

Disagreement Regarding the Posthumous Publication of Unpublished Works by P.-J. Proudhon.

[The first two letters originally appeared in the *Presse*, and then were reprinted in August Beauchery's 1867 *Économie sociale de P. J. Proudhon*. I have appended a translation of the original letter by Bauer. I have varied the formatting to make the letters-within-letters form of the articles easier to follow.—Shawn]

We receive the following letter:

Paris, November 16, 1865.

Dear editor,

The *Presse* of November 16 takes up again, after some literary journals, the question of the posthumous works of Proudhon, and the manner in which you intend to publish them. Your article contains two things: the principal et un incident. Let us begin by eliminating the incident:

Two persons, you say, have abstained from signing with us and associating with an act of literary dishonesty. Allow me to observe to you that these two persons are better positioned than us in journalism to explain the motives of their abstention; perhaps they would give others than those you lend them.¹

The incident dealt with, let's get to the core.

The introduction to *The Theory of Property* is composed of several parts:

1) Citations extracted from the older works of Proudhon:

2) Connecting phrases such as: "Chapter IV of the study on goods is titled: ECONOMIC BALANCES: Worker and masters; buyers and sellers, etc.," or: "Speak of taxation, I said."

3) Some phrases constructed exclusively with parts of phrases written by Proudhon, like this other "What was I attacking above all in 1840? The right of increase, that right so inherent, so intimate to property that, where it does not exist, property is nothing;"

4) Some handwritten notes scattered in the last manuscript;

5) Some phrases that Proudhon said to us in conversation and which remain in our memory;

6) Finally, the famous article of Mr. Paignon.

All deductions made, there remains in the 62 pages of the introduction, we believe, 90 lines or 3 pages. Thus the summary has been, in reality, on our part only a work of

¹ The six literary executors listed in *The Principle of Art* are J. A. Langlois, A. A. Rolland, G. Duchêne, F. G. Bergmann, G. Chaudey and F. Delhasse. Chaudey and Rolland did not sign the notice in *The Theory of Property*.

ordering, made with Proudhon, of published and unpublished work.

That is our defense, if indeed it matters to the true proudhonians, to the partisans of the political, economic, religious and moral reforms elaborated by Proudhon, who, in this debate, have still not spoken.

For ten days, epithets have been bestowed: impertinent, impious, dishonest, profaners. Against us, who have only shared with the great thinker the works and struggles, the trials and prison, is raised a clamor to make us proclaim the miracle. The Proudhonian doctrine is thus finally triumphant!...

When come to her from all sides,
These children she has not carried at her breast?²

Some men of letters who have never fumbled with the least economic, political, or social question; some Catholics who prompted the last three-year sentence for the author of the *Justice*; some Jacobin absolutists who have cried out against him: *Stupid federalist*; some proprietors who put the income from property well above its political function: some old fighters, become the conservatives of tomorrow: some satisfied sorts from all times: these are, from Mr. Barbey d'Aurevilly all the way to Mr. Bauer, the people who have raised their voices against us.

What a difference with what took place only ten months ago! Proudhon expressed himself before us one day in these terms:

The so-called democratic papers have said nothing of my *Theory of Taxation* (awarded a prize by the council of state of the canton of Vaud and published in France in 1861). The conspiracy of silence already existed; I have not even had on this occasion the honor of the assaults. (Phrase quoted on page 64 of our Introduction.)

Proudhon is dead, as Mr. de Girardin said so well, of the silence observed around his work and the suffocation of his thought.

He is dead, and so here he is, passed to the state of God, and, to employ the vigorous expression of the excellent Bergman, to the state of the Dalai Lama of whom one worships even the excrement. *Et stercora adorabant.*

² From Jean Racine, *Athalie*; my translation.

But these are not enthusiasts. There is an asp under the flowers that are lavished on the tomb of Proudhon. Proudhon once dead, must remain dead: that is what they want. He left seventeen works, where he continues the struggle, the propaganda from beyond the grave. This scandal must be cut short by smothering the thinker under the crowns bestowed on the artist.

Well, no, the fighter is not dead: we see it from time to time. But for the posthumous work to bear its fruits, it must be published in an intelligible manner. The editors have not been chosen from among these enthusiasts of the next day, fortunately.

“Put an end to a work which must inevitably detract from the intellectual legacy of the celebrated writer,” our friend Darimon advises us.”

