian railway station, the last important Spartacus stronghold in Greater Berlin,” and thereby brought the revolution to a close on the 13th.87 Though the number of those killed during the uprising is unknown, *The New York Times Current History* claims that “Berlin had been more shattered by explosions than London in four years of air raids.”88 Now that the city was in the hands of the Republic, the new Chief of Police, Richter, issued an order declaring invalid all the decrees of the Eichhorn régime. He also rearmed the police, who had been deprived of their weapons in the early days of the revolution. The police thereupon removed their red sleeve bands. Herr Richter said in an interview that the escaped leaders, such as Liebknecht and others, must be arrested at the earliest possible moment. He added: “We have in custody Georg Ledebour, Herr Meyer, and Dr. Liebknecht’s son, but not Rosa Luxemburg or Karl Radek. The Berlin Government announced is ability to protect the elections for the National Assembly, the decisive issue between the elements of order and those of chaos.89

After the collapse of the revolution, as some of the revolutionary “leaders disappeared. . . . A report circulated that Liebknecht and Luxemburg had gone to Holland. Liebknecht, however, wrote to the Rote Fahne: We have not fled, we are not defeated, we will remain here, and victory will be ours. For Spartacus is the personification of socialism and world revolution. The Golgotha way of the German revolution is not yet ended, but the day of salvation nears.”90 With the knowledge that two of the principle leaders of the uprising were still in Berlin proper, the government made every effort to capture both Liebknecht and Luxemburg, and even published

---

87 Ibid., 225.
88 Ibid.
89 Ibid.
an announcement in “The Volkswehr, [an] organ of the Berlin Volunteer Corps,” on 14 January stating

The fear has been expressed that the government would relax its persecution of the Spartacists. We have been assured by influential circles that the achievements made so far are not considered as satisfactory and that all energy will be used to proceed against the Spartacists and the leaders of the movement. The people of Berlin need not believe that the leaders, who for the time being have evaded arrest, will be able to enjoy life elsewhere. The next days will show that the situation has become critical for them.91

Liebknecht and Luxemburg, however, did not have days ahead of them. Shortly after the government publically avowed to locate them, on 15 January, both leaders were arrested and brutally murdered by members of the Free Corp units.92 On the 19th, The New York Times reported that in the wake of the assassinations of Liebknecht and Luxemburg

It would be idle to pretend that the overwhelming majority of the German people are grieved by the fate of the two foremost extremist leaders. On the contrary, satisfaction with the turn things have taken is almost general.

There was a possibility of the Government fearing that if Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg were treated as pernicious criminals an insignificant though very

---

91 Waldman, 194 – Footnote #62.
92 Trotnow, 197-198 – Both Liebknecht and Luxemburg were arrested after being discovered “in the house of the merchant Markussohn [or Marcussohn] by soldiers of the Wilmersdorf town militia and taken for identification to the Eden Hotel, the headquarters of the Gardekavellerie-Schützen division [Division of Calvary and Riflemen]. There they were interrogated by general staff officer Waldemar Pabst who later, according to his own testimony, worked out a plan with other officers to “liquidate” the two revolutionary politicians. However, contrary to the plan, Rosa Luxemburg was beaten nearly to death on leaving the hotel and shot soon thereafter [her body was later dumped into one of Berlin’s canals]. As far as Karl Liebknecht was concerned, everything ran largely according to plan: on the way to Moabit prison the vehicle carrying him stopped by a flat tire, at which time the already seriously injured Liebknecht was assassinated.”

According to Ettinger, “at a little after nine at night, the doorbell rang at the Marcussohn residence at Mannheimer Strasse No. 43” to arrest Liebknecht and Luxemburg without warrants (244-245).
troublesome part of the people would consider them martyrs for the case of the proletariat and that for that reason they might be spared perhaps to do more harm even than before. Their end, however cruel, will certainly do much for the restoration of peace and order.\textsuperscript{93}

Although the Weimar Republic deemed the deaths of Liebknecht and Luxemburg a victory over the Spartacist Uprising and therefore a triumph over Bolshevism itself, there was still immense instability throughout Germany and as Lutz points out “Munich, Düsseldorf, Duisburg, the Ruhr, Brunswick, Wilhelmshaven and Bremen [still] contained strong [Spartacist] groups. The international condition of Germany, moreover, rapidly altered the situation in their favor. The danger of national starvation was imminent, the industrial life had collapsed, wild strikes and widespread agitation created economic unrest, the National Assembly failed to bring order out of chaos. . . . Intellectuals, such as Hans Delbrück, openly threatened the Entente with Bolshevism. Lenin, who had planned to make Germany the first link in his chain of world revolution, had his agents in Berlin working with the Spartacans.”\textsuperscript{94} In light of Germany’s current situation, the Allies were starting to believe that the events in Central Europe were only the beginning to a larger worldwide communist takeover. As a result, on 21 January 1919, only four days after the Paris Peace Conference had formally opened, “The Council of Ten in Paris reported” that “Bolshevism was spreading. It had invaded the Baltic provinces and Poland, and that very morning they received very bad news regarding its spread to Budapest and Vienna. Italy, also, was in danger. The danger was probably greater there than in France. If Bolshevism, after spreading in Germany, were to traverse Austria and Hungary and so reach Italy, Europe would


be faced with a great danger. Therefore something must be done against Bolshevism.” 95  While the Allies convened in Paris for the Peace Talks, American and British envoys were scattered throughout Germany taking reports on the current economic and political state of the nation.

*The Paris Peace Talks, 1919*

Prior to the start of the conferences, newspapers in the United States had already informed the public of Europe’s dire food situation. Whereas, *The New Republic: A Journal of Opinion* reported the appointment of Herbert Hoover as “Director-General of the inter-Allied organization to feed the Allied, neutral and enemy peoples” on 11 January, the journal also explained to readers that

> Mr. Hoover understands better than any other living statesman the political consequences of mass starvation. He knows that any population threatened with famine will turn Bolshevik. There is a sense in which food won the war against autocracy, but in a truer sense food alone can with the war against Bolshevism. . . . the lifting of the blockage against Germany so far as concerns food, appears already agreed upon. We may expect very soon to hear that Mr. Hoover has succeeded in his efforts to set at work the three million tons of German shipping. The peace negotiations may drag on indefinitely, but in the meantime the peoples must be fed. 96

A week later *The New Republic* again informed the nation that “President Wilson’s message urging upon Congress the prompt appropriation of money for food relief to Europe, on the ground that only by good can the westward progress of Bolshevism be checked, may help to open the eyes of Americans to the real issues at stake in Europe. . . . not even the calmest observer would be willing to vouch for the continued stability of European institutions if

---

widespread famine is to be added to the other conditions making for disorder.”97 Similar sentiments regarding Germany’s potential to further unrest as a result of their economic conditions were also being sent to Britain and on 10 April, an Interim Report was sent to members of Britain’s War Cabinet by “an officer recently returned from Berlin on the result of an investigation into the influence and growth of Bolshevism in Germany,” revealing “conversation[s] with individual Germans, of whatever class and station, all go to confirm the opinion that the danger of Germany embracing Bolshevism is both real and imminent. . . . The poorer classes of Berlin are literally starving, and at present see no hope of improvement either in food or labour conditions, except such as are conveyed by Bolshevist propaganda, backed up by the distribution of forged notes.”98 For the Allies in Paris, not only were the Council of Four – President Wilson, George Clemenceau of France, Lloyd George, and Vittorio Orlando of Italy – attempting to rebuild Europe, but they were also responsible for settling reparation payments with the Central Powers. While conditions continued to worsen throughout Europe, however, the Allies were unable to reach an agreement in regards as to how aid should be distributed.

As Margaret MacMillan argues, while the Allies were willing to give food supplies, the issue became how those goods would be imported seeing that “the European Allies could not finance relief on the scale that was needed, and the defeated nations, except Germany, were bankrupt. That left the United States, but Congress and the American public were torn between an impulse to help and a sense that the United States had done enough in winning the war.”99 When it was suggested that Germany’s gold reserves could be used as a possible means of food

---


98 CAB/24/77 – Secret Document from an Officer returning from Berlin, forwarded to the War Cabinet by Winston S. Churchill. Dated 10 April 1919 and entitled “Bolshevism in Germany.”

payments, France blocked the idea, “determined those should go toward reparations, did not want to see them used up financing imports.” Only when Lloyd George “claimed” that Germany “was on the edge of a famine” did “the French reluctantly backed down. [And] by late March 1919, the first food shipments were arriving.” The threat of Bolshevism in Germany was further addressed in an 31 March, secret memorandum written by Lieutenant-General R. Haking, Britain’s chief military delegate at Spa and forwarded to the Cabinet by Winston Churchill and entitled “The Defeat of Bolshevism,” in which Haking gave twelve key points to the state of European affairs writing that “it is quite apparent that Germany is at present engaged in a great struggle against Bolshevism, the Bolshevist boiler is being heated up daily, it has no safety valve, and unless something is done immediately to relieve the pressure it will soon burst, and will destroy any Government in Germany which can have the power of carrying out terms of peace or of maintaining order within its borders.” Germany, however, was not the only nation that was threatened by the Bolsheviks. According to an article on 11 May 1919, The New York Times reported that in the aftermath of the armistice, there were “Sixteen Wars Now Raging” in Europe, of which “the Bolshevik are fighting nine” against the Allies in Russia, Russian Loyalists, Ukrainians, Germans, Poles, Rumanians, Letts, Finns, and Lithuanians. Taking into account Europe’s food crisis and continual wars, the aftermath of the Great War fostered a dire situation and the inability of the Allies to quickly agree to terms of peace with their former military rivals, created the perfect opportunity for Bolshevism to quickly filter throughout the continent. In England, the threat of strikes in the aftermath of the Great War resulted in the

100 Ibid., 60.
101 Ibid., 160.
creation of “an Industrial Unrest Committee” on 4 February 1919 in order “to make the
necessary arrangements for dealing with any situation that might arise from industrial unrest both
at the present moment and in the future.”

Even so, conditions in England soon deteriorated to the point that on 10 February, Lloyd George had returned to London where “he managed to head off the threatened strikes.”

On the 19th, newspapers reported on the near assassination of Clemenceau by Eugène Cottin, “a half-mad anarchist.” Shortly after Lloyd George’s returned to Paris in early March, Sir Robert Laird Borden, Prime Minister of Canada, made a note in his diary on the 6th expressing his desire to “see him in order to discuss my return to Canada, my well-beloved country. Riots of a serious nature were reported to have broken out among the Canadian troops. It was reported to me that disturbances had lasted two days and that twelve had been killed and twenty-one wounded.”

By this point, fears regarding a Bolshevist revolution

---


105 MacMillan, 151.

106 Ibid., 150 – MacMillan writes that Clemenceau was shot as he “was leaving his house in the Rue Franklin to drive to a meeting with House and [Arthur] Balfour at the Crillon, [when] a man in work clothes who had been lurking behind one of the public urinals jumped out and fired several shots at the car. . . . One bullet hit him between the ribs, just missing vital organs. (It was too dangerous to remove and he carried it for the rest of his life.) Clemenceau’s assailant . . . was seized by the crowd, which was waiting as usual to see the prime minister’s comings and goings, and nearly lynched.” While Clemenceau “refused to allow Cottin to be condemned to death: “I can’t see an old republican like me and also an opponent of the death penalty having a man executed for the crime of lèse-majesté.” Cottin got a ten-year prison sentence but was released half-way through, much to Clemenceau’s annoyance, after the left took up his cause (151).”

107 Robert Laird Borden: *His Memoirs*. Henry Borden, Ed. Toronto, Canada: The MacMillan Company of Canada Limited; 1938, 919 – According to Robert Laird Borden, “in Canada, as elsewhere, the conditions of business and employment were abnormal. Equally abnormal was the state of mind of the people in general, or at least of the great majority of them. There was a distinctive lack of the usual balance; the agitator, sometimes sincere, sometimes merely malevolent, self-seeking and designing, found quick response to insidious propaganda. In some cities there was [a] deliberate attempt to overthrow the Government and to supersede it by crude, fantastic methods founded upon absurd conceptions of what had been accomplished in Russia. It became necessary in some communities to repress revolutionary methods with a stern hand and from this I did not shrink (972).”
were further strained when the First Communist International or Comintern was announced in Moscow on 2 March after it became evident that

in Europe the world revolution was being sabotaged by the Social Democratic leaders. The revolutionary workers were in confusion, being continually misled and deceived by the men who stood at the head of their outworn organisations. Lenin proposed the immediate formation of a new revolutionary International with a Marxist programme of its own which would make a decisive break with the Second International. . . . The Congress was fixed to take place on February 15, but had to be postponed to March. Passports were refused, delegates were arrested, some lost their lives, and in the circumstances of the blockade very few were able to enter Russia.108

Nearly a month later, Walter Kendall notes that “in April 1919, Munich declared itself capital of a Soviet Bavaria, only to be suppressed the next month,” while “the end of the war [brought], the dismemberment of the old Austro-Hungarian Empire . . . brought a similar crisis in Hungary,” when “the old regime collapsed in October 1918, and was replaced by a progressive coalition under Count [Mihaly] Karolyi [von Nagykaroly]. The Karolyi government gave way in March 1919 to the Communist regime of Béla Kun. The Hungarian Soviet Republic survived until August 1919, when it was overwhelmed by outside military intervention. [And] In June 1919, whilst the Soviets still ruled in Budapest, an unsuccessful rising took place in Vienna.”109 Although the Bolsheviks continued to openly attack capitalism whenever possible, their attempts at a full government overthrow remained short-lived in any area that was outside that of the Soviet Union. Still, the possibility that Bolshevism could eventually take hold somewhere in the industrialized world appeared probable for any state that was facing post-war labor strikes, bids for self-determination, or immigration.

