

August Bebel:
A Life For Social Justice and Democratic Reform

James Retallack

Forthcoming in *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*, vol. 58 (2018)

The arc of my reflections in this essay will try to draw a link between the practice of biography and the theme of this volume: “practicing democracy.”¹ Both offer an opportunity to reflect upon the conditions under which political participation can be realized as the “rules of the game” are being transformed by social, economic, political, and cultural change—as they patently were during August Bebel’s lifetime. In the first section I will discuss the challenge of writing “a life” without falling into what Pierre Bourdieu called the “biographical illusion.” In part two I will consider whether Bebel can be said to have devoted his life to social justice. In part three I will consider whether he sought democratic reform, and I will conclude with some observations about Bebel’s life of celebrity.

Stepping back from my chosen subject for a moment, it may be worth reflecting on the phrase that the *New York Times* op-ed columnist Maureen Dowd applied to the year 2016. She called it “the year of voting dangerously.”² She was referring of course to the unexpected election of Donald Trump in America, but also to the equally surprising Brexit vote and plebiscites in Colombia and Hungary. In 2018, some observers are claiming that democratic institutions are under duress—so *much* duress that democracy’s survival is endangered. The German Bundestag elections of September 2017, for some, seemed to confirm Hagen Rether’s quip that

casting a ballot is like brushing your teeth: if you don’t do it, they can turn brown.

The claim that even staunch defenders of democracy have become prone to “vote dangerously” often conflates election inputs and election outcomes. One reason Bebel continues to fascinate is that—even as he moved from one election victory to the next, using voting returns to measure the growth of Social Democratic strength—he mounted increasing attacks on election inputs that always constrained that growth: the laws of association, the suffrage regulations, and the voting procedures that narrowed the gauntlet through which campaigners could get the message out on behalf of individuals and parties, and through which electors had to pass to cast a free vote. And yet, the changing nature of election campaigns in Imperial Germany had a distinctly modern ring by the 1890s. They produced election outcomes that could be as startling as any today. Nineteenth century statesmen would have understood the American literary critic James Wolcott, who once observed that “A lost election can have the jolt of a drop through the gallows door, leading to a dark night of the soul in which the future presses down like a cloud that will never lift.”³

“Voting dangerously” has also become associated with voting for a dangerous individual. Historical comparisons between charismatic leaders in different historical eras can prompt useful reflection. What judgements are in order when a narcissistic individual, without acknowledged political pedigree, uses a narrative of victimhood to tap into the hatreds and discontents of certain ranks of society who have not benefited from modernization and globalization? At what point must democrats set aside their differences to halt the rise of a toxic leader who launches vitriolic attacks against alleged enemies of the state, who claims that international banks are plotting the destruction of national sovereignty in order to enrich global financial powers, who claims that only one person can save the country from ruin, who came to power because respectable politicians

believed they could control him, who endorsed harassment by his followers and sanctioned intimidation on election day, and who hinted at enabling legislation to throw his opponents into jail?

The events of 2016-18 have taught the friends of democracy that they should continue to make their case and show their colors, right up to election day and—no less important—thereafter. Only then will virulent forms of demagoguery and nativism find their most resolute opponents. As with the “birther” canard about former U.S. President Barack Obama having been born outside the United States, the real question is not about where a leader came from; it is about where disadvantaged groups are allowed to go. This Bebel knew well. His lifelong campaigns to banish discrimination based on class, gender, religion, or ethnicity—these remain our campaigns. Likewise, Bebel’s passion in opposing the anti-democratic plans of Otto von Bismarck—despite the latter’s introduction of universal manhood suffrage—is mirrored in the passion of resistance movements in parts of eastern Europe, Africa, and the Middle East that decry autocratic leaders who rule over “illiberal democracies.” The rhetoric and the realities of exclusion have rarely been as salient, and potentially as corrosive to liberal democracy, as they are in 2018.

I. A Life

Three issues crop up for a biographer who has chosen to grapple with a life like Bebel’s, which can be told so many ways. These issues revolve around questions of narrative coherence, perspective, and intended audience. Canadian and Anglo-American readers may not know even the rudimentary contours of Bebel’s life: his birth in February 1840 in a military barracks near Cologne, his destitute and mainly fatherless childhood, his years as a journeyman and then a master turner who specialized in producing door handles from buffalo horns, his uncontested leadership of Germany’s Social Democratic Party (SPD) by 1890, and his unique position in the Second International until his death in August 1913. By that time, the SPD had over one million members, and with 110 deputies it

fielded the largest party caucus in the German Reichstag. In the national elections of 1912, every third voter cast a ballot for the “party of revolution”—an ominous sign for a state preparing for war. On the face of it, Bebel’s place in history is assured by this extraordinary upward trajectory. But is it?

In a short essay published some thirty years ago, Pierre Bourdieu wrote of “*l’illusion biographique*,” which can be translated as the biographical illusion, fallacy, or trap.⁴ By this he meant the mistaken belief that a “biological individual” has a life that can be recounted as a “coherent narrative of a significant and directed sequence of events.” Bourdieu argued that such a life should not be seen as a progression, a passage, a directed journey. Instead he argued that “reality” is formed from discontinuous elements that are unique and difficult to grasp because they “continue to appear, unpredictable, untimely, and at random.” He cited phrases that commonly crop up when a biographer has fallen into this trap, for example, “from his earliest days,” “from now on,” or “he was making his way.”

Today, few biographies follow the structure of an *Entwicklungsroman*. Biography is usually based instead on discontinuous narrative approaches, to emphasize contradictions, ambiguities, reversals, ruptures, failures, and doubts. How is this done in practice? Karl Heinrich Pohl has offered a good example with his recent biography of Gustav Stresemann.⁵ Yet Pohl, in the end, hypothesizes that there was a “red thread” to this life, which readers can grasp in order not to lose their way. Pohl argues that Stresemann was a perpetual border-crosser: his life was shaped by recurring efforts to overcome social, cultural, and political boundaries. A second example comes to mind. Near the beginning of his 2013 biography of Bebel, Jürgen Schmidt refers to Bebel’s *Gesellenstück* from the 1850s.⁶ He suggests that Bebel, as a craftsman, displayed here what he later in life perfected as a professional politician: “to fit together many small pieces and individual parts and make from them a coherent whole.”⁷

Bebel was a gifted organizer, mobilizer, and conciliator. His only modern biographer in the English language, William Harvey Maehl, has written that, “within his party, he was the gyroscopic stabilizer that balanced and countered all diverse sides. For a man who was the titular head of a party that was a maze of contradictions and who mirrored them all it was difficult to move very far from the center of gravity of party opinion.”⁸ There is food for thought in these ideas of Bebel as a border-crosser, a fitter-together, a “curator” of a movement whose unity was perennially threatened by internal centrifugal forces. The SPD’s divergent factions included radicals and moderates, Marxists and revisionists, core regiments and fellow-travelers (*Mitläufer*). Sometimes, we know, Bebel had to play the role of the ferocious unifier. To echo Bourdieu’s words, the biographer cannot ignore the unpredictable, untimely, even random elements of Bebel’s constantly evolving relationships with other leaders of the German and international labour movements, who did not so much gravitate toward Bebel as orbit around him. However, a life of habitual incoherence can become tedious. Almost certainly it is no fun to read. What other narrative strategies present themselves?

