

was not entertained, nor so much as mentioned, during the negotiations. The consultations between Mr. Adams and Lord Bathurst commenced on the basis of requiring us the renunciation of the boat or shore fisheries, and of no others. At the first interview, his Lordship used this distinct and emphatic language: "As, on the one hand, Great Britain could not permit the vessels of the United States to fish within the creeks and close to the shores of the British Territories, so, on the other hand, it was by no means her intention to interrupt them in fishing anywhere in the open sea, or without the territorial jurisdiction, a marine league from the shore." Again, and on a subsequent occasion, he said, it is not "of fair competition that His Majesty's Government complain, but of the preoccupation of British harbors and creeks." The negotiation proceeded and terminated on this supposition, that we relinquished the inner grounds, as they are termed, and retained the outer, or vessel fisheries, "anywhere," and everywhere three miles from the coast. Did space allow, it might be shown, from both sides of the correspondence, that this original thought of Lord Bathurst was kept continually in view; and that the "Bays" named by Lord Stanley are not once referred to.

Contemporaneous exposition of a paper is always authoritative to some extent, and, in this case, I claim that it is decisive. It is of consequence, also, to know whether the renunciations clause on which Lord Stanley relies was introduced by our diplomatists, or their opponents. It was brought forward by Messrs. Rush and Gallatin for special objects, and is in no sense applicable to the purposes for which it is now used. On the day the treaty was signed, these gentlemen wrote our Secretary of State, that they "insisted" upon the insertion of that clause; and why? "With the view, first, of preventing any implication that the fisheries secured to us were a new grant, and of placing the permanence of the rights secured and of those renounced precisely on the same footing. Secondly, of its being extended only to the distance of three miles." And they add, that from communications received by them, it appeared that, with the exception of the open boat fishery, the fishing ground on the whole coast of Nova Scotia is more than three miles from the shores; and they conclude with the remark, that notwithstanding the three mile renunciation, "it is hoped that a considerable portion of the actual fisheries on that coast (of Nova Scotia) will be preserved."

If, as Lord Stanley contends in these dispatches, we cannot enter a single "Bay" of this Colony, what did the American Ministers who had signed the Convention of 1818, mean? Under circumstances highly interesting to his fame with this generation and with posterity, the late President Adams declared that that Convention "secures essentially and substantially all the rights acquired by the treaty of 1783;" and that it "has secured the whole coast fishery of every part of the British dominions, excepting within three marine miles of the shores." Is it to be believed, in view of the course of Mr. Adams and Mr. Gallatin at Ghent, and of the remarks of Lord Bathurst at the opening conference, which I have cited, that, after three years of negotiation, a treaty should have been framed which took from us very much more than the British Government required us to surrender at the outset? The thing seems not only improbable, but utterly impossible. Our Statesmen have been accused, on the other side of the Atlantic, of a limited knowledge of international law, but never of yielding up our interests. Indeed, the standing charge against them is, that they overreach, and drive too hard bargains. But in the supposition that the right of fishing has been abandoned in the "bays" of New-Brunswick and Nova Scotia, those negotiators who consented to the Treaty of 1818, allowed themselves to be most scandalously overreached, and never discovered the cheat.

And it must not be said, that the relinquishment of the boat or shore fisheries was too inconsiderable an object to be strongly insisted on by the British Government. Practical men understand their value quite too well to allow any force to such a suggestion. The Colonists, secure in these, have vast treasures at their very doors, and may dispense with the use of vessels. Oftentimes they have but to cast, turn and draw seines and nets, to take hundreds of barrels of mackerel and herring; and years have occurred when no less than forty thousand barrels of the former fish have been caught in a single season, on a portion of the coast only twelve miles long. And as for the shore fishery, for the kinds usually dried, that in the region of Barrington is, of itself, a mine of wealth. Colonial fishermen, here and elsewhere along the coast, can take care of their little farms, and may sleep in their beds in their own homes, after every day's toil.