108 James, 110-111.
The Palmer Raids, 1919-1920

While Chanie Rosenberg points out that “during those early months of 1919 in Britain, as in Russia, Germany, Hungary and so many other countries, the revolutionary urge to smash capitalism overrode and drew in its wake the myriad economic demands of the workers,” civil unrest quickly filtered out of Europe and economic distress and misgivings of Bolshevism eventually found a way to terrorize the United States. According to Paul Sann, when the soldiers started to arrive in the United States, they did [not] march back into the short day and high pay he was enjoying when Uncle Sam tapped him to go make the world safe for democracy. Oh, no. The prosperity of 1914-1918 dried up as fast as the signatures on the Armistice. There would be two years of depression and more than five million unemployed before the economy could adjust itself to peace. The Hun quit too soon; our factories were over expanded, our shelves glutted, our foreign markets devastated by the years of havoc and destruction, our price structure shot.

The wartime honeymoon between labor and capital blew up in fearful strife.

For the United States, the first major labor demonstration that aroused suspicions that a Bolshevik revolution was possible came when 35,000 shipyard workers in Seattle, Washington walked off their jobs on 21 January 1919, demanding better wages. Speculation that the strike was somehow backed by the Bolsheviks was fanned by members of the media who by 4 February printed a full page editorial that read: “STOP BEFORE IT’S TOO LATE. This is plain talk to the common-sense union men of Seattle. You are being rushed pell-mell into a general strike. You are being urged to use a dangerous weapon – the general strike, which you have never used before – which, in fact, has never been used anywhere in the United States. It is [not]

110 Rosenberg, 40.
too late to avert the tragic results that are sure to come from its use.”

Perhaps the most blatant stand against Bolshevism comes in the last paragraph of the paper which reminds the strikers that “Confined to Seattle or even confined to the whole Pacific coast, the use of force by Bolsheviks would be, [sic]d should be, quickly dealt with by the army of the United States. These false Bolshevik leaders haven’t a chance on earth to win anything for you in this country, because this country is America – not Russia.” On the 5th, The Seattle Star boasted the headline, “UNDER WHICH FLAG?” and readers were informed that

The general strike is at hand. And more, a general SHOWDOWN is at hand – a showdown for all of us – a test of Americanism – a test of YOUR Americanism. As The Star stated yesterday, this is no time to mince words. A part of our community in fact, defying our government, and is, contemplating changing that government, and not by American methods. This small part of our city talks plainly of “taking over things,” of “resuming under our management.”

We call this thing that is up us a general strike, but more than that. It is to be an acid test of American citizenship – an acid test of all those principles for which our soldiers have fought and died. It is to determine whether this is a country worth living in and a country worth dying for. The challenge is right up to you men and women of Seattle.

Under which flag do you stand?^114

Despite the warnings, on 6 February, the striking shipyard workers were joined by nearly 60,000 other sympathetic union employees. Anticipating the worse, Seattle “business men took out riot insurance on their warehouses and purchased guns. . . . the people of the city laid in supplies

^112 The Seattle Star. Page One. “Stop Before It’s Too Late.” Tuesday, 4 February 1919 – Italics and bold print are part of the original.

^113 Ibid – Italics and bold print are part of the original.

^114 The Seattle Star. Page One. “Under Which Flag?” Wednesday, 5 February 1919 – Italics and bold print are part of the original.

for the long siege,” however, the general strike began without incident. In fact, regarding the lack of hostilities, even “Major General J. D. Leitch, whose troops of the Thirteenth Division were on their way to suppress the expected disorder, publicly acknowledged that he was impressed. So, too, was the Seattle chief of police.” Although civility was maintained by the strikers fears were still manifested by the city officials resulting in the arrival of “federal troops . . . after the first day of the strike [and] ordered special police to patrol the streets” by Mayor Ole Hanson who also, in spite of any “disorder . . . issued a proclamation on the second day of the strike that gave a completely opposite impression:

I hereby guarantee to all the people of Seattle absolute and complete protection. They should go about their daily work and business in perfect security. We have 1,5000 policemen, 1,500 regular soldiers from Camp Lewis, and can and will secure, if necessary, every soldier in the Northwest to protect life, business and property.

The time has come for the people of Seattle to show their Americanism. Go about your daily duties without fear. We will see to it that you have food, transportation, water, light, gas and all necessities. The anarchists in this community shall not rule its affairs.

All persons violating the laws will be dealt with summarily.

Regardless of the fact that the general strike was resolved peacefully on 11 February and a federal agent, from the Bureau of Investigation, commented that “the strike as far as union labor

116 *The Seattle General Strike: An Account of What Happened in Seattle and especially in the Seattle Labor Movement, during the General Strikes, February 6 to 11, 1919*. Issued by the History Committee of the General Strike Committee. Seattle, Washington: The Seattle Union Record Publishing Co., Inc.; 1919, 3 – “Those workers, of whom there were probably few, who thought “the social revolution” was ready to start in Seattle, were also doomed to disappointment.

“Probably hardly any of the so-called leaders,” accused by the press of trying to start Bolshevism in America, believed that the revolution was at hand (61).”


118 Ibid., 73.
is concerned is lost and amounted to nothing, simply inconveniencing people for two or three days,” the damage to the public psyche was already done.\textsuperscript{119} The actions of Mayor Hanson and the assumptions of the press granted the federal government the opportunity to make a move against ridding the country of anything and anyone that constituted radicalism.\textsuperscript{120}

With the passage of wartime legislation – the Espionage Act, 1917; Selective Service Act, 1917; Sedition Act, 1918; and the Immigration Act of 1918 – the federal government had already “strengthen[ed] the nation’s internal security” and thereby granted the Bureau of Investigation the right to “secure the convictions of over 2,000 individuals – but none involved

\textsuperscript{119} Regin Schmidt. \textit{Red Scare: FBI and the Origins of Anticommunism in the United States, 1919-1943}. Copenhagen, Denmark: Museum Tusculanum Press, University of Copenhagen; 2000, 134 – Once the strike ended writes Schmidt, “the Bureau swung into action. . . . [as] Special Agents Robert P. Collins and Walter H. Thayer, assisted by police officer A. H. Petri, raided the IWW Propaganda Committee and confiscated two large boxes of IWW literature together with the organization’s letters, minute books and other records and brought the acting secretary, James J. Exstel, in for questioning. On the following day, the two federal agents accompanied by members of the Sheriff’s office raided the IWW Defense Committee on Pacific Block and took into custody 26 IWW members. Aliens were turned over to the immigration authorities with a view toward initiating deportation proceedings while American citizens were turned over to the local authorities for prosecution under the Washington criminal anarchy law. Thus, the Bureau broke up the activities of the IWW and sent a warning to radicals and union leaders alike.”

Foner also points out that “regardless of what the General Strike Committee may have done, the newspapers would have insisted on calling the general strike a “Bolshevik plot.” The \textit{Literary Digest} found that “all over the country, papers congratulated the nation on what they considered the complete collapse of our first general strike, a complete victory in our first open grapple with Bolshevism in America (\textit{History of the Labor Movement in the United States, Volume 8: Postwar Struggles, 1918-1920}, 77).”

\textsuperscript{120} According to Foner, “no matter that the New York \textit{Tribune’s} correspondent in Seattle reported that the city was calm and that “there was absolutely no violence.” “The whole thing,” declared the \textit{Outlook}, “had been planned by the IWW and Bolshevist elements as the beginning of a revolution. The Seattle hold-up was to extend to the entire state and then to other states, until it had spread over the entire country. The government was to be conducted by the Workmen’s and Soldiers’ Delegates, as in Russia.”

“The general level of reporting by the press was expressed by the Cincinnati \textit{Times-Star}, which called the general strike “a revolution, a deliberate attempt by agitators, many of them foreigners, to start a disturbance on the Pacific Coast, which they hoped would spread and eventually result in the overthrow of the Government at Washington” (\textit{History of the Labor Movement in the United States, Volume 8: Postwar Struggles, 1918-1920}, 73).”
espionage or sabotage by German operatives or their American sympathizers. Instead, Bureau investigations focused on members of labor unions, members of the Socialist Party, and pro-German and pro-Irish activists (the latter because of the Irish rebellion of 1916 to obtain independence from Great Britain). Since the war federal law had already revealed the policy of the United States toward radicalism and so when the shipyard workers first walked off their jobs on 21 January, the government did not hesitate to expand its powers of authority in another effort to protect the state. Before Seattle’s general strike was announced, on 5 February 1919, *The New York Times*, informed its readers that on the previous day

the sub-committee of the Senate Committee on Judiciary, which, under the chairmanship of Senator [Lee] Overman of North Carolina, has been investigating German propaganda in this country, was instructed by unanimous vote of the Senate this afternoon immediately to being an investigation of Bolshevism and all other forms of anti-American radicalism in the United States. The resolution was offered by Senator [Thomas J.] Walsh of Montana and covers every phase of the radical propaganda which is now being preached in various parts of the country.

---

121 *The FBI: A Comprehensive Reference Guide*, 7 – While the Selective Service Act “require[ed] men aged 21 to 30 to register to be drafted for military service), the Immigration Act of 1918 “require[ed] the deportation of alien residents who were members of organizations promoting anarchy or violent revolution.”

122 *The New York Times*. “Senate Orders Reds Here Investigated. Directs Overman Committee to Turn the Light on American Bolshevism.” Washington, 5 February 1919 – According to Schmidt, “in September 1918 the Senate Committee on the Judiciary had appointed a subcommittee headed by Senator Lee Slater Overman . . . to investigate charges made by, among others, A. Mitchell Palmer, then alien property custodian and Attorney General from March 1919, against the United States Brewers’ Association and the liquor industry for harboring pro-German sentiments and for attempting to influence politicians and the public opinion by bribes and by controlling the press. The Overman Committee interpreted its mandate broadly and launched a wide probe into both the activities of the brewing and liquor interests and “pro-German propaganda and activities” in general, thereby initiating, for the first time in US history, a congressional investigation of political activities and opinions.

“It has generally been assumed that when the Senate in February 1919 extended and broadened the committee’s mandate to include the investigation into Bolshevik propaganda in the US, the senators responded to and reflected the growing anti-radical opinion in America, heightened by the imminent Seattle general strike. There are, however, several indications that agencies and individuals connected with the federal government played an important role in channeling the anti-German hatred, whipped up by the government during the war to gain popular support for the
While the newspapers sustained the federal government’s position that Bolshevism was indeed on the move in the United States, many civilians were also keen on speaking out against the threat of communism, including Seattle’s Mayor Ole Hanson. Described by one newspaper as a “red-blooded patriot,” for his hatred of communism, Mayor Hanson continued his attacks against suspected Bolsheviks long after laborers in his city had returned to work.\(^{123}\) Despite the occasional raid or public speech, however, the danger of a Bolshevik uprising seemed minimal until the April bombs were discovered, the first of which was sent to Mayor Hanson’s office on the 28\(^{th}\). Although the bomb was discovered before it exploded, news of the incident was quickly circulated throughout the country. General fears that something more sinister was behind the attack were confirmed when a second homemade bomb was detonated by the unsuspecting maid of former Senator and Chairman of the Immigration Committee Thomas W. Hardwick at his home in Atlanta.\(^{124}\) Any doubt that the bombs were directly related to a open attack of Bolsheviks directed against the United States were removed when 32 homemade bombs were discovered in various Post Offices across the United States, including sixteen in New York City that were destined for such notables as “Commissioner of Immigration at Ellis Island Frederic C. Howe; Commissioner General of Immigration Anthony J. Caminetti; Chairman of the Senate Bolshevik Investigation Committee Senator Lee S. Overman; Associated Justice of the United States Supreme Court Oliver W. Holmes, Jr.; Postmaster General Albert S. Burleson (who earlier had banned radical literature from the mails); Judge K. M. Landis (famous for his sentencing of intervention in Europe, into an anti-Bolshevik hysteria. Thereby, the committee was provided with its new raison d’être and the government with a means through which it could publicize the radical threat. In other words, instead of explaining the Overman Committee as a product of the public opinion, there are reasons for viewing it as an instrument by which the opinion was influenced and shaped (136).”

\(^{123}\) Murray, 69.

[Victor] Berger and [William D.] Haywood); Senator William H. King (a bitter opponent of labor); Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer; Secretary of Labor William B. Wilson; John D. Rockefeller; and J. P. Morgan.” Though the originals of the bombs were never discovered, reports that they would have been delivered on 1 May (May Day) only perpetuated the idea that the explosives were somehow connected to a larger Bolshevik plot. This notion was further maintained when a bomb was successfully detonated on the front porch of Attorney General Palmer’s house in Washington D.C. during the night of 2 June 1919.

As part of “a coordinated attacks” direct against “judges, politicians, law enforcement officials, and others in eight cities nationwide,” while the bomb that hit Palmer’s house did succeed in inflicting property damage, nobody inside was actually injured. An investigation ultimately led officials to believe that the further destruction of the house or harm to those inside was minimized by the fact that the bomber had probably tripped while walking up the steps causing the premature explosion that claimed his life. Similar to the April bombs, with little evidence to denote the identity of the bomber, speculation was again immediately placed on foreign Bolshevik radicals who were intent on sparking revolution. Two days after the bombing, Washington Attorney Jesse W. Tull sent a letter to Palmer writing “permit me to congratulate you on your very narrow escape from the Anarchists Bomb, and I rejoice with you, that he, received the full benefits of his dastardly attempt. And got just what he deserved and all others of his clan deserves the same. . . . Every true American citizen will join you in annihilating all such people from the Nation.”

125 Murray, 71 – According to Allen, it was Postal Clerk Charles Caplan of New York who first alerted authorities to the bombs at his station (43).