All three of the subthemes addressed in this volume on “practicing democracy”—arenas, processes, ruptures—resonate in the life and career of August Bebel. Due to limits of space I can reflect on just one of these three. Consider the economic, social, and political arenas in which Bebel made his mark before 1890. The Kingdom of Saxony, a cradle of German Social Democracy, provided the political launching pad that propelled Bebel into the Reichstag in February 1867 and then, in 1881, into the Saxon Landtag. On many issues—public school fees, religious instruction, state-sponsored fire insurance, women’s and child labour, and industrial safety—the Social Democrats in Saxony’s Landtag tested the limits of doctrinal purity during the 1880s in ways they could not in the Reichstag, where debate on great issues of the day required clear statements of Social Democratic principles.⁹

Bebel’s activities in Saxony during the 1870s and 1880s are under-represented in all biographies of him. How did Bebel conceive the relative importance of his own leadership at the local, regional, and national levels during these decades? The local dimensions of the discrimination he suffered are intriguing. After June 1881 Bebel was banished to the small town of Borsdorf outside Leipzig, because the Saxons had imposed the Lesser State of Siege on Leipzig city and its administrative district.¹⁰ In a parliamentary farce, the Prussian Interior Minister Robert Puttkamer had informed the Saxons that socialist activities—of which he said the hapless Saxons could have no knowledge—had made Leipzig a nest of subversion.¹¹ When the Saxons relented, Article 28 of the Anti-Socialist Law (the expulsion clause) forced Bebel and Liebknecht to abandon their families on seventy-two hours notice (they walked eastwards until they reached Borsdorf). As Bebel noted in his memoirs, “It was not possible to exceed the effrontery with which the minister of one government [Prussia] dropped a hint as heavy as flat irons to another [minister] of what was expected of him. And in Dresden the hint was understood.”¹²

While researching my book *Red Saxony*, I found evidence that runs counter to Vernon Lidtke’s claim that Bebel’s Social Democrats “enjoyed” the “more relaxed atmosphere of Dresden” and “felt much more a part of the [parliamentary] system in Saxony than in the Reich as a whole.”¹³ Bebel felt that Saxony’s “assembly of estates,” despite its relatively liberal suffrage until 1896 and its cosy seating plan, was still antediluvian in the 1880s:

A very considerable proportion of the [Saxon] chamber was made up of rural deputies whose political horizons were as narrow as the boundaries of their own constituency. [These were] people who had only the most laughable conceptions of what we Social Democrats actually wanted. Along with them went a number of small-town mayors who lived in a parochial middle-class milieu and thought the same way. The remaining deputies were made up of some government officials, a few

industrialists, and a large contingent of lawyers. [...] There wasn't a single day when it was a pleasure to sit in such a chamber.¹⁴

What does a new appreciation of Bebel's early activities in local and regional arenas add to existing scholarship on his life, which is understandably oriented toward his national and international stature as the "grand old man" of the Social Democratic movement? If nothing else, it allows Bebel's biographer to reflect on the real or perceived turning point he reached on February 22, 1890—his fiftieth birthday. Just two days earlier, Bebel's party had registered a stunning breakthrough in Reichstag elections, and within a month the young Kaiser Wilhelm II had dismissed Bismarck from office. As Friedrich Engels wrote at the time, noting the defeat of Bismarck's *Kartell* of antisocialist parties: "All the King's horses and all the King's men cannot put Humpty Dumpty together again."¹⁵ By 1890, Bebel had spent more than four years of his life in prison since the 1860s, accused of treason, *lèse majesté*, and other crimes; but his opponents never dared throw him into prison again. In the summer of 1890 Bebel followed the advice of his colleague Paul Singer and abandoned the "Saxon frog pond" for the "lion's den" in Berlin.¹⁶ It is more difficult to judge how Bebel's experiences in the first five decades of his life conditioned his responses to later—quite different—crises in his party. To say that Bebel's outlook on politics after 1890 reflected a half-century of personal hardship and doubt is an understatement, but it also leaves unanswered important questions toward which coherent narrative strategies cannot always steer us.

II. A Life for Social Justice

A biographer should be willing to take deep dives into his or her subject's speeches and writings. These reveal (at least) six themes that inspired Bebel and contributed to the respect he won as a champion of the underprivileged. The first three suggest that it was less Bebel's adherence to Marxism, or the doctrine of revolution, or even the socio-economic plight

of workers specifically, that contributed to his contemporary celebrity and historical significance, but rather his pursuit of social justice on a world-wide scale.

1. Bebel championed the rights of women. His 1879 study, *Woman under Socialism*—affectionately known among Social Democrats as *Frau Julie*, after Bebel's wife—was issued in fifty-three editions and 140,000 copies during his lifetime.¹⁷ It brought the socialist message to hundreds of thousands of workers for the first time, and as a best-seller of the nineteenth century it made Bebel financially secure. Testimonials to the impact of the book can be cited by the hundreds. Clara Zetkin claimed that the work was "more than a book, it was an event, a deed."¹⁸ Or consider the recollection of Hildegard Wegscheider, the daughter of a Protestant pastor in Berlin who became the first Prussian woman to receive the *Abitur*.

I secretly read Bebel's *Woman under Socialism*. The book was still outlawed [...] [but] it was read everywhere. I discovered it on my mother's bedside table [...] It struck like lightning. We had already read [John] Stuart Mill [...] However, this was something else. It has been rightly said that if Marx had embodied class thinking turned into reason, Bebel must be class life incarnate. The impact was incredible. [...] On top of it all, one learned that Bebel had written the book in prison. That was not true, of course, but it endowed his words with the seriousness of a martyr's gospel.¹⁹

Bebel also fought for the rights of homosexuals. He was an early supporter and signatory of Magnus Hirschfeld's 1897 petition to the Reichstag, which argued for repeal of restrictive measures against homosexuals. In his speech of January 13, 1898, Bebel told the Reichstag that repeal of Paragraph 175 of the German Criminal Code was advocated not only by him but also "by a number of colleagues from other parties, and further by people from literary and academic circles, by jurists of the most illustrious standing, by psychologists and pathologists, by experts of the highest rank

in this field.”²⁰ In 1902, however, the SPD’s Reichstag caucus refused to support Bebel’s demand that Paragraph 175 be repealed.

