THE IDEOLOGY OF GOTTFRIED KINKEL: A SURVEY OF HIS NEWSPAPER ARTICLES, 1848-49

by

Thomas E. E. Hallensleben

A Thesis
presented in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
in the Department of History and Anthropology
Central Missouri State University

October, 2003

THE IDEOLOGY OF GOTTFRIED KINKEL: A SURVEY OF HIS NEWSPAPER ARTICLES, 1848-49

by

Thomas E. E. Hallensleben

October, 2003

APPROVED:

Carol P. Heming
Thesis Chair

Mary Ellen Rowe
Thesis Committee Member

Eric M. Isaacs
Thesis Committee Member

ACCEPTED:

J. L. Sheets
Chair, Department of History and Anthropology

Lowell Lemmi
Dean, Graduate School

CENTRAL MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY
WARRENSBURG, MISSOURI

THE IDEOLOGY OF GOTTFRIED KINKEL: A SURVEY OF HIS NEWSPAPER ARTICLES, 1848-49

by

Thomas E. E. Hallensleben

An Abstract
of a thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
in the Department of History and Anthropology
Central Missouri State University

October, 2003

ABSTRACT

by

Thomas E. E. Hallensleben

The university professor Gottfried Kinkel was the leading democrat in Bonn, Germany, during the 1848/49 revolution. As editor of the democratic newspaper, he wrote over 150 articles, nearly all of which contain references to his political ideas. Kinkel's political philosophy can be determined through content and quantitative analysis of his articles. The picture that emerges is that of a powerful yearning for a free, egalitarian and united Germany, which can best be achieved through the establishment of a republic, soundly based on popular sovereignty. This interpretation is supported by existing literature. What becomes apparent as well, however, is that Kinkel was never in doubt as to the final outcome in the struggle for political control between the reactionary nobility and the oppressed masses. The popular will was sure to achieve victory sooner or later in pursuit of desires and needs of the German people.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my thesis committee, Dr. Carol Heming, Dr. Mary Ellen Rowe and Dr. Eric Tenbus, for their time and invaluable help with this work. I would also like to thank Dr. Norbert Schloßmacher of the Bonn City archives and Dr. Thomas Becker of the Bonn University archives for their support and encouragement. A special thanks to Dr. Alfred E. Twomey, without whose influence I would not have studied history at all. Mostly, I want to thank my parents and my wife for their constant support in everything I have done.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

ABBREVIATIONS IN THE FOOTNOTES

BZ	*Bonner Zeitung*
NBZ	*Neue Bonner Zeitung*

INTRODUCTION

The Paris revolution of 1848 sparked similar events all across Europe in the months that followed. The German states were no exception. In mid-March, barricades were built in Berlin, and many people lost their lives in the street fighting that ensued. The Prussian king, Friedrich Wilhelm IV, made concessions to the people's demands for political freedom to be ensured by a liberal constitution. The Prussian monarchy was to become a limited one, checked by a popular parliament.[1]

In Frankfurt on the Main, an elected parliament, with representatives from all German states, convened in order to work out a constitution for a unified Germany. Widely regarded as one of the most educated parliaments in modern history, it was composed of the German educated elite. This level of education, however, caused its members to attempt the creation of an absolutely perfect document, resulting in indecision and lost time.[2] This time lost for German constitutionalism was time gained for the German monarchies, namely the Prussian and the Austrian, and allowed the

---

[1] For general works on the Revolution of 1848, see Charles Breunig, *The Age of Revolution and Reaction, 1789-1850* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1970); Robert W. Lougee, *Midcentury Revolution, 1848: Society and Revolution in France and Germany* (Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Company, 1972); Pricilla Robertson, *Revolutions of 1848: A Social History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952); Thomas Nipperdey *Deutsche Geschichte, 1800-1866: Bürgerwelt und starker Staat* (Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck, 1983); Otto Rühle, *Achtzenhundertachtundvierzig (1848): Revolution in Deutschland* (Münster: Unrast Verlag, 1998); Veit Valentin, *Geschichte der deutschen Revolution 1848-1849*, 2 vols. (Berlin: Ullstein, 1930-1931).

[2] Information on the Frankfurt Parliament can be found in Frank Eyck, *The Frankfurt Parliament 1848-1849* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1968); Brian E. Vick, *Defining Germany: the 1848 Frankfurt Parliamentarians and National Identity* (London: Harvard University Press, 2002); Veit Valentin, *Frankfurt am Main und die Revolution von 1848/49* (Berlin: Cotta, 1908); Paul Wentzcke, ed., *Die erste deutsche Nationalversammlung und ihr Werk; ausgewählte Reden* (Munich: Drei Masken Verlag, 1922).

conservative powers to regain their footing and begin the process of reversing the revolutionary gains.[3]

In November 1848 Friedrich Wilhelm IV disbanded the Prussian parliament. In December he handed down a constitution and called for new elections for a two-chamber parliament under a reduced franchise. The high degree of approval of this action among the Prussian people and their satisfaction with the royal constitution, admittedly liberal considering its source, drowned out the few cries of outrage coming from the voices of the far left and all but doomed any attempt by the democratic movement to regain the upper hand. The Frankfurt constitution and subsequent *Reichsverfassungskampagne* (campaign for the imperial constitution)[4] came far too late for either to have had much of a chance at success. The fighting in Baden and the Pfalz in the spring of 1849 was, for the time being, the final whimper of the mid-century revolution in Germany.

In the small Rhenish town of Bonn, just south of Cologne in the part of the Rhineland which had been awarded to Prussia during the Congress of Vienna in 1815, most of the inhabitants followed these events intently and discussed them eagerly. As

---

[3] Important works on the *anciens regimes* and their fight for survival include Arno J. Mayer, *The Persistence of the Old Regime: Europe to the Great War* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1981) and A. J. P. Taylor, *The Struggle for the Mastery of Europe 1848-1918* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1954). Mayer believes that until 1914 "premodern elements were the very essence of Europe's incumbent civil and political societies" (Ibid., 6-7). He argues that the mostly pre-industrial and pre-bourgeois old order, although losing ground to the advances of industrial capitalism, was still strong enough to resist and slow the modernization process while fighting to prolong its own life. Taylor states that each state in Europe followed only its individual and voluntarily accepted moral code, while acknowledging no superior. Ensuring a state's survival against another was the balance of power, seeing to it that no state grew powerful enough to be able to defeat the rest. The political system was threatened from within as well, however. The ideology of international socialism presented its first serious challenge to "monarchical solidarity" within the entrenched "conservatism of tradition and respect" after the French Revolution in 1789 (Ibid., xx). The first half of the nineteenth century saw repeated attempts of the sort, but the old system managed to survive and function within the balance of power until the end of the Great War in 1918.

[4] All translations from German to English are the author's, unless otherwise indicated.

everywhere else, members of the educated elite there were already in the habit of discussing politics, albeit behind closed doors. One of these, a liberal university professor named Gottfried Kinkel, was primarily responsible for waking the interests of a relatively large number of working-class people as well, getting them to participate in meetings, discussions, and elections. As co-founder of the Bonn Democratic Club and founder of the *Arbeiterbildungsverein* (the workingman's educational club), Kinkel immediately took a very prominent position among Bonn democrats.[5]

Gottfried Kinkel was a social democrat and humanitarian, driven by his empathy for the plight of Germany's lower classes. He was a socialist in the sense that he believed in the necessity to build a state that would actively see to the improvement of their lot through the gradual and government-imposed redistribution of personal property. He was not, however, in favor of the abolition of private property in general or the communal ownership of the means of production. What he did desire was that the acquisition of property be based on talent and work as opposed to any unfair advantages stemming from inherent class privilege. He wanted to construct a state of the worker. By this he meant that all members of society ought to contribute to that society through work—not defined

[5] On events in Bonn during the revolution, see Max Braubach, *Bonner Professoren und Studenten in den Revolutionsjahren 1848/49* (Cologne: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1967); Renate Kaiser, *Die politischen Strömungen in den Kreisen Bonn und Rheinbach 1848-1878* (Bonn: Ludwig Röhrscheid Verlag, 1963); and Hans Kersken, *Stadt und Universität Bonn in den Revolutionsjahren 1848-49* (Bonn: Ludwig Röhrscheid Verlag, 1931). On the Rhineland as a whole see Jonathan Sperber, *Rhineland Radicals: The Democratic Movement and the Revolution of 1848-1849* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991). For information on Gottfried Kinkel see Angelika Berg, *Gottfried Kinkel: Kunstgeschichte und soziales Engagement* (Bonn: Ludwig Röhrscheid Verlag, 1985); Wofgang Beyrodt, *Gottfried Kinkel als Kunsthistoriker: Darstellung und Briefwechsel* (Bonn: Ludwig Röhrscheid Verlag, 1979); Alfred R. DeJonge, *Gottfried Kinkel as Political and Social Thinker* (New York: AMS Press, 1966); Hermann Rösch-Sondermann, *Gottfried Kinkel als Ästhetiker, Politiker und Dichter* (Bonn: Ludwig Röhrscheid Verlag, 1982); Klaus Schmidt, *Gerechtigkeit-das Brot des Volkes: Johanna und Gottfried Kinkel, Eine Biographie* (Stuttgart: Radius-Verlag, 1996); and Adolph Strodtmann, *Gottfried Kinkel. Wahrheit ohne Dichtung. Biographisches Skizzenbuch*, 2 vols. (Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campen, 1850-1851).

merely as manual labor—in place of the status quo, in which the members of the privileged classes were wholly supported through the labor of others. Moreover, he hoped for a society in which all its members could face one another as equals, not just politically, but also socially—a brotherhood of man.

What sets Kinkel apart from many of his fellow revolutionaries is that his thought was pre-industrial in that he believed that the artisan held the promise of a bright future for Germany. While he obviously saw and recognized the start of industrialization in Germany, he dealt with it primarily in connection with its meaning for and effect on the future of artisans. In his 1848 work *Handwerk, errette Dich!*[6] (*Artisan, save yourself!*), Kinkel offered suggestions on how the artisan could benefit from industrial production and utilize industrial goods and machines to guarantee his future financial survival.

In order to disseminate liberal ideas and to support the democratic cause, leading Democrats, Kinkel among them, founded the newspaper, the *Bonner Zeitung*, in May 1848. At the beginning of August of that year, Gottfried Kinkel took over the editorship of the paper. From that time until his capture by the Prussians in June of 1849, he contributed well over 150 articles of various types and with varying intent, changing the paper's name to *Neue Bonner Zeitung* along the way. The vast majority of these articles appeared in the main section of the paper, either as lead articles with personal commentary or as straightforward news pieces. In all cases, Kinkel's political opinion and democratic convictions are incorporated in some fashion.

---

[6] Gottfried Kinkel, *Handwerk, errette Dich!: Was soll der deutsche Handwerder fordern und thun, um seinen Stand zu bessern?* (Bonn: Verlag von W. Sulzbach, 1848).

What becomes clear is that Gottfried Kinkel, primarily concerned with easing the plight of the masses, was a staunch proponent of constitutionally guaranteed freedoms. He became convinced that the republic, which in its final incarnation he hoped would fulfill his deeply rooted emotional desire for a unified Germany, offered the only avenue to achieve this goal. He calmly explained his ideas, using logic to dismantle reactionary arguments and to bolster his own, sprinkling in a dose of sarcasm for good measure. He believed that the establishment of a republic encompassing all of Germany was imperative for the well-being of his countrymen and women and that a monarchy, by definition, would not be able to achieve the same positive results. But most importantly, he believed that democracy and the republic would be achieved, if not now, then later, if not by him and his peers, then by his and their children. Gottfried Kinkel, who was considered a revolutionary martyr throughout Germany during his incarceration after the movement had ended, was an idealist who never gave up hope that all would end well for his country and its people.

While a number of works dealing with Gottfried Kinkel do exist in the German language, all but a biography belonging to the genre of popular history were published in 1985 or earlier. In these works, Kinkel's newspaper contributions were cited as supporting documentation, but his articles have to date not been utilized as the primary source of information. This is also true for the lone work on Gottfried Kinkel in the English language authored by Alfred DeJonge and originally published in 1926. The literature, especially in English, is certainly insufficient for a man, who was a popular poet, a respected historian of the fine arts, and a social democrat revolutionary. Kinkel is of particular relevance to American historians when one considers that Carl Schurz, who

later became a prominent politician under President Abraham Lincoln, a cabinet member in the Rutherford B. Hayes Administration and the subject of extensive historical study, was one of Kinkel's students and very much influenced by him. The author hopes this paper will help fill that void to a small extent.

CHAPTER 1
THE REVOLUTION OF 1848

The *Vormärz*

The term *Vormärz*, meaning "before March," refers to the years between Napoleon's defeat in 1815 and the outbreak of revolution in March of 1848. This time period was full of conflict, much of it having to do with the economic transformation that was slowly beginning to take hold in Germany. Agriculture and handicrafts remained the predominant occupations through the middle of the century, after which time industrialization began in earnest. A strong professional and bureaucratic middle class also influenced social conditions. The rapid change and transformation of the economic landscape at the time resulted in an uneasy mixture of pre-industrial and industrial institutions and social groups. Feudal remnants, a declining lower middle class—itself torn between politically democratic and socially conservative tendencies—as well as a rising upper bourgeoisie and proletariat, which were simultaneously economically codependent but socially antagonistic, were forced to co-exist.[1]

Three main sources of social conflict can be pinpointed for *Vormärz* Germany. Agricultural work and ownership practices remained what they had been for centuries, stuck in pre-capitalist times. Simultaneously, however, the gradual spread of a capitalist economy caused an increasing number of small producers to become dependent on access to the market, for which they required the financial resources of creditors in spite of owning the means of production. Exacerbating these two problems was the increasingly

[1] Hans Rothfels, "1848—One Hundred Years After," *Journal of Modern History* 20 (December 1948): 304.

demanding government, intruding through taxes, economic programs, military conscription, and local government issues.[2] The combination of these economic and political factors made for an extremely combustible atmosphere. In addition, the years 1845 and 1846 witnessed widespread harvest failures, which, in turn, helped produce a commercial crisis in the following two years.[3]

These generalizations are true even given the extremely diverse political practices and institutions throughout the German states. Each followed its own social, economic, religious, and political traditions, and often enough these varied within any given state as well. In most cases, however, custom or law, such as restrictions of assembly, inhibited political speech and party alignment. This left the university-educated and influential members of the middle class as the logical choice for political leadership positions or elective office where that might have existed. The composition of the Frankfurt National Assembly bears this out. A full eighty percent of the delegates were university-educated men, and more than half of those were employed by the state as civil servants, teachers, or judicial officials. Lawyers, physicians, clergymen, writers and journalists made up the rest of the group, with businessmen and agriculturists comprising the other twenty percent of the delegates.[4]

The educated elite held political leadership positions in Prussia just as in all other German states. This became a problem for Prussia, however, when the relatively new province of the Rhineland was awarded to it in Vienna in 1815. The Rhineland was

---

[2] Jonathan Sperber, "Eine alte Revolution in neuer Zeit," in *Die Revolution von 1848/49: Erfahrung – Verarbeitung – Deutung,* ed. Christian Jansen and Thomas Mergel (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 18-19.
[3] Sperber, *Rhineland Radicals*, 37.
[4] James J. Sheehan, "Liberalism and Society in Germany, 1815-48," *Journal of Modern History* 45 (December 1973): 585.

mainly Catholic, whereas the Prussian ruling house was Protestant. The upper classes in the Rhineland, however, were disproportionately Protestant, a fact which added to the religious antagonisms already in place.[5] The identification of the government with the ruler's confession resulted in all classes interpreting conflicts between the church and the state as confessional conflicts.[6]

What made the Rhineland even more of a special case was its years of French rule under Napoleon, which had given the region a more deeply-rooted sympathy for the concepts of *liberté, egalité,* and *fraternité* than was found in any other area of Germany. The Rhineland had, to a large extent, preserved the social, economic, and legal institutions which had been put into place by the French regime at the beginning of the nineteenth century. By comparison, Bavaria and Hesse-Darmstadt, both of which had constitutions, had a much easier time integrating their portions of the Rhineland than did Prussia. This conflict manifested itself in constant bickering and arguing over law codes and local government.[7]

Carl Schurz, Gottfried Kinkel's student, fellow Democrat, and later U.S. Secretary of the Interior under President Hayes, wrote in his memoirs that the Rhinelanders' hatred of Prussians was in full bloom in the 1840s.[8] Calling another person a "Prussian" was considered quite the insult. Of the three governments which had had control over the Rhineland over the previous five decades, the Archbishopric of Cologne, the French Empire, and the Kingdom of Prussia, the last was the most hated.

---

[5] Sperber, *Rhineland Radicals,* 44, 50.
[6] Ibid., 82-84.
[7] Ibid., 38-41.
[8] Carl Schurz, *Autobiography: An Abridgement in One Volume,* ed. Wayne Andrews (New York: Scribner, 1961), 19-20.

The animosity toward the ruling house was exacerbated by the difficulty with which sentiments of loyalty took root in the population because of the rapid succession of sovereigns. The importation of authoritarian and overly orderly state officials from Prussia and their Protestant confession did nothing to endear the new rulers to the more tranquil, free-spirited, and Catholic Rhinelanders.[9] To say the least, the situation was ripe for something to happen. The economic and social change that was slowly manifesting itself all over Germany would necessitate a political change as well.

The Revolution in Bonn

In 1849 the city of Bonn counted 17,744 inhabitants, including the garrison stationed there. Of those, 83.3 percent were Catholic, 14.3 percent Protestant, and 2.4 percent Jewish. There existed no substantial industry. The university and the city's attractive natural surroundings, however, caused the communal policy to focus on actively attempting to attract the well-to-do. As a result, Bonn was known as an upper-class residential and retirement community.[10]

The news of the proclamation of the republic in France arrived in Bonn some time in late February 1848. Carl Schurz remembers sitting in his room reading when a friend burst through his door and told him that the French had chased their king, Louis Philippe, out of the country. Full of excitement, they both ran to the market place to see what was going on in town. It was full of university students talking very animatedly about the news and what it might mean for Germany. What was going to happen nobody knew, but

---

[9] Ibid.
[10] Renate Kaiser, *Die politischen Strömungen*, 11.

the general consensus was that since the French had acted, surely something had to happen in Germany as well. Schurz, like some of his friends, felt that finally the time had come to win freedom for the German people and unity and strength for the German nation. It was the duty of every German to do everything in his power and to fear no sacrifice for this "holiest of causes."[11]

The initial reaction of many citizens of Bonn was to worry about their own safety. The garrison stationed in Bonn, small as it was, helped keep the peace, and people were afraid that it might be moved out of town toward the French border in anticipation of war. As a result, a civic guard or civilian defense force (*Bürgerwehr*) was created to help the local police force. This brought to the fore one of the main issues of concern in Bonn, which continued for the duration of the revolution: would student involvement in this and other groups be a danger to the rest of the town because of the students' more radical tendencies, and would it in any way compromise the autonomy of the state university? The liberal sympathies of many of the professors helped the students' cause.[12]

In Bonn, as everywhere else in the Rhineland, March was a month of petitions showing the general interest of the population in the recent events. A general meeting of Bonn's citizens as well as one of the university faculty decided to draft petitions enumerating certain wishes and desires, while making sure to express their full support of the king. In spite of the university's existence and ability to produce a political leadership group, political apathy and passivity were widespread, especially among the

---

[11] Schurz, *Autobiography*, 53-55.
[12] Thomas P. Becker, "Universität und Revolution: Das Beispiel Bonn," in *Revolution im Rheinland: Veränderungen der politischen Kultur, 1848/49*, ed. Stephan Lennartz and Georg Mölich (Bielefeld: Verlag für Regionalgeschichte, 1998), 203.

general public. This had changed only among those enfranchised by the introduction of the Rhenish communal elections in 1846.[13] Moderate liberals were the predominant group in Bonn, and this was apparent in the general consensus regarding the revolution. The majority of Bonn residents viewed the revolution with the utmost reserve and received the newly granted liberties only skeptically. University students, on the other hand, were wholly enthusiastic regarding the success of the revolution in France and the promise of things to come in Germany.[14]

The pinnacle of the revolution in Bonn came on March 20 after news arrived in the city that the king had agreed to liberal reforms two days earlier. Full of enthusiasm, university professors led a spontaneous parade to the market place with Gottfried Kinkel at the helm carrying the black-red-gold flag symbolizing German unity. This day of inspiration was the only one during which all political differences of opinion took a back seat to patriotism. Shortly thereafter, news about the bloodshed in Berlin reached Bonn. The fighting had been followed by a procession of the dead past the royal palace, during which the king, watching from a balcony, had been forced to humble himself by baring his head to the victims. Knowledge of these events sparked reactions of shock and dread in Bonn.[15]

The royal call for elections for a Prussian parliament, utilizing an electoral system, kicked off an election race mainly between the Constitutionals, those who favored a constitution and limited liberal reforms under the continued monarchy, and the

---

[13] Kaiser, *Die politischen Strömungen*, 19-21.
[14] Heide Thielbeer, *Universität und Politik in der Deutschen Revolution von 1848* (Bonn: Verlag Neue Gesellschaft, 1983), 97.
[15] Becker, "Universität und Revolution," 204.