127 National Archives. R. G. 60. Department of Justice Central Files. Straight Numerical Files. 202600.
Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that any person within the United States of America, or in any Territory or place within the jurisdiction of the said United States, not at the time a citizen of the United States of America, who shall throw or place any bomb or explosive or do any act with the object to destroy life or property shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and on conviction thereof before the district court of the United States for the district in which said crime was committed, shall be at once, by decree of the court, ordered executed and said criminal shall suffer death.

Although Palmer remarked that in regards to the bill, “I wish it to be understood that I have neither initiated this proposed legislation, nor do I personally or officially advocate its adoption. As you know, attempts have been made upon my own life by bomb throwers since I became Attorney General and I know you will acquit me of any desire for additional legislation which might be construed as having been introduced at my suggestion for my own protection,” he still initiated an organization that would be responsible for documenting subversive activities occurring throughout the United States. And so, “on August 1, 1919” Palmer “created a special Radical Division (subsequently renamed the General Intelligence Division, GID) to collect and collate all information about radical political activities uncovered by the Bureau of Investigation, other government agencies (the State Department’s consular service and military
and naval intelligence), local police, and patriotic organizations and citizens. Palmer appointed
an attorney in the Justice Department’s anti-radical alien enemy unit, J. Edgar Hoover, to head
the GID.”130 Despite the fact that “the bombs killed a total of two men during the year,” Stanley
Coben argues that the ramifications of the attempts produced

prophesies of national disaster abounded in 1919, even among high government
officials. . . . Lansing confided to his diary that we were in real peril of social
revolution. . . . Palmer advised the House Appropriations Committee that “on a
certain day, which we have been advised of,” radicals would attempt o rise up and
destroy the Government at one fell swoop.” Senator Charles Thomas of Colorado
warned that “the country is on the verge of a volcanic upheaval.” And Senator
Miles Poinsette of Washington declared, “There is real danger that the
government will fall.” A West Virginia wholesaler, with offices throughout the
state, informed the Justice Department in October 1919 that “there is hardly a
respectable citizen of my acquaintance who does not believe that we are on the
verge of armed conflict in this country.”131

Considering the general suspicion coming from both the public and government representatives,
the Annual Report of the Attorney General of the United States for the Year 1920, notes that

130 The FBI: A Comprehensive Reference Guide, 8 – While “the GID quickly amassed over 200,000
dossiers on radical activists and organizations, on the role of radicals in the 1919 steel and coal
strikes, on some 500 foreign-language newspapers (to keep up with “radical propaganda”), and
also on progressive senator and antiwar critic Robert La Follette, settlement house reformer and
pacifist Jane Addams, the pro-Irish Chicago Tribune and Hearst newspapers, militant black
nationalist and founder of the Universal Negro Improvement Association (UNIA) Marcus
Garvey, members and officers of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored
People (NAACP), and editors of black newspapers and periodicals whom Bureau officials
suspected were “exciting the negro element of this country to riot and to the committing of
outrages of all sorts.”

“The GID was created to promote an intensified antiradical campaign that Bureau Director
William Flynn initiated in April 1919. Flynn had ordered “a vigorous and comprehensive”
investigation of all anarchists, communists, and “kindred” alien resident agitators. Cognizant that
the Bureau’s authority to investigate radicals would terminate with the formal end of the war (the
Espionage and Sedition Acts applied only during wartime and required proof of intent to assist
the nation’s enemies), Flynn nonetheless ordered agents to secure evidence “which may be of use
in prosecutions under the present existing statutes or under legislation of that nature which may
hereinafter be enacted.”

“upon the formation of the General Intelligence Division . . . it was soon found that the Federal statues were inadequate to properly handle the ultraradical situation by criminal prosecutions. There is need of legislation which will enable the Federal Government to adequately defend and protect itself and its institutions through criminal prosecutions of not only aliens within the borders of the United States, but also of American citizens who seek to injure or destroy the Government by force or violence. Consequently, the efforts of the General Intelligence Division became centered upon the activities of alien agitators, with the object of securing deportation of such of these persons as were violating the provisions of the act of October 16, 1918, familiarly known as the “deportation statute.”132 After the formation of GID, conditions throughout the United States continued to produce unrest for laborers and as Coben points out “the wave of postwar strikes – there were 3,600 of them in 1919 involving over 4,000,000 workers – reached a climax in the fall of 1919. A national steel strike began in September and nationwide coal and rail walkouts were scheduled for November 1. Unions gained in membership and power during the war, and in 1919 labor leaders were under strong pressure to help workers catch up to or go ahead of mounting living costs.”133 With the formation of GID, the availability of wartime legislation, and public support, the federal government was now ready to wage an all out war against radicalism in the United States.

On Friday, 7 November 1919, the second anniversary of the Russian Revolution, local police along with federal agents stormed the local headquarters of the Union of Russian Workers (URW), located at the Russian People’s House on 133 East 15th Street in New York. Armed


with only 27 warrants, the police proceeded to openly attack and arrest 200 people inside the building.\textsuperscript{134} While the New York headquarters of the URW was being raided, simultaneous attacks were occurring in Detroit (MI), Philadelphia (PA), Newark (NJ), and Ansonia (CT) and like New York all of the assaults were directed against communist headquarters.\textsuperscript{135} Once the raids began, anyone present inside the URW were assumed to be communists or at least sympathizers and were brutally mistreated before they were taken to local police stations. According to Edwin P. Hoyt, “the manhandling was severe. Nightsticks and blackjacks were swung vigorously, and those who showed the slightest signs of resistance were repeatedly clubbed by the police and the federal officers. Doors were knocked off their hinges, desks were ripped open in the search for papers. The occupants of the building were lined up and run down the stairs into waiting paddy wagons for delivery to the police station. Those who complained were beaten.”\textsuperscript{136} Two days later, \textit{The New York Times} ran an article headlining, “Will Deport Reds as Alien Plotters: Palmer’s Blow Friday Hit Leaders of Russian Society, Worse Than Bolsheviki,” claiming that the arrests of 7 November “ended the first phase of a campaign which the Department of Justice is waging to rid the United States of alien radical agitators who are urging the overthrow by violence of the Government. Other arrests, which will involve alien agitators of other nationalities will soon be made. “This is the first big step,” it was stated in Attorney General Palmer’s office this morning, “to rid the country of these foreign trouble


\textsuperscript{135} Ibid., 53 – According to the \textit{Annual Report of the Attorney General of the United States for the Year 1920}, “in conjunction with the Commissioner General of Immigration approximately 300 arrests were made in 11 cities in the United States simultaneously on the night of November 7, 1919, of the secretaries, organizers, and agitators of this organization (174).”

\textsuperscript{136} Ibid., 53-54.
makers.”137 Four days after the raids against suspected radicals, *The New York Times* reported that “deportation proceedings have been begun in a number of cities to rid the country of the violent radicals caught in the nationwide raids which have been in progress since Friday, Attorney General Palmer announced tonight” and “in the meantime the cleanup of the country will continue, Mr. Palmer announcing tonight that there must be “no let up.” The total number actually held on deportation warrants had reached 391 tonight, while from some cities in which radical leaders were picked up, reports had not reached the department.”138 Among those arrested following the 7 November raids, were noted anarchists Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman who, along with 247 others, were deported to Russia, without trial, on 21 December 1919 on aboard the *USS Buford*.

Following the success of the First Palmer Raids, “a second and more massive coordinated attempt to curb radical activities” lead by Caminetti and J. Edgar Hoover on 2 and 6 January


138 *The New York Times*. “391 Alien Reds Now Under Arrest: No “Letup” in Drive on Violent Radicals, Especially the Russian Union – Will Rush Deportation – Attorney General Begins Proceedings – $10,000 Bail is the Least Accepted.” Tuesday, 11 November 1919 – The article goes on to explain that “efforts of the department representatives, it was said, are being directed more particularly at the union of Russian workers. This organization, branded by the Attorney General as the most dangerous anarchistic group in the country, was said to have wide ramifications. Department agents are sill uncovering new evidences of its activities. . . .

“Acting under instructions from Commissioner General of Immigration Camminetti to agents of the Immigration Service, in whose custody the prisoners are held, all of the prisoners, with the exception of two, are held in $10,000 bail. The two exceptions are Adolph Schnabel and Peter Bianki, both high officials of the Russian Union. Bail in the case of these two men has been fixed at $15,000 each. To secure their freedom pending the final decision of the courts in the deportation proceedings, soon to start, the radicals now under arrest must raise a cash fund of $3,920,000.

“At the Department of Justice it was said today that the Government’s war on these alien agitators and conspirators is just getting under way and that there will be no letup until the country has been rid of them. Other important arrests in various parts of the country are known to be pending.”
1920.\textsuperscript{139} This time the authorities were instructed to target “public meetings, banquets, [and] private homes” where “all persons present – citizens and aliens alike without discrimination – were arbitrarily taken into custody and searched as if they had been burglars caught in the criminal act.”\textsuperscript{140} The success of the second raid was due to the fact that Bureau of Investigation agents, who had infiltrated both communist organizations [the Community Party and Communist Labor Party, formed in September 1919], ensured that their local branches held meetings on the night of January 2 – enhancing the numbers of those who could be arrested. In addition, Caminetti convinced Acting Secretary of Labor John Abercrombie (enforcement of the immigration laws was a Labor Department responsibility) to revise departmental rules to permit the use of “telegraphic warrants” (blank arrest warrants with the name of the alien to be filled in by the arresting officer) and to suspend a provision known as Rule 22 (which would have provided arrested aliens the right to legal counsel during deportation hearings).\textsuperscript{141}

By the 4\textsuperscript{th} of January, \textit{The New York Times} reported that “the nation-wide raids on radicals have bagged 5,483 suspected Reds in fifty-one cities . . . . New York, with 800 arrests, headed the list, Boston and Detroit each reported 600; Chicago, 550, including a large number taken in the State; 200 in New Hampshire; 164 in Philadelphia and vicinity; 100 each in Cleveland, Trenton, Youngstown, Ohio, and Brockton, Massachusetts.”\textsuperscript{142} On the 5\textsuperscript{th}, \textit{The New York Times} disclosed that “the Department of Justice announced . . . that more than 4,000 warrants had been issued for foreign radicals who had sworn allegiance to the Communist Party of American and the Communist Labor Party, and that its agents would continue their activities until a complete

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{139} \textit{The FBI: A Comprehensive Reference Guide}, 8-9 – This time, “Palmer did not personally engineer the . . . Raids of January 2 and 6, 1920. Only after the raids were conducted did Palmer attempt to ride the initially favorable publicity (based on the belief that a radical revolutionary threat had been aborted) to the Democratic presidential nomination that summer (9).”

\textsuperscript{140} Murray, 31.


\end{flushright}
Americans citizens who have been arrested in the raids are being turned over to State authorities with the request that they be prosecuted as anarchists, and these cases are not included in the total given.”

Not only did the Bureau authorize the arrests of “4,000 Communist Party and Communist Labor Party members and sympathizers in 33 cities” but “to ensure success and preserve the element of surprise, between 6,000 and 10,000 individuals were taken into custody on January 6, including many who were either citizens (and thus not subject to deportation) or were not actually members of these organizations (these individuals were released without undergoing interrogation in the hastily assembled deportation hearings).”

Although the state blatantly suspended civil rights during the November 1919 and January 1920 Palmer Raids, there was a brief period of support for the government’s actions from the general population who at the time genuinely that the Bolsheviks were poised for a revolution in the United States. As Frederick Lewis Allen writes,

Late in 1919 Professor Gordon S. Watkins of the University of Illinois, writing in the Atlantic Monthly, set the membership of the Socialist party at 39,000, of the Communist Labor party at from 10,000 to 30,000, and of the Communist party at from 30,000 to 60,000. In other words, according to this estimate, the Communists could muster at the most hardly more than one-tenth of one per cent of the adult population of the country, and the three parties together – the majority of whose members were probably content to work for their ends by lawful means – brought the proportion to hardly more than two-tenths of one per cent, a rather slender nucleus, it would seem, for a revolutionary movement.

But the American business man was in no mood to consider whether it was a slender nucleus or not. He too, had come out of the war with his fighting blood up, ready to lick the next thing that stood in his way. He wanted to get back to

---

143 The New York Times. “Palmer Pushing War on Radicals. Only about Half the 4,000 Aliens who are Sought have been Taken. Wants Davey Bill Passed. Propaganda of the Communist Party is Exposed in Seized Documents.” Monday, 5 January 1920.