2. Bebel’s defense of Jewish rights helped inoculate workers against the contagion of antisemitism, although he was not the first to label antisemitism “the socialism of fools.” Louise Kautsky, who died in Auschwitz, wrote on the ninetieth anniversary of Bebel’s birth that he often spoke out passionately against what Wilhelm Liebknecht in 1881 called the *Judenhatz* sweeping Germany.²¹ (Liebknecht was intentionally conflating the two terms *Judenhaß* and *Judenhetz*.) “Contrary to most people,” Kautsky wrote, “for whom a bit of antisemitism is the most natural thing and who don’t give a second thought to a disparaging word against the Jews, Bebel was one of the few people for whom the question ‘whether Jew or Christian’ simply did not exist.”²² Bebel’s address to the SPD’s Cologne congress on October 27, 1893, stands as one of the most courageous attacks on antisemitism in the Kaiserreich.²³ He warned Social Democrats that they faced a long, uphill struggle to find fellow-travelers among the ranks of the *Mittelstand*. As he wrote to Friedrich Engels in London, “I was amazed by the deep and fanatical hatred against the Jews that one finds in artisanal and shop-keeping circles. The most sorrowful human being at present is the traveling Jewish businessman. [...] There are shops in Saxony where signs are hung, reading: No entrance to beggars, dogs, and Jews.”²⁴

3. The rights of indigenous peoples and of military recruits were defended in some of Bebel’s most famous parliamentary speeches, even in the 1880s. Bebel denounced adventurers such as Carl Peters who abused native populations in German Southwest Africa (now Namibia) and other colonies.²⁵ Germany’s war on the Nama and Herero peoples in 1904-07 has been identified as the twentieth century’s first genocide, suggesting that the course of history might have been changed if Bebel’s calls to end such injustice had been heeded. His attacks on a state that demanded unquestioning acceptance of authoritarian principles also dovetailed with larger assaults on militarism and imperialism. In a 1886 article he wrote

bitterly about Germany’s trinity of brute force: “infantry, cavalry, and artillery—the rifle that shoots, the sabre that cuts, and the shell that demolishes.”²⁶ But the human side of injustice animated him particularly. When Bebel rose in the Reichstag in 1892 to condemn the abuse of military recruits at the hands of non-commissioned officers, he explained that bourgeois officers “were happy, after having been maltreated [...] in any number of ways by their superiors, [...] to be allowed to whack and abuse one of their comrades.”²⁷ In a speech in March 1904, Bebel described government policy in German Southwest Africa as “not only barbaric, but bestial.” In response, the nationalist *Coburger Zeitung* objected to Bebel’s “kowtowing” to native insurgents and referred scathingly not to the “heroic” but to the “Herero-like Bebel.”²⁸ During the Reichstag campaign preceding the so-called “Hottentot elections” of January 1907, the Imperial League Against Social Democracy published a political cartoon depicting “Bebel’s Legions at Work.” In this and countless other images, Bebel personified the SPD’s un-national, “unreliable” stance on Germany’s colonizing mission.²⁹

Taking stock of these three themes, it is not necessary to downplay Bebel’s allegiance to socialism in order to emphasize the importance of social justice and human rights in his world view. In 1996 Helga Grebing observed that “no one more consistently and resolutely than [...] August Bebel held up against the monarchical-authoritarian state its alternative—not in the first instance, as one might believe, with the utopia of the *Zukunftsstaat*, but rather through his concrete advocacy for human rights, for women’s emancipation, for social rights, against discrimination against Poles, Russians, Jews, and non-conformists in the German Reich, against the abuse of soldiers and antisemitism and the inhuman treatment of indigenous populations in the German colonies.” Grebing then cast her gaze forward to the 1920s and 1930s: “Standing in this tradition, the German labour movement, later, not only postulated but actually realized the right of resistance against an unjust, criminal authority as a human right.”³⁰ We do not have to rely on hindsight. One English newspaper correspondent in 1912 ascribed the SPD’s great Reichstag election victory

that year to the fact that Bebel and his colleagues were “the only unterrified, tooth-and-nail foes of reaction, insensate militarism and class rule, the one voice which cries out insistently, fearlessly, implacably, against the injustices which, in the opinion of many patriotic men, are retarding the moral progress and sapping the vital resources of the German nation.”³¹

III. A Life for Democratic Reform

4. My fourth theme is Bebel’s advocacy of electoral reform, in part to extend the Reichstag’s general, equal, direct, and secret suffrage to Landtag elections in Germany’s federal states and to municipal elections.³² Bebel’s struggle for democratic reform, however, cannot be distilled down to the demand for a wider, or “democratic,” electorate. From the outset of his political career, and as one of the reasons he distanced himself from the teachings of Ferdinand Lassalle, he understood that universal suffrage was not a panacea for working-class grievances. The lengthy catalogue of electoral, parliamentary, and other reforms Bebel advocated from the beginning to the end of his career can be assessed with surprisingly little direct reference to a socialist state of the future. Even while the internal party debate about the *Zukunftsstaat* raged in the 1890s, it took four successive party congresses before Bebel convinced his colleagues that they should contest Prussian Landtag elections under the notorious three-class suffrage.³³ Bebel’s campaign for electoral reform went far beyond the question of formal participation in Prussia or in other undemocratic systems. The electoral chicanery on which he sought to shine a light has a twenty-first-century ring to it. Gerrymandered constituencies, weighted votes, wrangles over candidate selection, illegal campaign contributions, voter suppression, attack ads, “fake news”—these were all part of Bebel’s world, as they are part of ours.

5. It is not difficult to see why issues of state surveillance and violence attracted Bebel’s special attention. During the “heroic” period of the Anti-Socialist Law (1878-1890), which Bebel once described as a “white

terror,” German police sought their quarry everywhere: Bebel “was almost never without a police ‘poodle’ dogging his footsteps or without his governmental ‘honor guard’ waiting for him outside his domicile, hotel room, or assembly hall in whatever city he chanced to be.”³⁴ Bebel’s experience of intimidation, repression, and imprisonment in the 1870s and 1880s fueled his later determination to document and publicize the draconian use of the “Saxon Jewel”—its Association Law dating from 1850—by Saxon police and civil servants.³⁵ Bebel was more ambivalent about the use of violence and non-violence. That ambivalence contributed to rancorous debates within the German and European labour movements about the usefulness of the mass strike as a political weapon. Would it stop war? No one knew. Could it wring Prussian suffrage reform from the authoritarian state? No one knew. Could it block a *coup d’état* from the Right? No one knew.³⁶

Bebel’s biographer can use the mass strike issue—and other issues that came to the fore after 1900—to reconsider larger questions. Was Bebel a pacifist or a patriot? What did workers think of his willingness to defend his Fatherland if attacked? Did Bebel perhaps become addicted to Reichstag election victories? Did he *really* have confidence in the masses? In a famous debate between Bebel and the leader of French socialists, Jean Jaurès, at the 1904 congress of the Second International, Bebel declared that “one cannot mobilize the [party’s] 3 million voters and bring them before the royal palace to depose the Kaiser.”³⁷ But as the German émigré historian Francis L. Carsten concluded in his 1991 biography, neither the SPD nor its leader had a viable “end game” after 1903. Carsten put it this way: Bebel “hoped for more voters, but he did not have an answer as to what these could accomplish, as long as the power apparatus of the Kaiserreich remained unshaken.”³⁸

6. We come, lastly, to the issues of international terrorism and global solidarity. Bebel was jailed in 1871 for his “treasonous” support of the Paris Commune. During and after the Anti-Socialist Law he strove to distance his party from another international movement, anarchism.³⁹ All

the while Bebel remained profoundly influential in the Second International. Most bourgeois Germans believed instinctively that Bebel and his followers sought “the total overthrow of the existing state and society” (as they often put it). Loyalty to the nation became a litmus test of German citizenship: as Kaiser Wilhelm II famously pronounced, Social Democrats were “*vaterlandslose Gesellen*.”⁴⁰ These words are often cited, but the question should be put more provocatively. Were the Social Democrats the terrorists of their time?

