

A NEW PROUDHON LIBRARY



1848:

REVOLUTIONARY
IDEAS.

SELECTED WRITINGS ON
THE REVOLUTION OF FEBRUARY

BY

PIERRE-JOSEPH PROUDHON.

EXPANDED FROM THE EDITION OF 1849.



WORKING TRANSLATIONS BY
SHAWN P. WILBUR

CORVUS EDITIONS, 2024

TRANSLATOR'S NOTE

These *draft translations* are part of an ongoing effort to establish an edition of Proudhon's works in English. They are very much a *first step*, as there are lots of decisions about how best to render the texts which can only be answered in the course of the translation process. It seems important to share the work as it is completed, even in rough form, but the drafts are not necessarily suitable for scholarly work, particularly without consultation of the original French sources, and are not for publication elsewhere in their present state.

The present volume is an expansion of the 1849 collection, *Idées révolutionnaires*, assembled by Alfred Darimon from Proudhon's contributions to *Le Représentant du Peuple* and *Le Peuple* in 1848. It includes additional articles published in the volumes of *Mélanges* after Proudhon's death, as well as material that could not be included in those volumes due to ongoing censorship. Darimon's account of the various newspapers associated with Proudhon during the Second Republic, as well as one unsigned editorial piece demonstrating the positive use of the notion of *anarchy*, are included in an appendix.

In the coming months, this material, together with the draft translation of *The Confessions of a Revolutionary*, will be supplemented by the letters from 1848 included in the *Correspondance* in 1875, the relevant sections of Darimon's *A Travers une Révolution*, and some additional material from the press of the time. The goal is to assemble in one thick volume the materials for understanding Proudhon's experience of the 1848 revolution and its aftermath — minus the material on mutual credit, which seems destined to occupy its own relatively substantial volume.

— SHAWN P. WILBUR, translator

Who will tell me that the right to work and to live is not
the whole of the Revolution?

Who will tell me that the principle of Malthus is not the
whole of the counter-revolution?

*The Malthusians.*¹

PREFACE TO THE 1849 EDITION.

By Alfred Darimon.

This is the February Revolution judged in its various phases by the man who, by the admission of his adversaries themselves, is its most complete personification.

As such, this book is recommended to the attention of anyone who has faith in this Revolution and wants to understand it in its idea, in its scope and in its goal.

Strictly speaking, it is not a work in the true sense of the word; because if it is a whole, it is not an ensemble. The various fragments that compose it have no link between them other than the common thought that dictated them and the criterion of truth that guided the author in his assessments. The author wrote them most often in the current of his pen, always under the influence of the first impressions caused by events, and sometimes as himself playing an important role on the revolutionary stage.

This state of mind, which is usually a danger, in the sense that it leaves room for passions, was not one for him. Subject in his intelligence as in his political conduct to a sure and rational method, he only put warmth and feeling in his style; the most severe logician and the most scrupulous impartiality would find no reason to accuse him of having failed to follow the rules of dialectic to establish a prejudice or of having broken the series of events to make a party triumph.

We therefore boldly present this book as being able to alone provide the key to this revolutionary charade that has been playing out in France for a year and which will soon be resolved. It is more than the story; it is the commentary.

We, a servant of the idea that gives life to these pages, have tried to sew a shred to these shreds, and to add some considerations that were necessary, it seemed to us, to guide the reader. The author does not begin his book until the day after April 16. What should we think of the events that precede this date, which has become famous and which will become much more so? This, we said, is what we will undoubtedly ask ourselves, and what it is impossible not to say a few words about.

¹ In the published edition, the two lines from the text were apparently combined during typesetting, so that the epigraph read: *Qui viendra me dire que le droit de travailler et de vivre n'est pas contre la Révolution?* — TRANSLATOR.

But we feared breaking the logical thread that unites these pages by placing our particular thoughts alongside them. The author had elsewhere,² much better than we could do ourselves, expressed his opinion on these extraordinary events. We had nothing better to do than to refer to him. What you will read here is therefore not ours, but from him. We have allowed ourselves to condense into a few pages what he had said at greater length. This is what our work was limited to.

*
**

Who made the February Revolution? Who is the real author?

Certainly, this is not an unimportant question, for on its solution depend the morality, the justice and the legitimacy of the insurrection which, by throwing down the throne of Louis-Philippe, gave us the Republic.