144 The FBI: A Comprehensive Reference Guide, 9 – “Assistant Secretary of Labor Louis Post, after examining the rationale for deporting the arrestees, and concluding that the law’s standard of “knowing membership” had not been met, ordered the release of the vast majority of the arrestees (only 556 of the original 4,000 arrestees were eventually deported.”
business and enjoy his profits. Labor stood in his way and threatened his profits.¹⁴⁵

Regardless of the justifications and support for the raids coming from Bureau officials, Palmer’s means of ridding the nation of suspected Bolsheviks was already started to raise serious concerns among some political officials including from Francis Fisher Kane, U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

According to The New York Times, Kane resigned from his post on 12 January “because of his hostility to the policy of Attorney General Palmer in the arrest, prosecution and deportation of Communists and other radicals” and “charge[d] the Attorney General with playing into the hands of the capitalists and suggested that he devote the energies of the Department of Justice to enforcing the prohibition act, the laws against unscrupulous contractors and those made rich by the war who were trying to dodge taxes.”¹⁴⁶ Although Palmer claimed that his “chief reasons” for supporting the raids were due in part to “the affiliation of the Communists parties [in the United States] with the Third Internationale, which declared at Moscow for the establishment of the rule of the proletariat and the overthrow of the State by force of arms, and the fact, as stated in their manifesto issued in the United States, “that the aim of the Communists in America is for the destruction of Government”,”¹⁴⁷ questions had been raised and “the tide shifted. [And] On January 26, Secretary of Labor William Wilson reinstated Rule 22, precluding Immigration Bureau officials from using statements obtained from the arrested aliens during

¹⁴⁵ Allen, 41-42.
¹⁴⁷ Ibid.
interrogations conducted without the presence of legal counsel.”148 Despite the fact that J. Edgar Hoover still maintained in a public hearing held in April “that at least fifty per cent of the influence behind the recent series of strikes was traceable directly to communist agents,” support for the Palmer Raids was failing.149 Public sympathies fell even further in “in May 1920” when “the liberal National Popular Government League published the findings of 12 distinguished lawyers who had reviewed the planning and execution of the raids”150 in a 64-page account entitled To the American People: Report Upon the Illegal Practices of the United States, Department of Justice disclosed to the public that

Under the guise of a campaign for the suppression of radical activities, the office of the Attorney General, acting by its local agents throughout the country, and giving express instructions from Washington, has committed continual illegal acts. Wholesale arrests both of aliens and citizens have been made without warrant or any process of law; men and women have been jailed and held incomunicado without access of friends or counsel; homes have been entered without search-warrant and property seized and removed; other property has been wantonly destroyed; workingmen and workingwomen suspected of radical views have been shamefully abused and maltreated. Agents of the Department of Justice have been introduced into radical organizations for the purpose of informing upon their members or inciting them to activities; these agents have even been instructed from Washington to arrange meetings upon certain dates for the express object of facilitating wholesale raids and arrests. In support of these illegal acts, and to create sentiment in its favor, the Department of Justice has also constituted itself a propaganda bureau, and has sent to newspapers and magazines of this country quantities of material designed to excite public opinion against radicals, all at the expense of the government and outside the scope of the Attorney General’s duties.

. . . . We are concerned solely with bringing to the attention of the American people the utterly illegal acts which have been committed by those charged with the highest duty of enforcing the laws – acts which have cause widespread suffering and unrest, have struck at the foundation of American free institutions, and have brought the name of our country into disrepute.151

151 To the American People: Report Upon the Illegal Practices of the United States, Department of
Among the accusations were the use of: Cruel and Unusual Punishments; Arrests without Warrant; Unreasonable Searches and Seizures; Provocative Agents; Compelling Persons to be Witness against Themselves; and Propaganda by the Department of Justice, which according to the report maintains that “the legal functions of the Attorney General are: to advise the Government on questions of law, and to prosecute persons who have violated federal statutes. For the Attorney General to go into the field of propaganda against radicals is a deliberate misuse of his office and a deliberate squandering of funds entrusted to him by Congress.”

Regarding the threat of a Bolshevik uprising, the lawyers acknowledged that “there is no danger of revolution so great as that created by suppression, by ruthlessness, and by deliberate violation of the simple rules of American law and American decency.” By this point, however, many of those who had been arrested during the raids were released and “after 1920, Bureau appropriations and personnel were reduced, although not to the prewar level.” Even though the raids were rendered irrational by a wider political community, the Bureau of Investigation “continued monitoring political radicals, radicals, trade union activists, and civil rights activists, in part because they were convinced that the arrest of Communist and Communist Labor Party members during the Palmer Raids had resulted in “a marked cessation of radical activities in the United States,” and “in October, GID Director J. Edgar Hoover broadened the role of his division form its original focus on “radical activities in the United States and abroad” to cover “the study of matters of international nature, as well as economic and industrial disturbances incident

---


152 Ibid., 6 – Concerning the subject of “Jailing Radicals in Detroit” please refer to Appendix Q.
153 Ibid., 8.
On 11 December 1920, *The New York Times* reported that “Mr. Palmer disclose[d] that the Department of Justice has developed a card index system, containing more than 200,000 cards, giving detailed data on the activities of ultra-radicals and their organizations as well as a complete library of reference on the general radical movement.”¹⁵⁶ While the Palmer Raids came during a time of uncertainty in the United States, the lack of a proper Bolshevik uprisings and the inquiries regarding the legality of the Bureau’s tactics started to turn public opinion against the hysteria of the Red Scare, especially as the economy began to stabilize.

Though the armistice of 1918 held the promise of peace and stability, the dramatic ending of the Great War instead fostered an environment of fear and suspicion as empires were toppled and political parties openly quarreled. President Wilson’s 14-Points failed to transpire in the opening weeks of the Paris Peace talks even though they were the guidelines that Germany had in mind when they asked for an armistice. Oddly enough, while the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 failed to ignite the worldwide industrial uprising immediately after the Romanovs fell from power, the threat of communism produced a wave of hysteria that filtered throughout Europe and into the United States. As war industries grounded to a halt in 1919, the fallout from labor magnified war related phobias that simply replaced one fear for another. And as the year progressed, time and again Bolshevism failed to retain control over any government outside of Russia despite several attempts. Europe’s uprisings were directly related to the political and economic troubles created as a result of the war and manifested as empires collapsed, borders were redrawn and new states created. While some members of the Spartacists and KPD realized that Germany was not yet ready for a Bolshevik revolution, political infighting not only brought

¹⁵⁵ Ibid.
about a Republic, but it forced labor unions and revolutionists, social democratic and communists into a strained relationship that was unable to lead the general public or properly challenge the state when the uprising began unintentionally. By resorting to military aid, apprehensive leaders of the SPD’s Executive Committee including President of the Weimar Republic Ebert used outright violence as a way of dealing with the radical left and justified the hostility as a necessary means to protecting the Republic when it appeared most fragile. With open war against Bolshevism being waged in Europe, it was only a matter of time before concerns that a revolution could affect the United States eventually took hold of the public’s thoughts. Whereas the United States did in fact also experience a post-war crisis in regards to the state of the economy, the terror evoked by labor strikes in January 1919 fostered an atmosphere of fear toward Bolshevism that was already being mirrored in Europe. Unlike the total collapse of Germany’s political structure in the aftermath of the Great War, trepidation that a similar Bolshevik uprising could occur in the United States seemed plausible. Given President Wilson’s absence from the United States during the first six months of 1919 meant that his time and attention were focused on the events unfolding in Europe, leaving command of domestic affairs to fall into the hands of various politicians and government offices. Attitudes toward labor strikes, race riots, a weakened economy, and immigration were heightened by sensational reporting and politicians who were looking to advance their own careers especially after President Wilson suffered a debilitating stroke on 2 October 1918. Although there were a series of strikes that impacted the United States in the immediate aftermath of the Great War, the overall structure of the federal government remained intact, allowing for political stability to be quickly secured by 1920 and bringing about an end to fears of radical revolution. Despite the fact that the fear of a Bolshevik uprising started to diminish in 1920 the fallout from the Great War
had already succeeded in creating state sponsored surveillance organizations like the *Freikorps*, Cheka, and the General Intelligence Division.
CONCLUSION.
THE FALLOUT OF 1919
IN GERMANY AND THE UNITED STATES

Although the Great War was viewed as the “War to End all Wars” the consequences of Archduke Franz Ferdinand’s assassination resonated well beyond Austria-Hungary and Serbia. The outcome of the war not only incited revolutions, uprisings, and provoked nativist ideals, but 1919 also created an atmosphere where fears manifested by the four-year struggle could be redirected by states that were intent on maintaining order and stability. When the Bolsheviks succeeded in taking power in Russia in October 1917, the new Soviet leaders “proceeded to establish the world’s first Communist state on a territory covering one-sixth of the globe, that stretched from the Arctic to the Black Sea, from the Baltic to the Far East.”¹ While Piero Melograni points out that Lenin was not in favor of an international revolution, at the time of the Bolsheviks’ rise to power, foreign leaders – especially in the West – viewed the situation in Russia with increasing apprehension.² Although Germany and the United States utilized the legal system in an effort keep radicalism at bay throughout the latter half of the nineteenth century, the sudden and dramatic nature of the Great War as well as its duration fostered an environment of widespread fear and devastation that had the potential to create a charged

² Piero Melograni. Lenin and the Myth of the World Revolution: Ideology and Reasons of State, 1917-1920. Julie Lerro, Tr. Atlantic Highlands, New Jersey: Humanities Press International, Inc.; 1989, xi – Melograni writes “In fact, from the beginning the state established by the chief of the Bolsheviks was a “state without revolution.” Not only did it block the revolutionary aspirations of Russian socialism, but it was also a state that looked inward, that closed itself up in its diversity, that gave up its designs of global revolution. The Russian revolution did not act as a spark that set off European revolutionary uprisings. Although it is often maintained that Lenin’s state lasted “in spite of the fact” that no European revolution broke out, it could be argued that the Bolsheviks’ power survived ‘exactly because’ there were no revolutions in the countries that were more industrialized than Russia.”
atmosphere advocating for even further change. Suddenly, by the end of 1917, the Bolshevik revolution had not only been proven possible, but for the Allied governments, communist uprisings appeared imminent. On 2 December 1917, Lansing sent a memorandum to President Wilson claiming that “the one thing they [Lenin and Trotsky] are striving to bring about is the ‘Social Revolution,’ which will sweep away national boundaries, racial distinctions and modern political, religious and social institutions, and make the ignorant and incapable mass of humanity dominant in the earth. They indeed plan to destroy civilization by mob violence.”

Given the general upheaval shortly after the armistice was made effective, Lansing’s predictions seemed all the more relevant. Instead of 1919 becoming the age in which peace was reintroduced throughout the world, conflicts involving labor, politics, the economy, and ethnicity threatened to disrupt those governments and empires that had managed to survive the four-year war. Consequently, Margaret MacMillan argues that while “the peacemakers” meeting in Paris “were concerned about the spread of revolutionary ideas, [their concerns were] not necessarily [based solely on] Russian ones.” Rather the term bolshevism became synonymous with all threats of revolutionary activity in 1919. The reason for this, writes MacMillan, was that “the survivors of the Great War were weary and anxious. . . . Europe had been a place of unsatisfied longings before the war – of socialists hoping for a better world, of labor for better conditions, of nationalists for their own homes – and those longings emerged again with great force because in the fluid world of 1919 it was possible to dream of great change – or have nightmares about the collapse of order.” And so, it was these two conflicting ideas that came to signify 1919.

---


4 MacMillan, 65.

5 Ibid.
When the Paris Peace Talks opened on 18 January 1919 it was with the promise of rebuilding a New World in which freedom and liberty would become the staples of international policy making. The conference, however, began in the shadow of Bolshevik uprisings, labor strikes, and calls for self-determination by nations who were still held under the imperialist ideologies of some of the Allied leaders in attendance. As a result, political infighting regarding the division of the spoils from war as well as situations on the home front distracted the victors and prevented them from quickly drafting treaties that would deal with the fallout from the war. This delay caused the peace talks to break down by early spring to the point that Borden confided in his diary on 2 April that the constant debates and rewrites impeded progress to the point it appeared that “the Council of Four is not doing any better than the Council of Ten. They fiddle while the world burns.” On 28 June 1919, though the Allies had finally set the terms for the Treaty of Versailles which they forced upon the German delegates, Hermann Müller (MSPD) and Johannes Bell (Centre), to sign. Considering the economic and political upheaval that marked Germany in the wake of the armistice, the terms set by the Allied governments were among the harshest directed at any one nation. According to Martin Gilbert, “the 200-page document” dictated that Germany was to be “punished both territorially and financially.

Her territory was reduced in both the east and west, her army, navy and air force were disbanded, and her responsibility for the war was expressed in the financial liability imposed on her to make reparations, especially to France and Belgium. Articles 42 to 44 forbade Germany from fortifying the Rhineland or having any armed forces there. Article 80 forbade German union with Austria ‘except with the consent of the Council of the League of Nations.’ Articles 100 to 106 transferred the port of Danzig from German sovereignty and made it a Free City under the protection of the newly created League of Nations. Articles 119 to 120, in five lines, deprived Germany of all her colonial possessions. Article 170 forbade Germany from importing any arms, ammunition or war materials. Article

---

6 Robert Laird Borden: His Memoirs, 928.
191 forbade her from building or buying submarines. Article 198 forbade her from having any military or naval air force.

Germany was to be denied the ability to make war. Under Article 231 of the Treaty, she was forced to accept, with her allies, ‘responsibility’ for the loss and damage caused as a result of the war ‘imposed upon’ the victors ‘by the aggression of Germany and her allies.’ This was the war guilt clause, which served as a preamble to the reparations demands, and to which the German negotiators had particularly objected.7

Considering the terms of the treaty and the fact that the United States failed to approve the terms, Adam Hochschild noted that Sir Alfred Milner, “called the Versailles treaty ‘a Peace to end Peace’.”8 Once the Weimar Republic was presented with the terms of the treaty, significant backlash erupted throughout Germany and was aimed at both the Western Allies and the new government. Already, on 20 June 1919, Scheidemann’s Cabinet had resigned, leaving the treaty to be signed by “a new coalition government made up of Majority Social Democrats and

7 Martin Gilbert, 518 – In regards to Germany’s overseas empire, William Roger Louis points out that “there were two groups of German colonies, the ones in the Pacific and the Far East, and the ones in Africa. The colonial empire was over 1,000,000 square miles, almost five times larger than the mother country. The European population in the colonies was small: at the outbreak of the war, approximately 25,000, of whom about 20,000 were Germans. Most of the European emigration to the colonies took place in the early years, and by 1913 only about 30 Germans a year went to settle permanently – approximately one out of 1,000 annual German emigrants. Germany’s trade with the colonies amounted to only 0.6 per cent of her total exports and 0.5 per cent of her total imports. The overseas Empire never ran at a profit; in 1913 the deficit amounted to over £6,000,000. But the value of the colonies cannot be measured statistically, if only because of the popular belief that great nations possessed colonial empires (Great Britain and Germany’s Lost Colonies, 1914-1919. Oxford, England: Clarendon Press; 1967, 10).”