After his dismissal from office, Bismarck declared: “The fact that the government treats the socialists as a political party, as a power in the land to be treated seriously and to be reckoned with, instead of robbers and thieves who need to be crushed [...] has greatly increased their power and importance. I would never have sanctioned that. They are the rats in the land and should be destroyed.”⁴¹ In his lectures delivered at the London School of Economics in 1896, the philosopher Bertrand Russell noted that “Social Democrats are persistently regarded by their opponents as a set of vulgar revolutionaries, prepared at any moment, wantonly and for the fun of the thing, to cut their neighbours’ throats and cause a temporary reign of terror.”⁴² How did things stand twenty years later? The Centre Party leader Matthias Erzberger, who became one of the fiercest opponents of the Wilhelmine authoritarian state near the end of the First World War, declared in May 1914 that “the biggest problem [...] the Reich must solve is the *destruction* of the vast power of Social Democracy.” All other problems, Erzberger continued, “stand in second place behind this *core* issue of domestic political life.”⁴³ A central question for any Bebel biography, then, concerns how Bebel and the SPD retained their pariah status in the view of German elites and the state from the 1870s to 1913.

Again and again, Bebel and other Social Democrats claimed—and sincerely believed—that their actions and the fate of their movement lay not in their own hands but in those of their bourgeois antagonists. In a letter of January 1882 to Ignaz Auer, Bebel explained the challenges he and his party faced:

Our behavior will not change the behavior of our opponents one whit. To achieve even modest success we would have to swear off and deny our activity altogether, destroy our [press] organ, and emasculate our speeches in the Reichstag and Landtag [...] And if we did all that, they would demand still more of us; in the end they would not believe us anyway, declaring instead that everything we do is merely calculated hypocrisy and duplicity, and that now everyone must really be on their guard. [...] The only thing that we can and must do is avoid unnecessary provocation and keep our nerve, even though it is damned difficult to do this in the face of the swinishness that is constantly unleashed against us. [...] Thus our tactics [...] are determined much more by our enemies than we can prescribe them ourselves.⁴⁴

The sense of outrage conveyed by Bebel’s words provides a useful reminder: we must try to understand what contemporaries thought the Anti-Socialist Law and other examples of political repression actually accomplished. Historians have tended not to believe bourgeois and aristocratic Germans in the Second Reich who claimed that Bebel’s party was, literally, a criminal organization, an international conspiracy, and an existential threat. In our post-9/11 age, there is an understandable liberal tendency to ascribe overheated rhetoric about such threats to a self-interested, mendacious elite of political insiders. But historians need to listen closely to the enemies of Social Democracy and to judge carefully their avowed fears for the future.

These six issues offer new opportunities to study discrimination based on class, gender, religion, and race; to examine militarism, pacifism, and the use of violence in international contexts; to consider how terrorism was defined and anti-terrorism implemented; and to explore the processes of democratization in Germany and Europe over more than half a century. But one more important question arises from biography’s focus on human agency:⁴⁵ To what degree did Bebel—personally—widen or narrow the

social, political, and cultural divides that separated his party from the rest of Germany? Bebel was a popular firebrand *and* a parliamentary pragmatist, a late-to-the-party Marxist *and* the harbinger of world-wide revolution, a doctrinal touchstone *and* a political chameleon. The category of class is important, but there are two other keys that can help unlock Bebel's contemporary influence and historical significance. The first is a fear of violent revolution found among significant sections of the German bourgeoisie and dating all the way back to the French Revolution. The second is the pervasive set of resentments felt by underprivileged groups in German society when their "hero" was defamed as an outlaw. Bebel's life of celebrity puts these two interpretative keys on the same ring of explanation. Bebel was an enigma, even though, ironically, almost no one thought so at the time.

IV. A Life of Celebrity

How did German workers "find" Bebel, embrace him as "their emperor," and put their faith in Social Democracy's message? In what ways did Bebel serve as a metaphorical hook on which German workers could hang their hopes and dreams? One answer was provided by a brickyard worker named Wenzel Holek.⁴⁶ A leaflet smuggled into his workplace offered Holek a "revelation experience" that other Social Democrats remembered in similar terms:

The message of the leaflet swirled around in my head. [...] But when I compared what was said here about the workers with what was written about their demands and character [in the right-wing press], I realized that [...] the expressions they used against the workers—"oily fellows," "traitors to the fatherland," "agitators," "subversives"—these just didn't agree at all with what I'd heard in the leaflet. But how was I to be certain who was actually right?

Holek was looking for *truth*:

Where was someone who really professed socialism and could explain to me its principles and its views of the workers' situation? There I was—at a loss. And for a long time I groped in the dark [...].

Bebel was uniquely able to provide the spark of enlightenment and hope that Wenzel and millions like him yearned for. This emotional connection can hardly be overestimated. Now, it may be true that more lies are told at a funeral than anywhere else on earth. Nevertheless, at Bebel's funeral in Zürich on August 17, 1913, the Austrian socialist leader and Bebel's friend Viktor Adler expressed a sentiment found in countless obituaries and memoirs: From Bebel, declared Adler, "emanated a warmth of the heart that necessarily embraced everyone who came close to him. He was not able to see the promised land, he did not see victory. But he saw the *Aufmarsch* of the army that will triumph."⁴⁷

Bebel's portrait often hung beside that of Luther or Kaiser Wilhelm II on the walls of working-class homes. Or it replaced them. This, too, signaled an emotional connection, though it was one that was often ignored outside the Social Democratic milieu. Bebel's political enemies and foreign observers believed they understood why he gained such stature as a political superstar. The British envoy in Dresden remarked as early as 1884 that "such is the eloquence of Bebel, that no topic is so mean that he cannot raise it in a few sentences to first-rate interest and importance." A few months later the envoy added that "[Saxony's] Minister of the Interior recently told me that the great orator's door-handles are nearly as excellent as his speeches."⁴⁸ Prussia's minister of the interior, Robert Puttkamer, once voiced the same opinion: "Deputy Bebel is known to be the most capable and eloquent, as well as the most dangerous, of all Social Democrats. [...] I fear his oratory and the impression he has made upon the masses."⁴⁹ However—and this is the more important point—nothing would be more mistaken than to see Bebel *only* as a great orator, as a cold, professional politician.⁵⁰

As Germany's medial age dawned, celebrity mattered. For it was also an age of mass politics, mass culture, and the mass press.⁵¹ Once the age of film dawned in the 1890s, the towering figures of Bismarck and Bebel appeared on the big screen: apparently cinema patrons did not always know—because they were not let in on the secret—that actors were playing these parts.⁵² As both the foundation and the consequence of his celebrity, Bebel became a master at exploiting monarchical, colonial, and other scandals, using them to identify myriad injustices in his world.⁵³ But as the sociologist Robert Michels noted perceptively, the root of Bebel's stature and influence was not to be found exclusively in any one arena: not in the party alone, not in parliament alone, not even in personal sacrifice or political celebrity. "What made the masses trust Bebel," Michels wrote, "was his nearness. His language was their language. His manner was their manner. He did not distinguish himself from them through profound theorizing. [...] He was the man of political *Praxis*. He was their man. They did not mind that he was a parliamentarian through and through. On the contrary."⁵⁴

Why is the attitude of non-working-class Germans so important in this story? Why are the cat-calls that greeted Bebel in parliament and the broadsides launched against him in the press just as important as the applause and adulation he received? As I have argued elsewhere, many members of Germany's newly ascendant bourgeoisie wanted no part of a global order based on the rights of workers, women, and other oppressed groups.⁵⁵ Thus Bebel became the bourgeoisie's anti-Kaiser too, a kind of German Robespierre poised to unleash another Reign of Terror. Perhaps the comparison with Danton would be more accurate. Bebel and his party comrades famously spoke "out the windows of the Reichstag" when the extra-parliamentary activities of their movement were suppressed under the Anti-Socialist Law. One wonders whether Conservatives in the Reichstag, after the "devil incarnate" spoke, were tempted to throw open the windows of parliament to dispel the smell of sulphur.⁵⁶ Whatever the answer, Bebel's biographer needs to explore how the title of "emperor"

conferred iconic authority on Bebel and what these developments meant for the future of democracy.