The interest of monarchical passions alone can insinuate that this Revolution is only due to the chance of a few indifferent causes. Everyone has said it for a long time: the author of the February Revolution was the People.

In fact, it was not the Opposition which, on February 22, through the mouth of M. Odilon Barrot, withdrew in the face of the ministers' veto.

It was not the National Guard which, despite its sincere love of liberty and its disgust for what we called the system; despite the support it gave to the revolt with its arms, it feared a catastrophe as much as it wanted the fall of the ministry.

It was not the radical press, since on the morning of the 23rd the most advanced sheet of the Republican Party, setting out the conditions under which it thought it could guarantee the reestablishment of order, was far from expecting the astonishing success of the the following day.

Finally, it was not the socialist utopia, which, in all its publications, preached patience to workers, distrusting a Republic in which it could only see the indefinite postponement of its reveries.

It was neither a party nor a sect that made the Revolution; it was the People, the People outside of any party and any sect. It was they whose consciences suddenly exploded and who, in less time than it took in 1830 to botch the Charter, established the Republic. But how did the People rise up? For whom, why did they take up arms? What was their goal in this serious event; — their idea ; we will say more, their right?

There is a profound lesson in the answer to these questions. It is here that we must study the logic of the People, superior to the logic of the philosophers, and which alone can guide us in the obscurities of the future.

If in those glorious days the People had behaved as any man who loved legality would not have failed to do, there would have been no revolution. Because, let us not be afraid to admit it, everything that was done by the People was done in violation of legality.

² See *Solution of the Social Problem*, 1st installment.

Indeed, on February 20, by the Opposition manifesto that called the national guard into its ranks, the law on gatherings was violated! The law on the national guard, violated. It is not even certain that on this right of assembly, the subject of so many quarrels, the law and jurisprudence were, whatever was said, for the ministry: in this respect, legality would therefore have been violated.

That's not all, the minority of the House, acting by intimidation on the royal prerogative, violated the Charter; the abdication of Louis-Philippe, which ministerial responsibility was to cover, violated the Charter; the law of regency was twice violated, first by the substitution of the Duchess of Orléans for the Duke of Nemours, then by the appeal made to the nation; finally the People, making their will prevail by force, instead of sticking to a legal act, as the Opposition wanted, trampled all laws underfoot.

And yet the People were not perjured! The Revolution, product of a series of illegalities, was not made against right; on the contrary, in its principle, it is marked by the highest legitimacy.

The People, — we say the People, one and indivisible, we do not mean by this the multitude, which is only plurality without unity, — the People reason with a conscience and from a point of view superior to all individual reason. Therefore their conclusions are almost always different from those of the legal experts.

The People are sovereign. As such, they are only obligated to themselves. No one deals with them as an equal; and when they stand up for their dignity, being offended or compromised, it is absurd to ask whether this demonstration of the People is legal or not. A constitution is not a synallagmatic contract between king and people, between legislator and citizens, between principals and agents. It is the system by which the People, as a collective man, eternally organizes its functions, balances its powers,

The People therefore, when they learn that their liberty is in danger and that the time has come for them to resist, understand and can only understand one thing: it is up to them not to protest, but to decide in a sovereign manner. The Opposition was therefore very ignorant of the rights of the People and its logic, when wanting, it said, to show by an example that the People were capable of respecting the power and of protesting against the power, it invited them to come with it to sign a protest against the government. To protest was to abdicate. When the People stand up, they understand that it is they who judge and execute.

The People allowed the Opposition to confine itself within the narrow limits of legality. Their protest was an act of sovereignty. With a simple riot, they made a Revolution.

Now, if it is true that the act of the ministry that prohibited the banquet of the 12th arrondissement, legal in itself, was only an opportunity for the People; if it is then true that the entirely parliamentary protest of the deputies of the left was only a cry of alarm, what is the basis of the insurrection that followed? Was there sufficient right to overthrow the ministry, to drive out a dynasty, to change the form of government, to revolutionize society from top to bottom? Because it is there, let us be careful, that the morality of the event and the entire revolutionary idea must be found.