And now, what has been the British construction of the treaty? I have documentary evidence on this head that is entirely satisfactory, but cannot adduce it all. "On meeting with any foreign vessel fishing or at anchor in any of the harbors or creeks in His Majesty's North American dominions, were the orders of Admiral Milne to Capt. Chambers, or within our maritime jurisdiction, you will seize," &c. And Captain Chambers' report of his doings shows that he did seize or molest vessels found fishing in creeks and harbors, and in the interdicted limits of three miles, and so others. The Commerce, one of our fishing vessels, was seized in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and sent in for trial, by a Colonial cutter; but it was released after a hearing, because, though within the body or "headlands" of the Gulf, no offense had been committed within the shore prohibition. In the official letter of the commander of another revenue vessel, whose chief duty it was for a considerable period, to attend to the fisheries, I find it stated, that "from 600 to 700 sail of American fishermen drive into the Gulf annually," where they remain "without molestation from the Government" of Prince Edward's Island. A respectable Colonial newspaper, in commenting upon the dispatch of March 30th, which opens the Bay of Fundy, objected to the permission, on the ground that our privileges were already ample; for, "in the Convention of 1818, it is stipulated that the citizens of the United States shall be allowed to fish within three nautical miles around all our coasts." It should have been different, it argues, and should have reserved to "British subjects, the quiet and undisturbed possession of our bays and inlets." This last is not of decisive authority, as may be admitted; but the article from which the words are quoted is able, and was copied by the Colonial press, and commented on as expressing sound views. I cite it, as against the Colonists, to show that a portion of them, with great fairness, in 1845, adhered to the old construction.

If Lord Stanley be in the right, how has it happened that we have had uninterrupted use of the "bays" of New-Brunswick and Nova Scotia since the Convention of 1818, in the same sense that we did under the Treaty of 1783? This fact admits not of the shadow of a doubt. I have known about three hundred American fishing vessels to be in sight of each other at one time, in one of these "bays." I have known armed ships of the Crown, sent specially to present aggressive on our flag, to pass or to board vessels bearing our flag "bound in these bays," without capture or

warning, and this, year after year. Hundreds of witnesses are alive to testify to the same fact. But under the supposition that this has been done by permission, and not of right, I submit with confidence, that the permission granted during more than a quarter of a century under this treaty, with the certain knowledge that we claimed what was thus permitted, as a right, has confirmed that claim, and that the privileges thus enjoyed cannot be withdrawn. The principle that rights to a fishery may be acquired and held by use, is distinctly recognized by writers on international law. Hence, I maintain that all the elements in the case, namely, contemporaneous understanding; subsequent construction by both parties; and constant occupation, are against the doctrine asserted in these dispatches.

If asked how I dispose of the term "bays" in the treaty, I answer that it applies to such arms of the sea as, on some coasts, are called coves or creeks, and was meant to designate all sheets of water which are not six miles wide, and no others. That our ministers acted upon information obtained of persons engaged in the fisheries, seems certain, for the negotiation was suspended to obtain it; and we may reasonably conclude that their informants spoke of these coves or creeks by the popular name of bays. On the coast of Nova Scotia, there are a multitude of "bays," some of which are more, and many less, than six miles wide at their mouths or outer headlands. In fact, I know of no coast where there are so numerous. To mention all would occupy more space than we can spare. Mace's, St. Mary's, Barrington, Liverpool, Malapanah, Mahone, Marguot's, Blind, Temant's, Pennant's, Chisnet-cook, Musquidobit, Newtonquoddy, Shoal, Tom Lee's, Nunsquiquire, Nicoutam, and Dover, are but a part, though the most considerable, of those between the St. Croix and Cape Canso alone. That it may be fully understood in what sense the word "bay" is used in speaking of indentations of the coast, at the East, I give an example in the case of the Passamaquoddy, which in itself is only a branch bay of Fundy. In this small branch bay, then, in common language, are Cipp's, S.uth, East, Rumsey's, Cobcock, Strait, Friar's, Casco, and Westquoddy; and the Passamaquoddy, after being thus minutely divided, takes the name of St. Andrew's Bay, northerly and westerly of Eastport. The term "bays" is, therefore, of sufficient significance in the treaty, without embracing bodies of water which are as large as many European seas, and which are held as seas, in America. I claim that our vessels can enter these seas of right, and fish in them, and can enter and fish in their branches, where the shore on either hand is more than three miles distant. In my judgment, we can no more be excluded from the Bay of Cansu, from the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and the Bay of Fundy, or from any similar "bays" or seas, than from the great ocean itself. I shall conclude the subject in another letter. Respectfully,
LORENZO SABINE.

Another View of the Case.

To the Editors of The New-York Tribune:

The public mind is, I think, led astray on this subject on two or three important points.

First, it is supposed that the right set up by Great Britain is unjust to the United States, and unreasonable.

Secondly, that the rights she now claims are founded on a new construction of an old treaty, and are now advanced for the first time.

Thirdly, that a large fleet has been suddenly sent out from England to drive off or capture American vessels fiercely, and without notice to any one. All these ideas are erroneous.