Rather than simply register the reverence or the abuse directed at Bebel, we need to dig deeper to understand the man and the message. Ironically, Bebel's words sometimes mattered hardly at all. Consider one report from a Social Democratic rally during the national election campaign of 1912:

The giant room is already filled. Feverish excitement grows and grows. [...] Over there at the railway station, a train comes in. [...] Suddenly [...] a gap has opened down the middle of the hall. A small, silver-grey-haired man stands at the entrance, hat and briefcase in his hand. Three times a *Hoch!* thunders out. [...] Bebel speaks.

What he said, I don't know, I never did know. Most of the assembled listeners experienced the same thing. It lay over us all, like hypnotism. One saw only white hair, the movement of arms; one heard rage, ridicule, slashing barbs. [...] If Bebel had said two times two is five, everyone would have believed it. And in closing: a short, clipped command: [...] "Man for man to the polls, for the candidates of Social Democracy!" [...] Only later did the excitement die down, when Bebel sat in the train.⁵⁷

The point here is not that Bebel's contribution to the SPD's growth was always decisive, but rather that his symbolic presence often was. Celebrity and excitement, solemnity and respect—these were ties that bound Bebel to the masses and the masses to him. Recent studies have analysed the rhetorical power of parliamentary speaking and the symbolic power of parliamentary routine.⁵⁸ These, too, put issues of inclusion and exclusion on public display. The biographer's task is to look behind "the barricades of the courageous word."⁵⁹ There one finds not one Bebel, but two: the hero and the heretic.

V. Conclusion

August Bebel has provided his biographers with a subject, but has he provided them with a story? Most biographers try to weigh individual agency against structural constraints. They must be ready, when necessary, to call their subject a horse's ass. And they can choose to construct their biographical subject, at least in part, as discourse. But in doing so, might Bebel's biographers be instrumentalizing or even subverting his life? This danger is real, as Roger Chickering has noted: discourses, too, have a life of their own, extending over time, and often they appear to have a beginning, middle, and end that prove to be illusory.⁶⁰ Bebel was *sui generis*, but the contemporary discourse about his role in Germany's political culture, while fractured, can illuminate more than just the phenomenon of celebrity itself.

In studying power, privilege, and social cohesion through the analytical lens of their preferred genre, biographers should take up the opportunity, when appropriate, to address contemporary public debates. It is not always easy to sidestep the dangers of an overly presentist perspective, as scholarship on Bebel amply demonstrates. Not long before the Berlin Wall fell in 1989, one West German study was unwilling to concede an inch to Marxist triumphalism, while East German biographies celebrated Bebel according to strict Marxist doctrine.⁶¹ A careful balance must be struck, not only in judging "the man" but also in assessing the prospects and paradoxes of "his times." Both in the present day and over the *longue durée*, the mobilization of expanding electorates can be seen as a success story—and as a cautionary tale. The success story points toward social inclusion—liberty, equality, fraternity, and their twenty-first-century variants. Democrats around the world took heart that German Chancellor Angela Merkel, on January 13, 2015, offered a ringing response to the murder of Charlie Hebdo journalists in Paris. "Xenophobia, racism, and extremism," Merkel declared, "have no place in this country." Germany, she added, is "a country based on democracy, tolerance, and openness to the world." The cautionary tale takes account of the power of social exclusion: it reminds

us that the struggles for social justice and democratic reform waged by Bebel shaped much of the twentieth century and continue today, without clear trajectories. In many parts of the world, as in Germany in a bygone age, leaders still seek to be responsive to the masses without being responsible to the people. Dictatorship and the criminal abuse of human rights are also possible outcomes of what Karl Mannheim in the 1920s called the "fundamental democratization of society."⁶²

Daily headlines demonstrate that Arab Springs can become Arab Winters when transitions to democracy produce hybrid regimes that satisfy no one. Salman Rushdie has written that when such transitions are misread, cultures "bleed into each other."⁶³ Wherever pluralism is under attack, a kaleidoscopic view of history can contribute to revealing the truth and to reconciling opposing groups who mistakenly believe they are embarked on incompatible paths to a better future. A belief in pluralism and a faith in human compassion animated Bebel throughout his long career and set him apart from millions of his fellow Germans. Nevertheless, in 1913-14, before Social Democratic conscripts were sent to die in Flanders and on the eastern front and in the Atlantic, Kaiser Wilhelm II and the authoritarian German state were hemorrhaging political legitimacy: the respect of the masses flowed in a different direction. By viewing strategies for emancipation and counter-strategies for exclusion through the lens of a single life, Bebel's biographer can suggest that struggles for democracy are inseparable from beliefs, institutions, and conflicts that claim to make the world safe for it.

James Retallack
The University of Toronto

Notes

¹ I am grateful to the editors of *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte* for the opportunity to publish a revised version of the remarks I delivered at the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung Berlin on 9 November 2016. The present text has benefited from comments provided by James M. Brophy and Deborah Neill. Apart from adding references I have tried to preserve the informal, inquiring tone of the original presentation. Funding for my research has been generously provided by the Killam Program at the Canada Council for the Arts, the John S. Guggenheim Memorial Foundation, and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

² Maureen Dowd, *The Year of Voting Dangerously. The Derangement of American Politics* (New York, 2016).

³ James Wolcott, “All Over Except for the Pouting,” *Vanity Fair*, 7 November 2012.

⁴ Pierre Bourdieu, “The biographical illusion,” in *Identity: A Reader*, ed. Paul du Gay, Jessica Evans, Peter Redman (London, 2000), 297-303; originally published as “L’illusion biographique,” *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* 62/3 (1986): 69-72. I am grateful to Roger Chickering for pointing out to me the relevance of Bourdieu’s essay to my planned biography.

⁵ Karl Heinrich Pohl, *Gustav Stresemann. Biographie eines Grenzgängers* (Göttingen, 2015).

⁶ *Gesellenstück*: journeyman’s piece.

⁷ Jürgen Schmidt, *August Bebel, Kaiser der Arbeiter. Eine Biographie* (Zürich, 2013), 34 and plate II.

⁸ William Harvey Maehl, *August Bebel: Shadow Emperor of the German Workers* (Philadelphia, 1980), 362. Published as vol. 138 of the *Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society*, Maehl’s biography had a limited print run and is difficult for interested readers to find.

⁹ Vernon Lidtke, *The Outlawed Party: Social Democracy in Germany, 1878-1890* (Princeton, 1966), 222-8; Werner Lesanovsky, “Die bildungspolitische Tätigkeit der sozialdemokratischen Fraktion im sächsischen Landtag von 1877 bis

1890,” Ph.D. diss., Pädagogische Hochschule Zwickau, 1976; Werner Lesanovsky, “Die Bemühungen der sozialdemokratischen Abgeordneten im sächsischen Landtag um die Verbesserung der proletarischen Familienerziehung und der Kampf gegen die kapitalistische Kinderausbeutung (1877-1900),” *Sächsische Heimatblätter* 28 (1982): 121-126.