If the question was only literary, if it was a question of novels, of sonnets and ballads, we would not have worried about it. But the question is political. The public must have the whole of Proudhon’s thought, even if some of his present eulogists receive blows in exchange for their swings of the censer. Four or six remain to us to be done, and they will.

Accept, Mr. Editor, our attentive salutations.

J. A. LANGLOIS, G. DUCHÈNE.

Let us exclude from the debate the personality of Mr. Langlois or Mr. Duchène. It is not at issue. No one thinks to put in doubt their devotion to the Proudhonian cause, nor the good faith that they bring to the work in which they are engaged. If someone did that, you would see us on the front line to defend them. They are old comrades at arms; I battle them only by complaining.

What the public complains of, is that instead of publishing the posthumous works of their master as he left them, Mr. Duchène and Mr. Langlois rework, arrange, and assemble them, as they say in the preface to the book on art.

To find this manner of proceeding bad, it is not necessary to be guided by a political passion; it is enough to be a man of taste. That is how it happens that Duchène and Langlois encounter, uniting in a common criticism, people belonging to the most opposed camps. There is nothing astonishing about seeing, in these circumstances, a friend of Proudhon, Mr. Darimon, agree with Mr. Barbey d’Aurevilly, one of his adversaries; it is the opposite which would be strange. In questions of good sense, there can be no dissent.

At base, Duchène and Langlois share the sentiments of the whole world. They feel so strongly that to make alterations to the work of a dead author is to profane it, that they strive to prove that the additions made by them to the *Theory of Property* consist largely of verbatim quotes taken from Proudhon himself. But even this admission condemns them; they plead extenuating circumstance; it is not a right that they assert, and in that alone they have been right.

Within the limits that my two excellent friends put on their work, to my [other] friends they still go too far. That in order to make the fragments left by Proudhon intelligible, as they say, they supply some notes intended to clarify the text, no one contradicts; but that they make Proudhon speak as if they had in them the very mind and soul of the master, that is what everyone is permitted to find detestable.

MM. Duchêne et Langlois conclude their letter with a sentence that proves they are determined to continue, despite the good advice that comes to them from all sides. We are sorry for them, for their obstinacy (the word is not too hard) they will certainly attract indiscreet questions. Already it is said in public that neither they nor anyone else received the mandate from Proudhon to publish his posthumous works, that Proudhon had limited himself to designating six persons charged with overseeing the republication of his Complete Works, and that he had not given a mandate to anyone to revise his unfinished manuscripts. One adds that not only do Langlois and Duchêne act without title, but that the true Proudhonians, — to borrow their expression, — deplore the way they have treated the unpublished works of their leaders, and have let them know. Some go even further: it is said that the publisher, the honorable Mr. Lacroix, is, on this point, of the opinion of the friends of the famous publicist.

If this was so, one need not despair of seeing Mr. Duchêne and Mr. Langlois come to repentance. It is unfortunate that two men of heart and intelligence persist in pursuing a labor that earns them such severe and unanimous cautions. — Alfred Darimon. *Presse*, November 18, 1865.

We receive the following letter:

Monsieur,

The *Presse*, in its issue for the 16th of this month, has addressed to us, under the signature BAUER, some advice and criticism on the manner of understanding the publication of the works of Proudhon. We are clearly charged with dishonesty. At two o'clock, we had given an answer: We have learned that the article signed Bauer was by Mr. Darimon. Then, after reflection, we declared that to Mr. Darimon the response should not be the same as to the signatory behind which he thought he could hide his greatness. We have withdrawn our letter, and we have replaced it with another: the new one appeared on November 18, but with the suppression of six words.

Mr. Darimon, so severe regarding our arrangement of the works of Proudhon, which he considers dishonest, knows perfectly that that suppression of six words constitutes a falsification. We have said, in citing a phrase from the article:

“Put an end to a work that must necessarily harm the intellectual heritage of the famous publicist,” we advise friend Darimon UNDER THE SIGNATURE OF M. BAUER.”

The suppression of these words: “Under the signature of Mr. Bauer,” renders completely unintelligible the qualification of friend; and that is why we are obliged to correct that *gracieusetés* that Mr. Darimon because of the twisting of our thought, believes he must pour out on us, and on Proudhon as well. Mr. Darimon promises, if we are attacked in our devotion and good faith, to put himself “in the first rank to defend us.” Thank you! When we are no longer enough to defend ourselves, we will accept some auxiliaries, but of our own choice.

M. Darimon calls himself the *friend* of Proudhon; we will publish some letters that show how the living Proudhon understood that somewhat posthumous friendship.