With regard to the first, England, it would seem, is only carrying out the principle of giving protection to native industry; and this she does at the urgent solicitation of the British fishermen. The Americans visit the British coasts to take fish, and this they frequently do in the very harbors and bring them to the United States for the sale, which they effect at a handsome profit; while, if the British fisherman come with his fish, he is met with a prohibitory duty of twenty per cent. This is a hard case, but would be acquiesced in, if the Americans would confine themselves to the provisions of the treaty, which, it is vehemently alleged, they do not, but violate it in sundry ways.

It is these repeatedly imputed violations which give rise to all these troubles.

With regard to the second point, that the case is new, the error is still more palpable, for it is within my own recollection that this fishy hab-bub has occurred annually for upward of twenty years, and commonly makes its periodical visitation with *shad* and *salmon*. As long ago as 1833, the Lexington U. S. Corvette, Capt. Shubrick, was sent down to give protection to the American fishermen. Her stay was short, for her presence gave great offence to the British Government, because she was sent to exercise police in British waters wholly within British territories.

The large fleet of nineteen vessels was not suddenly sent out from England, but consisted of 74, under Admiral Seymour, and all the larger vessels under his command, are nothing more than the regular squadron of the West India and North American station; and the reason why they are on the Nova Scotia shores now is, that Halifax, during the summer season, is always the headquarters of that fleet.

All the additional force brought into service for enforcing the provisions of the treaty, this year, consists of some small vessels, the advent of which was duly announced to the Government of the United States some time ago. A NEUTRAL.

NEW TRACKS ON OLD ROADS.

No. VII.

A CHAPTER ON FRANKFORT.

FRANKFORT ON THE MAIN, Friday, July 9, 1852.

One may travel far before coming to another so attractive stopping-place as the Free City of Frankfort. It is one of the cheeriest cities of Germany. The broad modern streets, lined with stately edifices; the narrow, crooked but cleanly ways of the older parts, overhung by quaint projecting gables and busy with traffic; the broad, shaded promenade that surrounds the city on the site of its old fortification, and the suburban residences of wealthy citizens on its outskirts; in fine, all the external appearances of Frankfort give a favorable impression of the general prosperity of its people. So far as I learn—not that one makes very profound inquiries in five days—this impression is not belied by facts. The very great proportion of the Frankforters are in comfortable circumstances, and their poorer brethren are well cared for by public provision. Many of the merchants and bankers are in the receipt of princely incomes and live in princely style. At their head are the Rothschilds, whose central houses still here. Old Meyer Asenath Rothschild is, I think, the oldest surviving member of the family; a withered, ancient man, in feeble health of body, but retaining full possession of all his arithmetical faculties. An amusing anecdote in proof was told me this morning. In spite of the old gentleman's excessive wealth, he is not heedless of the poor. When a beggar, to whom he had given six kreutzers, thanked him with the customary formula, "May God return it to you a thousand fold, the banker was heard to murmur, "That would come to sixty-six gulden four kreutzer." His nephews are men of pleasure as well as business; they have their country-houses and follow the chase, and the uncle lives in a grand house on the Zelt, which is the grand street of Frankfort. But he can remember the time when he and his race were limited to the old Judengasse, (Jews' lane) which was shut up with gates and bolts every evening, and on Sundays and holidays. If he or his ventured after dark or on these days out into the

Christian streets, they were fined if not more severely punished. It was under such foul oppressions, however, that the fortunes of his house took their rise and began to flourish. At the entrance of this street is still the bureau, the council-rooms of the imperial firm, where they receive tributes from the principalities and powers of the world. A poor devil of a Christian clerk sits there.

Jews settled in Frankfort under some imperfect, dearly-paid protection of the German Emperors as early as the twelfth century. In 1339 their wretched habitations were set fire to by religious fanatics, called Flagellants. In 1402 they built in the present Judengasse, or New-Egypt, as it is sometimes named. Fire came upon them yet again in 1711. I roughly translate a brief account of the last conflagration, as illustrative of the spirit of that time: "Meanwhile, all the houses were burned up stock and branch, and indeed in such wise that not a single one of so many houses, nay, not so much as a stick of wood of an arm's length remained, which is surely marvelous. It was remarkable, also, that when one side of the street was burned down, the wind turned about as though it had finished there the business on which it was sent, and would now carry it on further; so that by this the other and greater part of the street was seized on by the fire and laid in ashes. The fire broke out almost in the middle of the street, in the house of the Rabbi Naphthali, their most famous Doctor. It is related for a certain truth, that when their Rabbi, who was residing in the Cabala, and had kindled for experiment a great heap of wood in his house, he became confused in his incantation, and in place of conjuring the water-spirit to extinguish the fire kindled by him, called up the fire-spirit. Wherefore it was altogether in vain to try to save the smallest Jewish building. This is also to be considered in the conflagration, that of the many Christian houses that were not a single one was spared." Seeing on one side this account, written about one hundred years, and the persecutions and oppressions under which the Jews existed until the close of the last century, and seeing on the other side the friendly terms on which Jews and Catholics and Protestants now live and work together here, one would say the world had made progress. More, however, it is to be made. Some additional measure of justice was dealt out to the Jews in the Revolution of 1848; but they are not yet admitted to a full political equality with the Christian citizens of Frankfort. Just at this time the question of revising the constitution of the city is much discussed, and some propose as one of the alterations, the admissibility of Jews to the Senate. With the present reactionary spirit of the German powers, it would seem, however, a dangerous time to attempt a revision; the next at a change to something better might easily result in a change to something worse, forced on from without.