¹⁰ Wolfgang Schröder, *Blickpunkt Borsdorf: August Bebels und Wilhelm Liebknechts Asyl 1881-1884* (Borsdorf, 2004).

¹¹ This episode is discussed in James Retallack, *Germany’s Second Reich: Portraits and Pathways* (Toronto, 2015), 68-71.

¹² August Bebel, *Aus meinem Leben* (orig. 1910-14), 3 vols. in 1 (Berlin-GDR, 1961), 753. See also August Bebel, *Petition an den Deutschen Reichstag, die polizeilichen Ausweisungen aus dem Königreich Sachsen betreffend, nebst dem stenographischen Bericht über die Verhandlungen der II. Kammer des sächsischen Landtages am 21. Februar 1882* (Nuremberg, 1881); Heinzpeter Thümmeler, *Sozialistengesetz §28. Ausweisungen und Ausgewiesene 1878-1890* (Vaduz, 1979).

¹³ Cf. Lidtke, *Outlawed Party*, 222-228, 276-277, quotations at 227; James Retallack, *Red Saxony: Elections Battles and the Spectre of Democracy in Germany, 1860-1918* (Oxford, 2017), esp. 192-198.

¹⁴ Bebel, *Aus meinem Leben*, 784. The socialist Georg von Vollmar described his first impressions upon taking up his seat in the Saxon Landtag in 1883. He recalled “how I stood there on the day I entered the chamber, how I was surrounded by a ring of candles that radiated a real sense of ceremony where everyone was dressed in black, how the president gave the representatives of the people a school-lesson on the sanctity of the oath, which we had to read back to him word for word [...] And then the sessions themselves! We were squeezed together like herrings in a tin, so that the whole row had to stand up if someone wanted to leave. In front of us sat a number of National Liberals; frequently we could tell [...] just how much they disapproved of and were appalled by our conversations. Opposite us [sat] their excellencies, the state ministers, into whom no streak of modern thinking had penetrated and before whom the whole chamber,

by every entrance and exit, bent low as though it were a cornfield moved by the wind. [...] And surrounding our [Social Democratic] deputies were the representatives of the other parties, who for us really were ‘a reactionary mass’ and who accepted our most elementary statements with as much interest and understanding as if we had been speaking to a lifeless wall. My admiration for the Saxon comrades who were able to persevere [in the chamber] longer than I did sprang principally from the fact that neither rage nor boredom killed them off.” Sozialdemokratische Partei Sachsens, ed., *Sozialdemokratischer Parteitag Dresden 1903* (n.p. [Dresden], n.d. [1903]), 18-20.

¹⁵ Friedrich Engels to Karl Marx’s daughter Laura Lafargue, February 26, 1890, cited in Wilfried Loth, *Das Kaiserreich. Obrigkeitsstaat und politische Mobilisierung* (Munich, 1996), 189-91 (English in original).

¹⁶ Paul Singer to Friedrich Engels, 13 May 1890, cited in Wilhelm Liebknecht, *Briefwechsel mit Karl Marx und Friedrich Engels*, ed. Georg Eckert (The Hague, 1963), 370, note 2.

¹⁷ The first (1879) and fiftieth editions (1910) appear as vols. 10/1 and 10/2 in August Bebel, *Ausgewählte Reden und Schriften*, ed. Horst Bartel et al. (hereafter Bebel, *ARuS*), 14 vols. in 10 (Berlin-GDR and Munich, 1970-1997). See also Anne Lopes and Gary Roth, *Men’s Feminism: August Bebel and the German Socialist Movement* (New York, 2000); Ursula Herrmann, ed., *August und Julie Bebel. Briefe einer Ehe* (Bonn, 1997).

¹⁸ *Protokoll über die Verhandlungen des Parteitages der Sozialdemokratischen Partei Deutschlands. Abgehalten zu Gotha vom 11. bis 16. Oktober 1896* (Berlin, 1896), 164.

¹⁹ Hildegard Wegscheider, *Weite Welt im engen Spiegel. Erinnerungen* (Berlin-Grünwald, n.d. [1953]), 21f., in *Quellen zur Alltagsgeschichte der Deutschen 1871-1914*, ed. Jens Flemming, Klaus Saul, and Peter-Christian Witt (Darmstadt, 1997), 103f.

²⁰ Bebel, *Stenographische Berichte über die Verhandlungen des Reichstags* (Berlin, 1898), IX. Legislaturperiode, V. Session 1897/98, Bd. 1, 410 (13 Jan. 1898). Magnus Hirschfeld, *Von eins bis jetzt. Geschichte einer homosexuellen Bewegung 1897-1922* (Berlin, 1986) (orig. 1921/22), devoted a chapter to Bebel.

²¹ The term *Judenhatz* appeared in one of Wilhelm Liebknecht’s banned election pamphlets from the Reichstag election campaign of 1881. Sächsisches Hauptstaatsarchiv Dresden, Kreishauptmannschaft Zwickau, Nr. 201.

²² Louise Kautsky, writing (22 Feb. 1930) in the *Arbeiter-Zeitung* (Vienna), cited in Brigitte Seebacher-Brandt, *Bebel. Kündler und Kärner im Kaiserreich* (Berlin, 1988), 272.

²³ After the congress, Bebel’s speech was published (with a print run of 10,000) as *Sozialdemokratie und Antisemitismus* (Berlin, 1894); rpt. in Bebel, *ARuS*, vol. 3, *Reden und Schriften Oktober 1890 bis Dezember 1895*, ed. Anneliese Beske et al. (Munich, 1995), 363-398. Compare Lars Fischer, *The Socialist Response to Antisemitism in Imperial Germany* (Cambridge, 2007), 70-80, esp. 71, and the critique in Andrew G. Bonnell, “Was German Social Democracy Before 1914 Antisemitic?” *German History* 27, no. 2 (2009): 259-69, at 267. On working-class antisemitism, see also Richard J. Evans, ed., *Kneipengespräche im Kaiserreich. Stimmungsbilder der Hamburger Politischen Polizei 1892-1914* (Reinbek bei Hamburg, 1989), 302-321.

²⁴ Bebel to Engels, 25 June 1893, in *August Bebel’s Briefwechsel mit Friedrich Engels*, ed. Werner Blumenberg (The Hague, 1965), 697.

²⁵ August Bebel, speech of 13 March 1896, *Stenographische Berichte über die Verhandlungen des Reichstags*, 9. Legislaturperiode, IV. Session, Bd. 2 (Berlin, 1896), 1432-1435, rpt. in Bebel, *ARuS*, vol. 4, *Reden und Schriften. Januar 1896 bis Dezember 1899*, ed. Anneliese Beske et al. (Munich, 1995), 7-14. For accounts of the day’s debate in the Reichstag and reactions to Bebel’s accusations, see Arne Perras, *Carl Peters and German Imperialism 1856-1918. A Political Biography* (Oxford, 2004), 214-219; also Martin Reuss, “The Disgrace and Fall of Carl Peters: Morality, Politics, and *Staatsräson* in the Time of Wilhelm II,” *Central European History* 14, no. 2 (1981): 110-141, esp. 128-133 (however, Reuss ignores the second Peters trial).