He maintains that we *plead extenuating circumstances*, proof that we lean toward his position. It is an error: we intended to give a sample of our work, not to make a plea.

He speaks of *benevolent opinion*. No euphemisms: the Darimon-Bauer article accused us of dishonesty. Others have said: impertinence, nonsense, profanation, impiety, sacrilege. The givers of opinions belonging to politics are all simply people who fear the thrashings of the posthumous publications, and they will have them. They have attempted to stifle under the pact of silence the work of the living Proudhon; it is by force of hosannas, of acclamations, that they want to stop the work of Proudhon now that he is dead.

Mr. Darimon threatens us with indiscrete questions:

“Already, it is said...” he writes. We accept neither the *sayers* nor the *said*: it is necessary to name them, and not longer shelter attacks or insinuations under pseudonyms. Already the article of November 10 insinuated that we only have our mission from Madame Proudhon. Under the signature of Mr. Bauer, that could pass for a slip of the tongue; written by Darimon, it was an insinuation. What! If Proudhon had named his posthumous editors, wouldn't Darimon have been at their head?

We received *unanimous* and *stern* warnings.—Unanimous! This is the story of all Paris reviewers. None of those who bought the book on Art have complained, and the claims regarding the new book have only come from those who received their copies *gratis*. Put 25 or 30 journalists in Paris, that is the whole unanimity.

Finally, regarding the threat that we will be brought, willingly or unwillingly, to repentance, our profession of faith is without reservation. The day when the advice of Barbey d'Aurevilly, Darimon and consorts will be taken on the

publication the works of Proudhon, is the day that Duchêne and Langlois will retire; and if they have not been able to prevent the profanation, they will at least remain neither accomplices nor spectators.

It is not necessary that Mr. Langlois and Mr. Duchêne seem isolated on that question any longer. Here is the opinion of Mr. Bergman:

If, par impossible, Proudhon has been able to believe that all his papers were worthy of being published *in full* and *as-is*, they would not have been addressed to us; he would have said to his wife: When I am dead, bear these papers to the printing house; let them be printed without omission, without changing an iota.

Calvin said somewhere: Man is idolatrous by nature, a phrase truer and more profound than we think. We, the six, are not foolish idolaters of Proudhon to the point of prostrating ourselves before the leaves that he has blackened with his ink. If we pushed our admiration to that point, we would end by falling into cretinism. The shade of Proudhon would grow angry, and cry out to us: Back, blunderers! Have you, by chance, confused me with the Dalai Lama, whose idiotic sectarians even worship his excrement? Do you want someone to apply to you these words of the prophet: *Et stercora adorabunt?* Print what deserves to be printed from my works, and as it deserves to be printed, cut away what is not new, nor true, nor finished, nor aptly written, and respect my memory, taking care of reputation, as I would do it myself.

Mr. Delhasse, who has already maintained that thesis in the same sense as us, when it was raised from the beginning, has not changed his mind.

Mr. Chaudey and Mr. Rolland are in Paris; they have signed with us the book on Art, where the organization is much more considerable than in *The Theory of Property*. Mr. Chaudey especially, on the same question of *servile publication*, has shown that one could not be more decided. Have they made their *peccavi* since? Let them say so and we will know on whom to count. Receive, Mr. editor, our attentive greetings.

J.-A. LANGLOIS. G. DUCHÊNE.

In this long letter, that wishes to be mean, but is only ridiculous, only two points deserve to be addressed.

The first is the accusation of falsification, motivated by the suppression of these six words: "under the signature of Mr. Bauer." I was unaware that these six words contained the negation of the word *friend*; otherwise, I would have let them remain. It is quite obvious, in fact, that I was, just eight days ago, the friend of Mr. Langlois and Mr. Duchêne, and that today I am no longer. But I have not displayed so much malice there; if I deleted these sacramental words, it

is because they constitute an inaccuracy: it had been declared to these gentlemen, in the offices of the *Presse*, that, while written by Mr. Bauer, the article of which they complained had been elicited by me, and that I assumed all responsibility for it; as soon as I put myself in front of the person of our collaborator, Mr. Bauer no longer had anything to do with our debate, and, to remove any pretext for suspicion, I made him disappear.

I come to the second point, which is the more important. Mr. Langlois and Mr. Duchêne do not want me to call myself Proudhon's friend. I thank these gentlemen for finally furnishing me with the occasion that I have long watched for to clear up a question close to my heart. I will not attempt to deny the disagreements that existed between Proudhon and myself since the elections of 1863; they have erupted in public.