The old city is rich in historical associations.—They cluster about the gloomy old Saalhof, on the site of which Charlemagne in the year 794 presided over an assembly of the bishops and grandees of his Empire: Sachsenhausen, just across the Main, was peopled under his orders by a colony of conquered Saxons whom he had Christianized in his native land. His statue stands upon the bridge which his descendants, now mostly gardeners and vintners, cross in coming to the city. I will say nothing of the *Romer* where the German Emperors were crowned, nor of the square in front of it, the *Romerberg*, referring all who are not yet familiar with it to Goethe's admirable description of the coronation ceremonies and popular entertainments which took place there. Many other facts of his autobiography may be read with increased interest among the scenes of his boyhood, changed as they are, since his time. His fathers' house, in the rebuilding of which he almost makes us assist by the magic of his style, remains unaltered. On its front is a marble tablet with the inscription, "Here was born John Wolfgang Goethe, 18 August 1749."

A colossal image of him by Schwanthaler is erected in the square called the *Romerberg*. Another in marble of life-size, representing him in a sitting posture, is placed in the City Library, a work of high merit, by Marchesi, an Italian artist.—Several hospitals, a museum of natural history, and a number of collections of art, private and public, testify to the generous disposition and liberal tastes of the Frankforters. Thus, citizen Stadel, dying in 1816, left to the city his cabinet of paintings and engravings. Many other facts of his life, his hours and 1,300,000 guilders (say \$500,000), for the foundation of the Art-Institute which goes by his name. Among the celebrated modern works in this gallery are Overbeck's *Triumph of Christianity in the Arts*, too pedantically symbolic, and only to be understood by first reading a long exegesis—two masterpieces of Lessing, and other fine specimens of the Düsseldorf school. This collection is free to all visitors. The *Berlin* Museum, by the liberality of its owner, equally accessible. It is a collection of casts from the antique. But more attractive than these is the surpassing beauty of Droebecker's marble group—*Ariadne*, the bride of Bacchus, half sitting, half reclined upon a banister, and almost rigid past you in glad triumph. In boldness of conception and grand execution, it is unequalled by any other marble work in modern sculpture. It is placed, with the copies just mentioned, in a small building in the garden of Herr von Bethmann. Not even a porter stands at the garden gate to watch your entrance. A domestic is in attendance only to show the collection, not one of the vexatious band-organ species, that grind out to your vexation an unpunctuated catalogue raisonné of the objects before you, but a quiet, civil man, whose commendable taciturnity you reward with a few kreutzers. The amount of the fee, or the giving at all, is optional with the visitor. The fine series of imperial portraits lately placed on the walls of the great dining hall in the *Romer* is extremely interesting, in an historical as well as artistic point of view. It commences with Charlemagne (A. D. 768) and closes with Frederick III. (A. D. 1795), the last crowned Emperor of the Holy German Empire. Beneath the likenesses of these princes are their chosen mottoes, generally expressing some virtuous maxim or principle, with which the practice of their lives stands in sorry contrast. The paintings are the productions of thirty-five different German artists. Apart by itself, but in the same hall, and as an appendix to the series, his plain, singular, and singularly good, is the coronation robes of the others, hangs the portrait of Arch-Duke John, of Austria, Reichswirer, or Administrator of the Realm under the short-lived Constitution of 1848. But this is coming to the very brink of an historical-political paragraph, which I escape by a turn through the streets.