Democrats, who supported full popular sovereignty. Initially, even the Democrats, in an attempt to attract more voters, called for a constitutional monarchy. The ever careful citizens of Bonn in early May elected Constitutionals both to the national assembly in Frankfurt, which was to draft a constitution for a unified Germany, as well as to the Prussian assembly in Berlin: the university professors Peter Franz Deiters and Josef Bauerband, respectively. The Democrats had nominated Gottfried Kinkel, the only democratic professor, for both seats.[16] Next to Heidelberg's, Bonn's university supplied the most professors to the two assemblies.[17]

Far from discouraged, the Democrats in Bonn organized the Democratic Club at the end of May in order to attract more and more followers. This they did, mainly from the lower classes of the population. To allow for greater dissemination of their political ideals, Democrats also founded the *Bonner Zeitung*, the first issue of which appeared on 7 May.[18] Its main focus of interest for the next months was Frankfurt, although Berlin was not ignored.

During the election race, Gottfried Kinkel's political convictions were pushed farther to the left. The Democratic Club soon followed its leader and adopted a stance in support of the democratic republic. In order to assuage popular fears of perpetual chaos and anarchy, Kinkel and the club membership took great pains to speak out for the sanctity of personal property. As a reaction to the Democrats, the Constitutionals, dominated by professors, founded their own club in late June. They were never able, however, to achieve the same dynamism and popular attraction as the Democrats, in part

[16] Kersken, *Stadt und Universität Bonn*, 49-52.
[17] Thielbeer, *Universität und Politik*, 97.
[18] Kersken, *Stadt und Universität Bonn*, 58-61.

because they lacked the means of dissemination of their literature that the *Bonner Zeitung* afforded their adversaries. The Democrats, on the other hand, lost a good amount of their dynamism at the end of the university semester in August when most students, from whose ranks came the most active supporters of the democratic movement, left Bonn for the break.[19]

The fighting in Paris in June caused the professorship in Bonn to shift to the right politically. The Democrats, by contrast, became more determined and increased their agitation in the country to counteract the growing power of the reactionary forces. Another setback for the democratic movement came with the retroactive acceptance in Frankfurt of the Armistice of Malmö, with which Prussia had unilaterally ended the war in Denmark over the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein. Since it officially was a war by all of Germany, albeit carried out in great part by the Prussian army, this move by the delegates in Frankfurt was seen as cowardice on their part and a betrayal of the German people. Things only got worse for the democratic movement when the king, as part of his larger push to regain all of his powers, appointed the conservative Count von Brandenburg as Prime Minister in early November. At the same time he ordered the Prussian parliament to relocate to the city of Brandenburg, where he could more easily control it. The more conservative members of parliament acceded, but the remaining left-wing delegates proclaimed the illegality of this order and on November 15 called for a general tax boycott until parliament would be able to reconvene in Berlin. The news of this decision arrived in Bonn two days later.[20]

---

[19] Braubach, *Bonner Professoren*, 20-30, 47-51.
[20] Ibid., 51-64.

The civic guard in Bonn wholly supported the Democrats' call for a tax boycott. Without its support, the small garrison in Bonn was unable to prevent the city from falling into the hands of the Democrats on 19 November. A Security Council was formed to keep the city quiet, but it did not have control for long as Prussian reinforcements entered Bonn the following day to restore government authority over the city. Some voices called for an uprising, but after it became apparent that Cologne would not do the same, they decided against violent action. Kinkel's leadership role in the tax boycott cost him much of what little support he still had among his university peers, some of whom called for his arrest. The civic guard was dissolved as a result of its participation in the activities, but the surrender of members' weapons was accomplished only through force. The dissolution of the Prussian parliament and the handing down of a constitution by the king in December were enough to appease the majority of Bonn's citizens, who, by now, were far more interested in peace and order than revolutionary ideals.[21]

The following January elections were held for the new Prussian parliament, according to the new constitution. In a campaign marred by personal attacks against him, Gottfried Kinkel was nevertheless able to secure a seat for himself in Berlin as part of a broad victory for many democratic candidates in the Rhineland—the result of many months of political agitation. He left for Berlin in late February only to return two months later after the assembly was dissolved yet again by the Prussian king. The day after his departure, Bonn Democrats commemorated the one-year anniversary of the French revolution, a celebration which resulted in the arrest of several of the participating students. Carl Schurz, having very ably taken over the responsibilities of his mentor,

[21] Ibid., 64-74.

Gottfried Kinkel, did all he could to keep the fire in the belly of his fellow Democrats and to get those incarcerated freed.[22]

The National Parliament finally finished the German constitution in March 1849, crowning its achievement with the election of the Prussian king as hereditary Kaiser of Germany. The king's subsequent refusal of that crown dealt the assembly an embarrassing blow and nullified most of its work. The decision to exclude the Austrian monarchy and empire from the future Germany, a point that had been discussed endlessly, had been brought on, among other things, by the handing down of a constitution by the house of Habsburg in early March. The people of Bonn, with the obvious exception of the far left, were pleased with and supportive of the decision made in Frankfurt. Once Friedrich Wilhelm IV had turned down the German crown, the Frankfurt parliament and the German people were left with a constitution for a non-existent nation, and, more importantly, without any means of enforcing the provisions of the document. A few short weeks later, prompted by the acceptance of the national constitution by the Prussian assembly, the king dissolved it as well, solidifying the return to power of the reaction.[23]

After resignations and forced withdrawals by some members of the National Assembly, its remnants called on the German people to fight against their noble rulers and for the national constitution and German unity, thus sparking the *Reichsverfassungskampagne*. Aside from those in Saxony, mainly the Democrats in southwestern Germany heeded this call to arms and rose in a powerful show of solidarity.

---

[22] Kersken, *Stadt und Universität Bonn*, 124-132.
[23] Ibid., 133-135.

In order to counter this threat, the Prussian king called for the activation of the state militia, whose members in many cases refused to follow this order. A major fight was now no longer avoidable.[24]

Popular uprisings in Berlin and Breslau were quickly suppressed by military might. A meeting of Rhenish community representatives in Cologne declared support for the national constitution, but, because of the large contingent of Prussian troops in the city, any attempt at backing up this declaration, much less the threatened secession of the Rhineland from Prussia, would have been doomed to failure. The industrial cities of Iserlohn, Düsseldorf and Elberfeld east of the Rhine, however, with the aid of many rebellious militia members, did rise in support, able to achieve a short-lived victory.[25]

Under the unchallenged leadership of Gottfried Kinkel and Carl Schurz, the Bonn Democrats felt the time for words had passed and that immediate action on their part was necessary. In several meetings on May 10, they made the decision to march, under the command of former Prussian artillery lieutenant Fritz Anneke, to nearby Siegburg in order to take possession of the Prussian munitions depot and its contents. The Bonn contingent was then to continue north to Elberfeld to aid the Democrats in their struggles there. That night not even 120 men, armed with only a few muskets and even less ammunition, departed for Siegburg. A half hour into the march a messenger brought the news that a company of infantry had been dispatched from Bonn in pursuit of their group. When they had almost caught up, Anneke, not confident of his men's ability to turn back the Prussians, told his men to disperse. Upon seeing only thirty-some soldiers ride past

[24] Braubach, *Bonner Professoren*, 105-108.
[25] Schurz, *Autobiography*, 76-78.

him, Carl Schurz was overwhelmed with shame at the ridiculous and disgraceful manner in which the revolution in Bonn ended.[26]

Gottfried Kinkel, Carl Schurz, and Fritz Anneke continued on to Elberfeld, but, after finding that organizational problems there made defeat likely, they decided quickly to move on to the Bavarian Pfalz where the democratic movement was in control. Interested Bonn residents were able to follow developments there through Kinkel's articles in the *Neue Bonner Zeitung*, but the revolutionary fervor had dissipated. In July the Democratic Club was dissolved after the complete return to power of the conservative forces.[27]

Gottfried Kinkel

Gottfried Kinkel was born 11 August 1815, in Oberkassel by Bonn. His parents were both deeply religious Calvinists, his father the minister of the Reformed church in town.[28] At the young age of ten, Kinkel moved into Bonn to attend the gymnasium. From there he moved on to the university to study theology. In 1834 he moved to Berlin for a year of study—a time during which his interest in and love for the arts were awakened. This new interest prompted him to move away from the religious orthodoxy of his upbringing.[29] In 1837 at the age of twenty-two, Gottfried Kinkel was awarded a position as assistant professor in the Department of Protestant Theology at the University

---

[26] Ibid., 78-86.
[27] Braubach, *Bonner Professoren*, 110-118.
[28] Ingeborg Schnelling-Reinicke, "Gottfried Kinkel (1815-1882)," in *Petitionen und Barrikaden: Rheinische Revolutionen 1848/49*, ed. Ottfried Dascher and Everhard Kleinertz (Münster: Druckhaus Aschendorff, 1998), 288.
[29] Schmidt, *Gerechtigkeit*, 13-16.

of Bonn. Three years later he also began working as a teacher of religion in Bonn and assistant minister in Mühlheim on the Ruhr.[30]

In May of 1839 Kinkel, while already engaged to a friend's sister, met his future wife Johanna Matthieux—her maiden name had been Mockel—a divorced Catholic. In spite of their secret feelings for each other, the two avoided one another in order not to stir up a scandal. Not until March 1840 did Gottfried become sure of Johanna's affection for him, but he waited nearly another year to tell his surprisingly understanding fiancée about his new love. As rumors of the relationship began to spread, the population in Bonn grew incensed. The immediate result of the popular outcry was for Kinkel to lose his positions as religion teacher and assistant minister in Cologne, in spite of his status as one of the most popular preachers there.[31]

Johanna, five years Gottfried's senior, had made a name for herself well before she became involved in the revolution. She was a very talented musician and composer, who had been able to hone her skills under the tutelage of Franz Anton Ries, the first teacher of Ludwig van Beethoven. Lacking further cultural stimulation in small-town Bonn, she began to lead a group of music lovers in performances of assorted opera pieces and other musical works. Upon the recommendation of Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, she spent three years in Berlin to further her musical education. There she became not only a much sought-after private music teacher, in this manner gaining access to Berlin's social elite, but also a critically acclaimed composer of lieder. She returned to Bonn in 1839 in order to speed up the divorce proceedings from her long-estranged husband.

---

[30] Schnellig-Reinicke, "Gottfried Kinkel," 288.
[31] Schmidt, *Gerechtigkeit*, 20-29.

Johanna and Gottfried married in 1843 after the finalization of the drawn-out divorce process.[32]

As a result of his marriage to the divorced Catholic, Gottfried Kinkel was also forced out of his position at the university and shunned by his circle of peers. This prompted both of them to turn away from religion and Gottfried to turn to his other loves: literature and the fine arts. After the first volume of his history of the fine arts was published in the summer of 1845,[33] he was awarded a doctorate by the university in Bonn. Additionally, he was granted a position as assistant professor of history of the fine arts, literature and culture, the subjects chosen by and a position created for him. Hard financial times due to the birth of his second child and his extremely low salary forced him to search for alternate opportunities to earn a living after a full day's work at the university.[34]

Both Gottfried and Johanna earned positions of leadership in Bonn in the field of the fine arts, primarily through the *Maikäferbund*, the May-bug Society, which the two founded in 1840 and kept running until 1847. The group consisted of a number of people with a passion for the fine arts, who met regularly to read their own or classical works of literature or to listen to music performed by one of them. Between 1841 and 1849 Gottfried Kinkel also published several volumes of poetry in which a shift from a romantic to a more realistic worldview is discernable. Under the influence of Johanna, he began turning to social issues as well.[35] A Prussian official, in an attempt at winning

---

[32] Ingeborg Schnelling-Reinicke, "Johanna Kinkel (1810-1858)" in *Petitionen und Barrikaden*, 301.
[33] Gottfried Kinkel, *Geschichte der bildenden Künste bei den christlichen Völkern vom Anfang unserer Zeitrechnung bis zur Gegenwart* (Bonn, 1845).
[34] Schmidt, *Gerechigkeit*, 39-45.
[35] Schnellig-Reinicke, "Gottfried Kinkel," 289.

Kinkel's talents for the state lest he drift farther toward democratic convictions, courted him for a government position during this time. This ended quickly after the publication of one of Kinkel's works, the *Männerlied.* Published possibly to demonstrate his independent spirit, his song caused outrage among Prussian officials. Especially the third verse, proclaiming that all free men dismissed heavenly promises as secondary to those of a unified German fatherland, was perceived as scandalous.[36] His and his friends' initial enthusiasm regarding the possibilities of liberal reforms after Friedrich Wilhelm IV's accession to the Prussian throne in 1840 had rapidly been eroded by the new monarch's repressive actions, such as censorship, surveillance, and refusal to allow reforms. In Kinkel's case this disillusionment had quickly turned into opposition, especially through his contacts with political circles in Cologne.[37]

During this time Kinkel met Karl Marx, who was the chief editor of the liberal Cologne newspaper, *Rheinische Zeitung.* Not yet a communist, Marx shared similar ideas and critiques of the social status quo with Kinkel. Despite areas of agreement, however, their relationship was primarily an antagonistic one. It seems that most of the animosity originated with Marx, possibly as a result of feelings of jealousy after seeing Kinkel achieve the literary success and university position that Marx had wanted for himself.[38] Kinkel's later critical analysis of the *Communist Manifesto*, asking for a clear definition of the line separating the proletariat from the bourgeoisie, certainly did not help the amicability of their relationship. The term "class struggle," according to

---

[36] Schmidt, *Gerechtigkeit,* 46-47.
[37] Klaus Schmidt, "'Was wir friedlich gewünscht hätten, wird in Sturm und Wetter erscheinen': Gottfried Kinkel und die rheinischen Demokraten," in *Das war 'ne heiße Märzenzeit: Revolution im Rheinland 1848/49,* ed. Fritz Bilz and Klaus Schmidt (Cologne: Papy Rossa-Verlag, 1998), 91.
[38] Schmidt, *Gerechtigkeit,* 51-53.

Kinkel, was merely a popular expression behind which could be concealed a good amount of mental and conceptual ineptitude.[39] Kinkel and Marx did have similar beliefs in spite of this criticism, such as the idea of class leveling and the inevitability of the success of the revolution. Kinkel, however, was far more moderate in his views, and never became a believer in the communist philosophy that Marx came to represent.

In the winter semester of 1847-1848 Kinkel met the young Carl Schurz, a student in one of his classes and a member of the *Frankonia* fraternity, a stronghold of the democratic movement among the student body. Schurz was born just southwest of Cologne in the spring of 1829, but his family moved to Bonn before he had completed school. Schurz finished his schoolwork at a gymnasium in Cologne long distance while helping his father financially and sitting in on lectures at the university in Bonn. During the revolution, he became not only the leader of the student revolutionaries but also one of the main figures in the democratic movement in Bonn.[40] Schurz remembers Kinkel as having fiery eyes and a beautiful voice, which could be "sweet like a flute or forceful like a trumpet," making listening to him "a musical as well as an intellectual delight." Kinkel was a lighthearted man, whose ability to derive from everything in life as much pleasure as possible, made it easy to feel comfortable in his company. The Kinkel residence, Schurz remembered, formed a center for men and women of similarly frank convictions in the fields of religion and politics.[41]

---

[39] Schmidt, "'Was wir friedlich gewünscht hätten,'" 96.
[40] Walter Kessler, "'Republikaner mit Maß und Überzeugung': Der rheinische Demokrat Carl Schurz," in *Das war 'ne heiße Märzenzeit*, 109-111.
[41] Schurz, *Autobiography*, 43-45.

Gottfried Kinkel's first public appearance during the revolution was on March 18. After a procession to the market place celebrating the outbreak of the revolution and the promise it held for Germany, Kinkel gave a powerful speech from the town hall steps regarding the rights of the German people, which would have to be granted by the nobility or fought for by the population. After promising a bright future for a free and unified Germany, he waved the black-red-gold flag inciting endless enthusiasm among the crowd.[42]

In May Kinkel was instrumental in founding the Bonn Democratic Club as a strong believer in its professed support of the sanctity of property. The political unity that had overcome the population in the wake of the revolutionary euphoria dissipated quickly, however, and Kinkel was unable to win a seat in either the Frankfurt or the Berlin assemblies in the May elections, losing to the more moderately liberal candidates. The *Bonner Zeitung*, founded just days before the elections, was unable to influence their outcome.[43] The manner in which Kinkel's reform program had been dismissed by the Constitutional Monarchists led Kinkel and his Democrats to relinquish hope in the possibility of progressive reform under the monarchy and to adopt republicanism as their main principle. In order to reach their principal target audience, the working classes, Kinkel led the Bonn Democrats in the founding of the *Handwerkerbildungsverein*, an educational club for workers. This played a large role in helping the workers gain political control in Bonn. In early August, Kinkel took over the position as chief editor of the *Bonner Zeitung*, which, along with his presidency of both the Democratic Club and

[42] Schmidt, "'Was wir friedlich gewünscht hätten,'" 93-94.
[43] Schmidt, *Gerechtigkeit*, 60-61.

the *Handwerkerbildungsverein,* put him in control of every Bonn institution in support of democracy and republicanism.[44]

That summer Gottfried Kinkel published *Handwerk, errette Dich*! a book in which he laid out his ideas concerning work, capital and education in a plan for a future Germany in which the artisan was the driving force. During the September crisis over the Malmö armistice, the November tax boycott, and the December dissolution of the Prussian parliament and royal proclamation of a constitution, Kinkel was the leading force behind every resolution and action of the democratic opposition in Bonn. His strong opinions and calls for action earned him the animosity of his colleagues, some of whom viewed him as the root of all current problems and called for the state to take action against him. He did have to defend himself in two trials at the start of 1849, one resulting in an acquittal, the other in a conviction, but with a minimum of consequences for him.[45] But even incidents such as these did nothing to slow Kinkel in his work toward the future republic he envisioned Germany would surely become.