Proudhon included me in the condemnation pronounced by him against what he called the *sworn democracy*. But it is important to know the situation that these differences had created between us. Proudhon, in a circumstance where he had put in the balance some convictions and an old friendship, showed himself a man of heart. You will see what treasures of sensitivity that were in that mind, so firm and inflexible in appearance.

In the month of March 1863, he was troubled by some attacks of which, at the approach of the electoral period, I was the object. He said to me, by way of Mr. Langlois, whose letter I have in front of me:

Darimon and I separated in 1857 on the electoral question, and it is still probable that we will still be separated on the same question in 1863. But he is nonetheless a man who has principles and an upright conscience.

A few days later, seeing the attacked redoubled, Proudhon proposed to me a plan of conduct that, leaving me free to act as I intended, put me outside the polemic that he intended to engage against the partisans of the vote. It was obvious that he sought the means of not harming me. "I would rather," he wrote to me, "know that you were dead than not reelected." The following letter, at the same time that it shows his perplexities, indicates clearly what his feelings were in my regard:

Paris, April 18, 1863.

My dear Darimon,

I send you, attached, my letter of March 13, that I asked you for in order to make a copy, which I have not had time to do, it being too long. In rereading it, I notice that I am much more concerned with your interests than my own thesis, and I have let escape certain expressions that I could not use today. I do not regret them, however, in that they reflect my friendship for you; but I must in my turn, make some reservations there, in your interest.

My anti-electoral brochure has gone to press. I presume it will appear on Tuesday or Wednesday.

From the point of view of doctrine, I have a theory of universal suffrage, a commentary on the Constitution of 1852, and finally a demonstration of that proposition that universal suffrage is the corollary of the federative principle.

In what concerns the coming elections, it is a distinction of practical politics in which, after having justified my conduct in 52, 57 and 63, I show that, according to the principles, and while all the forms, conditions and guarantees of universal suffrage are violated by the present régime, the duty of the citizens is to abstain until the government has satisfied their demands, and recognized, by a certain number of amendments, the sovereignty of the nation. I will see at the same time what abstention is worth, as an electoral demonstration, what it perhaps calls forth, what, in the present circumstances, it will produce.

There are certainly a few attacks here and there against the old democracy, against the newspapers, the authors of the electoral Manual, etc., but nothing personal relating to any candidate.

You see by that, my dear Darimon, that I can not say to you today as I did in my letter of March 1, written before the composition of my work, when I only possessed my subject *en bloc* and had not calculated its practical significance; I can no longer, I say, say to you, for example, that the difference in our behavior does not imply any divergence of system, that we will organize our maneuvers, etc.

My practical conduct results directly from the theory that I have developed; it tolerates no exception on my part. I truly regard, after a month of consideration, the vote as compromising, unfortunate, contrary to our true interests, and leading to the sacrifice of principles. In addition, you will shortly have my work, and you can judge the obligations in conduct that it imposes on me. Thus, we can not coordinate our maneuvers: that would dishonor all of them; all that we can in this delicate circumstance, since you maintain your candidacy, is to stay true to the friendship, not to speak of other, except in cases where it would be a question of our personal worthiness, to avoid anything that could put us in conflict. This will be easy for you, it seems to me, because I have not raised the issue about persons, and as for the differences in our conduct, you will always have the recourse to say, without needing to discuss ideas, that your individual position seems to you, to command you to reappear before the voters.

This is one of the sorrows of life that individual considerations constantly come to separate the most united of

men. I would give I do not know what, right now, to free you, from all points of view, from this cursed reelection. Since your colleagues all run, and you think you should follow them, let me at least be permitted to hope that when this grand ceremony is complete, you will do justice to my views, and I will not have any other wrong in your eyes that to have, in this as in so many things, dared to confront the prejudice of the multitude.

Greetings and friendship to Mme. Darimon, as well as to Gabriel.

I shake your hand.

P.-J. PROUDHON.

These feelings, which do so much honor to the great writer, have not been contradicted once during the election period. A few days before the vote, the *Courrier du Dimanche* felt authorized to state that Proudhon considered me from now on as an enemy. I remarked to Proudhon everything that this expression contains that is excessive and personal. Proudhon wrote:

Passy, May 8, 1863.

Shed that word enemy, which escapes in the heat of the electoral fray and that, in my opinion, and if need be despite you, I withdraw: the fact nonetheless remains that we are in the position of political adversaries. The protest that has just been sent to the newspapers shows it, alas! more than would all declarations of war, and despite all the reservations we could make...