8 Adam Hochschild. To End All Wars: A Story of Loyalty and Rebellion, 1914-1918. Boston, Massachusetts: Mariner Books; 2012, 358 – Martin Gilbert notes that “on 19 November 1919 the United States Senate rejected the Treaty of Versailles. This was a blow to those who had hoped the Americans would not only help to maintain the treaty, but make an important contribution to the political and economic recovery of Europe. ‘The whole Treaty had been constructed’, one of its British participants later wrote, ‘on the assumption that the United States would be not merely a contracting but an actively executants party. France had been persuaded to abandon her claim to a buffer state between herself and Germany in return for a guarantee of armed support from the United States. The whole Reparation settlement was dependent for its execution on the presence on the Reparation Commission of a representative of the main creditor of Europe. The whole Treaty had been deliberately, and ingenuously, framed by Mr. Wilson himself to render American co-operation essential” (521-522).”
Centrists and led by the Social Democratic trade-unionist Gustav Bauer.”\(^9\) Whereas the government divided over the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, so too did the general population of Germany take issue with the severity of the treaty and the humiliation imposed on them by the victorious Allies. Given the general upheaval that erupted throughout Germany after the signing of the armistice, Ebert’s government had come to rely further and further on the military in an effort to keep radicalism at bay. And so, when the Weimar Constitution came into force on 11 August 1919, it contained a key clause that exemplified the era and would have a profound effect on Germany in the next two decades. Under Article 48, the Weimar Constitution “empowered the president to restore public law and order in the Reich as a whole, if necessary by armed force. To this end he could temporarily suspend some of the basic rights guaranteed by the constitution. Any such measures had, however, to be immediately notified to the Reichstag, which could render them invalid by voting against them.”\(^10\) Although the article did not cause concern throughout the 1920s, it only became problematic when the Reichstag was suspended in the summer of 1930 by then President Paul von Hindenburg. During the early 1930s, Article 48 would further result in Hindenburg’s ability to choose a new Chancellor, and in 1933 the office would fall to Hitler, who had been introduced to the German Workers’ Party (DAP – Deutsche Arbeiterpartei) in September 1919. By early 1920, Drexler changed the party’s name to the National Socialist German Workers Party (NSDAP – Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei) later nicknamed Nazi. A year later, Hitler challenged Drexler for power and eventually became the undisputed leader of the organization.

While far-right groups began to emerge in 1919, rumors that Germany’s loss in the Great War was directly related to the loss of support from the home front spurred outbreaks of anti-

\(^9\) Miller and Potthoff, 80.  
\(^{10}\) Feuchtwanger, 41.
Semitism. Steeped in the traditions of nineteenth century philosophy by individuals like Johann Gottlieb Fichte, Friedrich Ludwig Jahn, Christian Friedrich Rühs, and Ernst Moritz Arndt, who subscribed to the ideas that a completely united German nation was one that was absent of Jews. Due to the fact that Jews self-identify, these early philosophers claimed that because Jewish loyalty is directed at their own community before that of the nation they were essentially creating a “state within a state,” a concept first developed by Fichte.\textsuperscript{11} Following Fichte’s accusation, Rühs declared that “every people [Volk], that wishes to assert and develop its individuality and dignity, must seek to remove and exclude all alien components, which it cannot absorb ardently and completely. This is the case with the Jews.”\textsuperscript{12} These ideals directed toward the Jewish community were not only upheld by philosophers and private citizens, but government officials like Ludwig von Vincke, the Governor (Oberpräsident) of the Prussian province of Westphalia; his subordinate, Regierungsrat J. J. Esser and Frederick Wilhelm IV’s minister, Ludwig von Thile all spoke out against the integration of Jews into the German community. Von Thile “told the United Prussian Diet of 1847 that it was ‘inconsistent with Christianity to grant rights of political authority to Jews,’ since their fatherland was Zion, not Prussia – a view that coincided with that of the King.”\textsuperscript{13} By the 1880s, advancements in pseudoscience allowed for anti-Semitic attitudes to progress beyond religious hatred and into racial animosities. Even though some members of the Jewish community succeeded in assimilating into various European communities, other Jews, especially in the east, chose to live within their own communities called shtetels. At the turn of the twentieth century, Doris L. Bergen notes, “there were also more visible kinds of Jews” who spoke Yiddish and observed the Jewish dietary laws of


\textsuperscript{12} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid., 17-18.
kashrut. In the aftermath of the Great War, old prejudices resurfaced and with the economic and political fallout in Germany, anti-Semitism took on a new form as the 1920s and 1930s progressed. Germany, however, was not the only nation to experience a revival of nativism in 1919 especially in light of the mass hysteria produced by the threat of Bolshevism.

Since nativism also had been an integral part of American society before the war, the increasing attention put on Eastern and Southern European immigrants only fueled a desire for all citizens to prove their loyalty and patriotism. Already in 1919, organizations like the American Legion were founded and emphasized that the more than one million members were “ready for action at any time . . . against the extremists who are seeking to overturn a government for which thousands of brave young Americans gave their lives.” Other attempts to Americanize the population also erred more on the side of patriotism. Following the war, the American flag took on a more symbolic status. And anyone caught desecrating the flag – either through words or acts – was subject to investigation. A month prior to the raids, Senator William S. Kenyon of Iowa argued that “the time has come to make this a one-language nation.” According to Cohen, “the National Security League boasted . . . of establishing one thousand study groups to teach teachers how to inculcate ‘Americanism’ in their foreign-born students.” For the United States, the Palmer Raids unleashed a new kind of witch-hunt between November 1919 and January 1920, resulting in further attacks against suspected anarchists throughout the 1920s and highlighted, in particular, by the Sacco and Vanzetti case of 1921. Although 1920s America would later be glossed over with an emphasis on flappers, jazz,

---

17 Ibid., 71.
the Harlem Renaissance and industrial prosperity, the 1919 Red Scare led not only to patriotic Americans but also a renewed interest in nativist organizations like the Ku Klux Klan. Still, while the crest of internal revolution never formally materialized within the United States, public fears concerning Bolshevism were aided by headline inducing hysteria, which was coupled with federal laws and leaders who were bent on ridding the country of its foreign threat. Labor disturbances from east to west had momentarily derailed the United States, but by the end of 1920, the Senate had resolved not to enter into the League of Nations. Without a formal stake in the international community, the United States was able to once again withdraw into a policy of non-intervention. Since the economy began to grow and new power leadership was voted in, European affairs were pushed further and further from the mainstream.

Amid the general upheaval of 1919, the Spartacist Uprising and Palmer Raids serve as two striking examples of how the fear of bolshevism was used by the governments as a means of inciting public violence against citizens in an effort to reassert the state’s stability. The danger posed by the risk of revolution pushed Germany further into an abyss of political chaos and provided the U. S. government with the means to continue eradicating the country of both foreign ideas and people through increased surveillance. While the concept of a Bolshevik Revolution started broadly, as 1919 progressed an atmosphere of disloyalty and suspicion reigned during which time a person could be denounced and deported based on nothing more than political beliefs or ethnic origins. As fear replaced reasoning, a counterrevolution was launched on behalf of the state, which permitted the use of excessive force against its citizens. Following the events of the Great War, the entire world had in some way been transformed by its outcome. No longer would the twentieth century reflect the imperialist age of the nineteenth century. With the old empires of Europe collapsing and the emergence of new states as
boundaries were redrawn in Paris, both Germany and the United States indicate a transformation of the modern era. When the Spartacists attempted to overthrow the government and establish a Bolshevik state, they inadvertently unleashed a shockwave throughout the Western world which permitted other nations to supplant the fear of socialism into any foreign threat.

Unlike the Palmer Raids, Germany’s fears of a government overthrow were evident given the downfall of the monarchy and the weakened state of the Weimar Republic. According to Still, Peter Gay argues that “the greatest, most effective enemy of the Weimar Republic was the civil war fought within the Republican left, the struggle . . . which broke out as soon as the Republic was proclaimed” and resulted in the Spartacist Uprising.\textsuperscript{18} Although the uprising failed in Berlin, the event highlighted the long held notion that if a communist revolution was going to occur in Europe, it was going to happen in an industrial nation. Given the political and economic fallout from the Great War, chances that the Bolsheviks were going to attempt to destroy the Republic and replace it with a communist state in Germany, caused national leaders to panic. Having already endured a long struggle against the radical left throughout the war, members of the SPD’s Executive Committee who were now elected officials within the Weimar Republic resorted to extreme measures in an effort to secure the state and their positions within it. Repeated use of the \textit{Freikorps} units against laborers, protestors, and radical socialists, not only set a precedent for the 1920s and 1930s, but open clashes on the streets of Berlin brought open violence to a nation that had not witnessed opened warfare within its borders throughout the four-year war. The sudden downfall of Kaiser Wilhelm II, not only ended Germany’s monarchy, but his loss signified a complete break with the Old World. Since Germany’s unification, traditional outsiders including Jews, capitalists, communists, and eccentrics (homosexuals, 

modern artists, prostitutes, etc.) were suddenly at the forefront of politics, economics, and society. And while Germany underwent “fourteen different governments from June 1920 to the end of 1932, and none of them ran their full four-year course,” it seemed as though the nation was fully embracing the ideals of the French Revolution and liberalism. Moving away from all that was familiar, Germany essentially took what had been underground and instead paraded it throughout the country. New art movements like expressionism and cubism became subjects on art canvases and displayed to the public at large. Cabarets offered their patrons American jazz music, scantily clad women, and alcohol. To the shock of many right-wing conservatives, rather than Germany reverting back to the strict militant state of Bismarck, the nation continued to modernize for the first time since unification and in the opening months of 1919, this New World came much closer than any other nation to nearly mirror Russia’s 1917 Revolution.

While the United States endured general uprisings and labor disputes, fear that a Bolshevik revolution was going to overthrow the government was less of a threat considering how far removed the nation is from the European continent. Even so, as Joel Kovel explains “the logic of hysteria is that it exaggerates something real,” and therefore, “the reality which hysteria elaborated was not the evil of the Communists, but the threat they, and a number of other radical workers’ movements, posed to the established powers in the wake of the Great War and the Breakup of empire.” Although President Wilson was noticeably absent for the first six months of 1919, the government as a whole was never truly vulnerable to an attempted overthrow like the uprisings taking place throughout Europe. Despite the sporadic attacks against the general safety of public officials, Palmer did not launch his raids until 7 November a
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19 Ibid., 7-8.
20 Henig, 27.
month after President Wilson was incapacitated by a cerebral thrombosis on 3 October 1919. Without the fear of an executive reprimand, Murray explains that those left in positions of power, like Palmer, “were the chief apostles of that false security which it seemed the whole nation was seeking and, burning with personal ambition and trafficking in human weakness and emotion, they . . . fashioned the mood of the 1919 political scene.”22 And so, when Palmer unleashed his first major raids against suspected communist, he was not responsible to any higher office in the United States. With the turbulent events of the past few months, the general population was still harboring war hostilities toward anything foreign and so the anti-Bolshevik backlash from Western Europe was soon transferred to the United States and momentarily embraced not only by the federal government, but also by national citizens.

Especially when it was noted that “at least ninety percent of the members of the two American Communist parties formed in 1919 were born in Eastern Europe,”23 pro-American attitudes were refueled. In an effort to prove both patriotism and loyalty, naturalized Citizens denounced new immigrants and formed exclusive American only clubs. Organizations like the American Legion, were founded in 1919 under the declaration that more than one million members were “ready for action at any time … [to be used] against the extremists who are seeking to overturn a government for which thousands of brave young Americans gave their lives.”24 During this period, the American flag took on a more symbolic status, anyone caught desecrating the flag – either through words or acts – was subject to investigation. Also, a month prior to the raids, Senator William S. Kenyon of Iowa stated that “the time has come to make this
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22 Murray, 11.
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a one-language nation.” ²⁵ Cohen writes that in 1919 that “the National Security League boasted . . . of establishing one thousand study groups to teach teachers how to inculcate “Americanism” in their foreign-born students.” ²⁶ In spite of these actions, however, the federal government was still in a position of power to deflect current public attitudes toward the war, America, and immigrants. Harry N. Scheiber notes that “there is evidence that in November 1918, Wilson “would probably have granted a general amnesty to Espionage Act offenders but was dissuaded by his [then] Attorney General [Thomas W. Gregory]. Both Gregory and Palmer recognized the fact that injustices had been done and recommended commutations of sentences; but neither approved of a general amnesty.” ²⁷ Once Wilson was no longer in a position to warrant executive authority, Palmer was able to push forward. And riding not only on fears generated by the war, but also lingering mob attitudes toward that of the “other,” public opinion and federal law went hand in hand in creating the perfect environment for the Palmer Raids. When newspapers boasted in the days and weeks following the November raids of Beatings, arrests, imprisonments, and for some deportations, there was little outcry from the general public. The constant bombardment of facts, names, and suspected terrorist plots and revolution overwhelmed an already fearful population. Propelled forward by headline inducing hysteria and coupled with federal laws and leaders bent on ridding the country of its foreign threat, the suspected wave of internal revolution never formerly materialized within the United States and Palmer’s raids soon fizzled. Although labor disturbances had momentarily derailed the United States, by the end of 1920 the Senate resolved not to enter into the League of Nations. Without a formal stake in the international community, the United States was able to once again withdraw into a policy of non-

²⁵ Coben, 70-71.
²⁶ Ibid., 71.
²⁷ Scheiber, 57 – Footnote #23.
intervention. As the economy began to grow and new power leadership was voted in, European affairs were pushed further and further from the mainstream and America soon entered into the era of the “Roaring Twenties,” with the Red Scare all but forgotten.