All the work of the Bonn Democrats paid off when Kinkel was elected to the Berlin parliament in January 1849 where he took his seat as a member of the far left. He had spent only two short months in Berlin, however, when the Prussian monarch dissolved parliament yet again, and Kinkel returned to Bonn. Within two weeks of his return, the attack on the munitions depot in Siegburg was planned and attempted with its disastrous results. During the last few weeks before the reaction could regain complete

[44] Schmidt, "'Was wir friedlich gewünscht hätten,'" 96.
[45] Schmidt, *Gerechtigkeit*, 64-73.

control over all of Germany, Gottfried Kinkel offered his help to the revolutionary movements in Elberfeld in the Rhineland as well as in the Pfalz and Baden.[46] It was for the provisional government in the Pfalz that he was able to do the most, holding positions as a secretary of the Military Commission and a special envoy with executive powers. During this time he traveled to various towns where support for the revolutionary government was faltering to work as an agitator and a propagandist. On June 29 he received a wound to the head and was captured by the Prussians.[47]

After Kinkel was sentenced to life imprisonment by the military court, the King of Prussia changed the sentence, ordering him to be incarcerated as a common criminal, a move meant to dishonor him. This only elevated Kinkel's status to that of a martyr in a Germany which was rapidly losing all radical liberals to exile.[48] In Bonn it took only eighteen hours to collect 11,000 signatures on a plea for clemency addressed to the Prince of Prussia, and in cities all over Germany committees of solidarity were formed to collect donations to help support the Kinkel family. Even former political opponents were shocked at Kinkel's being treated as a common criminal.[49] Only Karl Marx retained animosity for Kinkel. He attacked Kinkel in an article written from exile in London and published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung-Politisch-ökonomische Revue*, the London re-incarnation of his Cologne paper.[50] This move brought howls of outrage from all levels

---

[46] Ibid., 74-88.
[47] Hanns Klein, "Gottfried Kinkel als Emissär der provisorischen Regierung der Pfalz im Frühjahr 1849 im Westrich, Bemerkungen zu neuentdeckten Kinkel-Briefen," in *Jahresbuch für Westdeutsche Landesgeschichte*, Band 8 (1982), 111-115.
[48] Schmidt, *Gerechtigkeit*, 104-115.
[49] Schmidt, "'Was wir friedlich gewünscht hätten,'" 104-105. In the *Jahrbuch des Bonner Heimat- und Geschichtsvereins*, the number of signatures is given at 1100, suggesting an error in one of the two works (9: 114). Given that the population of Bonn was well less than 20,000 at the time, and that a good number of those were not supporters of Kinkel, the lower number might very well be the more accurate one.
[50] *Neue Rheinische Zeitung-Politisch ökonomische Revue*, April 1850.

of German society and resulted in both English workers and German exiles distancing themselves from Marx.[51] The article appeared in April 1850 shortly after Kinkel's defense speech before the military court in Rastatt the previous August had been published in a Berlin paper. In it, Marx attacked Kinkel by cynically criticizing some of the statements in that speech. Marx called Kinkel a "supposed friend" of his party and stated that he was not the man many believed him to be. He claimed Kinkel's speech denounced his own party and that Kinkel had become a member of this party through a misunderstanding. Full of mockery, Marx conceded that Kinkel was not only deserving of the amnesty he had asked for, but even worthy of a position in the Prussian government.[52]

At another trial and acquittal in Cologne in the spring of 1850, Kinkel's continued popularity was reaffirmed. In November of the same year, his former student Carl Schurz, in constant danger of being arrested himself, freed Kinkel from his cell in Spandau near Berlin in a daring rescue operation. A couple of weeks later both Kinkel and Schurz arrived in London, via Edinburgh, where Kinkel remained for several years.[53]

Initial attempts at continuing the revolutionary fervor with his exiled colleagues even brought him to the United States on a fund-raising mission. Prompted by Johanna, who yearned for a normal family life, however, Kinkel began to withdraw slowly from the political scene. He began holding lecturer positions at several colleges, culminating in 1854 with a professorship in art history at the University of London.

---

[51] Schmidt, *Gerechtigkeit*, 132-133.
[52] Karl Marx, *Neue Rheinische Zeitung – Politisch-ökonomische Revue*, Viertes Heft, April 1850, <http://www.mlwerke.de/me/me07/me07_299.html> (29 August 2002).
[53] Schmidt, *Gerechtigkeit*, 116-118, 138-144.

These positions earned him the envy and animosity of many of his fellow German emigrants. His wife Johanna died suddenly in 1858 when she fell from her bedroom window, initially leaving Kinkel rather helpless. Finally, in 1866, after many frustrating years of waiting, Kinkel was hired as professor at the University of Zurich, where he moved with his second wife. Sixteen years later he died of a stroke, but not until he had witnessed from afar the realization of one of his dreams: the unification of Germany in 1871 under the leadership of his respected former adversary in the Prussian assembly, Otto von Bismarck.[54]

The *Bonner Zeitung* and the *Neue Bonner Zeitung*

A popular press in Bonn before 1848 was virtually non-existent. The *Bonner Wochenblatt*, which had been published since 1814, carried only official government decrees and personal advertisements. In 1843 it began publishing on a daily basis, curiously under the same name, under the stipulation that it not print anything related to politics, religion, government bureaucracy, or recent history. In 1824 the *Bonner Zeitung* appeared, publishing harmless political news and entertainment pieces. It existed for only a few years before folding.[55]

With the lifting of the press censorship laws following the outbreak of revolution in 1848, political newspapers began to flourish. The *Bonner Wochenblatt*, nevertheless, continued its careful approach, merely reproducing conservative articles from other publications. In May of that year, the *Bonner Zeitung* began its short-lived existence

[54] Ibid., 153-160, 173-179, 184-185, 201, 223.
[55] Kaiser, *Die politischen Strömungen*, 12.

under the motto of "Freedom over everything—but within the law! Education of the working classes, improvement of their lot, but without promises of a golden future, and without incitement that could lead to anarchy!"[56] The paper's democratically-minded founders naturally desired political and social reform and wished to express this ideal. At the same time, it seems, they felt the need to assuage the conservative portion of the city's population, who lived in perpetual fear of anarchy resulting from revolution and political power in the hands of the lower classes. In order to achieve the education of the working classes, a weekly section, "Extra Issue for the Education of the Artisan Class and for the Discussion and Promotion of their Interests," was published as well and sold with the paper. The success of the paper under several different chief editors, however, was quite limited.[57]

On 6 August, one day shy of the three-month anniversary of the first issue, Gottfried Kinkel took over the position of chief editor. Stating that popular sovereignty is founded on education, he announced that the goal of the paper would be to discuss political, social, and cultural issues.[58] The ultimate purpose of the paper, he declared, was "the realization of democracy."[59] The paper became the voice of the Democratic Party, peering not only into the activities of parliament, but also into the workshop of the artisan. One section of the paper was to simulate the exposure to the variety of viewpoints expressed in debates during town meetings by dealing with all types of differing political opinions. The main differences between the *Bonner Zeitung*

---

[56] Ibid.
[57] Ibid.
[58] Braubach, *Bonner Professoren*, 52.
[59] [Gottfried Kinkel], "An die Leser," *BZ*, 6 August 1848.

and Marx's *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* were the anticommunist tone and simpler language of the former, as opposed to the more difficult and cumbersome writing of the latter. Leading the way was Kinkel, whose style was full of pathos and very vivid.[60]

Gottfried Kinkel did everything he could to enhance the quality and enlarge the circulation of the *Bonner Zeitung*. In a letter written to a Heidelberg University student, for example, Kinkel expressed his gratitude for a report on the revolutionary activities there. He requested more such articles for the future in order to satisfy his interest in events in Baden. Carl Schurz added a few lines also expressing his gratitude and promising reciprocal reports on events in Bonn, although he judged the current situation there rather negatively.[61]

In another letter, written in late December to the chief editor of the *Dresdner Zeitung*, Mr. Wittig, Kinkel lamented the relative anonymity of both papers and suggested a deal to help alleviate that problem. Kinkel wanted Wittig to order the *Bonner Zeitung* through the post office, reprint any desired articles in his own paper, and then lay it out free of charge at one of the most popular coffee houses in Dresden, which was frequented by republicans. In return, Kinkel promised to do the same with the *Dresdner Zeitung*, thus dramatically increasing the readership of both. Additionally, he praised the quality of the contributions of two exiled correspondents living in "Belgium and Paris," respectively, in the hope of winning Wittig's interest and financial help. Kinkel needed

[60] Kaiser, *Die politischen Strömungen*, 13.
[61] Gottfried Kinkel, Bonn, to Johann Valentin, Heidelberg, 8 November 1848, in *Briefe von Carl Schurz an Gottfried Kinkel*, ed. Eberhard Kessel (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1965), 145-146.

the latter in order to cover the correspondents' fees, which he himself was not able to afford at the time.[62]

Next to Kinkel, Carl Schurz became the most important contributor to the paper. In addition to nine theater reviews, Schurz wrote a total of thirty-seven articles covering political issues such as the constitution for a united Germany, elections, candidates, events in Berlin, and the political and social issues of the revolution, as well as its historical importance. An energetic political tone, a strong ability to express himself stylishly, and a willingness to take a clear stand and pass judgments characterized his contributions.[63]

At the end of 1848, Gottfried Kinkel ended his relationship with half of the publishing team, the brothers Krüger, and, along with the other publisher, Sulzbach, founded the *Neue Bonner Zeitung*, the first issue of which appeared on 1 January 1849. This new paper was still to be the voice of the democratic movement, professing its support of social democracy and its desire to help the democratic movement through the peaceful dissemination of republican ideas into all spheres of society. The new weekly was called *Spartakus*, a name intended to bring the ancient slave's spirit to the present. The paper was to help in the fight of need against excess and of work against capital. As this weekly was aimed solely at the working classes, its language and content was much more radical than that of the daily *Neue Bonner Zeitung*.[64]

---

[62] Gottfried Kinkel, Bonn, to Wittig, Dresden, 28 December 1848, in *Bonner Geschichtsblätter: Jahrbuch des Bonner Heimat- und Geschichtsvereins*, Band IX (1955), 112-113.
[63] Christian Reinicke, "Carl Schurz (1829-1906)," in *Petitionen und Barrikaden*, 291.
[64] Kaiser, *Die politischen Strömungen*, 12-14.

After Gottfried Kinkel was elected to the Prussian parliament in February 1849, Carl Schurz took over the duties of chief editor until Kinkel's return from Berlin in early May. Under his guidance, the *Neue Bonner Zeitung* ceased being the voice of the local democratic group and became a paper of the democratic movement as a whole, doubling the number of subscribers. Schurz also adjusted the content of articles to be more compatible with the paper's readers, who, as members of the lower classes, had no use for basic factual news reporting.[65] Instead, Schurz wanted to avoid articles of purely local interest and replace them with more abstract news items, which were to be related from a consistently analytical democratic viewpoint. His priority was not to inform the public of events as quickly as possible, but he rather intended to bring an instructive element, although strongly interwoven with a reporting of the facts, into the paper, presented in a style which its readers could easily understand.[66]

Johanna Kinkel was also involved in the running of the *Neue Bonner Zeitung*. Initially, she strongly supported both her husband and Schurz in their political activities. Her own role became an active one when she helped Schurz run the paper in Gottfried's absence. During her time as editor of the paper, she spoke out strongly in favor of the social and democratic revolutionary demands and harshly criticized and commented on contemporary political events. She also wrote articles for the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, but had to turn down Marx's offer of a permanent position there because of the demands of her duties with the Bonn paper.[67]

---

[65] Ibid., 14-15.
[66] Carl Schurz, Bonn, to Gottfried Kinkel, Berlin, 20 March 1849, in *Briefe von Carl Schurz*, 50-52.
[67] Schnelling-Reinicke, "Johanna Kinkel," 301.

After Gottfried Kinkel and Carl Schurz left Bonn in May 1849, Johanna took over the duties of chief editor by herself until July of that year. At that time a committee of editors took control of the paper which then lost its high standards and appeared only twice, later three times, a week. On 30 June 1850 the *Neue Bonner Zeitung* ceased publication. The immediate reason for this was the security fee payable to the government that the paper could not afford, but in actuality, the failure of the revolution had eliminated the paper's basis of support.[68]

[68] Kaiser, *Die politischen Strömungen,* 15.

CHAPTER 2
QUANTITATIVE FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

Gottfried Kinkel wrote constantly throughout his lifetime. He was a published poet before the outbreak of the revolution in 1848, and his literary output was substantial. All of Kinkel's work contains insight into his ideas, convictions, and political views. His newspaper articles, however, while they comprise only a small percentage of his body of work, deal virtually exclusively with political issues and are thus an excellent resource for the researcher interested in determining Kinkel's political ideology. With the implementation of freedom of the press in March 1848, Kinkel was free to write on any subject he chose and to comment on current events as he saw fit. The goal of this analysis, therefore, is to derive from Kinkel's articles written between 1848 and 1849, a systematic understanding of his political thought. The rather tedious statistical analysis of Kinkel's terminology was undertaken in order to determine whether it alone might allow an insight into his ideology.

After taking over the *Bonner Zeitung* in August 1848, Gottfried Kinkel began to contribute articles to the paper on a regular basis. By the time of his capture in Rastatt in June 1849 he had written well over 150 articles in the *Bonner Zeitung* and the *Neue Bonner Zeitung*, as it was called beginning in 1 January 1849. The vast majority of those were either editorials or news pieces, which were published in the main portion of the paper. A much smaller number were speeches, fiction, poetry, reactions to or rebuttals of articles by one of his political opponents, or simply advertisements informing the public of an event.

The editorials, the first published 6 August 1848 and the last 23 June 1849, with only one exception were marked with the letter "K" next to the title of the article in order to identify it as Gottfried Kinkel's work. The lone variation was a piece from Karlsruhe published 22 June 1849.[1] His choice of using the initial of his last name, of course, made the identification of his articles very easy, even had he not made the announcement in his very first piece that the letter "K" would be his sign.[2] When one considers the size of Bonn and Kinkel's popularity and status as the leading Democrat, identifying his work would certainly not have been difficult for his contemporaries, even without those pointers. And since freedom of the press had been granted during those tumultuous March days, there really was no reason to fear being identified and linked to certain statements.

In this light, it is interesting to note that the vast majority of articles, no matter who the author might have been, in both the *Bonner Zeitung* and the *Neue Bonner Zeitung* were marked with more cryptic signs and symbols. Carl Schurz, for instance, marked most of his contributions with a "σ."[3] Gottfried Kinkel himself used the sign of the "+" for his news articles. He contributed these more or less neutral news pieces between 2 January and 22 June 1849, the majority of them coming to Bonn from Berlin during Kinkel's time as a member of parliament. There is only one exception to this practice: an article from Kaiserslautern published 30 May 1849 bears the letter "K" as its identifying mark.[4]

---

[1] Braubach, *Bonner Professoren*, 136-137.
[2] [Kinkel], "An die Leser," *BZ*, 6 August 1848.
[3] Braubach, *Bonner Professoren*, 142-143.
[4] Ibid., 137-140.

The explanation for the two variations could simply be a mistake. Kinkel's editorial was always the first article in the paper, and his news stories were placed farther back into the section of the paper that dealt with events in Germany. Other sections followed the goings-on in other parts of Europe with a focus on revolutionary activities there.[5] The lead article marked by a "+" was an appeal to his readers not to allow the *Neue Bonner Zeitung* to die even after his death in order to keep the democratic movement going.[6] The article from Kaiserslautern marked with a "K" relates the state of affairs of the revolutionary movement in the Pfalz and its military preparedness.[7] From their content it becomes clear that the articles were placed in the proper section of the paper, leaving an honest mistake as the most plausible explanation for their inverted marks. Whatever the reason for the inconsistent marks, the articles were included in their respective groups for analysis according to their mark, not their place in the paper. The possible inaccuracy resulting from this is minimal. The news article incorrectly marked with a "K" contains only one mention of one of the search terms, "popular will." The editorial marked "+" includes a few more key terms: two mentions of "political freedom," four occurrences of "democracy," and one reference to the "republic."[8]

The reason for marking the news articles with a "+" instead of his "K" is not clear either. Kinkel himself never gave an explanation for this, nor did he publish any statement explaining the use of the "+" as his mark as he had done with the "K." His

---

[5] *BZ* and *NBZ*.
[6] [Kinkel], "An unsere Leser," *NBZ*, 22 June 1849.
[7] [Kinkel], "Die Zustände in der Rheinpfalz," *NBZ*, 30 May 1849.
[8] [Kinkel], "Die Zustände in der Rheinpfalz," *NBZ*, 30 May 1849; and "An unsere Leser," *NBZ*, 22 June 1849.

distinct writing style, which naturally remained the same in all his pieces, makes the identification of Kinkel as the author of those articles relatively easy.

Another invaluable indicator is the consistent supplying of date and place of origin for each article. In this manner it is possible to match the "+" articles from Berlin with Kinkel's time spent there while a delegate for Bonn in the Prussian parliament. Kinkel left Bonn for Berlin on 23 February 1849 and returned a few days after the dissolution of parliament on 27 April 1849.[9] The articles marked with a "+" that were written in Berlin are all dated between 26 February and 28 April 1849. The editorials marked with a "K" and dated between 12 March and 28 April 1849 were also labeled as having been written in Berlin. The only two exceptions are two "+" articles written in Bonn on 7 and 9 April.[10] That, however, is explained through Kinkel's visit to Bonn for a few days over the Easter holidays.[11] The last article from Berlin marked "+" deals with the mood of the city's population after parliament had been dissolved.[12] The editorial marked "K," on the other hand, interprets the king's actions as evidence that the monarchy was neither willing nor able to pay heed to the popular will and that the embodiment of that will—parliament—had become too threatening to the power of the nobility.[13]

Another curiosity is the fact that in many articles Gottfried Kinkel referred to himself in the third person. While that practice is by far the exception in his editorials—it occurred only once or twice—it was rather common in the news stories, especially the

---

[9] Kersken, *Stadt und Universität Bonn*, 130, 135.
[10] Braubach, *Bonner Professoren*, 137-139.
[11] Ibid., 101.
[12] [Kinkel], "Die Stimmung," *NBZ*, 1 May 1849.
[13] [Kinkel], "Die Kammerauflösung," *NBZ*, 1 May 1849.

ones reporting on parliamentary activity in Berlin. This seems to indicate a desire to conceal his authorship of these articles, possibly in an attempt to make them seem more neutral and unbiased. If that were the case, it would be rather illogical since the paper existed expressly as a democratic mouthpiece. Moreover, the "+" articles displayed a very strong leftist leaning, leaving the political opinion of the author beyond doubt, albeit without the open judgments and democratic rhetoric concerning events that were inherent in the "K" articles. In a letter to Gottfried Kinkel, although he certainly knew the two were one and the same, Carl Schurz went so far as to request more articles from the "+" correspondent, as they were being devoured by the paper's readers.[14] Although it seems a bit odd for him to refer to Kinkel's pieces in that manner when writing a personal letter to their author, it was likely just a quirk without much meaning.

An oddity among the "+" articles is a very short one written in Endenich on 18 March 1849 praising the efforts of the Democratic Club there concerning their banquet celebration in honor of the one-year anniversary of the revolution.[15] Although the sign for the article is the same "+" as used by Kinkel, it cannot be attributed to him. In that same issue of the paper, another article appeared bearing the same sign, this one, however, authored in Berlin on 16 March. The next article bearing the "+" sign is another piece from Berlin written on 19 March and appearing in the paper on 22 March. Kinkel was definitely in Berlin at this time and the author of the two articles originating there. Who the author of the article from Endenich was is unclear. Writing style, unfortunately, is no help in this instance since the Endenich article is only a couple of

[14] Carl Schurz, Bonn, to Gottfried Kinkel, Berlin, 8 March 1849, in *Briefe von Carl Schurz*, 49.
[15] "Bankettfeier," *NBZ*, 20 March 1849.

sentences long and does not offer enough information to allow for the recognition of a certain style. Further complicating matters in determining the author of that article is the use of different versions of a "+" by different contributors. Kinkel's version is thin and as tall as it is wide. Another correspondent used a "+" that is thicker and wider than it is tall, and a third used a "†."[16] With the quality of print being what it was at the time, it is possible that one version looked much like another from time to time. Of course, it is also possible the wrong sign was printed with that article by mistake.

The articles bearing the shorter and thicker "+" appeared only in the *Bonner Zeitung* and not in the *Neue Bonner Zeitung*, while the reverse is true for the articles marked with the symmetrical and thinner "+." This opens up the possibility—contrary to what Max Braubach presents[17]—that both versions of the "+" might have been Kinkel's sign, and that they appear different only because of a different type set used after the switch of publishers at the turn of the year. Substantiating this possibility is the subject matter of some of these articles. One deals in an exasperated tone with the audacity of the conservatives to deny earlier events in Mainz.[18] Kinkel had reported and commented on these events including the murder of three boys by Prussian soldiers, in an article marked "K" only five days previously.[19] Another is a short report on the arrest of Kinkel's friend Ferdinand Freiligrath for his revolutionary poem,[20] an issue picked up by

---

[16] *BZ* and *NBZ*.

[17] Braubach, *Bonner Professoren*, 136-141. Braubach discusses only the sign of the "K" throughout both newspapers and the "+" in the *Neue Bonner Zeitung* as being indicative of articles by Kinkel (Ibid., 52, 98, 112). The slightly different style of the "+" appearing in the *Bonner Zeitung* is neither proposed as a possibility nor denied as such in connection with Kinkel.

[18] "Die Frechheit, mit der man jetzt den Mainzer Mord läugnet," *BZ*, 22 September 1848.

[19] [Kinkel], "Vorwort zu Erzählung von dem vorbedachen Menschenmorde durch die Soldaten zu Mainz," supplement to *BZ*, 17 September 1848.