Now could you be stirred to this point by the words of a journalist, an adversary, a competitor? My opinion is that you should drop this subject... All you can do here is to make Mr. Jauret and M. Girardin, or any other say: "If the *Presse* is well informed, the political opposition that now exists all too truly between Mr. Proudhon and Mr. Darimon, with concerns the issue of voting, and especially the list of only nine, does not involve any private and personal enmity, no hate, no low regard, and you do not think that it will ever go further..."

My best to you,

P.-J. PROUDHON.

I limit myself to these citations, which I could multiply. Do I mean, after that, that our relations had remained the same? No; whatever efforts good-hearted men make, it is impossible that some strains, however restrained they may be, will not leave their traces. But I have the right to say that, until his last day, while regretting that I followed a different political line than his own, Proudhon preserved his esteem and friendship for me.

So I have not committed an act of usurpation by presenting myself as a friend of Proudhon. The sensitivities of Mr. Duchêne and Mr. Langlois prove that

they never understood the feelings of their master. They want to make a hard, dry sectarian of a good man, who was full of tolerance. Do they find that he had too many friends? — Alfred Darimon.

To the preceding observations, we add the following letter that closes the debate. — E. Bauer.

Paris, November, 19 1865.

Mr. Editor,

The recent publication of *The Theory of Property* of Proudhon has given place, and the *Presse*, and in several other papers, to various protests against the editors. It has been remarked, on this occasion, that our two signatures are lacking in the preface and they have asked us for explanations.

It is difficult for us to give them. The absence of our signatures appears by itself to have a sufficient meaning. It seemed to us that by removing our names, we would rid ourselves of responsibility enough to no longer be taken to task, and many sorts of decorum prescribed for a silent dissent. We hoped thus to facilitate the reestablishment of harmony.

We feel today that we can no longer keep silent, and what causes us to explain ourselves, what has made it a necessity for us, is the following passage from the letter published in the *Presse*, November 18, by Mr. Langlois and Mr. Duchêne:

Two persons, you say, have abstained from signing with us and associating with an act of literary dishonesty. Allow me to observe to you that these two persons are better positioned than us in journalism to explain the motives of their abstention; perhaps they would give others than those you lend them.

All misunderstanding must end here.

If someone has lent us, as a motive for abstention, an accusation of literary dishonesty against Mr. Langlois and Mr. Duchêne, they are completely mistaken, and we are anxious that they know it. It would go against all our feelings to interpret our disagreement in that sense. But if they themselves wanted to give to understand that we have had other motives to remove our signatures than those that have been signified by us so clearly and on repeated occasions, we would be obliged to tell them that they fall into an error that is no less strange.

The disagreement between them and us, regarding the publication of *The Theory of Property*, has always been limited to this:

1) We have made an objection to their theory of organization, as being of a nature to make the public believe that we took more liberty with the texts of Proudhon than we had the right to take.

2) We have indicated to them, as absolutely lacking in literary propriety, the pretention of making Proudhon speak, through the use of the form *I*, in a historical introduction of sixty-two pages, that it was easy, in our opinion, to make just as complete, just as clear, and just as instructive, by speaking as simple editors and by distinguishing with care the interpolations of the texts cited, as by giving the appearance of acting the part of Proudhon. We have maintained that all their reasons to justify the use of that form, were so many reasons that imposed, on the contrary, the use of the third person. We have objected that what happened could not have been more shocking, if the result had been to attribute to Proudhon's pen the citation of a newspaper article several months after his death.

Our correspondence with these gentlemen will bear witness to all that. They can, if they wish, produce it before the public.

But the letter from these gentlemen to the *Presse* proves, as we had sensed, that, beneath the theory of organization, there was the germ of a more general disagreement. We have to note today that this disagreement bears, in fact, on all the posthumous publications.

But here again, it is good to rule out any uncertainty.

We desire, as much as these gentlemen, the publication of all the unpublished works of Proudhon.

We want, like them, for the public to have all the thought of Proudhon.

We attach as high a value as them to the slightest notes of Proudhon.

We believe ourselves to be friends as intelligent as they of the talent and ideas of Proudhon.

We do not recall any more than them before the responsibility for any of the works of Proudhon. It is for us a true regret of not being able to associate our names with the publication of *The Theory of Property*.