It must be said loudly, the movement was directed neither against the ministry, nor against the prince, nor even against the system. All this, in certain respects, was unworthy of the attention of the People. What the People wanted to strike and destroy was the Constitution. This results from the illegalities committed and the progress of ideas and facts over the past seventeen years,

The Revolution of 1830, a legal revolution if ever there was one, was essentially the work of the bourgeoisie; the working class had only been its instrument. As for the People themselves, taken in their entirety, their aim in 1830 was undoubtedly to push the experiment of constitutional government, the work of 1789, to the end. Now, seventeen years were enough to bring the experiment to an end and to demonstrate to the People all the contradictions that lay at the bottom of the restored Charter.

Everything, in fact, was suspicious and equivocal in this Charter of 1830, where everything was for the prince, and nothing for the People. On the most essential things, the Charter was silent, and this silence was always interpreted in favor of the royal prerogative, against the interest of the masses.

The Charter implied that the government, like the law itself, could only be the expression of the general will. The king was appointed by the nation, not to modify this will, but to ensure its sincere execution. Legislative power distributed between the king, the Chamber of Peers and the Chamber of Deputies seemed a fortunate combination capable of maintaining balance. But, rightly or wrongly, it happened that the law, that the government was always more the work of the king than of the three powers and the ministers, so that the nation could call itself sovereign, but only on condition of consenting to the wishes of the king.

This constitutional lie, denounced by all the men who had held power or who were close to it, determined the Revolution. The difficulty would have been resolved, let it be noted, even though the Revolution would have stopped at the demonstrations of the 22nd and 23rd, without going as far as the abdication of the king, or the expulsion of the dynasty. The Charter elucidated by the abolition of personal government, the power changed form.

The revolutionary question has been posed this way since 1830: in principle and from a constitutional point of view, should the will of the prince prevail over the will of the People? On February 22, the People answered definitively: No; from now on it will be our will that will prevail.

While bowing to the sovereignty of the People, the government had become the prerogative, the property of the middle class. But the People, they said: I want things to change. From now on the workers, like the bourgeoisie, will take part in the government. This was the meaning of the electoral reform supported in recent times by everyone.

Now, personal government abolished, the electoral and parliamentary reform obtained, the king remaining in the Tuileries, royalty was already nothing more than an empty title, and the Revolution was politically consummated. What followed was only a rapid and uncompromising deduction from these two premises: the abolition of personal government and electoral reform.

Parasitism proscribed in its highest incarnation, the reigning royalty, as despotism had been in its most complete expression, the royalty that governs; as venality, privilege and stock trading had

been in their deepest source, the royalty which corrupts; the social question was posed in fact and in right.

The People, whatever those who have an interest in maintaining the contrary say, were not asking that the government take over commerce, agriculture and industry, in order to add them to its attributions and make the nation French a nation of employees, but that it deal with matters of commerce, agriculture and industry, in such a way as to favor, according to the rules of science, which are those of justice, the development of public wealth, and to provide the material and moral improvement of the poor classes. And the government responded that these things were not within its competence, that it would not take care of them. But I, cried the People, I want the government to take care of it.

Thus, the reform of personal government contained the parliamentary reform; the parliamentary reform contained electoral reform; the electoral reform implied the reform of the Constitution; the reform of the Constitution led to the abolition of royalty, and the abolition of royalty was synonymous with social revolution. The only ones who understood the situation were the government on the one hand, and the People on the other. By the sole fact of the protest of the left, which was to take place on February 22, the entire Revolution was accomplished; the People only highlighted the event that was on everyone's mind.

The problem of social reconstitution having been posed, it was a matter of resolving it. This solution could only be learned from the People. We saw how, generalizing their ideas about government, the People suddenly concluded a revolution and converted the monarchy into a Republic. The mistake of those who took the lead in this Revolution was to not live up to the ideas of the People.

The February Revolution was not only a negation of the monarchical principle, it was a negation of the representative principle, of the sovereignty of majorities.

The provisional government, composed largely of jurists, declared that France would be constituted as a Republic; but it made the ratification of the citizens a condition. "What could be fairer in fact," said the formalists of the Hôtel-de-Ville, "than to reserve the adhesion of the departments? Could the good pleasure of a few hundred insurgents annul the rights of 36 million men, and could the proclamation of the Republic made in Paris bind the monarchical hearts of the departments? Was there no contradiction in this to the republican principle? Would this not be a blatant usurpation?"