[20] "Freiligrath," *BZ*, 4 October 1848. Ferdinand Freiligrath, born in 1810, was a German poet, famous during his own lifetime. He earned this fame through descriptive works on exotic places. He was forced into exile after he began to write political and social poetry in support of the ideals of freedom and

Kinkel upon his friend's acquittal a mere day later in another "K" article.[21] Two more articles report on the events during the National Democratic Congress held in Prussia's capital at the end of October.[22] Kinkel had been sent to the congress by the Bonn Democratic Club and was in Berlin during the dates on which the two articles were penned.

Diminishing the possibility of these articles being Kinkel's, however, is the location in which some of the articles were written. Of the sixty-six articles bearing this version of the "+," fifty-six were written in Bonn or vicinity and ten in Berlin. The aforementioned two articles dealing with the Democratic Congress aside, the remaining eight make a strong case that their author must have been someone other than Kinkel. They were written over the months of May through October, excluding September. The first of them was written on 27 May, the day immediately before Kinkel's founding of the educational club for workers and only four days before he helped found the Bonn Democratic Club. The months of June and July show only articles from Berlin and not from Bonn, which is not listed as the place of origin for an article in this group until August. Kinkel was not in Berlin during the summer months, however. The result of these contradictory findings is that there does remain a chance, albeit a very small one, that the articles in this group were written by Kinkel.

---

democracy. After his return to Germany in 1848 he worked as an editor for the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* with Karl Marx. He was arrested but later acquitted for his poem *Die Toten and die Lebenden*, about the victims of the revolution. In 1851 he was forced to flee Germany for England again, where he lived until 1868. His war songs in 1870 completed his transformation from revolutionary to patriot of the Bismarck era. He died in 1876.

[21] [Kinkel], "Die Freisprechung Freiligraths und was daran hängt," *BZ*, 5 October 1848.

[22] "Demokratenkongress, Wahl des Zentralen Ausschusses," *BZ*, 30 October 1848; and "Der zweite Congress der deutschen Demokraten," *BZ*, 5 November 1848.

For his other contributions, Gottfried Kinkel used a number of different signs. A "?" and a "¿" were the signs used for the first and second half of his *Geschichte eines Pathenlöffels* (*Story of a Godchild Spoon*), respectively, which appeared in the discussion section of the paper.[23] In the same section he published a series of articles about the political scene in Berlin using the "*" as a mark.[24] Other contributions were marked with a "K" or, as in the case of his poems, signed with his full name under the piece, or sometimes both.[25]

None of his contributions, including his poems and the like, was intended to be purely entertaining. He included a political message as a main ingredient in everything he wrote. In his poem *Fluth und Ebbe* (*Ebb and Flow*), for instance, he likens the high and low tides to the surging and retreating of the revolutionary momentum, expressing that even in times of reactionary superiority, the democratic forces are merely gathering force only to return with more strength than before.[26] In the poem *An das Volk* (*To the People*) Kinkel dealt with revolutionary themes as well, speaking out in support of unity and political rights.[27]

The only two pieces attributed to Gottfried Kinkel after he had been taken prisoner by the Prussians are the poem *Fluth und Ebbe* and his defense speech before the Cologne Court of Assizes in the spring of 1850.[28] Both were published while Kinkel was

---

[23] [Kinkel], "Geschichte eines Pathenlöffels," part 1, *BZ*, 7, 22 and 23 August and 2 September 1848; part 2, *NBZ*, 3, 10, 13, 17 and 25 January, 8, 11 and 14 February 1849.
[24] [Kinkel], "Nebelbilder aus Berlin," *NBZ*, 24 April 1849; "Ein Blick von der Tribüne," *NBZ*, 25 and 26 April 1849; "Die Rechte in der zweiten Kammer," *NBZ*, 28 April 1849; "Weise Staatsformen," *NBZ*, 2 May 1849.
[25] Braubach, *Bonner Professoren*, 140-141.
[26] [Kinkel], "Fluth und Ebbe," *NBZ*, 14 October 1849.
[27] [Kinkel], "An das Volk," *BZ*, 21 and 22 September 1848.
[28] Braubach, *Bonner Professoren*, 140-141.

incarcerated. The former, expressing his confidence in a favorable final outcome, was clearly intended to instill courage in his fellow Democrats in an attempt at keeping the movement alive. His speech, beautifully summarizing the revolutionary movement from Kinkel's point of view, was printed in the *Neue Bonner Zeitung* only a few weeks before the paper ceased publication.

This study will focus on the articles marked with either the "K" or the "+" and appearing in the main section of the *Bonner Zeitung* and the *Neue Bonner Zeitung*. Of those there are 136[29]: forty-seven marked "K" and eighty-nine marked "+." The editorials—or "K" articles—express Kinkel's political views very nicely as they are made up primarily of commentary and probably serve as the best indicators of his political thought. The news pieces—or "+" articles—tend to be more in line with straight news reporting, although even with them there is no doubt as to the political affiliation of the author. The two groups combined make up over eighty percent of his contributions, allowing for reliable results even when the remaining contributions are ignored.

Of Kinkel's speeches, only five are reproduced in the paper, amounting to only a fraction of those delivered by Kinkel during the course of the revolution. Such a small sample far too easily leads to distorted findings. Moreover, one of those five speeches is reprinted as part of one of Kinkel's own news pieces from Berlin,[30] and therefore is included in the study.

---

[29] Max Braubach lists only 127, but there can be no doubt that another nine were also authored by Kinkel. Of those, the first five are marked with a "K" and the other four with the "+." The "K" articles were published in the *Bonner Zeitung* on 18 (two articles), 19 and 22 November and 30 December 1848; the "+" articles on 2 and 17 Jaunuary, 3 April and 22 June in the *Neue Bonner Zeitung*.

[30] [Kinkel], "Ein Zwischenspiel," *NBZ*, 29 April 1849.

Gottfried Kinkel's contributions in the discussion section of the paper for the most part consist of literary pieces. These do contain political opinion and commentary, but the literary analysis necessary to extract his political views from them will be left for a future study.

Kinkel's personal advertisements are not included either, as they seem to have provided an opportunity for him to relax his restraint concerning sarcasm more so than in his other works. For the most part, they consist of a squabble over personal issues he appears to have had with a number of his political opponents and do not go much beyond his pointing out that person's fallacies and deficiencies. In one, for instance, he reprinted a letter threatening him with physical harm should he go through with his plans to appear in Endenich for a democratic rally. His reason for the reprint was to make fun of the letter's obvious deficiencies in the use of the German language and spelling as well as its content.[31]

All of Gottfried Kinkel's 136 "K" and "+" articles, which appeared in the papers' main sections, were searched for the same key phrases and terms. In this manner the number of times a certain word was used was counted and the frequency of its use figured. The importance to Kinkel of certain ideas can then be inferred from the statistical findings. For this, it is assumed that a higher frequency of use of a term indicates a topic of more importance. Of course, the same is assumed in reverse.

For all terms, the root of the term was of the essence. In other words, the idea was more important than the exact form of the word. So, in order to gauge the importance of the idea of the revolution, not only the exact word "revolution" was

[31] [Kinkel], "Zur Erheiterung des Publikums," *BZ*, 2 October 1848.

counted each time it appeared. Instead, any forms of the word, for instance "revolutionary" as well as "revolutionist," and so on, were included in the count.

If any of these words or their variations appeared in a direct quotation in any of the articles, they were included in the tally as well. The reason for this is that if Gottfried Kinkel deemed these quotations important enough to include them in his pieces, he must have also deemed their content, including their phraseology, representative of his own opinion. In the case of quotations by his political opponents, he consistently rebutted any kind of argument made, in a sense neutralizing any word count from them, which might distort the end result. At any rate, there are not enough direct quotations to significantly alter the findings.

For two of the terms, specifically "democrat" and "constitution," the findings cannot be viewed as conclusively as for the rest. The reason for this is the use of them to indicate another person's political affiliation during the revolution. Gottfried Kinkel himself belonged to the "Democrats." He and his like-minded friends desired full popular sovereignty, preferably in a republic. They belonged to "Democratic Clubs" and spoke to and of their fellow "Democrats." Their political opponents, also liberal, albeit to a far lesser extent, were the "Constitutionals." They were in favor of a constitution for Germany, but were more elitist and not convinced of the desirability of complete popular sovereignty. They more or less abhorred the idea of a republic, believing popular rule would surely result in anarchy. Instead, they fully supported the existing monarchy, but felt that the royal powers should be limited through a liberal constitution granting a limited franchise. Gottfried Kinkel referred to members of this group of "Constitutionals" on a relatively regular basis, especially in his news pieces reporting on

parliamentary activity during his stay in Berlin. Likewise, he discussed his fellow "Democrats" and meetings at "democratic clubs" and the like. As a result, the word count for these two terms distorts references to Kinkel's support of democracy and a constitution, although he certainly was a strong believer in both.

Findings by Article Sign

In the articles marked with the "K," the term that appears most frequently is "republic," followed by "democrat," "revolution," and "constitution," in that order. They are also the only terms to appear on average more than once per article (see Table 1). It is telling that "republic" appears more often even than "democrat" or "constitution," considering the fact that Kinkel used the latter two as labels when referring to other people or groups, as mentioned above. Kinkel, of course, was convinced that the republic offered the best hope for Germany's future and therefore was an adamant supporter of it, attempting to influence others at every turn to believe the same.

Because the "K" articles are editorials, the use of the terms "democrat" and "constitution" as a label for the differing political groups and their adherents does not account for as large a percentage of occurrences of the word as in the news articles. Allowing for thirty percent of each to have been used in such a manner, both nevertheless remain among the top four terms used in the articles at a frequency of 1.11 and 0.89, respectively. This should come as no surprise as Kinkel was a strong advocate of a democratic system of government for Germany, in which the individual's rights are protected by a constitution.

Table 1: Term Number and Frequency for Articles Sorted by Sign

	"K" Articles (47)		"+" Articles (89)	
	N	F	N	F
Capitalism	9	0.19	-	-
Class Struggle	1	0.02	2	0.02
Constitution	60	1.28 (0.89)	132	1.48 (0.74)
Democracy	75	1.59 (1.11)	63	0.71 (0.35)
Political Freedom	30	0.64	40	0.45
Popular Sovereignty	9	0.19	1	0.01
Popular Will	32	0.68	13	0.15
Proletariat	18	0.38	27	0.3
Republic	86	1.83	41	0.46
Revolution	74	1.57	48	0.54
Rights	20	0.43	50	0.56
Socialism	16	0.34	10	0.11
Unity	16	0.34	5	0.06

Note: The terms have been arranged alphabetically since ranking by number or frequency would have produced a different result for the two groups. The total number of articles for each group is in parentheses next to the group heading. The Terms "constitution" and "democracy" have parenthetical listings for their respective adjusted frequencies.

Frequent use of the term "revolution" is clearly very consistent with the times. It is only natural for those involved, and also for those who remained inactive, to speak of the revolution and its development often. The progress and setbacks of the revolutionary movement within and outside of Germany, with events in France garnering special attention, were constant topics of discussion in Kinkel's articles. He continually admonished his readers not to allow the revolution to die. Especially in his pieces from southern Germany, the revolution and its state of affairs in the insurrectionary areas was the main topic in an attempt at instilling hope and energy into the people despite the rapidly worsening situation.

The next most frequently used terms are "popular will" and "political freedom." The frequency for these, however, drops from at least once per article to only once in two out of every three articles. Nevertheless, their frequency puts them at the top of the list and is indicative of Kinkel's political thought. It was for the expression of the popular will, after all, that he desired the implementation of a democratic system. Political freedom was necessary for the uninhibited dissemination of ideas in order for the masses to be able to form such a will.[32] Appearing in slightly less than half the articles is the mention of individual rights. This idea ties in with that of political freedom under a constitution, underlining the importance of these ideals.

Gottfried Kinkel's socialist leanings become evident through his discussion of social issues. The term "socialism" and its variations are used on average once every three articles. "Proletariat" appears at roughly the same frequency. Included in the tally of the latter is also the term "worker," since Kinkel uses the two interchangeably, talking about the individual worker more often than the whole of the working classes. Seeing himself as a champion of the working classes and their causes, Kinkel invested much time and thought in providing possible solutions for ending their plight. The protection of the small worker or artisan from the power and advantage of capital was an important issue for him and paramount to the future strength of Germany. His own *Handwerk, errette Dich!* is the best testament to that philosophy.

What is interesting to note is the relative rarity of the mention of unity for Germany. Unifying all German states was one of Kinkel's principal desires. In his defense speech in Rastatt in 1849, for instance, he stated that the revolution of the past

[32] Kinkel, *Handwerk, errette Dich!*

year had been primarily about German unity. He believed that to have been the highest desire of all Germans.[33] In this light, the low frequency of that idea in his editorials is rather perplexing. One explanation might be that he believed that the attainment of popular sovereignty would result in unity. Were Germany made up of a majority who desired unity, that unity would certainly be achieved through the expression of the popular will in a republic, or even in a number of republics created separately in each state. In a democratically governed state with a majority desirous of German unity, that government would certainly vote in favor of unity, thus bringing it about. In spite of this logic, it is curious that he seemed reluctant to try to motivate his readers to fight for these political goals with the promise of unity as a reward should they succeed.

The rarity of the term "popular sovereignty" in Kinkel's articles is probably not as odd as it might seem at first glance. Popular sovereignty, after all, is a reality in a republic or any truly democratic system. Therefore, the count for this term can in, a sense, be added to that of the "republic" or "democracy."

The rarest of all terms and ideas discussed by Kinkel is class struggle. It is mentioned merely once in almost fifty articles. That fact is very telling, however, since it shows Kinkel's attitude toward communism. While he did desire an improvement of the social condition of the lower classes at the expense of the higher, he was averse to the idea of putting any one class ahead of another. Instead, he hoped for the creation of a brotherhood of mankind equally including all classes, creating just one group of equals. This goal was similar to that of Karl Marx in that Kinkel desired the elimination of any sort of class privilege, although he was far more moderate than Marx and not in favor of

[33] DeJonge, *Gottfried Kinkel*, 25.

communal ownership of property. Also, the manner in which Kinkel hoped this goal could ideally be achieved was through peaceful political processes as opposed to the violent destruction of the status quo. Communism did not appeal to Kinkel. He did not subscribe to its theories, nor did he use its terminology.[34]

A picture relatively consistent with the above emerges from the analysis of the "+" articles. Here "constitution" is far and away the most frequently used term. Because these are more journalistic news articles, many of which were written in Berlin about events and activities in parliament, that word was often used in reference to the political group and its members. Even allowing for as many as half of the recurrences to be of that nature, however, the term's frequency would be reduced only to 0.74, and it would retain its ranking as the most-used term in this article group (see Table 1). Parliament's dealings with the issues of the previously royally-decreed constitution during Kinkel's time in Berlin are surely significant to the statistical outcome as well. Also distorting the findings for this term is its appearance a total of twenty-eight times in one article alone. That piece, reporting on parliamentary activity, consists nearly completely of a passage reproduced from another democratic newspaper, the *Demokratische Correspondenz*.[35] After subtracting that total from the overall total, one is left with a total number of occurrences of 104 and a frequency of 1.17 or 0.59 when allowing for the term's use as party labeling. That would reduce it to the second most used term behind "democracy" and bring it down to a frequency more consistent with that of the other terms.

---

[34] Schmidt, *Gerechtigkeit*, 62.
[35] [Kinkel], "Sitzung der Zweiten Kammer," *NBZ*, 11 March 1849.

In the interest of consistency, the same estimation should be applied to the findings for the term "democracy" as well, reducing its frequency to 0.35 and lowering its ranking from second to seventh. But in spite of this, it is still in the group of terms appearing in at least one of three articles. The others, "rights," "revolution," "republic," and "freedom," are certainly consistent with Kinkel's ideas, as well as those of the time.

The top seven terms for each article group are remarkably similar. While the ranking has shifted somewhat, all but one of the terms are the same. The only differences are the terms "popular will" and "proletariat." The former is fifth in the "K" articles but only eighth in the "+" articles, and the latter is ninth and seventh in the respective groups. Naturally, the lower half of the terms remains largely unchanged as well, with even fewer changes in their order than in the top half. This gives a clear indication that Gottfried Kinkel discussed the same issues whether commenting on the situation around him or merely reporting it.

It is only logical that the same picture emerges when both groups are examined as one. "Constitution" is mentioned the most, with "democracy," "republic," and "revolution" making up the rest of the top four (see Table 2). A reduction of forty percent (the mean between the thirty percent reduction of the first group and the fifty percent reduction of the second) in the count of the first two words for the same reasons as stated above would seem in order. This would leave them with a frequency of 0.85 and 0.61 and lower their rankings to third and fourth, respectively. This places "republic" and "revolution" at the top of the list. The important issues of rights, political freedom, and the popular will round out the top half of the rankings. Almost completely ignored is the Marxist idea of class struggle.

Table 2: Term Number and Frequency for All Articles

	"K" and "+" Articles (136)	
	N	F
Constitution	192	1.41 (0.85)
Democracy	138	1.01 (0.61)
Republic	127	0.93
Revolution	122	0.9
Rights	70	0.51
Political Freedom	70	0.51
Popular Will	45	0.33
Proletariat	45	0.33
Socialism	26	0.19
Unity	21	0.15
Popular Sovereignty	10	0.07
Capitalism	9	0.07
Class Struggle	3	0.02

Note: The terms are listed according to frequency, the highest at the top. The number of articles is in parentheses. The terms "constitution" and "democracy" have a parenthetical listing for their respective adjusted frequencies.

Gottfried Kinkel clearly had one goal in mind: the realization of the revolutionary movement through the creation of a democratic and constitutional republic. His other desires, the social issue concerning the working classes and German unity, were certainly discussed. However, they were pushed into the background by the necessity to achieve the political basis to allow for their solution.

Findings by Article Place of Origin

There are three distinct geographical locations in which the 136 articles Gottfried Kinkel wrote for the main section of the *Bonner Zeitung* and the *Neue Bonner Zeitung* were created. Obviously Bonn is one of them. Kinkel wrote articles there between 6

August 1848, when he took over the editorship, and 5 May 1849, shortly before leaving town to help the revolutionary cause elsewhere. But actually Berlin is the one place where Kinkel wrote more articles than any other, penning seventy-four pieces there between 26 February and 28 April 1849 compared to only forty-seven in Bonn. The third is southern Germany, from which he mailed fifteen articles to the paper between 13 May and 22 June 1849.[36]

The majority—thirty-five to be exact—of the articles written in Bonn were editorials marked with the "K." With only one exception, all of these were written before Kinkel's stay in Berlin. Of the remaining twelve marked with the "+" sign, all but two were written before Kinkel left Bonn to take his seat in parliament, the last two coming while on a visit to Bonn over Easter. Unlike the Bonn articles, the ones originating in Berlin were predominantly marked with the "+." The imbalance is even greater here with sixty-five of them marked in that manner as compared to only nine editorials. Naturally, all of them were written during Kinkel's short two-month stay in Prussia's capital as a member of parliament. Of the contributions originating in southern Germany, only three are marked with the "K," the rest displaying the "+." The anomaly mentioned above—the news article marked "K" and the editorial marked "+"—is part of this group.[37] For the analysis in this section, however, the marks are irrelevant, as the articles are sorted by place of origin.

In the articles written in Bonn, the most frequently used term, or a derivative of it, is "democracy," followed by "republic," "constitution," and "revolution" (see Table 3).

[36] Braubach, *Bonner Professoren*, 136-140.
[37] Ibid., 101, 136-140.

Table 3: Term Number and Frequency for Articles Sorted by Place of Origin

	Bonn (47)		Berlin (74)		Southern Germany (15)	
	N	F	N	F	N	F
Capitalism	9	0.19	-	-	-	-
Class Struggle	1	0.02	1	0.01	1	0.07
Constitution	54	1.15	131	1.77	7	0.47
Democracy	77	1.64	48	0.65	13	0.87
Political Freedom	24	0.51	30	0.41	16	1.07
Popular Sovereignty	6	0.13	3	0.04	1	0.07
Popular Will	24	0.51	14	0.19	7	0.47
Proletariat	14	0.3	28	0.38	3	0.2
Republic	69	1.47	38	0.51	20	1.33
Revolution	52	1.11	47	0.66	23	1.53
Rights	25	0.53	42	0.57	3	0.2
Socialism	15	0.32	10	0.14	1	0.07
Unity	16	0.34	5	0.07	-	-

Note: The terms are arranged alphabetically. The total number of articles for each group is listed in parentheses below each group heading.