The night of the 22d and 23d of July, 1852, was a week to a July sun, they are neither dusty nor ill-remembered. They are clean-swept early in the morning, and sometimes again in the course of the day; and yet Frankfort is eminently a busy, business city. There is another laudable custom here, of "early closing." Four-fifths of the shops are shut by 8 o'clock, while at this season it is not till 10 o'clock, and do not start that shopkeepers or customers suffer by this daily vacation from business cares. Cigar-shops and bakers' shops are the exceptions to the general rule. By a city law, dealers in medicines, in articles of food, (*Lebensmittel*), and in cigars, are alone permitted to ply their trade on the Sabbath. This equality of bread and tobacco in the eye of the law, is a fair illustration of the universality and strength of the German smoking habit, which does not seem to produce all the ill effects here which are attributed to its practice in America.

I am staying at an old-fashioned, purely German inn, *zur Stadt Uim*. Its kitchen enjoys quite a reputation in the neighborhood, so that its distinguished guests are out of all proportion to its lodging capacities. It has another class of evening customers, whose sayings and doings I must not drop in on by one from 8 to 10 o'clock; each new comer gives to these already seated, but without orders, a flask of wine or of beer of cider, (the drinking of which is a Frankforter's speciality), hands him the bill of fare, and awaits his selection of a dish. By 9 o'clock the table is generally filled by some twenty middle-aged, respectable-looking come here every night, the year round. At least, I counted six long pipes in the room, and some owners sat just when I left the table a week since. These worthies are a set of rascals in the assembly, sometimes referred to as *arbiters* in difficult questions. Such questions, however, do not often arise; knotty subjects are rarely dealt with; debates are avoided as too fatiguing.

Local topics of the day, or some gone-to-seed in the newspapers, are the favorite topics of a low-toned conversation, freely punctuated with long whiffs of tobacco-smoke from the mouths of the interlocutors. As for helping out their rhetoric by any generalization, which are very possibly, to their habit, only an amodyne taken after the agitation of the day's business, as a preparation to full repose. They answer a questioning stranger intelligently and politely. May they sleep well! with quiet consciences and good digestions. They retire mostly before 10 o'clock. The Frankforters generally are early to bed. Think of my coming home from Don Pasquale at the theater last night, at a little after 9 o'clock! C. R. B.

GERMANY.

REVOLUTION AND COUNTER-REVOLUTION.

WE now come to the last chapter in the history of the German Revolution: the conflict of the National Assembly with the Governments of the different States, especially of Prussia; the insurrection of Southern and Western Germany, and its final overthrow by Prussia.

We have already seen the Frankfurt National Assembly at work. We have seen it kicked at by Austria, insulted by Prussia, disobeyed by the lesser States, duped by its own impotent Central "Government," which again was the dupe of all and every prince in the country. But at last things began to look threatening for this weak vacillating, insipid legislative body. It was forced to come to the conclusion that "the sublime idea of German Unity was threatened in its realization,"—which meant neither more nor less than that the Frankfurt Assembly, and all it had done and was about to do, were very likely to end in smoke. Thus set to work in good earnest in order to bring forth as soon as possible its grand production, the "Imperial Constitution."

There was, however, one difficulty. What Executive Government was there to be? An Executive Council? No; that would have been, they thought in their wisdom, making Germany a Republic. A "President"? That would come to the same. Thus they must revive the old imperial dignity. But—as of course a prince was to be Emperor—who should it be? Certainly none of the *Dinmuhren* gentium, from Reuss-Schleitz-Greiz-Lobenstein-Ebersdorf up to Bavaria; neither Austrian nor Prussia would have borne that. It could only be Austria or Prussia. But which of the two? There is no doubt that, under otherwise favorable circumstances, this august Assembly would be sitting up to the present day, discussing this important dilemma without being able to come to a conclusion, if the Austrian Government had not cut the Gordian knot and saved them the trouble.

Austria knew very well that from the moment in which she could again appear before Europe with all her provinces subdued, as a strong and great European power, the very law of political gravitation would draw the remainder of Germany into her orbit, without the help of any authority which an imperial crown conferred by the Frankfurt Assembly could give her. Austria had been far stronger, far freer in her movements, since she shook off the powerless crown of the German Empire—a crown which clogged her own independent policy, while it added not one iota to her strength, either within or without of Germany. And supposing the case that Austria could not maintain her footing in Italy and Hungary—why then she was dissolved, annihilated in Germany too, and could never pretend to retrace a crown which had slipped her hands while she was in the full possession of her strength. Thus Austria at once declared against all imperialist resurrections, and plainly demanded the restoration of the German Diet, the only central Government of Germany known and recognized by the treaties of 1815; and on the 4th of May, 1849, issued that Constitution which had no other meaning than to declare Austria an indivisible, centralized and independent monarchy, distinct even from that Germany which the Frankfurt Assembly was to reorganize.