In the end the Great War not only set into motion revolutions, uprisings and the resurrection of nativism, but 1919 also sparked further problems at home and abroad for those who were involved. When the armistice became effective on 11 November 1918, Europe was a shattered continent. As Mazower points out, “in that moment of “bourgeois triumph,” the ancien régime was finally toppled – sultans, pashas, emperors and dukes reduced to impotence. Before the First World War there had been just three republics in Europe; by the end of 1918 there were thirteen.”\(^{28}\) The wave of unrest that marks 1919 is firmly rooted in the events of the nineteenth century when European borders were contested by rival empires, ethnic identities were overshadowed by imperial forces, and the dominance of only a handful of monarchs established policy making for the vast majority of the world. Prior to the war itself, the advent of the Second Industrial Revolution and the reforms of the Progressive Era produced a struggle between capital and labor that continuously threatened to unleash a fury of demonstrations and revolutions. While the divisions in ideology regarding Marxism, communism, anarchism, socialism, and nationalism kept the radical left confined to small pockets of resistance, the effect of the Great War and the overthrow of the Russian monarchy created a charged atmosphere in the immediate aftermath of the armistice. Without the centralized power and authority resting among a selected few, the surviving nations in 1919 struggled to maintain their pre-war status as imperial forces and keep their own empires from falling by the wayside. And in doing so, the Allies wittingly fostered an environment of mass hysteria aimed at upholding the traditional worldview of the

\(^{28}\) Mazower, 3.
pre-war era. The restriction of civil liberties in 1919, however, did not necessarily immediately strike naturalized citizens as a blatant abuse of state power, but rather, for nearly a hundred years prior to the Great War, nations throughout Europe and the United States used the legal system as a means of preserving the state from immigrants, radicalism, labor unions, and socialism.

While the Allies gathered at Paris, already the fallout from the war was being felt. Problems with the creation of an independent Polish state caused territorial disputes between Germany and Russia, while outside of Europe nationalist demonstrations broke out in China because Japan took control of former German colonies in the area. These problems – only two of many – demonstrated a systematic breakdown of the initial 1918 armistice. Without realizing it at the time, the Allies were attempting to redraw the map of Europe that would in some way still function as it did prior to the outbreak of war. Unfortunately, the event of the Great War sparked a move toward an era of globalization that gripped took hold of the world in 1914 and by 1919 refused to let go. Although the United States attempted to distance itself from European affairs, Wilson’s concept of self-determination continually pushed both foreign and the American government into playing a larger role within the international community. What the Spartacist Uprising and Palmer Raids offer, is a new perspective on this history where global trends, political fallout and mass hysteria were factors of the time. A closer look at the political and public atmosphere of Germany and the United States in 1919 uncovers not only historical similarities, but also gives a better understanding to the foundation of World War II as well as the modern state. When fear is substituted for reason, dramatic events can result. Although Germany and the United States took such divergent paths during the war, 1919 marks a crucial period in the history of both countries. Since national leaders were acting upon the interest of protecting and preserving the state, the suspension of civil liberties leading up to and throughout
1919, inadvertently laid a foundation for future wars, political uprisings and genocides, which have all become hallmarks the twentieth century.
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APPENDIX A

August Spies’s article to Arbeiter-Zeitung
3 May 1886

Your master sent out their bloodhounds – the police – they killed . . . your brothers at McCormick’s this afternoon. They killed the poor wretches, because they, like you, had courage to disobey the supreme will of your bosses. They killed them because they dared ask for the shortening of the hours of toil. They killed them to show you ‘free American citizens’ that you must be satisfied and contented with whatever your bosses condescend to allow you, or you will be killed!

You have for years endured the most abject humiliations; you have for years suffered immeasurable iniquities; you have worked yourselves to death; you have endured the pangs of want and hunger; your children you have sacrificed to the factory lords – in short, you have been miserable and obedient slaves all these years. Why? To satisfy the insatiable greed and fill the coffers of your lazy thieving masters! When you ask him now to lessen your burden, he send his bloodhounds out to shoot you, to kill you!

If you are men, if you are the sons of your grandsires, who have shed their blood to free you, then you will rise in your might Hercules, and destroy the hideous monster that seeks to destroy you.

To arms, we call you, to arms!

---

APPENDIX B

Treaty of Friendship and Alliance between the Kingdom of Bulgaria and the Kingdom of Serbia,
29 February 1912

His Majesty Ferdinand I, Tsar of the Bulgarians, and His Majesty Peter I, King of Serbia,
being firmly convinced of the unity of interest and the identity of fate of their States and of the
two kindred nations, the Bulgarian and Serbian, are determined to defend those interests with
united force and to work for their general advancement, have agreed upon the following:

Article 1. – The kingdom of Bulgaria and the kingdom of Serbia guarantee to each other
their national independence and the integrity of their national territories, binding themselves
absolutely and without reservation to succour each other with their entire forces, in the event of
one of them being attacked by one or more States.

Article 2. – The two contracting parties also undertake to come to each other’s assistance
with all their forces in the event of any Great Power attempting to annex, occupy, or even
temporarily to invade with its armies any part of the Balkan territories which are to-day under
Turkish rule, if one of the parties should consider this as contrary to its vital interests and a casus
belli.

Article 3. – The two contracting parties bind themselves not to conclude peace except
jointly and after a preliminary understanding.

Article 4. – For the complete and most appropriate application of this treaty, a military
convention will be concluded which will provide minutely for everything that may have to be
undertaken by either side in the event of war, or that appertains to the military organisation,
disposition, or mobilisation of the armies and the relations between the higher commands which
must be settled in time of peace, as a preparation for war and its successful prosecution. The
military convention will form an integral part of the present treaty. Its formulation must begin at
the latest fifteen days after the signature of the present treaty, and the convention must be ready
within a maximum period of two months.

Article 5. – This treaty and the military convention will remain in force from the day of
their signature to December 31, 1920 (old style), inclusive. They can be prolonged after that
date through an additional understanding, explicitly ratified by the two parties. If, on the day
when the treaty and the convention expire, the contracting parties should be engaged in war, or
should not yet have would up the situation arising from a war, the treaty and convention will
retain their force until the conclusion of peace, or until the situation resulting from a war has
been definitely settled.

---

2 G. P. Gooch and Harold Temperley, Eds. British Documents on the Origins of the War, 1898-1914:
Volume IX: The Balkan Wars, Part I, The Prelude; The Tripoli War. Assistance from Lillian M.
Article 6. – The treaty will be signed in two identical copies, both of them in Bulgarian and Serbian. They will be signed by the two Rulers and their Ministers of Foreign Affairs. The military convention, also in two copies, both of them in Bulgarian and Serbian, will be signed by the Rulers, the respective Ministers of Foreign Affairs, and by special military plenipotentiaries.

Article 7. – The treaty and the convention may be published, or communicated to other States, only after a preliminary agreement between the two contracting parties, and even then only jointly and simultaneously by the two sides.

In the same way, a third party may be permitted to join the alliance after a preliminary understanding between the two parties.

Made in Sofia, on February 29, 1912 (old style).

IV. EV. GUESHOFF.
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Secret Annex to the Treaty of Friendship and Alliance between the Kingdom of Bulgaria and the Kingdom of Serbia.

Article 1. – In the event of internal troubles arising in Turkey which might endanger the State or the national interests of the contracting parties, or of either of them; or in the event of internal or external difficulties of Turkey raising the question of the maintenance of the status quo in the Balkan Peninsula, that contracting party which first arrives at the conclusion that in consequence of all this military action has become indispensable must make a reasoned proposal to the other party, which is bound immediately to enter into an exchange of views and, in the event of disagreement, must give to the proposing party a reasoned reply.

Should an agreement favourable to action be reached, it will be communicated to Russia, and if the latter Power is not opposed to it, military operations will begin as previously arranged, the parties being guided in everything by the sentiment of solidarity and community of their interests. In the opposite case, when no agreement has been reached, the parties will appeal to the opinion of Russia, which opinion, if and in so far as Russia pronounces herself, will be binding on both parties.

If, Russia declining to state an opinion and the parties failing to agree, the party in favour of action should on its own responsibility open war on Turkey, the other contracting party is bound to observe towards its ally a friendly neutrality, ordering at once a mobilisation in the limits fixed by the military convention, and coming to its assistance in the event of any third party taking the side of Turkey.

Article 2. – All territorial gains acquired by combined action within the scope of articles 1 and 2 of the treaty, and of article 1 of this secret annex, shall constitute common property (condominium) of the two allies, and their repartition will take place immediately or, at the
latest, within a period of three months after the restoration of peace, the following principles having been observed:

Serbia recognises the right of Bulgaria to the territory east of the Rhodope Mountains and the River Strouma; while Bulgaria recognises a similar right of Serbia to the territory north and west of Shar Mountain.

As regards the territory lying between Shar Mountain and the Rhodope Mountains, the Archipelago and the Lake of Orchrida, if the two parties should become convinced that the organisation of this territory into an autonomous province is impossible, in view of the common interests of the Bulgarian and Serbian nationalities, or owing to other internal and external causes, in such a case the said territory will be disposed of in accordance with the following declarations: Serbia undertakes to ask for nothing beyond a line, drawn on the accompanying map, with starts from the Turco-Bulgarian frontier, at Mount Golem (north of Kriva Palanka), and follows a general south-western direction to the Lake of Orchrida, passing through Mount Kitka, between the villages of Metchevo and Podarikin, through the heights to the east of the village of Nerav, along the watershed to the height of 1,000, north of the village Bashtevo, between the villages of Lubentzi and Potarlitza, through the height Ostricht 1,000 (Lissetz Mountain), the height 1,050, the height 1,000, through the village Kashali, along the main watershed, Gradishte Mountain to the height Gorishte, towards the height 1,023, along the watershed between the villages of Ivankovtzi and Logintzi, through Vetersko and Sopot on the Vardar, then across the Vardar, along the mountain ridge towards the height 2,550, as far as Peropole Mountain, along its watershed between the villages of Krpa and Barbares to the height of 1,200, between the villages of Erkenovo and Drenovo, to the height Tchesma (1,254), along the watershed of Baba Mountain and Kroushka Tepessi, between the villages of Salp and Tzersko, to the height Protoiska Mountain, east of the village of Belitza, through Brejani to the height 1,200 (Ilniska Mountain), along the watershed through the height 1,330, to the height 1,217 and between the villages of Livoishta and Gorentzi to the Lake of Orchrida, near the monastery of Gabovtzi. Bulgaria undertakes to accept this line, if His Majesty the Russian Emperor, who will be requested to act as supreme arbitrator, pronounces in its favour. It is understood that the two parties bind themselves to accept as a definite frontier the line between the indicated frontiers which His Majesty the Russian Emperor will esteem to correspond best to the rights and the interests of the two parties.

Article 3. – A copy of the treaty and of the secret annex, as also of the military convention, will be jointly communicated to the Russian Government, which will be asked to take note of them, to show itself benevolent towards their aims, and to request His Majesty the Russian Emperor to accept and sanction the parts reserved by the treaty for His Majesty and the Imperial Government.

Article 4. – All disputes concerning the interpretation and execution of any part of this treaty, of its secret annex, and of the military convention will be submitted to the final decision of Russia, as soon as one of the contracting parties declares that, in its opinion, an agreement by direct negotiation is impossible.
Article 5. – No disposition of the present secret annex shall be made public, or communicated to another State, without the previous consent of the two parties and the permission of Russia.

Made in Sofia, on February 29, 1912 (old style).
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APPENDIX C

Listing of Major Political Assassinations, 1792-1914

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>James Lyall, British Deputy Consul in Bolivia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Umberto, King of Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Nikolai Pavlovich Bogolepov, Russian Minister of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>William McKinley, President of the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Dmitri Sergeevich Sipiagin, Russian Minister of the Interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Alexander Obrenović, King of Serbia, and his wife, Queen Draga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>M. Bogdanovich, Russian Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>General N. I. Bobrikov, Governor of Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Viacheslav Konstantinovich Plehve, Russian Minister of the Interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Bogoslavsky, Governor of the Caucasus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>M. Johnson, Procurator of the Finnish State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Grand Duke Sergei of Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Theodoros Delyannis, Prime Minister of Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Count I. E. Shuvalov, Prefect of the Moscow Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>August von Hennings, Assistant Chief of Courland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Professor Mikhail Yakovlevich Herzenstein, Jewish member of the Russian Duma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Count Alexei Ignatiev of Moscow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>General Liarpiarski, Military Governor of Warsaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>General von der Launitz, Perfect of the St. Petersburg Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Nikola Petkov, Prime Minister of Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Amin-es-Sultan, Prime Minister of Persia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Carlos I, King of Portugal, and Luis Felipe, Crown Prince</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Count Potocky, Governor of Galicia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Scott-Moncrieff, British Deputy Inspector of the Blue Nile Province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Asutosh Bisuas, Public Prosecutor of Bengal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Prince Dizhavakov of Transcaucasia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Fehmi Effendi, Albanian Politician</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1909  Marquis Hirobumi Ito, Japanese Statesman

1910  Butrus Pasha Gali, Prime Minister of Egypt

1911  Robert Ashe, District Magistrate at Tinnevelly, India
1911  Pyotr Arkadyevich Stolypin, Prime Minister of Russia
1911  Ramón Cáceres, President of the Dominican Republic

1912  José Canalejas y Méndez, Prime Minister of Spain
1912  Kopassis Effendi, Turkish Governor of Samos

1913  Francisco I. Madero, President of Mexico
1913  Franz Schuhmeier, Austrian Socialist Leader
1913  George, King of Greece
1913  Nazim Pasha, Commander in Chief of the Turkish Army
APPENDIX D

Note presented by Herr von Below Saleske, German Minister at Brussels, to M. Davignon, Belgian Minister for Foreign Affairs.
Brussels, 2 August 1914

Reliable information has been received by the German Government to the effect that French forces intend to march on the line of the Meuse by Givet and Namur. This information leaves no doubt as to the intention of France to march through Belgian territory against Germany.