This is not a surprising finding, since, while in Bonn, Kinkel led the Democratic Club and the movement for democracy in general, thus discussing the issue on a regular basis. The number one ranking of that term is almost certainly also due also to the above-discussed use of the term as a label for his political group and its members. If one takes that into consideration and allows for only a small percentage of the mentions of it to be of that nature, it is safe to say that "republic" easily eclipses "democracy" as the term with the highest frequency. But even with a reduction of as much as half, certainly more than is realistically warranted, "democracy" still retains the fourth highest frequency. With a similar alteration to the frequency of the term "constitution," it would take the fourth

spot, pushing "democracy" back up to third and leaving "republic" and "revolution" in first and second place, respectively.

The next three terms in the Bonn articles are clustered, each appearing on average in every other piece. These are "rights," "political freedom," and "popular will," all issues important to Kinkel and integral to the revolutionary movement. With a few minor changes, the ranking of the terms for this group is very similar to that of the editorial group discussed above (see Table 1). This is logical, however, since most of the editorials were written in Bonn, and editorials also make up roughly seventy-five percent of Gottfried Kinkel's contributions originating from there. The top seven terms consist of the same ones for each of these groups.

The likeness is even more pronounced when one compares the "+" articles to the Berlin articles. It should also seem less curious, however, since these two groups are even more exclusive of pieces belonging to another category. Of the seventy-four articles written in Berlin, nearly ninety percent are news stories. The number of "+" articles written in Berlin, although fewer, is still nearly three-quarters of the total number of news articles. The result is that the entire ranking, with the exception of the inversion in order of only two pairs of terms, is exactly the same. Because the two terms in the top half are within four percentage points of one another in both listings, and the others are at the bottom of the list, the changes are almost negligible.

Comparing the frequencies of each individual term makes the similarities even more pronounced. For all terms, except "constitution," for which it is twenty-nine, none has a greater frequency variation than twelve percentage points. When comparing the Bonn articles with the "K" articles, by contrast, one finds a variation of more than ten

points for many of the terms, even though the order of the ranking is very similar. The greatest variation is for the term "revolution" at forty-six points, followed by "republic" at thirty-six.

Helping to explain these variations, albeit not all of them, are the figures for the articles written in southern Germany. There, Kinkel makes more mention of the term "revolution" than of any other term (see Table 3). That, of course, is due to his dealings with the revolutionary governments and movements in the Pfalz and Baden. The goal there was the creation of a republic, either one encompassing both regions, or two separate ones.[38] Kinkel's discussions of these desires made "republic" the second most frequently used term in the articles. The political freedoms, which were being suppressed everywhere in Germany except in those two areas at that time, are mentioned the third most. Naturally, Kinkel was reporting on the democratic governments leading these two areas of resistance, as well as about the desire for a constitution, which would have been the necessary next step in the founding of a republic. These two issues, as well as that of the popular will, were also important topics for discussion. The matter of German unity was completely ignored in all of the articles coming out of the south. The time for that question apparently was not ripe, when one considers that the whole revolutionary movement stood close to eradication by the reactionary powers. For the time being, it was of the essence to ensure the victory of the revolution in that small part of Germany. The popular will, once it could assert itself, Kinkel believed, would see to it that German unity would come to be. That was merely a matter of time.

[38] [Kinkel], "Hoffnungen und Gefahren," *NBZ*, 19 May 1849.

The ranking by place shows the terms in the upper as well as the lower halves to be the same as in the evaluations of the other groups. The single exceptions here exist in the "Berlin" and "+" groups. In both of them the term "proletariat" is ahead of "popular will," putting it in seventh place. While some of the terms change positions within the rankings, the top four over-all, "constitution," "democracy," republic" and "revolution" (see Table 2), never fall lower than the fifth spot in any of the sub-groups. Similarly, the bottom of the list does not change much either. That the term "class struggle" is not in last place in all groups is merely due to the fact that "capitalism" in the Berlin group, and "capitalism" and "unity" in the southern Germany group, are not mentioned even once.

In any case, a strong picture of consistency emerges for all five groups. No matter where Gottfried Kinkel was or whether he wrote an editorial or a news article, he continuously discussed the topics that were most important to him. While the solution to the social ills of his time were his motivating factor, he believed that the opportunity to deal with them would be greatest given the right circumstances, and it was to achieve these that he argued and fought during the revolution. Kinkel was convinced that a republic held the highest promise to remedy the current situation; he was of the opinion that full popular sovereignty protected by a constitution was necessary to make a democratic system function properly; and he believed the thrones of Europe to represent the main obstacle to the fulfillment of these goals and ideals. He did not, however, believe in communist theories and therefore made virtually no use of Marxist rhetoric.

Findings by Article Date

During the eleven months that Gottfried Kinkel contributed articles to the papers, several key events of the revolution took place. In late August Prussia unilaterally agreed to the Malmö Armistice, one of its first shows of strength after the revolution had broken out. The Frankfurt Assembly in September first voted to reject the treaty, but quickly reversed its course and accepted it. November saw the royal order for the Prussian parliament to relocate to the city of Brandenburg, followed by the refusal to do so by its left-wing members and their declaration of the Prussian government's lack of authority to levy taxes shortly before its dissolution. The Prussian King decreed a constitution in December and announced new elections for the following year. The month of January was spent with election campaigns for the following month. The winners of those elections convened as a two-house parliament for only two months before the king dissolved the lower house in late April. This move was caused by the representatives' vote to accept the Frankfurt Assembly's constitution for a unified Germany after the king had refused the German imperial crown from the Frankfurt Assembly. May and June saw the *Reichsverfassungskampagne*, the rising in many parts of Germany in favor of the Frankfurt constitution and German unification. Prussian troops finally ended this last chapter of the revolution in late June.[39]

Until late summer 1848 everything seemed to show promise for a future Germany with more political freedoms and popular involvement in government activity. The Frankfurt Assembly was working toward a constitution for a unified nation, and the

[39] Sperber, *Rhineland Radicals.*

Prussian king had seemed quite liberal in making his concessions in March. The war with Denmark, officially a war carried out by the whole of Germany through the Frankfurt parliament, seemed to move the country in the right direction as well, utilizing the widespread feelings of patriotism. The summer following the outbreak of the revolution had remained relatively quiet and in line with the revolutionary dreams.

It would seem only logical for Gottfried Kinkel to grow ever more anxious, however, as the revolutionary gains of March 1848 slowly were rescinded by the Prussian crown, making his dream of unity and a republic for Germany, through which would be solved the social problems, an increasingly unreasonable hope. An increase in revolutionary agitation and radical language might be expected in an effort to salvage what gains had been achieved or to prod the public to take action in an attempt at reversing the reactionary tide. A certain panic might even become evident in his writings.

In order to examine this issue, Kinkel's articles were sorted according to the month in which they were written, ignoring their date of publication. This was done in an attempt to achieve a higher degree of accuracy. As some of them were not published until the following month, this method allows for a larger number of articles to be counted toward the month in which a certain event took place.

Kinkel's articles in the month of September do show a marked increase in the use of the terms "democracy," "republic" and "constitution," the first two appearing an average of well more than twice per article (see Table 4). This makes sense since the Prussian move concerning the armistice certainly failed to incorporate any democratic decision making and threatened the creation of a German republic. Surprising, however,

Table 4: Term Frequency for Articles Sorted by Month

	Aug. (3)	Sept. (11)	Oct. (5)	Nov. (10)	Dec. (4)	Jan. (6)	Feb. (10)	Mar. (38)	Apr. (33)	May (9)	Jun. (7)
Capitalism	1.33	0.18	0.2	0.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Class Struggle	-	0.09	-	-	-	-	0.1	-	-	0.11	-
Constitution	-	1.18	1.8	1.1	1.75	1.5	0.2	2.21	1.33	0.44	0.57
Democracy	1	2.55	2.6	1.6	-	1.33	0.6	0.61	0.79	-	1.86
Political Freedom	0.67	0.91	0.6	0.4	0.25	0.17	0.2	0.47	0.3	1.67	0.43
Popular Sovereignty	0.67	0.18	-	-	0.25	-	0.1	0.03	0.03	0.11	0.14
Popular Will	-	0.64	1.4	0.4	0.5	0.17	0.3	0.23	0.18	0.33	0.57
Proletariat	2	0.36	-	0.1	-	0.17	0.3	0.29	0.48	0.11	0.28
Republic	0.67	2.36	2.8	1	0.5	2.33	0.1	0.45	0.61	1.22	1.43
Revolution	0.33	0.91	2.8	1.2	2	0.5	0.1	0.45	0.97	0.89	2.29
Rights	1	-	-	1.1	0.25	-	-	0.84	0.58	0.33	0.14
Socialism	-	0.55	0.8	-	0.5	0.5	-	0.16	0.12	-	0.14
Unity	0.33	0.18	-	0.1	-	0.67	-	0.05	0.15	0.67	-

Note: The term number is omitted for space reasons. The number of articles for each month is in parentheses.

is the fact that German unity is barely mentioned in September. Looking ahead to the following month in order to allow for the inclusion of continued discussion on the topic does not yield the expected results either. "Unity" does not appear even once in October. This is rather interesting, since Prussia's show of power in this matter did nothing if it did not threaten the possibility of German unity. There is an increase for the other three terms mentioned above, albeit a relatively modest one.

Looking into the month of November, one sees a marked reduction in the frequency of all four of the most common terms. The only term to register an increased frequency is that of "rights." This is only logical since the order to relocate the Prussian parliament was an attack on its and the people's rights in a democratic system. When one considers that this order was given in the first half of the month, it is reasonable to see a change in language during the same period. Of course, Gottfried Kinkel did lead Bonn in its tax boycott movement and reminded his readers that they were merely exercising their rights in carrying out the boycott, which accounts for at least some of the mentions of the term. In this manner Kinkel obviously reacted to the situation at hand. He did not, however, try to instigate a new revolutionary wave. Instead, he remained calm and admonished his readers to do the same while insisting on their rights.[40]

In December Kinkel mentioned the revolution more than any other term. Due to the royal decree of a constitution and the obvious intention of the Prussian monarchy to fight to retain its powers, the revolutionary gains were now severely threatened. Thus, it makes sense for Kinkel to address the revolution and the missed opportunities by the left

[40] Kersken, *Stadt und Universität Bonn*, 84; [Kinkel], "Die Steuerverweigerung ist ausgesprochen," *BZ*, 18 November 1848.

to ensure their political gains from it.[41] The extremely low number of articles, the lack of a feeling for the necessity to discuss the issues, in other words, seems to indicate a lack of apprehension and panic.

January and February were dominated by the election campaigns for the Prussian parliament. Since Kinkel himself was a candidate, it would have been natural for him to campaign through the paper, now called *Neue Bonner Zeitung*. Although there are more than in December, the number of articles oddly enough did not increase over that of other months. The frequency in January of certain terms, specifically "democracy" and "republic," did, but without surpassing that of some previous months. The articles written in February, however, show a very pronounced and surprising decrease in the frequency of nearly all terms. Of all the time Kinkel wrote articles for the paper, it would seem that this month should have shown increased vigor and activity. After all, he was attempting to win a seat for himself and other democrats in the Prussian parliament in order to push for the continued progress of the democratic movement. Half of the ten articles written in February are news pieces that came to Bonn from Berlin after Kinkel had taken his seat in the assembly, which helps explain the lack of revolutionary terminology. The noteworthy observation, however, is the fact that so few articles promoting democracy and the republic were written before the elections.

The following two months saw by far the highest output of articles by Kinkel. This is due to his regular reporting on the events in parliament in specific and the capital in general. The nature and origin of the articles also explains the high frequency of the term "constitution," since Kinkel constantly referred to the moderately liberal members

[41] [Kinkel], "Am Sankt Thomastage," *BZ*, 24 December 1848.

of parliament as "constitutionals." This practice made that term the only one for either month to appear on average more than once per article. The low number of editorials also contributed to the lack of democratic agitation and propaganda with its inherent terminology.

During the *Reichsverfassungskampagne* in May and June, the expected terminology resurfaced. Freedom, democracy, the republic, and, above all, the revolution were discussed with regularity again. While the frequencies for these terms increased noticeably over the previous couple of months, only one of them, "freedom," reached a record high. As a matter of fact, all but that one show at least two previous months with higher frequencies.

The term "socialism" is relatively absent throughout all of Kinkel's articles. With the social issue as important as it was to him, this is rather curious. More frequent mention of the social problem would seem in order considering that it constituted a large aspect of his motivation during this time. Its absence from regular discussion, however, does serve to underline Kinkel's step-by-step approach, through which he focused on the establishment of the proper circumstance, the republic, in order to subsequently solve the issues that were essential to him.

Even as conservative forces were closing in on all that was dear and important to Gottfried Kinkel, he oddly enough did not appear too concerned with what this meant for the future and the possibilities of achieving his ideals. He did lament the break-down of everything that had been accomplished to this point and admonished his readers not to allow the paper and the democratic movement in Bonn to die even after his own possible

death,[42] but his terminology does not display any indication of a feeling of finality or impending doom.

Quantitative Conclusions

The statistical analysis of Gottfried Kinkel's articles mostly confirms previous findings in regards to his political philosophy.[43] The establishment of a republic was Kinkel's most ardent wish, as he believed that it would provide the necessary framework around which the social problem could be solved. The republic was what he argued and fought for. The term's number one over-all ranking (see Table 2), after the adjustments to the terms "constitution" and "democracy," supports the claim that the realization of a republic in Germany was Kinkel's primary concern during the revolution.

Coupled with the desire for a republic were the inherent ingredients of it: democracy, a constitution guaranteeing certain rights, and political freedom. For Gottfried Kinkel, however, these four issues were not important in isolation because they were essential aspects of a republic. Instead, the reverse was true. Kinkel desired the republic precisely because it encompassed those elements. He felt that the free popular will ought to govern the people because the people alone could heal the social problem through democratic means.[44] The statistical findings certainly serve to demonstrate the importance of these issues to Kinkel.

---

[42] [Kinkel], "An unsere Leser," *NBZ*, 22 June 1849.
[43] See footnote 5 in the introduction for a list of previous works on Gottfried Kinkel.
[44] Gottfried Kinkel, "Vertheidigungsrede Kinkels vor dem Geschworenengerichte zu Köln am 2. Mai 1850," *NBZ*, 8 May 1950.

The social issue was Kinkel's driving concern. The two terms indicative of this, "socialism" and "proletariat," are mentioned with regularity though not very frequently. It was to achieve the improvement of the condition of the working classes, whose champion he considered himself,[45] that Kinkel supported the form of government that he did. His conviction that a popular government would resolve the social question and his support thereof are demonstrated through the high frequency of use of terms connected to that type of government. What is somewhat surprising, when one considers his emotional attachment to the social question, is the relatively low frequency with which socialism and the working classes are mentioned. It would seem only logical had he used the promise of social improvement to win supporters for his side. To be sure, Kinkel did discuss the logic behind his support of republican democracy, but not as frequently as one might have expected.

Gottfried Kinkel was also convinced that only a republic could bring unity for Germany.[46] This helps explain the relatively few mentions of unity in his articles. Just as with the social issues, Kinkel believed that the establishment of a republic would fulfill this other of his desires. Again, the question arises, why did he not use the promise of unity to garner more support for the democratic cause? After all, unity, he claimed, was the deepest desire of the German people.[47] While that answer is elusive, it does become clear that he believed that both the social question and the issue of unity would be resolved through the establishment of a republic. This conviction rendered the realization

[45] DeJonge, *Gottfried Kinkel*, 25.
[46] Ibid., 33.
[47] [Kinkel], "Der deutsche Herzenswunsch," *NBZ*, 6 May 1849.

of a republic his single most important goal during the revolution. The statistical findings certainly support that same conclusion.

The virtual absence of the terms "capitalism" and, more importantly, "class struggle" allows for the conclusion that Kinkel did not support communist ideas. Had that been the case, he most certainly would have attempted to provoke the masses into precisely such a class war in order to overthrow the capitalist society, which was in the process of taking root in Germany. His newspaper articles, therefore, underscore previous assessments of Kinkel as a "reformist evolutionary socialist" as opposed to the violent revolutionary Marx.[48]

The fact that the term "revolution" appears as often as it does is only to be expected since the articles were written in the midst of one. The revolution, with its developments, was on everyone's mind and a constant topic of discussion during this time. The discussion of revolutionary gains, the loss of them and, from Kinkel's standpoint, the need to keep the revolution going is certainly to be expected. Only a low frequency for that term would warrant raised eyebrows. Its high frequency, on the other hand, only confirms that Kinkel did indeed participate very actively in it.

A lack of panic in Gottfried Kinkel's writing manifests itself when one analyzes the month-to-month statistics. It would seem only logical if, over the course of the revolution, Kinkel's articles showed an increased frequency of at least some of the terms searched. While this is the case for some of the terms in the months of May and June 1849 as compared to April, there is not a consistent increase over a longer period of time (see Table 4). The findings for the whole time period show an irregular pattern of

[48] Kersken, *Stadt und Universität Bonn*, 79.

upward and downward fluctuation for every term. A steady increase in frequency over at least the last few months might instead be expected from a person observing what must have seemed like the certain end to his dreams. But no such increase is evident. Nor do any of the terms, except "political freedom" and "unity," register at a record frequency during those last two months. Instead, the highest frequencies for most terms appear in the fall of 1848. That seems to indicate that Kinkel was certain that the revolutionary movement would inevitably end favorably to his cause.

CHAPTER 3
GOTTFRIED KINKEL'S POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

Like most Germans growing up during the *Vormärz*, Gottfried Kinkel did not have the opportunity to get much of a political education nor, as a consequence, to develop any political opinions or ideas early on. Encouraged by a cousin a few years older than he, he began to observe the world around him. Literature, such as the works of Schiller, Goethe or Lessing, was the first vehicle that helped him to broaden his horizons. Early in his life he considered himself a rationalist, convinced that nothing is real which does not make sense.[1]

Through literature Kinkel came into contact with the ideal of political freedom, picking up on the themes and desires of liberty running through some of the works he read. He himself incorporated such yearnings into his early works, including a drama he wrote while studying in Berlin. He also began to make a connection between unity, the strength that could be drawn from it, and freedom, first expressed in a sermon in 1840. "Germany became [*sic*] united, therefore she soon liberated herself, too," Kinkel said. "If we want to enjoy the fruit of this victory, let us secure our union."[2] In 1840, at the accession to the throne of Friedrich Wilhelm IV, who was expected to be a liberal monarch, Kinkel was full of hope that freedom would come through peaceful reform. Disillusionment set in very quickly, however, when it became clear that the king had no such desires. The year 1842 marked Kinkel's religious and political turning point. He distanced himself from the church and started to believe that a revolution would be

[1] Schmidt, *Gerechtigkeit*, 13.
[2] Gottfried Kinkel, quoted in DeJonge, *Gottfried Kinkel*, 3.

necessary to bring about the desired changes. In addition, he believed that such a revolution would originate in France. Not only was the king to blame for the status quo, but also the church; and the servility of the masses made reform difficult to bring about. Kinkel, however, was far from a radical revolutionary and still supported a constitutional monarchy.[3]

Unity and Freedom

"We want unity: we want to become one people under one constitution, under the same rights, with one and the same popular representation and government. Unity is the deepest, undeniable demand in the heart of our people, and that is why it will become a reality": With these words, Gottfried Kinkel summarized the popular sentiment in Germany during the revolution, as well as his own deeply-rooted emotions.[4] As a young man several years before the revolution, Kinkel had already turned his youthful enthusiasm for political freedom and national unity into an ardent ideal. As late as the May 1848 elections, as evidenced by his election platform, he put far more emphasis on his desire for unity than he did on freedom, and did not even make mention of the republic.[5]

After his election defeat, Kinkel still continued to pursue his ideal of unity, making it the only goal he had in common with the more conservative Constitutionals. The war with Denmark and Prussia's unilateral handling of the Malmö armistice in August made it clear to him that the issue of German unity had become a struggle for

[3] DeJonge, *Gottfried Kinkel*, 2-15.
[4] [Kinkel], "Der deutsche Herzenswunsch," *NBZ*, 6 May 1849.
[5] DeJonge, *Gottfried Kinkel*, 14, 17.

power and predominance between Germany's royal houses. Instead of recognizing and acting in accordance with what would be best for German unity, Prussia chose to position itself more favorably in its competition with Austria. Worse yet, the Frankfurt national assembly, after an initial refusal to do so, performed an about face and voted to recognize the armistice. Kinkel initially had overestimated the power of the Frankfurt assembly, but this move revealed the parliament as a spineless farce. Most Democrats began to turn their attention to the Prussian parliament in Berlin, convinced that its more radical composition offered a more fertile ground for their goals. Kinkel, however, motivated by his yearning for unity, pondered how to rid Germany of this poor representation of the popular will in order to achieve the democratic republic for his fatherland.[6]

As a member of the Prussian parliament the following year, Kinkel became outraged and distressed at its support of the "small-German" solution to German unity, a plan that was to exclude all of Austria. In the *Neue Bonner Zeitung* he lamented the idea of "throwing ten million Germans to the Slavs." He also expressed his disappointment in the negative vote concerning the publication of the bill of rights, believing that to be necessary in order to convince the southern states to join in the creation of a unified Germany.[7]

Even after his capture in Rastatt by the Prussians in 1849, Kinkel still held the ideals of unity and liberty as a higher priority than his desires concerning the form of government. In his plea before the military court there, he stated that he would be more than happy to support the Prussian monarchy, provided that it would guarantee political

[6] Kersken, *Stadt und Universität Bonn*, 67-71, 76.
[7] [Kinkel], "Verwerfung der Grundrechte," *NBZ*, 29 March 1849.

freedom and a more even distribution of wealth in order to ensure the poor enough food. He declared that the honor and greatness of Germany were more important to him than his political ideals. The most important goal of the revolution in Germany had been its unity, without which, he believed, Germany could not become a great and prosperous nation.[8]

In Cologne in May of 1850, Kinkel made similar statements in front of the Court of Assizes, again stressing that one of his principal goals during the revolution was to achieve unity for Germany. The ideal of liberty was the foundation of German unity, the latter resulting from the former; and the best chance for the guarantee of liberty, in Kinkel's mind, was the republic.[9]

By August 1848 Kinkel had become convinced that only the establishment of a republic could guarantee unity for Germany. While his desire for unity never abated, he no longer believed that the monarchy would be able or willing to achieve it, although he would back it if it did.[10] Therefore, albeit not exclusively for that reason, Kinkel became a steadfast supporter of a republican form of government. He worked and argued for the realization of a republic throughout the remainder of the revolution in the firm conviction that it would surely result in German unity as well.