This open declaration of war left, indeed, the Frankfurt wisecracks no other choice but to exclude Austria from Germany, and to create out of the remainder of that country a sort of lower empire, a "Little Germany," the rather shabby imperial mantle of which was to fall on the shoulders of His Majesty of Prussia. This, it will be recollected, was the renewal of an old project fostered already some six or eight years ago by a party of South and Middle German liberal doctrinaires, who considered as a god-send the degrading circumstances by which their old crotchets was now again brought forward as the latest "new move" for the salvation of the country.

They accordingly finished, in February and March, 1849, the debate on the Imperial Constitution, together with the Declaration of Rights and the Imperial Electoral Law; not, however, without being obliged to make, in a great many points, the most contradictory concessions—now to the Conservative or rather Reactionary party—now to the more advanced fractions of the Assembly. In fact, it was evident that the leadership of the Assembly, which had formerly belonged to the Right and Right Center, (the Conservatives and Reactionists), was gradually, although slowly, passing to the Left or Democratic side of that body.

The rather dubious position of the Austrian Deputies in an Assembly which had excluded their country from Germany, and in which yet they were called upon to sit and vote, favored the derangement of its equipage; and thus, as early as the end of February, the Left Center and the Left went themselves, by the help of the Austrian votes, very generally in a majority, while on other days the Conservative fraction of the Austrians, all of a sudden and for the fun of the thing, voting with the Right, threw the balance again on the other side. They intended by these *ad hoc* surrenders to bring the Assembly into contempt; which, however, was quite unnecessary, the mass of the people being long since convinced of the utter hollow and futility of anything coming from Frankfort. What a specimen of a Constitution, in the meantime, was framed under such jumping and counter-jumping, may easily be imagined.

The Left of the Assembly—this *élite* and pride of revolutionary Germany, as it believed itself to be—was entirely intoxicated with the few paltry successes it obtained by the good will, or rather the ill will, of a set of Austrian politicians acting under the instigation and for the interest of Austrian despotism. Whenever the slightest approximation to their own not-very-well-defined principles had, in a homeopathically diluted shape, obtained a sort of sanction by the Frankfurt Assembly, these Democrats proclaimed that they had saved the country and the people. These poor, weak-minded men, during the course of their generally very obscure lives, had been so little accustomed to anything like success, that they actually believed their paltry amendments, passed with two or three votes' majority, would change the face of Europe. They had from the beginning of their legislative career been more inclined than any other fraction of the Assembly with that insupportable, *parliamentary* criticism,

a disorder which penetrates its unfortunate victims with the solemn conviction that the whole world, its history and future, are governed and determined by a majority of votes in that particular representative body which has the honor to count them among its members, and that all and everything going on outside the walls of their house—wars, revolutions, railway-constructions, colonizing of whole new continents, California gold discoveries, Central American canals, Russian armies, and whatever else may have some little claim to influence upon the destinies of mankind—is nothing compared to the incommensurable events hanging upon the important question, whatever it may be, just at that moment occupying the attention of their honorable House. Thus it was the Democratic party of the Assembly, by effectually smuggling a few of their nostrums into the "Imperial Constitution," first became bound to support it, although in every essential point it flatly contradicted their own oft-proclaimed principles; and at last, when this mongrel work was abandoned and bequeathed to them by its main authors, accepted the inheritance, and held out for this *monarchical* Constitution even in opposition to everybody who then proclaimed their own *republican* principles.

But it must be confessed that in this the contradiction was merely apparent. The indeterminate, self-contradictory, immature character of the Imperial Constitution was the very image of the immature, confused, conflicting political ideas of these democratic gentlemen. And if their own sayings and writings—as far as they could write—were not sufficient proof of this, their actions would furnish such proof; for among sensible people it is a matter of course to judge of a man not by his professions but by his actions; not by what he pretends to be, but by what he does and what he really is; and the deeds of these heroes of German Democracy speak loud enough for themselves, as we shall learn by and by. However, the Imperial Constitution with all its appendages and paraphernalia was definitively passed, and on the 28th of March the King of Prussia, by 290 votes, against 248 who abstained and some 200 who were absent, elected Emperor of Germany, *minus* Austria. The historical irony was complete: the imperial farce executed in the streets of astonished Berlin, three days after the Revolution of March 18, 1848, by Frederick William IV. while in a state which elsewhere would come to the Maine Liquor Law—this disgusting farce, just one year afterward, had been sanctioned by the pretended Representative Assembly of all Germany. That, then, was the result of the German Revolution!