The German Government cannot fear that Belgium, in spite of the utmost good-will, will be unable, without assistance, to repel so considerable a French invasion with sufficient prospect of success to afford an adequate guarantee against danger to Germany. It is essential for the self-defence of Germany that she should anticipate any such hostile attack. The German Government, would, however, feel the deepest regret if Belgium regarded as an act of hostility against herself the fact that the measures of Germany’s opponents force Germany, for her own protection, to enter Belgian territory.

In order to exclude any possibility of misunderstanding, the German Government makes the following declaration: –

1. Germany has in view no act of hostility against Belgium. In the event of Belgium being prepared in the coming war to maintain an attitude of friendly neutrality towards Germany, the German Government bind themselves, at the conclusion of peace, to guarantee the possessions and independence of the Belgian Kingdom in full.

2. Germany undertakes, under the above-mentioned condition, to evacuate Belgian territory on the conclusion of peace.

3. If Belgium adopts a friendly attitude, Germany is prepared, in coöperation with the Belgium authorities, to purchase all necessaries for her troops against a cash payment, and to pay an indemnity for any damage that may have been caused by German troops.

4. Should Belgium oppose the German troops, and in particular should she throw
difficulties in the way of their march by a resistance of the fortresses on the Meuse, or by destroying railways, roads, tunnels, or other similar works, Germany will, to her regret, be compelled to consider Belgium as an enemy.

In this event, Germany can undertake no obligations towards Belgium, but the eventual adjustment of the relations between the two States must be left to the decision of arms.

The German Government, however, entertain the distinct hope that this eventuality will not occur, and that the Belgian Government will know how to take the necessary measures to prevent the occurrence of incidents such as those mentioned. In this case the friendly ties which bind the two neighboring States will grow stronger and more enduring.
APPENDIX E

The Speech of Mr. Hugo Haase of Koenigsberg, Member of the Socialist Party

4 August 1914

Under instructions from my party I have to make the following statement. We stand before a fateful hour. The consequences of imperialistic policies, through which an era of competitive armaments was ushered in and the antagonism between the nations intensified, have swept over Europe like a tidal wave. The responsibility for all this rests upon those who uphold these policies. We refuse to share it. The socialists have fought against this ominous development with all their might, and to the last they have endeavored to secure peace through impressive demonstrations in all countries, especially in cordial agreement with our brothers in France. Their efforts have been in vain. Now we stand face to face with the grim fact of war. We are threatened by the horrors of hostile invasion. Neither for nor against the war have we to decide to-day, but solely on the means necessary for the defense of the country. To-day we must think of the millions of our fellow-countrymen who, without guilt of their own, have been drawn into this doom. They will be hardest hit by the devastation of the war. Our fervent wishes accompany our brothers who have been called to the colors, without difference of party. We also think of the mothers who must surrender their sons, and of the women and children who are deprived of husband and father and who, in addition to the anxiety for this beloved ones, are threatened by the terrors of hunger. Furthermore, there will soon be tens of thousands of wounded and mutilated soldiers. To help all of these, to lighten their lot, to alleviate all this untold distress – this we consider a compelling duty.

For our people and its future liberty much, if not all, is at stake, should victory be on the side of Russian despotism sullied with the blood of the best of its own people. It is necessary to ward off this danger, to render secure the civilization and independence of our own country. Under these circumstances we carry out what we have always maintained – in the hour of danger we do not leave the fatherland in the lurch. In so doing we feel in agreement with the international socialistic union, which at all times has recognized the rightful claim of every people to national independence and self-defense, just as we feel in agreement with it in condemning every war of conquest.

We demand that as soon as the goal of self-protection shall be attained and our enemies be inclined toward peace, the war be ended by a treaty which shall render possible friendly relations with the peoples that are our neighbors. We make this demand not only in the interest of that international solidarity for which we have always stood, but also in the interest of the German people themselves. We hope that the cruel school of the sufferings of war will awaken in additional millions the abhorrence of war and win them over to the ideal of socialism and of peace among nations. Guided by these principles we are willing to vote the credits asked for.

---

APPENDIX F

“An Appeal to the American People”
By President Woodrow Wilson
18 August 1914

The effect of the war upon the United States will depend upon what American citizens say and do. Every man who really loves America will act and speak in the true spirit of impartiality and fairness and friendliness to all concerned. The spirit of the nation in this critical matter will be determined largely by what individuals and societies and those gathered in public meetings do and say, upon what newspapers and magazines contain, upon what ministers utter in their pulpits, and men proclaim as their opinions on the street.

The people of the United States are drawn from many nations, and chiefly from the nations now at war. It is natural and inevitable that there should be the utmost variety of sympathy and desire among them with regard to the issues and circumstances of the conflict. Some will wish one nation, others another, to succeed in the momentous struggle. It will be easy to excite passion and difficult to allay it. Those responsible for exciting it will assume a heavy responsibility, responsibility for no less a thing than that the people of the United States, whose love of their country and whose loyalty to its government should unite them as Americans all, bound in honor and affection, to think first of her and her interests – may become divided in camps of hostile opinion, hot against each other, involved in the war itself in impulse and opinion, if not in action. Such divisions among us would be fatal to our peace of mind and might seriously stand in the way of the proper performance of our duty as the one great nation of peace, the one people holding itself ready to play a part of impartial mediation and speak the counsels of peace and accommodation, not as a partisan, but as a friend.

I venture, therefore, my fellow countrymen, to speak a solemn word of warning to you against that deepest, most subtle, most essential breach of neutrality which may spring out of partisanship, out of passionately taking sides. The United States must be neutral in fact as well as in name during these days that are to try men’s souls. We must be impartial in thought as well as in action, must put a curb upon our sentiments as well as upon every transaction that might be construed as a preference of one party to the struggle of another.

My thought is of America. I am speaking, I feel sure the earnest wish and purpose of every thoughtful American that this great country of ours, which is, of course, the first in our thoughts and in our hearts, should show herself in this time of peculiar trial a nation fit beyond others to exhibit the fine poise of undisturbed judgment, the dignity of self-control, the efficiency of dispassionate action; a nation that neither sits in judgment upon others nor is disturbed in her own counsels and disinterested and truly serviceable for the peace of the world.

---

Shall we not resolve to put upon ourselves the restraints which will bring to our people the happiness and the great and lasting influence for peace we covet for them?
Comrades: The information which I have recently obtained in connection with the proposed International Socialist Conference, scheduled to be held in Copenhagen on January 17th, is of such a nature that I strongly question the expediency of American participation in it.

The Conference as originally planned, or at least as understood on this side of the Atlantic Ocean, as to include representatives of all Socialist Parties in the neutral countries affiliated with the International Socialist Bureau, i.e., Bulgaria, Denmark, Holland, Italy, Norway, Roumania, Sweden, Spain, Switzerland, and the United States.

It appears, however, that the Socialists of Bulgaria and Roumania have either not been invited, or have declined to accept the invitation. The Socialist Party of Spain was requested to participate in the Conference, but has deemed it inadvisable to accept the invitation.

The Socialist of Italy and Switzerland had held a joint conference in the early days of the war, and agreed upon a common programme of action. It was hoped that they would join their comrades in the northern countries in the effort to secure a more representative and authoritative expression of neutral Socialist opinion. Within the last few weeks, however, several statements have appeared in the Socialist press of Germany and Switzerland which seemed to indicate that neither the Italian nor the Swiss Socialists intended to take part in the Copenhagen Conference.

Thus the much-hoped-for International Conference has dwindled down to a meeting of the Socialists of the three Scandinavian countries with the participation of the neighboring Holland.

That changes the entire aspect of the situation. The voice of a general council of the Socialists of the neutral countries might be expected to carry considerable weight with their comrades on both sides of the conflict; to influence their mutual feelings during the war and to aid them in the formulation of a uniform programme in connection with the future negotiations of their respective countries. A purely local conference, such as the Copenhagen assembly will unfortunately be, can hardly be expected to have such an effect. Moreover, the four countries which will be represented at Copenhagen have certain specific local and sectional interests, which are not shared by the other neutral countries, and I am inclined to believe that the United States would be out of place in such a conference. The neutrality of the countries of Europe is not as absolute as that of the United States. Owing to their geographical positions, commercial

---

interests, and racial ties, most European countries are somewhat biased in favor of one or the
other of the belligerent forces, and before the war is over some of them may be drawn into the
active conflict. The very fact that even the Socialists of all neutral countries refuse to meet in
common conference at this time indicates that the feeling among the neutral nations is somewhat
strained. America alone has no interest in this war except in its speedy termination, and
American Socialists above all others must studiously avoid even the slightest appearance of bias
or discrimination among their unfortunate comrades in Europe. This war will end sometime, and
when it ends somebody will have to initiate the work of reconstructing the shattered International
of the workers. This great task will logically fall to the Socialists of America, the Socialists of
the most important and least concerned nation. I fear that this mission, the largest that will ever
come to our movement, may be jeopardized by the participation in a somewhat one-sided
conference, and therefore have concluded not to go to Copenhagen.
Dear Comrades! Forgive me for writing only a few hurried lines. I am imprisoned and fettered by militarism; therefore, I am unable to come to you. My heart, my head, my entire cause is nevertheless with you. . . .

It is our duty to promote mutual understanding, encouragement, and inspiration among those who remain true to the flag, who are determined not to give way one inch before international imperialism, even if they fall victims to it, and to create order in the ranks of those who are determined to hold out – to hold out and to fight, with their feet firmly planted on the basis of international socialism. . . .

Civil war, not civil peace! Exercise international solidarity for the proletariat against pseudo-national, pseudo-patriotic class harmony, and for international class war for peace, for the socialist revolution. How the fight is to be fought must be decided. Only in co-operation, in the mutual working of one land with another, by mutually strengthening each other, can the greatest possible forces and thus the attainable results be achieved.

The friends of every country hold in their hands the hopes and prospects of the friends of every other country. You French and you German socialists especially, have one and the same fate. You French friends, I implore you not to allow yourselves to be caught by the phrase of national truce – to this you are really immune – or by the equally dangerous phrase of the party truce! Every protest against this, every manifestation of your rejection of the semiofficial government policy, every bold acknowledgement of the class struggle, of solidarity with us and of the proletarian will to peace, strengthens our fighting spirit, increases tenfold our force to work in Germany for the proletariat of the world, for its economic and political emancipation, for its emancipation form the fetters of capitalism, and also from the chains of Tsarism, Kaiserism, Junkerism, and militarism, which is no less international; to fight in Germany for the political and social liberation of the German people against German imperialists’ power and lust for territory; to fight for a speedy peace, which would also restore unhappy Belgium to freedom and independence and give back France to the French people.

French brothers, we know the peculiar difficulties of your tragic situation and bleed with you as with the tormented and stoned masses of all peoples! Your misfortune is our misfortune, as we know that our pain is your pain. Let our fight be your fight. Help us, as we swear to help you.

―

The new International will arise; it can arise on the ruins of the old, on a new and firmer foundation. Today, friends, socialists from all countries, you have to lay the foundation stone for the future structure. . . .

Long live the people’s peace of the future! Long live antimilitarism! Long live international, people-emancipating, revolutionary socialism!

Proletarians of all countries – reunite!
Proletarians of Europe! The war has lasted more than a year. . . .

Irrespective of the truth as to the direct responsibility for the outbreak of the war, one thing is certain: *The war which has produced this chaos is the outcome of imperialism*, of the attempt, on the part of the capitalist classes of each nation, to foster their greed for profit by the exploitation of human labour and of the natural treasures of the entire globe.

Economically backward or politically weak nations are thereby subjugated by the Great Powers who, in this war, are seeking to remake the world map with blood and iron in accord with their exploiting interests. Thus, entire nations and countries like Belgium, Poland, and the Balkan states, and Armenia are threatened with the fate of being torn asunder, annexed as a whole or in part as booty in the game of compensations. . . .

Workers! Exploited, disfranchised, scorned, they called you brothers and comrades at the outbreak of the war when you were to be led to the slaughter, to death. And now that militarism has crippled you, mutilated you, degraded and annihilated you, the rulers demand that you surrender your interests, your aims, your ideals — in a word, servile, subordination to civil peace. They rob you of the possibility of expressing your views, your feelings, your pains; they prohibit you from raising your demands and defending them. The press gagged, political rights and liberties trod upon — this is the way the *military dictatorship* rules to-day with an iron hand. . . .

This struggle is the struggle for freedom, for the reconciliation of peoples, for Socialism. It is necessary to take up this struggle for peace, for a peace without annexations or war indemnities. *Such a peace, however, is only possible if every thought of violating the rights and liberties of nations is condemned*. . . . The right of self-determination of nations must be the indestructible principle in the system of national relationships of peoples.

*Proletarians! Since the outbreak of the war, you have placed your energy, your courage, your endurance at the service of the ruling classes. Now you must stand up for your own cause, for the sacred aims of Socialism, for the emancipation of the oppressed nations as well as of the enslaved classes, by means of the irreconcilable proletarian class struggle*. . . .

---

PROLETARIANS OF EUROPE!

The war has now lasted for more than a year. The battlefields are strewn with millions of dead, millions have been crippled and doomed to remain a burden to themselves and to others for the rest of their lives. The war has caused terrific devastations, it will result in an unheard-of increase in taxes.