The Republic

Only after the start of the revolution in 1848 and the acceptance of the principle of a democratic republic by the national democratic convention in Frankfurt did Kinkel

[8] DeJonge, *Gottfried Kinkel*, 24-25.
[9] Ibid., 26.
[10] Ibid., 33.

begin to fully support the idea of a republic. The frustrating experience of his defeat in the May elections also played a role in bringing him into the republican camp. Witnessing the measures taken by the nobles to regain their power, he had become convinced that there was no hope for any kind of compromise. Accordingly, after taking over the editorship of the *Bonner Zeitung*, he purposely led that paper in a democratic-republican direction.[11] This is certainly supported by the high frequency with which Kinkel used the terms "democracy" and especially "republic" in his newspaper articles.

To Kinkel the republic was the ultimate goal because it guaranteed the expression of the popular will and the government's adherence to it. The formidable obstacles that needed to be overcome in order to achieve this were the thrones of Europe. Uninhibited popular sovereignty had been one of Kinkel's principal demands during his election campaign in May 1848. Initially a supporter of a constitutional monarchy, he had found his way to the republican side largely because of his rapidly dwindling trust in the constitutional intentions of the king.[12] But even had those been good, a constitutional monarchy retains the ability to suppress some or all of the popular will as it desires by utilizing the royal prerogative to veto legislation agreed upon by the people's representatives in parliament. Republican democracy, on the other hand, Kinkel argued, allowed for the uninhibited discussion and peaceful dissemination of any idea or opinion; and once this opinion had gained a majority, a proponent of it would be able to ensure its consideration in parliament, thus including it in government deliberations without

[11] Kersken, *Stadt und Universität Bonn*, 63-66.
[12] Ibid., 48-51.

superimposed impediments.[13] He became convinced that royal and popular sovereignty were mutually exclusive and that the latter would prove to be the stronger of the two.[14]

Of course Kinkel's fears were realized when the Prussian king dissolved parliament in December 1848. The relatively liberal constitution proclaimed by the king did nothing to assuage Kinkel and the Bonn Democrats, as it by no means guaranteed complete popular sovereignty. As a consequence, the Democrats became bitter, using ever more radical language. Their platform for the following elections included as a main point the demand for the revision of the constitution by the newly elected representatives, in part aiding Kinkel in winning a seat for himself.[15] As a member of that parliament, he saw that the representatives of the right and of the left were unable to come to terms because of their conflicting views on the most basic of beliefs: the true source of power. The notion of divinely granted royal powers was incompatible with that of the popular will.[16] The dissolution of parliament yet again by the king in April 1849 was further proof that the monarchy, even within constitutional limitations, was unable and unwilling to deal with and adhere to the popular will.[17]

In order for democracy and the republic to function properly, Kinkel believed in the necessity of education for the masses. In *Handwerk, errette Dich!*, published in 1848 and containing his ideas and proposals for a future Germany, he pointed out that in order to successfully practice democracy, the population had to be educated. He believed,

---

[13] [Kinkel], "An unsere Leser. Freiheit! Gleichheit! Brüderlichkeit!," *BZ*, 1 October 1848.
[14] [Kinkel], "Die letzte Entscheidung in Berlin," *BZ*, 29 September 1848.
[15] Kersken, *Stadt und Universität Bonn*, 87-89, 125-129.
[16] [Kinkel], "Nur die Ultra's," *NBZ*, 29 March 1849.
[17] [Kinkel], "Die Kammerauflösung," *NBZ*, 1 April 1849.

therefore, that educating oneself was not only desirable, it was every citizen's duty to acquire and maintain a political education.[18]

Power, he asserted, is based on knowledge and the limitation or denial of access to it to the masses. In the past the ruling classes had founded their power on educating the population only to benefit themselves, denying the masses education for its own sake. Now it was the people who were to become the rulers. The rule of the people, however, would have a chance to work properly only if they were able to utilize their power for their own benefit. Kinkel believed that knowledge is power for the masses as well, and it is the educated person, who is able to achieve victory in any situation.[19] Without an educated population, especially in the field of politics, the democratic republic could not aspire to achieve its full potential. To Kinkel, democracy was to the here and now what Christendom was to the afterlife. Just as the latter promises to everyone equal enjoyment of heaven's bounty, the former guarantees to all their just share of the goods and happiness of this world.[20]

Socialism

The motivational forces behind Kinkel's support of a system in which the popular will would be allowed to fully express and manifest itself were his social and humanitarian ideals. In his speech before the Cologne court defending his role and actions during the attempted storming of the munitions depot in Siegburg in May 1849, he proclaimed that throughout the revolution he had been driven by one principal

[18] Kinkel, *Handwerk*, 154-156.
[19] Ibid., 153-154.
[20] [Kinkel], "An unsere Leser," *BZ*, 1 October 1848.

emotion: empathy for the suffering of the oppressed. He had not become a socialist as a result of the revolution, but rather because for as long as he could remember he had been conscious of the poverty and distress among his people, an awareness which caused his heart to go out to them and to take their side.[21]

Kinkel was very proud of his family's laborer roots, his paternal grandfather having been a shoemaker. Very conscious of his deficiencies in real-world knowledge, he had begged his parents to allow him to learn a trade so that he would be able to support himself in that manner if need be. His parents were more than happy to oblige and apprenticed him to a bookbinder during vacation periods. Adding to his fond feelings toward the lower classes were the friendships he forged with farmers' sons during his youth, which were much more cordial than those with his classmates in Bonn, all of whom had an urban upbringing.[22]

Not only these personal experiences, but also socialist theories influenced Kinkel's thought. The ideas of socialism originating from England's industrial movement as well as France's revolutionary thinkers during his young manhood left a deep imprint in Kinkel's receptive mind. He was especially taken in with the theories of social betterment.[23]

The poor economic situation in the years immediately preceding the revolution brought to the fore the dire need for social change in the form of new and different demands on the government. Already at this time Kinkel believed that the social

---

[21] Kinkel, "Verteidigungsrede Kinkels vor dem Geschworenengerichte zu Köln am 2. Mai 1850," *NBZ*, 8 May 1850.
[22] DeJonge, *Gottfried Kinkel*, 108.
[23] Ibid., 109.

problems certainly outweighed the purely constitutional ones. This had caused him to become the advocate for the people of Bonn. Accordingly, his election platform in May 1848 was strongly socialist. He made the realization of the socialist and democratic republic his chief goal, as he believed socialism to be the logical and necessary complement to the republic.[24] According to Kinkel, the first question concerning a state is about the division of power or the constitution. But this question is immediately followed by the one about the division of work and wealth within the state, the social question. A constitution is, in actuality, the means, while the well-being of the population is the purpose. As a consequence, the best form of government is the one which allows the greatest number of its citizens to share in its wealth and education, in other words, the one which solves the social question in the best and most complete manner.[25]

Kinkel expressed his long-held conviction of the necessity of class leveling in his booklet, *Handwerk, errette Dich!* In it he laid out his plan for the complete readjustment of the social order, including a reform of the prison system. He believed that total freedom of trade would result in the complete victory of capital over labor, and thus exploitation of the worker, and he demanded government protection and aid for the latter. But he also recognized the need for the lower classes to help themselves.[26] To this end he

[24] Kersken, *Stadt und Universität Bonn,* 21, 42, 49-51, 76.
[25] Kinkel, *Handwerk,* 157-158.
[26] For a description of how the working classes could and did actively take part in their own development as a group, see E. P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (New York: Vintage Books, 1963). Thompson argues that class is a relationship and not a thing and that it defines itself through its relationship patterns, ideas and institutions over a long period of time. It can not be defined through its members' random place in the production process. It is rather an active process on their part in which people with common experiences recognize and articulate their interests in relation to one another as well as in relation to the interests of others, which are usually opposed to their own.

wanted to see the implementation of guild-style artisan associations to break the power of capital, a workingman's code of honor to restore customer-contractor trust, and, most importantly, educational clubs to raise the level of education among the masses.[27]

Gottfried Kinkel's socialist ideas, when compared to those of many of his contemporaries, were quite moderate. He fully believed that hard work should have its just reward, for instance, and, therefore, did not desire the elimination of the fair competition of talent. He even proposed ways in which an artisan could, through hard work during his years as a journeyman, save sufficient money to start a business. What he did want to see, on the other hand, was the eradication of the unfair advantage of speculative capital. In order to compete with larger businesses, he believed that smaller ones needed to form an association, thus pooling their resources and increasing the financial viability of each individual. In this way small businesses would be able to purchase machinery they would otherwise not have been able to afford, ensuring them a higher degree of competitiveness. This was one of his principal points, pronouncing that "capital is broken through association."[28]

The government, according to Kinkel, was to ensure a level playing field. This was to be achieved through the introduction of government-mandated schooling, in which all classes were to attend the same state-operated schools, as opposed to the existing church-operated ones. Children of all classes sitting next to one another in school, he believed, would also serve to increase mutual understanding among all groups. A progressive taxation system was to slowly eradicate differences in wealth, resulting in a

---

[27] DeJonge, *Gottfried Kinkel*, 110, 117-127.
[28] Kinkel, *Handwerk*, 24, 41, 45, 47, 57-58, 84-85.

class leveling. In order to speed up this process, the government needed to provide the working classes with access to business loans and a communal market hall, in which those without the finances to own a workshop and display area could have both. A system of quality control was to ensure honesty especially among those being subsidized by the state. Kinkel even went so far as to demand public reimbursement of lost income to those who had been left without work because of a new invention or mechanization, such as the factory production of certain products formerly made by artisans. On the other hand, Kinkel did believe that the artisan, in order to survive, would have to be reconciled with modern machinery by selling the cheaper machine produced goods as well as hand made ones of higher quality.[29]

The poor could not rely completely on the government for their financial improvement, though. The working classes would have to implement a system of autonomous control over their own ranks, including opportunities for a continued education for all, regulated examinations for artisans to ensure a high standard of product quality, and a credit union for small loans. He was also an advocate of the adoption of an honor system among the working classes. Dishonesty, such as non-compliance with self-imposed deadlines, Kinkel believed, only hurt the artisan by creating distrust among the clientele. At the same time, he admonished artisans not to underbid one another too much, as this would result in poor quality products and also contribute to a lack of trust on the part of the customer. By far the most important of Kinkel's proposals, however, was his recognition of the need to educate the people and of their own responsibility to bring this education about. To this end he suggested workers' educational clubs in which

[29] Ibid., 95-96, 116-117, 122-124, 77-82.

a number of different newspapers as well as books should be accessible and where lectures and discussions could be held.[30]

The monarchy, in Kinkel's eyes, did not offer any hope for Germany's future. It was a system in which a few exploited the many, which could be controlled solely with the help of the military. It was founded, in order to maintain and perpetuate itself, upon murder, "first within the family and then of the people." Kinkel offered the examples of the Ottoman Sultan who had all relatives' children killed in order to eliminate any threat to his power, and the use of Slavic troops by the Habsburg emperor in the bloody subjugation of the Hungarian uprising. By contrast, he assured his readers that despite widespread speculation that Germany might go to war as a result of the revolution, the people did not want war. And since the governments were now in the hands of the people, war would not come to be.[31] Naturally, Kinkel had a few words concerning the system of military control employed by the throne. Using one of the principal arguments of the conservatives, who constantly warned that the revolution, if allowed to continue unchecked, would result in anarchy, he contended that the use of military force against the people was in actuality "the most horrendous form of anarchy."[32] From the vantage point of the powerless subject, Kinkel's statement was certainly accurate in the sense that the use of military force was subject to the wanton will of the monarch as opposed to the stipulations of codified law.

---

[30] Ibid., 125-126, 132-138, 153.
[31] [Kinkel], "Giebt's Krieg?," *BZ*, 9 and 10 September 1848.
[32] [Kinkel], "An unsere Leser (Vorwort zu Erzählung von dem vorbedachten Menschenmorde durch die Soldaten zu Mainz)," supplement to *BZ*, 17 October 1848.

It was this system of social inequality, supported through military might, which Gottfried Kinkel wanted to bring to an end. A fairer division of property was necessary in order to allow equal enjoyment of life's pleasures for all. To eliminate this inequity, to ensure just pay and reward for work and talent, and to destroy modern slavery and the plight of hunger, that was what he and his followers desired. It was a fight for a whole new set of principles, not merely for a different form of government. The battle was not a political one, he contended, but rather a social one: "We are working as politicians merely because we are socialists!"[33]

In order to achieve his goals, Kinkel strongly believed that the democratic republic was the best form of government. Socialism, moreover, the state of the worker in which there would be no more idleness, to him was the only plausible system for the future Germany.[34] By the time he arrived in the Pfalz in May 1849, he not only displayed strong support for the democratic republic, but also was more than willing to fight for his primary ideal, the elimination of social inequality. In his opinion, the realization of democracy would entail the solution to the social issues.[35]

The inspiring aspect of democracy, Kinkel felt, was that it would more and more eliminate the difference between the socio-economic status of the masses and the inherited privilege of wealth and education. A man would be viewed merely as a man, shedding his professional garb and position at the end of the day for a place among equals, eliminating the desire for power and dominance. Democracy, he believed, is

---

[33] [Kinkel], "Muth!," *NBZ*, 1 January 1849.
[34] [Kinkel], "Ein Zwischenspiel," *NBZ*, 29 April 1849.
[35] Erich Schneider, "Gottfried Kinkel, die 'Neue Bonner Zeitung' und die revolutionäre Erhebung in der Rheinpfalz 1849," in *Sonderbuch, Jahrbuch zur Geschichte von Stadt und Landkreis Kaiserslautern*, Band 22/23 (1984/5), 189.

based on feelings of love, binding one human to another as equals. It is the coming of the age of reason in which all intellect and work are combined in order to achieve the one "holy goal: that there may be no uneducated, no servile, and no miserable brother anymore." The community, in accordance with the leading principle of the social republic, is to take responsibility for the freedom and the welfare of the individual.[36]

Peacefulness and Legality

Gottfried Kinkel was also constantly concerned with maintaining a non-violent course while striving for his ideals. In *Handwerk, errette Dich!* he contended that the artisan, once his economic improvement allowed him to participate in the process of human betterment, would ensure that the path to the republic could be taken without unnecessary bloodshed. At the very least, this class would see to it that the chaos of the revolution would soon be left behind for the "sunny land of humanity and onto the track of law and order."[37]

Even after the nobility had demonstrated its intention to strongly resist any change in the political landscape, Kinkel was nevertheless convinced that the republic could be ushered in peacefully. The acquittal of his friend Ferdinand Freiligrath in a political trial was an indication to him, that the ideal of democracy was taking root among the population. Every such acquittal of a fighter for the people caused the thrones to become more unstable, making it more and more certain that they would topple in a bloodless

[36] [Kinkel], "An unsere Leser," *BZ*, 1 October 1848.
[37] Kinkel, *Handwerk*, v.

push by the people. His desire was the construction of the free state, which was to be "christened with the wine of the intellect and not with the blood of its citizens."[38]

It was to this end that Kinkel took control of the *Bonner Zeitung*. He and his followers were determined to clear a way for the principle of political freedom in any peaceful way possible, especially after his more conservative colleagues had retreated even farther to the right in response to the bloody subjugation of the "red menace" in Paris during the June Days.[39]

When Friedrich Wilhelm IV ordered the Prussian parliament to move from Berlin and reconvene in Brandenburg in November, a meeting of Democrats in Bonn issued a vote of no confidence for their representative in Berlin, Bauerband, who had agreed with the order. Through Bauerband, who coincidentally was in Bonn at the time, they also agreed to send a letter to the parliament asking it to issue a warning to the military and to call for a general tax boycott. In this situation Kinkel prudently asked the people to remain calm, not to react violently even if provoked by their adversaries, and to make sure to maintain the peace on their way to present Bauerband with the document. After Bauerband refused admittance to any person in the group, the chief of police appeared through his door instead. Only because of Kinkel's promise to ensure the delivery of the paper in another manner and his plea to disperse quietly did the demonstration end peacefully at this time. Still the Democrats in Bonn did everything to ensure the legality of their actions.

---

[38] [Kinkel], "Die Freisprechung Freiligraths und was daran hängt," *BZ*, 5 October 1848.
[39] Braubach, *Bonner Professoren*, 51.

On 17 November the eagerly awaited news arrived in Bonn that the few left wing members of parliament remaining in Berlin, who were considered the true representatives of the government, had voted to deny the Prussian King and his cabinet the constitutional right to levy taxes. Only then did the Democrats take action to enforce this proclamation, making use of the civic guard, which was comprised mostly of revolutionaries anyway, and simultaneously preventing the mayor from using them in the enforcement of tax collection. The Democrats prevented the tax collection offices at the city gates from carrying out their duties during 18 and 19 November.[40] In support of this action and in the conviction that democracy would emerge victorious from this incident without the shedding of blood, Kinkel asked his followers to avoid any needless confrontation with the military. He also reminded everyone that they were fully within their rights in carrying out this tax boycott and that there existed no military strong enough to force a whole people to give up their rights.[41]

Gottfried Kinkel later had to answer for his actions during the tax boycott in court. There he stood accused of inciting the crowd to violently attack tax collection officers. The principal argument which he made in his defense was that the suit against him did not have any legal basis because he was acting wholly within his rights as a citizen in carrying out the boycott. He accused the state of bringing a political trial to court that had absolutely no merit. Much to the prosecution's chagrin, none of the

[40] Ibid., 64-65.
[41] Kersken, *Stadt und Universität Bonn*, 84.

witnesses was able to bring anything concrete against Kinkel in this matter, since it had been he, after all, who had admonished the crowd to keep the peace.[42]

With the reaction slowly regaining its power and control over the country, Kinkel began to concede that the republic would have to be achieved through battle.[43] This had never been his desire, but the continued strengthening of the conservative forces, coupled with the obvious lack of decisive action on the part of the population in regards to solidifying the revolutionary gains, made more violence seem inevitable. This was only the case, however, because the continued strengthening of the conservative hold on political control would make it all the more difficult to dislodge it. But as soon as the masses had learned what was necessary in order to create a better society, they would take the required action. This was in contrast to Marx, who believed that only a violent overthrow of the system would ready the masses and allow them to create a new society. Until that time came, according to Marx, the people would have to be led by the few party members who were educated in the ways of the Marxist theoretical system.[44]

It was for this reason that Kinkel decided to join the insurrection in southwestern Germany in May and June 1849. Although he had always hoped for a peaceful resolution of the political and social problems in Germany, he knew that a fight would ensue, if the nobility failed to voluntarily alleviate the plight of the masses. The anger of the lower classes would topple the existing structure in favor of the republic. Kinkel was certain that "what we would have desired in peace, will come to be through stormy weather."[45]

---

[42] Gottfried Kinkel, "Der Prozeß gegen Prof. Kinkel wegen angeblicher Aufforderung zum gewaltsamen Angriff auf die Steuerbeamten (Rede Kinkels)," *NBZ*, 22 and 23 February 1849.
[43] Schmidt, "'Was wir friedlich gewünscht hätten,'" 102.
[44] Toews, "Introduction," *The Communist Manifesto*, 51-52.
[45] Kinkel, *Handwerk*, 160.