²⁶ Bebel in *Der Sozialdemokrat*, 15 April 1886, cited in Maehl, *Bebel*, 208. Still indispensable on this topic is Reinhard Höhn, *Sozialismus und Heer*, 3 vols. (Bad Harzburg, 1961-69).

²⁷ See the exhaustive résumé in Hartmut Wiedner, “Soldatenmißhandlungen im Wilhelminischen Kaiserreich (1890-1914), *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte* 22

(1982): 159-197, esp. 172-3. August Bebel, speech of 15 Feb. 1892, *Stenographische Berichte über die Verhandlungen des Reichstags*, VIII. Legislaturperiode, I. Session, Bd. 6 (Berlin, 1892), 4218, cited *ibid.*, 173. See also Alex Hall, *Scandal, Sensation, and Social Democracy. The SPD Press and Wilhelmine Germany 1890-1914* (Cambridge, 1977), 125-133. Especially after 1900, despite his pamphlet of 1898, *Nicht stehendes Heer, sondern Volkswehr*, Bebel tended to demand a more effective military for national defence rather than a “people’s army.” See Nicholas Stargardt, *The German Idea of Militarism: Radical and Socialist Critics* (Cambridge, 1994); Helmut Bley, *Bebel und die Strategie der Kriegsverhütung 1904-1913* (Göttingen, 1975); Bernhard Neff, “Wir wollen keine Paradedruppe, wir wollen eine Kriegstruppe...” *Die reformorientierte Militärkritik der SPD unter Wilhelm II. 1890-1913* (Cologne, 2004).

²⁸ *Coburger Zeitung*, 17 January 1904, cited in Andrew Deas, “Germany’s Introspective Wars. Colonial and Domestic Conflict in the German Press’ Discourse on Race 1904–1907,” MA diss., Brandeis University, 2009, 44.

²⁹ Illustrated flyer Nr. 55 of the Reichsverband gegen die Sozialdemokratie, “Wählt zur Ehre des Vaterlandes gegen seine Zerstörer!” (“Bebels Heerscharen an der Arbeit”). Reproduced in Michael Klant, ed., *Der rote Ballon. Die deutsche Sozialdemokratie in der Karikatur* (Hanover, 1988), 87, also in Retallack, *Red Saxony*, 425.

³⁰ Helga Grebing, “Einführung,” *Mitteilungsblatt des Instituts zur Erforschung der europäischen Arbeiterbewegung* 18 (1997): 8-9. See also Gerhard A. Ritter, “August Bebel, Freiheit und Emanzipation. Menschenrechte und Arbeiterbewegung im Deutschen Kaiserreich,” in *zu aller Nutzen. August Bebel (1840-1913) – Wirken und Wirkung*, ed. Angela Bösl (Essen, 2013), 33-42; and Maehl, *Bebel*, 222: “Bebel was the champion of social progress, the visionary who saw a brighter future for the common people.” “Bebel had by the late 1880s become *the* tribune of German democracy.”

³¹ Frederick William Wile, *Men around the Kaiser* (London, 1913), 81, cited in Hall, *Scandal*, 20. Wile was an American journalist who wrote for *The New York Times*, the *Chicago Daily News*, and was a Berlin correspondent for *The Daily Mail*.

³² August Bebel, *Zu den Landtagswahlen in Sachsen* (Berlin, 1891), esp. 3-31; for Bebel’s resolution and speech of 28 Oct. 1893 on the universal suffrage

and German Landtage, see Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands, ed., *Protokoll über die Verhandlungen des Parteitages der Sozialdemokratischen Partei Deutschlands. Abgehalten zu Köln a. Rh. vom 22. bis 28. Oktober 1893* (Berlin, 1893), 253-265.

³³ August Bebel, “Unsere Beteiligung an den preußischen Landtagswahlen,” *Neue Zeit* 15 (1896-97), Bd. II, Nr. 46 (1897): 609-617, and *Neue Zeit* 16 (1897-98), Bd. I, Nr. 7 (1897): 196-203.

³⁴ Maehl, *Bebel*, 162. More generally see Dieter Fricke and Rudolf Knaack, eds., *Dokumente aus geheimen Archiven. Übersichten der Berliner politischen Polizei über die allgemeine Lage der sozialdemokratischen und anarchistischen Bewegung 1878-1913*, 3 vols. (Weimar, 1983-2004); also Ignaz Auer, *Nach zehn Jahren. Material und Glossen zur Geschichte des Sozialistengesetzes* (London, 1889, rpt. Nürnberg, 1929).

³⁵ August Bebel, *Die Handhabung des Vereins- und Versammlungsrechts im Königreich Sachsen. Auf Grund des Thatsachenmaterials dargelegt* (Berlin, 1897).

³⁶ The literature on the SPD and the mass strike is enormous. One recent contribution is Michael L. Hughes, “‘The knife in the hands of the children’? Debating the political mass strike and political citizenship in Imperial Germany,” *Labor History* 50, no. 2 (2009): 113-138.

³⁷ After Bebel’s stinging indictment of revisionists at the Dresden party congress of 1903—that is, shortly after the SPD’s “three-million victory” in the Reichstag elections of June 1903—his former party friend Johann Most likened the speech to the Catholic dancing procession of Echternach, which takes place in Luxembourg every Whit Tuesday: but whereas pilgrims take three steps forward and two steps backward, Most claimed Bebel’s speech offered three steps forward and three steps backward. Most, in *Der Freie Arbeiter*, Jg. 2, Nr. 43 (Berlin, 1905), cited in Robert Michels, “August Bebel,” *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik* 37 (1913): 671-700, at 690.

³⁸ Carsten added: “Even an absolute majority of the SPD in the Reichstag would have foundered on the veto of the Federal Council and the Kaiser.” Francis L. Carsten, *August Bebel und die Organisation der Massen* (Berlin, 1991), 251.

³⁹ See August Bebel, “Von den Anarchisten trennen uns grundsätzliche Gegensätze. Reden und Diskussionsbeiträge auf dem Internationalen Sozialistischen Arbeiterkongreß in Zürich,” rpt. in Bebel, *ARuS*, vol. 3, 349-354. The best treatment of this relationship in English is Elon T. Gabriel, *Assassins and Conspirators: Anarchism, Socialism, and Political Culture in Imperial Germany* (DeKalb, IL, 2014).

⁴⁰ Sometimes loosely translated as “scoundrels without a country.” See inter alia Dieter Groh and Peter Brandt, *Vaterlandslose Gesellen. Sozialdemokratie und Nation, 1860-1990* (Munich, 1990).

⁴¹ Bismarck in November 1895, quoted in a copy of the SPD’s *Maifeier-Zeitung* for 1898 found in the Staatsarchiv Hamburg, cited in Hall, *Scandal*, 200, note 17.

⁴² Bertrand Russell, *German Social Democracy* (New York, 1965), 99. Russell’s analysis of the German labour movement was, at many points, uncannily prescient.

⁴³ Cited in Walter Mühlhausen, “Gegen den Reichsfeind – Anmerkungen zur Politik von Staat und Gesellschaft gegenüber der Sozialdemokratie im Kaiserreich” (Friedrichsruher Beiträge, 16), in *Otto von Bismarck und das ‘lange 19. Jahrhundert’. Lebendige Vergangenheit im Spiegel der ‘Friedrichsruher Beiträge’ 1996-2016*, ed. Ulrich Lappenküper (Paderborn, 2017), 350f. (emphases added).