But we do not accept the interpolations without a distinctive sign that indicates them to the public in their text. In order for it to be known that these gentlemen have only put 90 lines of their own composition in an introduction of 62 pages, they must say so after the fact. It seems preferable to

us that the reader can discern these 90 lines and immediately and with a simple glance.

We do not accept that they complete the thought of Proudhon with some phrases retained from his conversation, other than in notes or appendices.

We do not accept that they every make Proudhon speak with the pronoun *I*, when the writing is not by him, and that even when it would be writers considering themselves as his sons. We know well enough that sons do not always replace their fathers well.

We do not accept that it was necessary, for the clarity of the series to have recourse to transitions, to sutures, to splices, etc. All of that becomes useless and puerile, as soon as one renounces the use of the *I*.

We do not accept that the posthumous works of Proudhon could only be published in an *intelligible manner* by the process of these gentlemen.

We do not accept that the effect of their intervention should be to transform into a regular work what would be, without them, would only be a hodgepodge.

We believe that a hodgepodge from Proudhon can be of interest by itself, and that it can await the critics.

We believe that the series of his ideas can manifest itself very sufficiently by a very simple ordering of these textual notes, when he has only left notes, and by his own text, when he has left a finished text.

All these divergences between these gentlemen and us, in the manner of understanding our common mandate, do not lack, as you can see, some gravity. They are complicated by a disagreement that is just as great on the very nature of that mandate, and we must, in order to finish, also explain ourselves on that point.

Six of Proudhon's friends have been specifically designated by him to the confidence of his widow for the reprinting of his works.

When it was a question of manuscripts, this designation has naturally appeared applicable to the posthumous publications as well as to the reprints.

That mandate was not at all legal: it did not result from a testament, but from a note dictated by Proudhon to his older daughter, only having the character of a recommendation.

We have been, by this title, invested with the confidence of Mme. Proudhon. We are nothing except through that confidence, and we are obliged to justify it. It obviously depends on Mme. Proudhon to continue or withdraw it, as she wishes.

In the disagreement that divides us, it is up to Mme. Proudhon, and to her alone, that it belongs to make her will

prevail. Mr. Langlois and Mr. Duchêne would only, like us, submit to it. We do not know how they could have written that phrase: Whether we remain four or six, it must be, and it will be.

In that state of the question, Mr. Delhasse and Mr. Bergmann, who have still known things from afar, would have to say their word as well as us; all the friends of Proudhon would have to have their say; public opinion will also have its own; and it will be up to Mme. Proudhon, thus enlightened, to make known to the house of Lacroix, charged with the publication, how she intends to settle the debate.

Please accept, Mr. Editor, the expression of our very distinguished consideration.

“GUSTAVE CHAUDEY, ABRAAM ROLLAND.”

La Presse. 16/11/1865.

The publication of the last work of Proudhon, *Theory of Property*, just brought forth an interesting question. We know that the work remained unfinished. Two friends of Proudhon thought they could fill the gaps in the manuscript. They have added, among other things, a long introduction, including 62 pages of the 246 that make up the work, in which they make Proudhon speak in the first person, absolutely as if these 62 pages had been written by him. Let us hasten to say that, in the preface, these two gentlemen have taken care to warn the reader and indicate their reasons for acting in this way.

These motives have not appeared sufficient to two persons to whom Mme. Proudhon has entrusted the publication of the posthumous works of her husband, for their names do not appear at the end of the preface of *The Theory of Property*. They have found, we are assured, that Proudhon, and the public, have been dealt with in too cavalier a manner and, out of respect for the memory of the master, they believed they should abstain.

The question raised by this incident, and which is debated by several literary journals, is this: Do the individuals who preside over the publication of the unpublished works of an author have the right to address the shortcomings in the manuscript and make, subject to the notes that he has left, a work of organization that substitutes for his own style that of the editors. Is the status as disciples of a thinker a sufficient title to legitimate such reworking of an unfinished work?

We believe that to ask these questions is to resolve them. The respect owed to a dead author, as well as literary integrity, demand that we publish fully and without changing anything, the manuscripts that they have left. Better an unfinished sketch, in which we see the stamp of the master, than a painting finished by some more or less skilled disciples. At all times, we have risen up,

and with good reason, against these editor-arrangers, who consider a manuscript as a canvas on which they can embroider at their ease.

The editors of Proudhon are people of heart and intelligence. So we believe that it is sufficient that some warning inform them of public opinion in order for them to put an end to a work that must necessarily harm the intellectual heritage of the famous publicist.—E. Bauer.