Gottfried Kinkel's ideal of peace went further than the peaceful implementation of his reform ideas, however. Using the United States and Switzerland as examples, he contended that the lack of tyrants, and their practice of fighting wars for personal gain, was the key to peace among all people. Only freedom could lead to peace, in his opinion. Therefore, the democratic republic held the only key to world peace. He wrote, "World peace, the quiet development of happiness for all peoples, the progress of education and humanity, they all know only one obstacle, and this obstacle is—the thrones!"[46]

Gottfried Kinkel and Karl Marx

In order to clarify Gottfried Kinkel's political and social philosophy, it is necessary to undertake a short comparison to Karl Marx, probably the best known German political thinker of the time. He and Kinkel had known one another for a number of years by the time of the outbreak of the revolution. Kinkel had certainly been influenced by the circle of Cologne Democrats to which Marx belonged in the early 1840s and the two agreed on some points before Marx became a Communist while exiled from Germany during the years immediately preceding the revolution. Marx's early desire to eradicate all conditions in which the human being is a humiliated, servile, abandoned, and contemptible creature was close to Kinkel's heart as well.[47] However, even though he and Marx continued to share certain views, Kinkel never took the step toward communism that Marx took, remaining an idealistic social democrat.

---

[46] [Kinkel], "Deutschland und der Osten," *NBZ*, 3 April 1849.
[47] Schmidt, "'Was wir friedlich gewünscht hätten,'" 92-93.

Much more basic than their individual philosophy, is the standpoint from which Kinkel and Marx interpreted and predicted political and historical developments. Kinkel, to a large extent, remained a pre-industrialist, pinning his hopes for the future Germany on the artisan. This becomes more than obvious through his work, *Handwerk, errette Dich!*, in which he proposed a variety of solutions for Germany's economic situation, the vast majority of which dealt with the improvement of the artisan's plight. Marx, on the other hand, viewed the world in the context of spreading industrialism and the growth of the proletariat. This difference might have arisen from Marx's experiences in exile in the far more industrialized countries of France and England, while Kinkel remained in Germany, where the process of industrialization was barely beginning to take hold. Accordingly, Kinkel's definition of the worker had little to do with industrial labor, but rather referred to any person performing any sort of work, as opposed to the "lazy" members of the upper classes, who profited from the work of the lower.[48]

The whole Marxist rigor, in general, was not compatible with Kinkel's personal nature. Even if his phraseology sometimes came across as radical, his social reform ideas were more moderate than Marx's. They were based on the logical step-by-step alteration of the existing economic system to benefit the poor.[49] He wrote: "It is for the poor that we are in this battle! Every pale face, every unfortunate and disgraceful being, each crime committed because of distress shall drive a hot spur into our flanks, should we even once slow or rest in our holy fight for the truth!"[50]

---

[48] [Kinkel], "Ein Zwischenspiel," *NBZ*, 29 April 1849.
[49] Kersken, *Stadt und Universität Bonn*, 96-97.
[50] [Kinkel], "Das Studentenbankett in Paris," *BZ*, 15 December 1848.

The principle of the Communist League, leaning strongly on Marx's theories, proclaimed that "the purpose of the League is the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, the rulership of the proletariat, the abolition of the existing society which rests on the foundation of class opposition and the founding of a new society without classes and without private property."[51] Kinkel did not support this interpretation of society or of which steps were necessary to alter existing conditions. He did not desire the rulership of any one class, but rather the equal distribution of political power among all members of society. His proposals for the assimilation of classes were a series of political steps, such as progressive taxation and increased government aid for the less fortunate, as opposed to the violent eradication of the ruling classes in order to establish a classless society. And he did not advocate a society without private property, but rather the leveling of the economic playing field in order to make the opportunity for the acquisition of private property equal for all and solely the result of talent, skill, and hard work.[52] In short, Kinkel was a socialist in the sense that he supported the principle of association and cooperation to break the power of capital even though he did not desire the elimination of individual competition. He defined socialism as the state of the worker in which every member of that state contributes to it through some form of work.[53] Marx, of course, was a communist in favor of insurrectionary working class politics and public control of the institutions of production and exchange.[54]

---

[51] John E. Toews, ed., "Introduction: Historical Context of the *Communist Manifesto*," *The Communist Manifesto, by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, with Related Documents* (Boston: Bedford/St.Martin's, 1999), 10.
[52] Kinkel, *Handwerk.*
[53] [Kinkel], "Ein Zwischenspiel," *NBZ*, 29 April 1849.
[54] Toews, "Introduction," *The Communnist Manifesto*, 18.

Another basic difference between Gottfried Kinkel and Karl Marx can be found in their ideas concerning the ability of the oppressed classes to help themselves. Marx believed that the communist party would have to lead the masses toward the violent overthrow of the status quo, during which they would learn what was necessary to build a communist society.[55] Kinkel, on the other hand, felt that the masses themselves would over time learn which system and laws would ensure a just and fair society and take the proper steps in order to implement them. Ideally, in this manner violence would be avoided in the realization of this future society.

Especially the notion of inevitability espoused by Gottfried Kinkel was founded on a wholly different set of beliefs and conclusions than those of Karl Marx. Marx spoke from the standpoint of what he believed to be verifiable historical truth. Capitalist competition, he thought, could only result in two classes, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The proletariat, through the spread of capitalism, would eventually encompass the vast majority of the world's population and over time would achieve a consciousness of its identity and interests. The increased impoverishment of labor stemming from the increasing severity of overproduction would finally provide the opportunity for a revolution through which the dictatorship of the proletariat would be initiated.[56]

Marx deduced this trajectory of history from specific social practices in relation to the production process. To him, production was the driving force behind all historical development. The core reality of human existence was the practice of appropriating the

---

[55]Ibid., 51-52.
[56] Toews, "Introduction," *The Communist Manifesto*, 47-48.

natural world and the realization of each individual's potential powers through the production of objects. The influence of religion and politics in the determination of the development of society he deemed an "illusion." Therefore, the revolution of the system of production was the only revolution that could achieve results.[57]

That this revolution would come to be was the result of the empirically observable development of humanity. In the *Communist Manifesto* Marx's theory of history was presented as verifiable truth, encompassing all other truths and providing interpretive solutions to them.[58] Gottfried Kinkel did not believe any such thing. He was of the opinion that the division of capital was to blame for the plight of the masses and that the system needed to be changed in order to allow for the equal enjoyment for all of the fruits of labor. But his idea of the inevitability of the success of the revolution stemmed from his belief that the spread of revolutionary ideas could not be halted and that the majority of the population, once convinced that the social republic was the key to their happiness, would see to its realization. Once this was accomplished, the problems facing society could, indeed, be solved politically. In a sense, instead of Marx's law of history, Kinkel relied on the law of nature to bring the revolution to the desired resolution. His own colorful metaphors serve to support this conclusion.[59]

It is certainly obvious that Gottfried Kinkel felt very deeply about the attainment of his political and ideological goals and would have done everything possible to ensure their victory. The most logical explanation for Gottfried Kinkel's lack of a feeling of impending doom, despite the "persistence of the old regime," therefore, is that he felt

---

[57] Ibid., 36-37.
[58] Toews, "Introduction," *The Communist Manifesto*, 48-49.
[59] [Kinkel], "Die Scheidung der Parteien," *BZ*, 24 November 1848.

confident that his cause would emerge victorious in the end. Instead of a feeling of finality and the desperate need to win the revolutionary struggle before all was lost forever, Kinkel must have believed that his dreams would come to fruition even if the reaction should win the current battle. To understand that this was indeed so, one must look more closely at the content of his articles.

CHAPTER 4
THE CONVICTION OF INEVITABILITY

For a man of Gottfried Kinkel's passion and commitment to the revolutionary movement and its theories, it is rather odd to display such calm and lack of worry. In the face of what would have had to appear as the sure end to all hope for the implementation of his social and political ideals, no panic is discernible. Clearly, he did not lack the time to voice distress at the reactionary movement's regaining of power. That, after all, did not happen in one strong push, but rather as a series of steps. Already in the summer of 1848 the Prussian monarchy had begun to take steps to recover what control it had lost and to reverse the revolutionary gains. Its decision to unilaterally work out the Malmö Armistice was a blatant slap in the face of the primary revolutionary goal of German unity and Kinkel clearly interpreted this as a positioning move in the power struggle for control over Germany.[1]

Kinkel also interpreted the king's actions of November and December as infringements on the rights of the people.[2] As a consequence, while a member of parliament in Berlin, he fought for the revision of the royal constitution in order to make it a document in accordance with the idea of popular sovereignty.[3] And during the *Reichsverfassungskampagne* Kinkel worked and fought against the return to power of the conservative forces in the hope of helping in the creation of a republic in southern Germany.[4]

---

[1] Kersken, *Stadt und Universität Bonn*, 62, 71.
[2] Ibid., 84.
[3] [Kinkel], "Die Linke gegen eine Adresse. Acqua toffana der Neuen Preußischen. Grebels Wahl. Belagerungszustand. Diäten," *NBZ*, 10 March 1849.
[4] Schmidt, *Gerechtigkeit*, 85-88.

All these events and actions took place over the course of nearly a year. Little by little, the conservative forces regained their footing and with it their power. Throughout the whole time, however, freedom of the press remained intact, allowing Kinkel to express himself as he saw fit. Moreover, after the acquittal of Ferdinand Freiligrath, he believed that no jury would convict any person for practicing free political speech again.[5] He therefore saw little reason to fear retribution should he agitate for a violent confrontation in order to decide the conflict in accordance with his desires. A now-or-never approach would have been consistent with that of many of his contemporaries and would have seemed completely normal and expected when one considers the steady loss of all that had been gained in March of 1848.

So why did Gottfried Kinkel not attempt to rile up the masses with revolutionary rhetoric at any point during this period? Until the republican movements in the Pfalz and Baden were close to falling to royal troops, one can find never-ending hope in Kinkel, even though many others had lost hope much sooner than that. But even in the bitter end, in late June 1849, Kinkel did not come across in his writings as a person who believed that the last chance for the defeat of the traditional power structure and the implementation of revolutionary goals was upon him. How could he have come to any other conclusion than that the window of opportunity was rapidly closing?

What becomes very clear from Gottfried Kinkel's writings in the *Bonner Zeitung* and the *Neue Bonner Zeitung*, aside from his obvious desires for a constitutional and democratic republic in which to solve society's ills, is that he never once wavered in his belief that all would end positively. He did recognize the immense opportunity presented

[5] [Kinkel], "Die Freisprechung Freiligraths und was daran hängt," *BZ*, 5 October 1848.

to him and his contemporaries and felt that he should do everything in his power in order to make the most of it.[6] On the other hand, he displays no sense of urgency. He believed, as he wrote repeatedly in his articles, that in one way or another the revolution would emerge victorious over conservatism. Therefore, rash and panicked agitation or actions were not necessary. The republic was inevitable.

Kinkel laid out the logic, through which he arrived at his conclusion of the inevitability of the success of the revolution, as early as August 1848 in his booklet *Handwerk, errette Dich!* In it, he explained that the foolish attitudes and convictions of the nobility and the well-to-do would cause the angry rising of the poor, toppling the existing system in favor of a republic. The general consensus of the upper classes was that the education of the poor would teach them to question the existing system and desire for themselves what only a select few could have. Therefore, in order to keep the peace, the lower classes had to be kept in ignorance.[7] But Kinkel argued that the opposite was true. Without knowledge concerning the present state of affairs and social problems, the lower classes were more dangerous than with it. Ignorance, he argued, made the population susceptible to the preaching of violence—stealing and extracting revenge from the wealthy—as a solution to poverty. Violence, however, could not bring the solution. Only knowledge and wisdom, therefore, could lead to the realization that a new political and social system was necessary to deal with the issues at hand. Education was also necessary to prepare the population for the effective participation in the future government. But the paranoid and delusional mentality of the upper classes, who would

[6] [Kinkel], "Muth!," *NBZ*, 2 January 1849.
[7] Kinkel, *Handwerk*, 159-160.

rather have "one hundred through worry and stress than eighty in peace and happiness," viewed with suspicion and punished the few who were attempting to learn how to build a brighter future. It was this misguided thought process, Kinkel believed, that would without a doubt cause the working classes to revolt angrily and bring the republic to Germany.[8]

And where, he went on to ask, should the leaders of tomorrow come from, if they were not allowed to learn what they would need to know? They certainly would not be found if their opportunities to acquire the necessary knowledge continued to be withheld. Up to that point, the military officers were still in control of their soldiers and thus were able to keep the population in check. But Kinkel saw the day coming when the soldiers, weary of perpetual servitude, would use their weapons in support of the other side. When that time came, the high and mighty would not be able to hold off the revolutionary tide any longer, and the only thing that could provide salvation for Germany then would be the "enlightened mind of the citizen and the calloused hand of the worker."[9] While this is generally consistent with the idea of class conflict, it does not arise out of the Marxist notion of historical truth, but rather out of a lamentable, albeit understandable, refusal of the nobility to relinquish its position of power in favor of an egalitarian social order.

Gottfried Kinkel expressed this view on numerous occasions in his articles in the *Bonner Zeitung* and the *Neue Bonner Zeitung*. As early as September 1848, in a reaction to a statement by Friedrich Wilhelm IV, Kinkel argued that the king, by taking a political stand, had caused a rift between parliament and the royal house, which could not be

---

[8] Ibid.
[9] Ibid., 160-161.

mended. The king's statement had come in response to the resignation of the cabinet and had proclaimed his belief that parliament should not have the power to intervene in administrative issues. In this manner, the king, who was supposed to remain party neutral, sided with the political minority in parliament, those in favor of a continued and strong monarchy. Consequently, the majority of parliament was in conflict with the king, and both sides were in a position of no retreat. The monarch, because of the statement, was now forced to appoint a cabinet of the same opinion as he, but the assembly, with the majority of the population behind it, could not approve such a cabinet. This, in turn, would necessarily have to result in conflict between the people and the monarchy, inevitably leading to the latter's downfall.[10]

In Kinkel's opinion, the will of the people, rather than the laws of history, was the force that could not be denied. "That which is carried in the heart of the people as their deepest and most burning desire," Kinkel believed, "will be achieved by them [and] will be successful." And this burning desire of the German people was unity under one constitution, with equal rights and one popular representation for the whole of Germany. Attainment of this under the leadership of the nobility, he argued, had long since been recognized as impossible by some. What had been necessary, however, was for the whole of the country to realize this. Kinkel was convinced that it had, as evidenced by the popular outrage which had followed Friedrich Wilhelm IV's refusal of the imperial crown.[11]

---

[10] [Kinkel], "Ein Königswort," *BZ*, 15 September 1848.
[11] [Kinkel], "Der deutsche Herzenswunsch," *NBZ*, 6 May 1849.

The popular will had been shaped by a number of factors, one of the principal ones being the poor economic situation of a vast part of the population. Kinkel believed that more than two thirds of the population of Europe were consumed by the daily worry over mere sustenance, and that half of the remaining third could see their own day of need drawing steadily closer. To alleviate the situation, radical reforms were needed in property rights and taxation. But these reforms could not be carried out by the monarchy because of its own interests and those of its main source of support: the upper classes. The majority, then, was clearly not in favor of the continuation of the status quo, and Kinkel predicted an even higher number of radically anti-monarchical representatives to be elected to the Prussian Assembly in February 1849 to go along with the shift to the left in the Frankfurt Assembly.[12]

Later in 1849 Gottfried Kinkel sarcastically welcomed the aristocratic attempt at ensuring the unemployment of democratic sympathizers. This was to be done by supporting only conservative-minded business people while boycotting stores and workers with leftist tendencies. Kinkel believed that the result would be that the educated middle-class Democrats, driven to poverty in even larger numbers through this action, would increasingly infuse the masses with their education and knowledge. The raised level of education of the lower classes, in turn, would then complete the transfer of power into the hands of the people. "At that point," he warned, referring back to the June Days in Paris in 1848, "we will not lose another June battle." He sarcastically offered his gratitude to his political enemies for systematically speeding up this process and warned

[12] [Kinkel], "Am Sankt Thomastage," *BZ*, 24 December 1848.

reactionary workers and merchants not to be surprised when they suffered the same fate after the Democrats had come to power.[13]

The monarchy's use of the military to force the population into submission could not solve the regime's problems in the long run either, according to Kinkel. Even though the intent of this practice was to restore peace, the constant feeling of unease did not allow for the necessary faith in the stability of the economy to substantially increase investment in order to alleviate even some of the problem.[14] In fact, Kinkel believed that quite the opposite was true. The military oppression in many cities would certainly ensure that many, who had heretofore belonged to the bourgeoisie, would be financially ruined and become members of the ever-growing masses of the poor. "The warehouses are closed quickly before the muzzles of loaded cannon, and packed forts are followed by empty merchants' pockets," Kinkel warned. The swelling of the lower by members of the former middle classes would result in one positive, however. Kinkel prophesied that those new to poverty and hunger would quickly become some of the most enthusiastic adherents of the republican doctrine, not out of conviction, admittedly, but rather out of despair.[15] Kinkel's prediction was based on the despicable economic situation at the time and the belief that the economy would not be able to recover at gunpoint.