The capitalists of all countries, who at the price of proletarian blood have been reaping enormous profits during the war, demand of the masses that they strain all their efforts and hold out to the end. They say: “The war is necessary for the defence of the fatherland, it is waged in the interests of democracy.” They lie! In not a single country did the capitalists start the war because the independence of their country was threatened, or because they wanted to free an oppressed people. They have led the masses to slaughter because they want to oppress and to exploit other peoples. They were unable to agree between themselves as to how to divide the peoples of Asia and Africa that were still independent; they were lying in ambush for each other, watching for a chance to snatch from each other the spoils previously seized.

It is, therefore, no reason why this fratricidal war should be waged to the end, to the last drop of blood; on the contrary, every effort must be strained to put an end to it.

The time for this has already come. What you must demand first, is that your Socialist Deputies, those whom you delegated to Parliament to fight against capitalism, against militarism, against the exploitation of the people, do their duty. All of them, with the exception of the Russian, Serbian, and Italian comrades, and with the exception of Comrades Liebknecht and Rühle, have trampled upon that duty; they have either supported the bourgeoisie in their rapacious war, or else have vacillated and have shirked responsibility. You must demand that they either resign from their seats, or that they use the platform of parliament to make clear to the people the nature of the present war, and that outside of parliament they help the working class to resume its struggle. You first demand must be this: refusal of all war credits, withdrawal from the cabinets in France, Belgium, and England.

But that is not all! The Deputies cannot save you from that rabid beast, the World War, that subsists on your blood. You must act yourselves. You must make use of all your organisations, of your entire press, to rouse the broadest masses groaning under the burden of...
war to revolt against it. You must go out into the streets and throw into the face of the ruling classes your rallying cry: “Enough of slaughter!” Let the ruling classes remain deaf to it, the discontented masses will hear it, and they will join you and take a part in the struggle.

The demand must immediately and energetically be made that the war be stopped; a loud protest must be raised against the exploitation of one people by another, against the division of any people among several states. All this will take place, if any capitalist government comes out victorious and is able to dictate the terms of peace to others. If we allow the capitalists to conclude peace in the same manner as they started the war, without the participation of the masses, the new conquests will not only strengthen reaction and arbitrary police rule in the victorious country, but they will sow the seeds of new wars, even more horrible.

The overthrow of the capitalist governments – this is the object which the working class in all belligerent countries must set themselves, because only then will an end be put to the exploitation of one people by another, an end put to wars, when capital has been deprived of the power of disposing of the life and death of peoples. Only people who shall be freed of want and misery, of the rule of capital, will be in a position to settle their mutual relations, not by war, but by friendly agreement.

Great is the goal we set ourselves, great are the efforts that will be required to attain it, great will be the sacrifices before it is attained. Long will be the road to victory. Methods of peaceful pressure will be insufficient to overcome the enemy. But it is only when you are ready to make for your own liberation, in the struggle against capital, part of those innumerable sacrifices that you have been making on the battlefield for the interests of capital, only then will you be able to put an end to the war, to lay a firm foundation for a lasting peace, which will transform you from slaves of capital into free men.

But if the deceitful phrases of the bourgeoisie and of the Socialist parties that support it succeed in restraining you from energetic struggle, and if you confine yourselves to pious wishes because you are unwilling to proceed to an attack and to sacrifice your bodies and souls for the great cause, then capital will go on shedding your blood and wasting your belongings at its own discretion. In all countries the number of those who think as we do grows daily. It is by their order that we have assembled, representatives of various countries, to address to you this call to battle. We shall carry on this struggle with mutual support, as there are no interests to divide us. It is essential that the revolutionary workers of each country deem it their duty and honourable distinction to serve as a model for others, a model of energy and self-sacrifice. Not timid expectation as to whither the struggle of others will lead, but struggle in the first ranks – that is the road that leads to the formation of a powerful International which will put an end to war and capitalism.

September 5-8, 1915.
APPENDIX K

Liebknecht’s May Day Manifesto, 1916

Poverty and misery, need and starvation, are ruling in Germany, Belgium, Poland and Servia, whose blood the vampire of imperialism is sucking and which resemble vast cemeteries. The entire world, the much-praised European civilization, is falling into ruins through the anarchy which has been let loose by the world war.

Those who profit from the war want war with the United States. To-morrow, perhaps, they may order us to aim lethal weapons against new groups of brethren, against our fellow-workers in the United States, and fight America, too. Consider well this fact: As long as the German people does not arise and use force directed by its own will, the assassination of the people will continue. Let thousands of voices shout ‘Down with the shameless extermination of nations! Down with those responsible for these crimes!’ Our enemy is not the English, French, nor Russian people, but the great German landed proprietors, the German capitalists and their executive committee.

Forward, let us fight the government; let us fight these mortal enemies of all freedom. Let us fight for everything which means the future triumph of the working-classes, the future of humanity and civilization.

Workers, comrades, and you, women of the people, let not this festival of May, the second during the war, pass without protest against the Imperialist Slaughter. One the first of May let millions of voices cry, ‘Down with the shameful crime of the extermination of peoples!’ Down with those responsible for the War!’

---

APPENDIX L

Reich Conference of the Spartacists and Left Radicals
7 October 1918

(1) Immediate release of all persons who because of their fight for the interest of the interests of
the proletariat are suffering in prisons and jails, in protective custody or serving a
sentence. . . .

(2) Immediate abrogation of the state of siege.

(3) Immediate cancellation of the compulsory labor law.

Beyond these the proletariat must request:
(1) Annulment of all war loans without compensation.

(2) Expropriation of the entire bank capital, mines and foundries; substantial reduction of
working hours, establishment of minimum wages.

(3) Expropriation of all large estates and middle-sized estates. Transfer of the direction of
production to the delegates of agricultural workers and small farmers.

(4) Decisive changes in military affairs, such as:
a. Granting to soldiers the right of free association and assembly for matters
pertaining to official and non-official business.

b. Abrogation of the right of military superiors to discipline subordinates;
discipline will be maintained by soldier delegates.

c. Abrogation of courts-martial.

d. Transfer of military superiors by majority decision of the subordinates.

(5) Transfer of the distribution of food to representatives of the workers.

(6) Abolition of individual states and dynasties.

Proletarians, the achievement of these demands does not mean the realization of your aims; this
is only the acid test to determine if the democratized which the ruling classes and their agents are
telling you about is genuine. The struggle for real democratization does not revolve around

---
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parliament, election law or ministers who can simultaneously retain their deputy status in the Reichstag, and other swindles; [the fight] is directed against the real foundation of all enemies of the people: ownership of landed property and capital, control over the armed forces and over the judiciary. . . .
Workers, Awake! – The dreams of the German imperialists of world domination, which they sought to rear on heaps of corpses, in a sea of blood, have gone up in smoke. Vain are their efforts! The sword cannot forever rule the world. In one night everything has tumbled down with a crash. . . . In the battlefields of Flanders, the Balkans and Palestine defeat after defeat. The alliance of the Central Powers, that was to serve as a foundation for world domination by Germany, has failed completely. . . . The German people do not any longer want a German protectorate and war, the people desire peace. . . .

Thus the ruling clique in Germany tries to remain in power. It feels the ground is slipping away beneath it. It is bankrupt – bankrupt in the battlefields, bankrupt in its internal and external policies. And now it stands aghast before the consequences of its criminal military adventure. It is appalled at the very thought of the awakening of the tortured, misled proletariat, at the thought of coming judgment of the people. . . .

. . . the German proletariat must become the master of the whole situation. Forward with the banner of Socialism! Long live the revolution of the international proletariat!

We must not look forward to a victory of Anglo-French imperialism. If arms dictate peace, then the cause of freedom and socialism will be lost. No matter which guns be victorious, whether German or English, the working class everywhere will have to pay the bill. The international reaction and militarism, in case they are victorious, will put on the working class chains ten times heavier than before.

The proletariat of all countries must stop the slaughter by rising. They are called to dictate peace in the interests of freedom and Socialism.

Now the hour has come to act. At this moment the English and French workmen may follow the single given by the German workers. This signal must be given. Forward, German workers, soldiers, male and female! Forward to the battle for freedom, for an immediate peace and Socialism! Forward toward the brotherhood of all peoples under the banner of free labor! Down with the class rule of the bourgeoisie! All power to the proletariat! Long live the German republic! Long live the international revolution of the proletariat!

APPENDIX N

Conditions Between SPD & the USPD on the Evening of 9 November 1918

“In order to give the full context, both the USPD conditions and the MSPD [Majority Socialist Party] replies are reprinted below:

1. Germany is to be a Social Republic.

   (Reply): This demand is the goal of our own policy. In the meantime the people must decide on it through a constituent assembly.

2. In this republic all executive, legislative, and judicial powers should lie exclusively in the hands of the elected delegates of the whole working population and of the soldiers.

   (Reply): If what is meant by this demand is the dictatorship of one part of one class without the backing of the majority of the people, then we must reject this demand as it contradicts our democratic principles.

3. The exclusion of all bourgeois members from the government.

   (Reply): We must reject his demand as its implementation would endanger our ability to feed the people, if not render it completely impossible.

4. The participation of the Independents is only provisional for three days in order to create a government capable of bringing about an armistice.

   (Reply): We regard the cooperation of both socialist parties as desirable; at least until the opening of the constituent assembly.

5. The departmental ministers are only to serve as technical advisors to the cabinet, which is to be the real decision maker.

   (Reply): We agree to this demand.

6. Equality of the two leaders of the cabinet.

   (Reply): We are in favor of all members of the cabinet being equal; but it is for the constituent assembly to decide on this matter.

---

APPENDIX O

Joint Proclamation from the Revolutionary Shop Stewards: Karl Liebknecht, Paul Scholze and Georg Ledebour
5 January 1919

Attention! Workers! Party Comrades!

The Ebert-Scheidemann government had heightened its counterrevolutionary activities with a new contemptible conspiracy directed against the revolutionary workers of Great Berlin: it tried maliciously to oust Chief of Police Eichhorn from his office. It wished to replace Eichhorn with its willing tool, the present Prussian minister of Police, Ernst.

By this action, the Ebert-Scheidemann government wishes not only to remove the last trusted man of the revolutionary Berlin workers, but primarily it intends to establish in Berlin a despotic rule antagonistic to the revolutionary workers.

Workers! Party Comrades! The person of Eichhorn is not the main issue; you yourselves will lose the last remnants of your revolutionary achievements throughout this major blow.

The Ebert government with its accomplices in the Prussian Ministry intends to support its power through bayonettes and to secure for itself the grace of the capitalist bourgeoisie, whose disguised representative it was from the very beginning.

By this blow directed against the Berlin police headquarters, the entire German proletariat, the entire German Revolution is to be stuck.

Workers! Party Comrades! This you cannot and must not permit! Therefore, turn out for powerful mass demonstrations. Prove your power to the autocrats of today; prove that the revolutionary spirit of the November days has not been extinguished.

Come today, Sunday, at 2 p.m. to the impressive mass demonstrations in the Siegesallee!

Come in masses! Your freedom, your future, the fate of the Revolution is at stake! Down with the despotism of Ebert, Scheidemann, Hirsch, and Ernst! Long live revolutionary, international socialism!

---

APPENDIX P

“An Act to Exclude and Expel from the United States Aliens who are Members of the Anarchistic and Similar Classes”

Approved
16 October 1918

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That aliens who are anarchists; aliens who believe in or advocate the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States or of all forms of law; aliens who disbelieve in or are opposed to all organized government; aliens who advocate or teach the assassination of public officials; aliens who advocate or teach the unlawful destruction of property; aliens who are members of or affiliated with any organization that entertains a belief in, teaches, or advocates the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States or of all forms of law, or that entertains or teaches disbelief in or opposition to all organized government, or that advocates the duty, necessity, or propriety of the unlawful assaulting or killing of any officer or officers, either of specific individuals or of officers generally, of the Government of the United States or of any other organized government, because of his or their official character, or that advocates or teaches the unlawful destruction of property shall be excluded from admission into the United States.

SEC. 2. That any alien who, at any time after entering the United States, is found to have been at the time of entry, or to have become thereafter, a member of any one of the classes of aliens enumerated in section one of this Act, shall, upon the warrant of the Secretary of Labor, be taken into custody and deported in the manner provided in the immigration Act of February fifth, nineteen hundred and seventeen. The provisions of this section shall be applicable to the classes of aliens mentioned in this Act irrespective of the time of their entry into the United States.

SEC. 3. That any alien who shall, after he has been excluded and deported or arrested and deported in pursuance of the provisions of this Act, thereafter return to or enter the United States or attempt to return to or to enter the United States shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by imprisonment for a term of not more than five years; and shall, upon the termination of such imprisonment, be taken into custody, upon the warrant of the Secretary of Labor, and deported in the manner provided in the immigration Act of February fifth, nineteen hundred and seventeen.

---

On January 2 [1920] Arthur L. Barkey, Chief agent of the Department of Justice in Detroit, received an order from Attorney General Palmer instructing Mr. Barkey, according to his own statement, to raid the headquarters of a group of interdicted organizations, principally the Communist party,” as long as they continue to meet,” in a “supreme effort to break the back of radicalism” in Detroit. As a result, eight hundred men were imprisoned for from three to six days in a dark, windowless, narrow corridor running around the big central areaway of the city’s antiquated Federal Building; they slept on the bare stone floor at night. * * * They were compelled to stand in long lines for access to the solitary drinking fountain and the one toilet; they were denied all food for twenty hours, and after that were fed on what their families brought in; and they were refused all communication with relatives or with attorneys. These eight hundred men, so closely packed that they had to step over one another’s bodies to move about at all, included in their number citizens and aliens, college graduates and laborers, skilled mechanics making $15 a day and boys not yet out of short trousers. They were seized without warrant while attending dances and classes in physical geography and similar subjects; * * * . . . .

Today, January 19, the 300 men left of the 800 seized are housed in an old army fort here. In addition, about 140 are out on bond. Warrants for holding these 440 arrived from Washington on January 12, ten days after the raids.

---