⁴⁴ Bebel to Auer, 4 Jan. 1882, International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam, ARCH00029, August Bebel Papers, A. Briefe von August Bebel, Inv. nr. 2, Ignaz Auer (online). Fifteen years later Bebel expanded on the same idea. In a speech to students in 1897 he declared that whereas he had once envisioned violent revolution, that was no longer necessary: “The biggest revolutionaries are not the Social Democrats, they are their avowed enemies; Herr von Stumm, for example, Herr Krupp, those are the revolutionaries par excellence.” August Bebel, *Akademiker und Sozialismus. Ein Vortrag, gehalten in der öffentlichen Studentenversammlung am 14. Dezember 1897* (Berlin, 1898), 12, cited in Carsten, *Bebel*, 251.

⁴⁵ See also Simone Lässig and Volker R. Berghahn, eds., *Biography between Structure and Agency: Central European Lives in International Historiography* (Oxford, 2008).

⁴⁶ Wenzel Holek, *Lebensgang eines deutsch-tschechischen Handarbeiters*, ed. Paul Göhre (Jena, 1909), excerpted and translated by Alfred Kelly, ed., *The German Worker: Working-Class Autobiographies from the Age of Industrialization* (Berkeley, 1987), 102f.

⁴⁷ For Adler’s remarks, see “Die Trauerreden im Krematorium,” *Vorwärts*, 18 Aug. 1913, 2.

⁴⁸ British envoy to Saxony, George Strachey, Dresden, to British Foreign Secretary, Earl Granville, London, No. 14, 23 Feb. 1884, and Nr. 31, 7 May 1884, The National Archives, UK, FO 68/168.

⁴⁹ Hermann Wendel, *August Bebel*, 3rd ed. (Offenbach, 1948), 67, cited in Maehl, *Bebel*, 176-7. The same tone of grudging respect was found in Theodor Mommsen’s observation of December 1903 in Theodor Barth’s *Nation*: “But it is unfortunately true; at the present time Social Democracy is the only great party that can lay claim to political respect. It is unnecessary to mention talent; everyone in Germany knows that with a brain like Bebel’s one could outfit a dozen East-Elbian Junkers so that they would shine among their own kind.” Cited in Maehl, *Bebel*, 7.

⁵⁰ See Thomas Welskopp, “Existenzkampf um Abkömmllichkeit. ‘Berufspolitiker’ in der deutschen Sozialdemokratie bis zum Sozialistengesetz,” in *Regierung, Parlament und Öffentlichkeit im Zeitalter Bismarcks*, ed. Lothar Gall (Paderborn, 2003), 185-222.

⁵¹ See also Lucy Riall, “The Shallow End of History? The Substance and Future of Political Biography,” *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 40 (2010): 375-39.

⁵² See still frames of actors playing Bismarck and Bebel in a *Wochenschau*, illustrated in Otto-Ernst Schüddekopf, ed., *Herrliche Kaiserzeit. Deutschland 1871-1914* (Berlin, 1973), 74. Images of Bebel as a wild revolutionary, armed with a dagger in one hand and a bottle of petroleum in the other, are prominent in Klant, ed., *Der rote Ballon*.

⁵³ See Frank Bösch, *Öffentliche Geheimnisse. Skandale, Politik und Medien in Deutschland und Großbritannien 1880–1914* (Munich, 2009); Martin Kohler, *Der Monarch im Skandal. Die Logik der Massenmedien und die Transformation der wilhelminischen Monarchie* (Berlin, 2005).

⁵⁴ Michels, “Bebel,” 674f. The left-liberal politician Friedrich Naumann, who once argued for a parliamentary bloc from Bebel on the left to Ernst Bassermann on the centre-right, expressed a similar comment: “[Bebel] was flesh of the flesh and bone of the bone of the common people. [...] The grandeur of German Social Democracy rests in part upon the limitless trust that the masses reposed in their ‘August’.” Friedrich Naumann, “Erinnerungen an Bebel,” *Neue Hamburger Zeitung*, 20 Aug. 1913, cited in Maehl, *Bebel*, 7.

⁵⁵ Retallack, *Germany's Second Reich*; Retallack, *Red Saxony*.

⁵⁶ Once, after the rebellious French painter Eugène Delacroix visited the Louvre, the conservative court painter Jean-August-Dominique had the windows thrown open for exactly this reason. Recounted in Julian Barnes, *Keeping an Eye Open: Essays on Art* (London, 2015), 53.

⁵⁷ Heinz Kühn, ed., *Auf den Barrikaden des mutigen Wortes* (Bonn, 1986), 51f. Cf. a similar account in Michels, “Bebel,” 693.

⁵⁸ Hans-Peter Goldberg, *Bismarck und seine Gegner. Die politische Rhetorik im kaiserlichen Reichstag* (Düsseldorf, 1998); Thomas Mergel, *Parlamentarische Kultur in der Weimarer Republik. Politische Kommunikation, symbolische Politik und Öffentlichkeit im Reichstag* (Düsseldorf, 2002); Dieter Langewiesche, Klaus Schönhoven, Peter-Christian Witt, *August Bebel. Repräsentant der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung* (Heidelberg, 1991). On different aspects of “political ceremony” in the medial age, see also Andreas Biefang, “Die Reichstagswahlen als demokratisches Zeremoniell,” in *Das politische Zeremoniell im Deutschen*

Kaiserreich 1871-1918, ed. Andreas Biefang, Michael Epkenhans, Klaus Tenfelde (Düsseldorf, 2009), 232-269 (and other contributions to the same volume); Andreas Biefang, *Die andere Seite der Macht. Reichstag und Öffentlichkeit im »System Bismarck« 1871-1890* (Düsseldorf, 2009); Andreas Biefang, “Wahlsieg 1912 – der glücklichste Moment der Parteigeschichte,” in *Deutsche Sozialdemokratie in Bewegung 1848 – 1863 – 2013*, ed. Anja Kruke and Meik Woyke (Berlin, 2012), 88-91.

⁵⁹ Kühn, ed., *Auf den Barrikaden des mutigen Wortes*.

⁶⁰ Roger Chickering, “Comment” at the session entitled “Leben Schreiben: Historische Biographien als Impulsegeber für die Geschichtswissenschaft?” German Studies Association, Annual Meeting, San Diego, 29 September – 2 October 2016.

⁶¹ Seebacher-Brandt, *Bebel*; Heinrich Gemkow, *August Bebel*, 2nd ed. (Leipzig, 1986); Ursula Herrmann and Volker Emmrich et al., *August Bebel. Eine Biographie* (Berlin-GDR, 1989).

⁶² Karl Mannheim, *Man and Society in an Age of Reconstruction* (orig. German 1923), trans. Edward Shils (New York, 1967), 44.

⁶³ Salman Rushdie, *Shalimar the Clown: A Novel* (Toronto, 2005). Greg Denning, *Islands and Beaches: Discourse on a Silent Land. Marquesas 1774-1880* (Honolulu, 1980), 6: “To know cultures in contact is to know the misreadings of meanings, the transformation of meanings, the recognition of meanings.”