Kinkel did not fail to see the irony of the current situation. In order to control the population, ever-larger numbers of troops were needed all over the country. Supporting a standing army cost vast amounts of money and actually used up more than three times the amount available to the government in its entire budget. To make matters even worse,

---

[13] [Kinkel], "Arbeitsentziehung," *NBZ*, 18 April 1849.
[14] [Kinkel], "Der Wirkliche Thatbestand," *BZ*, 29 November 1848.
[15] [Kinkel], "Der Belagerungszustand," *BZ*, 26 September 1848.

the population, because of the poor state of the economy, was contributing to government income in the form of taxes at only one third of its normal level. At this rate, the bankruptcy of the state was not far off. Even if the government had had enough troops for some to be stationed in every village, Kinkel argued, there would not have been enough tax income to feed them. As an example, Kinkel used the government income in Bonn after the Prussians had brought the tax boycott in November to an end. Not even an amount large enough to pay for the transport from Worms to Bonn of the additional troops, which had been called in to help those stationed in Bonn, had been raised in taxes since the end of the boycott. From this state of affairs, he concluded that the military could not remain an obstacle indefinitely. "A little patience," he wrote, "the soldiers will move out—one thing will remain, the people," implying that a sure lack of soldiers in the future would leave the people free to pursue their goals.[16]

The situation of militarily enforced quiet at the end of 1848 was not exclusively a negative in Kinkel's mind at all. The early modestly liberal cabinets, through their lack of economic success, had proved to the people that their ideals and theories of government were useless. Now the military would have the opportunity to prove that its artificial order would not lead the country even one step away from the brink of disaster. Financial ruin would surely come, as the finances for this form of government did not exist in order to sustain its base of power: the army. The time this process would take afforded the democrats the luxury of being able to calmly and steadily instill in the masses a familiarity with the ideas of socialism. The people's prejudices against this form of government could now be dismantled. In their place a positive and confident

[16] [Kinkel], "Der wirkliche Thatbestand," *BZ*, 29 November 1848.

familiarity with the theories of socialism could take hold. Then, when the time came, it would be possible to implement these ideas with much less effort. If all Democrats helped each other in achieving this, Kinkel argued, especially in the countryside where he believed the future army for this cause was to be found, then it would be worth more than any majority in parliament could bring.[17]

The attempted suppression of revolutionary ideas and agitation with the help of the military did in no way mean that peace and quiet had returned, as had been the goal of the reaction. Gottfried Kinkel argued that this was not the case, however, since "calm exists when a large majority of humanity, or at least of a people, is satisfied with the current situation to the point of not desiring any substantial changes." Where this was not the case, there would be either war or the harbingers of it, party fighting and agitation.[18] After all, it was the people's spirit, Kinkel believed, which was responsible for toppling governments and rebuilding new ones. And the people of Germany no longer supplied the basis of support for a weak monarchy and nobility propped up by a violent military. The rising number of members in democratic clubs and the increase in democratic supporters from among the ranks of those who used to oppose them proved beyond a doubt that democracy had to emerge victorious. Bad circumstances merely served to swell the ranks of the Democrats, as they had in the past, and multiple small victories of the reaction in warding off democratic gains would only ensure the continuation of this. But eventually and inevitably the people would achieve their single cataclysmic victory

[17] [Kinkel], "Die letzte Entscheidung in Berlin," *BZ*, 29 September 1848.
[18] [Kinkel], "Am Sankt Thomastage," *BZ*, 24 December 1848.

which would result in the final destruction of royal military institutions and of the thrones themselves.[19]

Not even the German desire for unity could alter the final outcome for the Prussian monarchy. As Kinkel saw it, Friedrich Wilhelm IV could not afford to take the title of Emperor of Germany as that would have included the strongly revolutionary areas in southern Germany. This would have weakened the overall support of the crown, the stronghold of which were the northern and eastern parts of Prussia, and added to the blow it had already endured with the acquisition of the Rhineland. Additionally, the revolutionary movement would have been able to focus on only one goal, the overthrow of the political system, since the other, German unity, had already come to fruition. The king's refusal of this title, of course, had earned him the increased displeasure of the German population as a whole, but especially of the moderate Conservatives, who saw this as a display of his inability to take a strong stand even under favorable circumstances.[20] Assuming the title, of course, could have been done only with the realization and acceptance that it was a product of the revolution and the sovereign will of the people. As a consequence, all noblemen who opposed this would have been considered rebels and fought against as such, ending in a war against Austria. This would have been unimaginable, of course, and would have robbed the imperial crown of its popular support and ensured its demise.[21]

Gottfried Kinkel had already pointed out in March 1849 that the Prussian monarchy did not have sufficient support among the population to allow for its continued

---

[19] [Kinkel], "Das Königthum der Bajonette," *BZ*, 26 November 1848.
[20] [Kinkel], "Die Kaiserfrage," *NBZ*, 7 and 8 April 1849.
[21] [Kinkel], "Adressen in Kaisersachen," *NBZ*, 5 April 1849.

survival. He arrived at this conclusion by interpreting the reactionary goals in parliament, which were to dismantle the rights granted the previous March and to further reduce the franchise in favor of the upper classes. Especially the latter Kinkel believed to be an admission of the weakness of the conservative forces, since they required the alteration of the popular will in their favor in order to remain in power. As a matter of fact, the "elements of change, the republican youth under the age of twenty-four and the needy proletariat" had not even been allowed to vote in the previous elections. This proved that the people as a whole had moved even farther to the left politically than the make-up of their elected representatives reflected. It was obvious, therefore, that the majority of the population did not support the monarchy, but rather favored a republic.[22]

Had the elections been carried out under universal manhood suffrage, Kinkel felt he would not have had to suffer defeat in parliament over the issue of the royally proclaimed constitution. The seventeen votes that made up the difference in the decision to accept the constitution would surely not have been cast in favor, had the lower classes been permitted to participate in the general elections. Their exclusion from the polls coupled with the very small conservative majority in parliament convinced Kinkel that the true desires of the people were not represented in government. He therefore felt confident that the continuation of the revolution could without worry be left to these groups.[23]

What was to be done in order to prepare everything for the time when the revolution would emerge victorious, Kinkel believed, was to work out the laws that

[22] [Kinkel], "Enthüllungen," *NBZ*, 16 March 1849.
[23] [Kinkel], "Die Verfassung gültig erklärt," *NBZ*, 23 March 1849.

would have to be implemented immediately following its triumph. Gaining parliamentary victories in the present was not at all important. Rather, defining the principles of the future was of the essence, even if it meant total defeat today. This, he felt, would achieve total clarity for all concerning the areas in need of change as well as the powers presently standing in the way of addressing them. Additionally, Kinkel thought this process would bring those men of intelligence and character to the fore, who would patiently wait until they were entrusted—albeit not by a crown, but by the people—with the task of creating a new state.[24]

The people, Kinkel believed, wanted to focus their loyalties on strong and able leadership, for which they were more than willing to go into battle. This was what the mental power (*geistige Macht*) of the monarchy had been based upon in the past. But this "illusion" had been shattered. The true friends of the people, the popularly elected officials, bound by their positions to act in the interest of the people, would soon enough be called upon to inherit the power of the nobility and thus become the new focal point of the masses.[25] This changing of the guard, Kinkel said, was partly due to the fact that the German nobility did not have among its members even one person who could command respect and loyalty. At this point, the only source of support for the old system came from selfish motivations of the upper classes. But once it would become obvious that there was nothing more to be gained from the monarchy, all support for it would vanish since no enthusiasm for the regime existed.[26]

---

[24] [Kinkel], "Nur die Ultra's," *NBZ*, 29 March 1849.
[25] [Kinkel], "Die republikanische Volksbewegung und die Gegenpartei," *BZ*, 7 October 1848.
[26] [Kinkel], "Aprilschauer," *NBZ*, 26 April 1849.

Vast enthusiasm did exist, however, among the supporters of the revolutionary movement. This enthusiasm stemmed from the nature of the movement. It was not a movement that was primarily concerned with the form of government, but rather with the lives and happiness of all of humanity. The struggle was not a political one, Gottfried Kinkel reasoned, but rather a social one, which meant that it was fought not only with the brain, but also and to a very high degree with the heart. It was a fight over principles, which could not be quieted through force for any long stretch of time. To subdue a whole people was possible only if the surrounding peoples were their enemies. The current struggle, however, flowed through all peoples and was engaged in not only externally by everyone but also within the heart and mind of every individual. Such a battle could not be won by merely eliminating the leaders of one of the parties to it. The martyrs of early Christendom and of the Reformation, Kinkel argued, had proven that such principles were eventually followed by a leader or leaders, who would ensure their political victory as well.[27]

Kinkel believed that never had there been more discontented people in the world as there were then; never had the distribution of worldly goods been as uneven. This made the revolutionary struggle essential to the broad masses, and ensured that it would not subside. What made matters even worse for the reaction, Kinkel believed, was the fact that the people had learned from their recent past. It had become obvious that there could not be two equal powers in the state. A constitutional monarchy, therefore, was an impossibility. The time of half-hearted attempts and good will without the necessary actions on the part of the government had passed. The people could not be fooled any

[27] [Kinkel], "Muth!," *NBZ*, 2 January 1849.

longer, since they had realized that the current regime, in addition to being inactive on matters of reform, even constituted a threat to their freedom.[28] And even though the reactionary powers were in control at the moment, Kinkel believed that the revolutionary movement was steadily gaining unstoppable momentum. The daily spread of revolutionary thought in the minds of the people was slowly destroying the reaction. He likened this to cannon balls rolling across the sand, seemingly without any strength. Should someone put his foot in front of one of them with the intent of stopping it, however, the cannon ball would shatter his leg.[29]

Gottfried Kinkel used such metaphors to emphasize his points on more than one occasion. But more than that, they also served to demonstrate his firm belief that the revolution would emerge victorious in the end. He believed that a metaphor from nature could be found for all things in the world of thought. In this manner he likened the retreat of the democratic movement before the strengthened reaction in the fall of 1848 to the ebbing of the tide, leaving all peoples weakened like the drying shellfish on the beach. But the law of nature left no doubt that the tide would come back in, infusing them anew with strength and leveling everything that had been built on the sand. It was also a law of nature that the birthing pains of a woman in labor should come and go, until the final and most painful one resulted in the birth of a new child. Another law of nature ensured that the trees would be nourished by mother nature all through the bleak winter months, until this nourishment brought out buds and leaves in the spring, transforming the gray of the forest into a beautiful green. The trees, Kinkel said, were the people, and

---

[28] Ibid.

[29] [Kinkel], "Aprilschauer," *NBZ*, 26 April 1849.

the nourishment the idea of democracy, which seeped unseen into the minds of the people.[30]

It was such a metaphor that Gottfried Kinkel used to express his confidence over the outcome in one of his reports from the Pfalz. "Every new wave of the revolution in southern Germany," he wrote, "climbs higher than the previous one: that these waves will flood and break the dam of tyranny, that the republic is coming for all of Germany, cannot be doubted by any thinking person any more." He reiterated his belief that, because the revolution for most was a fight for mere survival, its movement slowly gained support even during reactionary triumphs, while at times of revolutionary victories, supporters joined its cause in masses. As a result, more and more people participated in the struggle. An ever-increasing number of royal troops were even fighting for the republican side, making final victory ever more certain.[31]

Ensuring that the republic would emerge triumphant at first in the region and then in the whole of the country, Kinkel jubilantly reported, was the coming together in southern Germany of all German leaders of the revolutionary cause. There they were awarded various positions according to ability in the preliminary republican government and military, providing the insurrectionists with the best possible leadership, leaving no doubt for Kinkel as to the final outcome. He was incredulous at the idea that there still existed those who could not recognize what a people could accomplish when it was fighting for its freedom.[32]

---

[30] [Kinkel], "Die Scheidung der Parteien," *BZ*, 24 November 1848.
[31] [Kinkel], "Die Bewegung and Oberrhein," *NBZ*, 2 June 1849.
[32] [Kinkel], "Die herannahende letzte Entscheidung," *NBZ*, 18 May 1849.

Even after the movement in the Pfalz had been crushed, Gottfried Kinkel did not lose faith. From Baden he reported that the state of the military was much better there than it had been in the Pfalz. Leadership and equipment were of a much higher standard, and the commanding officer of the revolutionary army was utilizing more advantageous tactics by deploying smaller units to attack the enemy at several different places, keeping them off balance. Should the movement succeed in bringing the neighboring duchy of Würtemberg into the struggle, Kinkel felt then there would be no more reason to worry about the final victory of the German republic.[33]

In his last article from Baden, only a week before his capture, Gottfried Kinkel still did not waver in his belief that all would end well. In spite of a number of lost towns in the north of the area, he was sure the tide was about to turn. The well-equipped army of Baden, 40,000 troops strong and growing, had won some skirmishes and was eager to continue fighting. But far more important to Kinkel, and fully in congruence with his general conviction, was his comparison of Germany to France in the spread of the movement among the population of the provinces. The capital, he believed, ignited the provinces, and then the provinces would lead the capital to the final conclusions of the revolution. "The fire of the revolution flashes across the land of the entire country, and while it is suppressed in the capital, it flares up in frightful beauty in the provinces. Once a revolution has reached this point," Kinkel was convinced, "it cannot be stopped any longer."[34]

---

[33] [Kinkel], "Die Stellung der Heere," *NBZ*, 18 June 1849.
[34] [Kinkel], "Die badische Bewaffnung. Der Aufstand in Lyon," *NBZ*, 22 June 1849.

With this declaration in one of the two articles he wrote on 19 June 1849, his last to appear in the *Neue Bonner Zeitung*, Gottfried Kinkel expressed his beliefs one final time. The people were in control and their desires would not be denied. The ideas of democracy, socialism and the republic had spread throughout Germany, and there was no possibility of eradicating them. Military power could certainly control and subdue the masses physically, but only for a time. Revolutionary ideas, however, could not be prevented from spreading, even if ever so slowly. And once they had saturated the population, even military might would not be able to put a stop to the fulfillment of the popular will. The only logical conclusion from this line of reasoning was that the republic, as the wish of the majority of the population, would without a doubt become reality, if not immediately then at some future point in time.

Gottfried Kinkel, of course, lived to see only the realization of German unity. The republic did not come to be until more than thirty years after his death. One of Kinkel's metaphors, nevertheless, prophesied future developments best: "The grave robber finds a stone coffin in the graves of the nobility, and after prying off the lid, he finds a female corpse, beautifully robed in velvet and silk, as if it had just been buried, even though it is many centuries old. The robber is astonished over the natural wonder, and so he opens the door to the tomb in order to admire the clothes of the dead body—but a breath of fresh air rushes in and the ghostly body collapses as if by magic without form or color. The body was able to withstand the musty decay, but the breeze of spring is its death."[35] Although the dead body of the monarchy withstood the fresh air of spring much

[35] [Kinkel], "Her die Fesseln!," *NBZ*, 4 April 1849.

longer than he had thought it would, Gottfried Kinkel's conviction proved to be true in the end.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Becker, Thomas P. "Universität und Revolution: Das Beispiel Bonn." In *Revolution im Rheinland: Veränderungen der politischen Kultur 1848/49*, ed. Stephan Lennartz and Georg Mölich, 199-216. Bielefeld: Verlag für Regionalgeschichte, 1998.

Berg, Angelika. *Gottfried Kinkel: Kunstgeschichte und soziales Engagement.* Bonn: Ludwig Röhrscheid Verlag, 1985.

Beyrodt, Wolfgang. *Gottfried Kinkel als Kunsthistoriker: Darstellung und Briefwechsel.* Bonn: Ludwig Röhrscheid Verlag, 1979.

Bonner Geschichtsblätter: Jahrbuch des Bonner Heimat- und Geschichtsvereins. Vol. 9. 1955.

Bonner Zeitung. 6 August 1848 – 24 December 1848.

Braubach, Max. *Bonner Professoren und Studenten in den Revolutionsjahren 1848/49.* Cologne: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1967.

Breunig, Charles. *The Age of Revolution and Reaction 1789-1850.* 2d ed. New York: W. W. Norton, 1977.

DeJonge, Alfred R. *Gottfried Kinkel as Political and Social Thinker.* New York: AMS Press, 1966.

Eyck, Frank. *The Frankfurt Parliament 1848-1849.* New York: St. Martin's, 1968.

Kaiser, Renate. *Die politischen Strömungen in den Kreisen Bonn und Rheinbach 1848-1878.* Bonn: Ludwig Röhrscheid Verlag, 1963.

Kersken, Hans. *Stadt und Universität Bonn in den Revolutionsjahren 1848-1849.* Bonn: Ludwig Röhrscheid Verlag, 1931.

Kessel, Eberhard. ed. *Die Briefe von Carl Schurz an Gottfried Kinkel.* Heidelberg: Carl Winter – Universitätsverlag, 1965.

Kessler, Walter. "'Republikaner mit Maß und Überlegung:' Der rheinische Demokrat Carl Schurz." In *Das war 'ne heiße Märzenzeit: Revolution im Rheinland 1848/49*, ed. Fritz Bilz and Klaus Schmidt, 109-118. Cologne: Papy-Rossa-Verlag, 1998.

Kinkel, Gottfried. *Geschichte der bildenden Künste bei den christlichen Völkern vom Anfang unserer Zeitrechnung bis zur Gegenwart.* Bonn: 1845.

_____. *Handwerk, errette Dich! oder Was soll der deutsche Handwerker fordern und thun, um seinen Stand zu bessern?* Bonn: Verlag von W. Sulzbach, 1848.

Klein, Hanns. "Gottfried Kinkel als Emissär der provisorischen Regierung der Pfalz im Frühjahr 1849 im Westrich, Bemerkungen zu neuentdeckten Kinkelbriefen." In *Jahresbuch für Westdeutsche Landesgeschichte*, Vol. 8, 107-135. 1982.

Lougee, Robert W. *Midcentury Revolution, 1848: Society and Revolution in France and Germany.* Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Company, 1972.

Marx, Karl. "Gottfried Kinkel." In *Neue Rheinische Zeitung – Politisch-ökonomische Revue.* Viertes Heft. April 1850. <http://www.mlwerke.de/me/me07_299.html> (29 August 2002).

_____ and Friedrich Engels. *The Communist Manifesto.* Edited by John E. Toews. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 1999.

Mayer, Arno J. *The Persistence of the Old Regime: Europe to the Great War.* New York: Pantheon Books, 1981.

Neue Bonner Zeitung. 2 January 1849 – 23 June 1849.

Neue Rheinische Zeitung—Politisch-ökonomische Revue. April 1850.

Nipperdey, Thomas. *Deutsche Geschichte, 1800-1866: Bürgerwelt und starker Staat*. Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck, 1983.

Reinicke, Christian. "Carl Schurz (1829-1906)." In *Petitionen und Barrikaden: Rheinische Revolutionen 1848/49*, ed. Ottfried Dascher and Everhard Kleinertz, 290-292. Münster: Druckhaus Aschendorff, 1998.

Robertson, Priscilla. *Revolutions of 1848: A Social History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952.

Rösch-Sondermann, Hermann. *Gottfried Kinkel als Ästhetiker, Politiker und Dichter*. Bonn: Ludwig Röhrscheid Verlag, 1982.

Rothfels, Hans. "1848—One Hundred Years After." *Journal of Modern History* 20 (December 1948): 291-319.

Rühle, Otto. *Achtzehnhunderachtundvierzig (1848): Revolution in Deutschland*. Münster: Unrast Verlag, 1998.

Schmidt, Klaus. *Gerechtigkeit—das Brot des Volkes: Johanna und Gottfried Kinkel, Eine Biographie*. Stuttgart: Radius Verlag, 1996.

_____. "'Was wir friedlich gewünscht hätten, wird in Sturm und Wetter erscheinen:' Gottfried Kinkel und die rheinischen Demokraten." In *Das war 'ne heiße Märzenzeit: Revolution im Rheinland 1848/49*, ed. Fritz Bilz and Klaus Schmidt, 91-108. Cologne: Papy-Rossa-Verlag, 1998.

Schneider, Erich. "Gottfried Kinkel, die 'Neue Bonner Zeitung' und die revolutionäre Erhebung in der Rheinpfalz, 1849." In *Sonderbuch, Jahrbuch zur Geschichte von Stadt und Landkreis Kaiserslautern*, vol. 22/23, 189-221. 1984/1985.

Schnellig-Reinicke, Ingeborg. "Gottfried Kinkel (1815-1882)." In *Petitionen und Barrikaden: Rheinische Revolutionen 1848/49*, ed. Ottfried Dascher and Everhard Kleinertz, 288-290. Münster: Druckhaus Aschendorff, 1998.

_____. "Johanna Kinkel (1810-1858)." In *Petitionen und Barrikaden: Rheinische Revolutionen 1848/49*, ed. Ottfried Dascher and Everhard Kleinertz, 300-302. Münster: Druckhaus Aschendorff, 1998.

Schurz, Carl. *Autobiography: An Abridgement in One Volume*. Compiled by Wayne Andrews. New York: Scribner, 1961.

Sheehan, James J. "Liberalism and Society in Germany, 1815-1848." *Journal of Modern History* 45 (December 1973): 583-604.

Sperber, Jonathan. "Eine alte Revolution in neuer Zeit: 1848/49 in europäischer Perspektive." In *Die Revolutionen von 1848/49: Erfahrung-Verarbeitung-Deutung*, ed. Christian Jansen and Thomas Mergel, 14-36. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998.

_____. *Rhineland Radicals: The Democratic Movement and the Revolution of 1848-1849*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991.

Strodtmann, Adolph. *Gottfried Kinkel: Wahrheit ohne Dichtung*. 2 vols. Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campen, 1850-1851.

Taylor, A. J. P. *The Struggle for the Mastery in Europe 1848-1918*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1954.

Thielbeer, Heide. *Universität und Politik in der Deutschen Revolution von 1848*. Bonn: Verlag Neue Gesellschaft, 1983.

Thompson, E. P. *The Making of the English Working Class.* New York: Vintage Books, 1966.

Valentin, Veit. *Frankfurt am Main und die Revolution von 1848/49.* Berlin: Cotta, 1908.

_____. *Geschichte der deutschen Revolution 1848-1849.* 2 vols. Berlin: Ullstein, 1930-1931.

Vick, Brian E. *Defining Germany: The 1848 Frankfurt Parliamentarians and National Identity.* London: Harvard University Press, 2002.

Wentzcke, Paul, ed. *Die erste deutsche Nationalversammlung und ihr Werk: ausgewählte Reden.* Munich: Drei Masken Verlag, 1922.