KARL MARX.

London, July, 1852.

EUROPE.

The Dissolution of Philosophy.

Correspondence of The N. Y. Tribune.

BERLIN, Tuesday, June 29, 1852.

Is it, shall we say, a too gloomy foreboding which perceives everywhere in Europe, at least in Western Europe, dissolution and decay, ruin and catastrophe?

Is it the democratic habit of taking everything for the worst, which gives democracy the appearance of gloom, when confusion and perplexity have reached the highest point in official places, as well as in the common relations of life, as if it flattered itself with the hope that when the most desperate state of things had arrived, she might be called in as a reconciler—or rather hopes that everything may tumble to pieces, of itself and then fall into her possession?

No! Neither of the two.

It is not a gloomy view, for I shall show in the course of this article, what rich positive germs of life are concealed and cherished in the midst of the dissolving elements.

It is not taking the worst for granted, for I cannot assume that confusion and dissolution are accidental events, which again pass away of themselves, making room for order and life. Not at all. I will show that they are the genuine and legitimate conclusion of a long, historical development, and the necessary transition to a new organization.

Is it then an accident that philosophy, on which more than twenty centuries have now labored, should undergo the same catastrophe, which has befallen Constitutionalism and the privileges of class among individual orders of people, as well as the natural privileges possessed by one country over another?

Is it merely an accident that philosophy, to which the Germans for the last eighty years have been devoted with their best powers, should collapse at the same moment, in which Germany with all her national assemblies, conferences, congresses of princes, and revenue consultations, has shown that she no longer has any inner force by which to organize herself?

Is it accidental that the invader power with which philosophy subjugated the separate sciences, moral as well as physical, to herself, should be completely destroyed, that the supremacy which it arrogated over the sciences should be called in question, at the very time when the nation which shook all Europe in the name of philosophy, overreached the whole continent and threw the feudal constitutions into ruin (I mean the French nation) has likewise lost its invader power?

Is it accidental, that the reverses of stupid German professors, who still rejoice in the phrase of "the legitimate influence of philosophy on the moral and physical sciences," have become as childish and obsolete, as the ruminations of the present Bonapartist journals in Paris, which talk as if the "Great Nation" still existed, which was bound to care for all Europe, and from which Europe waited orders, and expected the solution of the most vital problems?

Is it accidental, finally, that in the same moment in which the intellectual supremacy of metaphysics has reached its end, a nation holds the dictatorship of the continent, which, from the commencement of its existence, has been a pestiferous stranger to the philosophical labors of the West, to which every theoretical attempt is still foreign, and which—I mean the Russian nation—knows only one point of view, the practical?

No! It is not an accident—the catastrophe which has befallen all the systems of the European States, both forms of constitutions and metaphysics,—is a perfect, coherent event.

The catastrophe of metaphysics is undeniable. It is now two centuries, since the philosophical Heracles, who regarded as completely closed up, brought to an end.

The Universities, which formerly engaged all educated men with the struggles of their development, no longer attract general attention, and are now only preparatory seminaries for a special office, not one of them has produced so much as a single new thought. While formerly, in the Middle Ages, the exclusive occupation with science, and in the last century, the exclusive interest in the aristocratic of all Europe, and even by the reigning princes, the universal necessity, from which only some few capitalists are free, the struggle with daily misery, and the toil for the passing moment, have well-nigh destroyed all inclination for general and comprehensive studies. While in the Middle Ages thousands from the whole West thronged the most renowned universities and teachers—Abelard, for instance, attracted 10,000 hearers—the number now frequenting the German Universities diminishes every year, and is exclusively confined to those who are obliged to qualify themselves for civil office, by attending certain courses of lectures. In the Middle Ages, the historical hour-time of metaphysics, an influence in the Scholastic Philosophy either gave a certain guarantee of power, so long as it was in the hands of the spiritual, that is the scholastically educated order, or when the two orders contended for supremacy, the secular seeking manipulation from the Papacy, and found its authority in the 16th century, metaphysical culture gave a valid

claim to the high office of arbiter between the two contending parties. But what can now be expected by a philosopher in the University? An empty lecture-room, when he wishes to present any question, but what the leaders need for those of their own kind. In the Middle Ages, metaphysics held the sovereignty of the world—a sovereignty which the Greek philosophers sought in vain to reach, and the sophistical errors in Universities now-a-days are no longer an idea, to which the world is obliged to give its attention.

The Royal Academies have indeed never allowed themselves to come in contact with metaphysics—but in their way, they are confined to the domain of general studies, since they are obliged to recruit their numbers from the most ordinary men of routine.

The man who has now attained the importance which in the Middle Ages belonged to the philosopher, is the engineer. All the philosophical Europe put together cannot dream of obtaining for instance, by Paxton, the design of the Crystal Palace, with a fortunate throw of the dice. The engineer, who conducts the erection of industrial establishments on new and effective principles, who improves the chemical laboratory of a manufacturer, who conquers difficulties in the way of constructing a bridge on a bold plan, or laying out the line of a railroad on a large scale,—is the man, whom the people now make use of, and to whom they yield their entire confidence. The people now wish to bring nature into contact with themselves—but they cannot be helped in this by any philosopher with his system of nature. They wish, in order to come nearer together, to conquer time and space—but they have no longer any taste for the disputes of philosophy on the abstract idea of time and space.

And the Government? The people in philosophical schools, which immerse the people in the only prevailing system of order and regularity. They tolerate the teachers of the old metaphysics only at the Universities, just as a wild rum is tolerated at the side of a new establishment, so long as there is as yet no time for the removal.

When the Austrian Government, during the past winter, deposed a philosophical teacher, it pronounced the Hegelianism which he taught an obscure product of the creative imagination of a hitherto no Government had expressed itself with equal aversion and contempt on any philosophical system.

When the Government of Louis Napoleon recently deposed Quinet and Michelet, (who were not even metaphysicians, but only litterateurs), a newspaper inquired, as an apology for the step, whether could a great part of the world's salary philosophers, who made it a business to controvert their faith—with equal courtesy and flippancy the question on the position of philosophy has not yet been answered.

When a year and a half ago Austria threatened Prussia with a war, a Croatian journal stated that it was now high time for Germany to be freed, and especially for her Universities to be freed from their abstract theories—the Slavonic dictum does not stand alone, it expresses rather the universal opinion of Europe in regard to philosophy.

And Europe is right; it thus expresses only the same thing, which was declared by German criticism ten years ago.

Europe has entirely turned its back upon metaphysics—the foundation of metaphysics has been broken, the abstract theories which it created, philosophy—no man will henceforth establish a physical system, that is to say, one which will take any place in the history of civilization,—quite as little as any one will be capable of composing a symphony after Beethoven, that is an actual symphony of profound character, and of artistic value,—quite as little as any one could expect to create a new style which will compare with the ecclesiastical structures of the Middle Ages—or quite as little as any one can create a statue which shall equal the sculpture of antiquity.

The critical movement has directed its attacks against two points—but they were the vital points of philosophy—its systematic unity and its transformation of all reality into mere objects of thought.

When in the Middle Ages, the two schools of Realism and Nominalism contended with each other, that is, when the question in dispute was whether ideas were realities existing in themselves, or whether they had existence purely in the thought, the victory which toward the end of the Middle Ages was gained for the latter opinion, that is for Nominalism, was still too early. What was the advantage of this decision, which immediately after a great part of the world was first discovered, and the researches took place which first discovered Law in the infinitely small as well as in the Universe at large. That victory was without fruit, since at the time, for example, when Galileo first gave to the European world the sublime view of the law, which governed the celestial notions as well as the terrestrial sphere, the question, which the Middle Ages had first discovered, and which the researches took place which first discovered Law in the infinitely small as well as in the Universe at large. That victory was without fruit, since at the time, for example, when Galileo first gave to the European world the sublime view of the law, which governed the celestial notions as well as the terrestrial sphere, the question, which the Middle Ages had first discovered, and which the researches took place which first discovered Law in the infinitely small as well as in the Universe at large. That victory was without fruit, since at the time, for example, when Galileo first gave to the European world the sublime view of the law, which governed the celestial notions as well as the terrestrial sphere, the question, which the Middle Ages had first discovered, and which the researches took place which first discovered Law in the infinitely small as well as in the Universe at large. That victory was without fruit, since at the time, for example, when Galileo first gave to the European world the sublime view of the law, which governed the celestial notions as well as the terrestrial sphere, the question, which the Middle Ages had first discovered, and which the researches took place which first discovered Law in the infinitely small as well as in the Universe at large. That victory was without fruit, since at the time, for example, when Galileo first gave to the European world the sublime view of the law, which governed the celestial notions as well as the terrestrial sphere, the question, which the Middle Ages had first discovered, and which the researches took place which first discovered Law in the infinitely small as well as in the Universe at large. That victory was without fruit, since at the time, for example, when Galileo first gave to the European world the sublime view of the law, which governed the celestial notions as well as the terrestrial sphere, the question, which the Middle Ages had first discovered