"But," said the People for their part, "if it was we who spoke in Paris, we cannot contradict ourselves in Bordeaux. The People are one and indivisible; it is not majority and minority; they are not a multitude; they do not split. Their will is not counted or weighed like shareholder votes: it is unanimous. Wherever there is division, it is no longer the People: representative theories are a negation of their sovereignty. The People always agree with themselves; everything is connected, everything is linked in their decisions; all their judgments are identical. To suppose that after the event of February 24, prepared, predicted for so long, accomplished by the competition or antagonism of all ideas, the proclamation of the Republic could be the subject of controversy, was to nullify all that which, during these three days, the People had done to win M. Guizot's case."

Indeed, if, after the declaration of the People of Paris, the Republic were to be called into question before the electoral assemblies, this would suggest that the will of the People is not unanimous and that this will is none other than the will of the majority. Now, if it is the majority that makes the law, it must also be said that it is the majority of majorities, and so on until we return to personal government; that thus the government belongs to the middle class elected by the majority of primary assemblies; that the middle class in its turn owes respect to its own majority, to the majority of its voters; that the majority of voters must obey the majority of deputies, the majority of deputies submit to the ministry, which is required to do the will of the king, who, by virtue of the majority, reigns and governs.

With representative theory, we will never escape this circle, and it is precisely outside this circle that the People had just placed themselves. The law of the majority, they said, is nothing, except as a provisional transaction between antagonistic opinions, while awaiting the solution of the People.

Thus three general questions were resolved by the Revolution of February 24 in a sense diametrically opposed to all received ideas:

1. *Question of legal resistance.* — The People had said it once and for all: To protest, for them, is synonymous with ordering; to blame is synonymous with opposing; to resist, synonymous with overthrowing the object of one's resistance.

2. *Question of reform.* — The Opposition, while demanding the same things and in the same terms as the insurrection, but not considering them separately and in detail, expressly reserved in the protest the monarchy, the Charter, the constitutional institutions, at the same time as it rejected social reform. The People, on the contrary, embracing all the reforms requested in a single bundle, had understood that from this bundle resulted a new idea; it had reduced everything to dust, the royalty and the Constitution.

3. *Question of representative majority.* — All the publicists are agreed that it is the majority, not of the People, but of their representatives, that makes the law. The People, on the contrary, had seen that the authority of majorities is not absolute; that it is subject to caution, and that, in certain cases, it may happen that the entire People is condemned by the majority of the People; that there was therefore reason to revise this principle in the new Constitution.

Without doubt, if every citizen took this logic as a rule, we would necessarily end up in civil war; but this superior individuality which we call THE PEOPLE always concludes in peace and unity. The logic of the People is the law of history, the source of law and progress, the principle of all morality, the source of all justice. — **ASK THE PEOPLE!** That is the secret of the future! **ASK THE PEOPLE!** It is the whole science of society.

ASK THE PEOPLE! The government that was installed on February 24 at the Hôtel-de-Ville did not know how to do this, and for lack of knowing it, it lost the Revolution.

What did we see the day after the popular triumph? The Republic transformed into a doctrinaire democracy; empiricism and utopia taking the place of ideas and making the People a subject for experimentation; little men, little ideas, little speeches; mediocrity, prejudice, doubt, and soon the anger of the multitude. The will of the People, which should have empowered their

leaders, had diminished them. It was expected of these improvised magistrates, carried on the wings of the Revolution, that they would bring security, but they sowed terror; — that they would shed light, but they created chaos; — that they would know how to clarify the questions, say what the People wanted and what they did not want, but they affirmed nothing, let everything be believed and made everyone fear. It was necessary both to reassure property and to give guarantees to the proletariat by reconciling their antagonism; they pitted them against each other, and they started the social war. We counted on actions, but they produced inertia. They were asked for work, they trained managers; credit, they decreed assignats; for outlets, they referred to the attitude of the Republic on the matter. Once they told us that the *organization of labor* could not *be done in a day*; another time, that the question was complex; fifteen days later, they sent us back to the placement office. The People had withdrawn from these men; however, they *loved* them and deigned to tell them so. But nothing, nothing, nothing detected in them the intelligence of this People, whose destinies they carried. Everywhere in their actions, instead of these universal, sublime thoughts that the People give birth to, we found only *warm addresses, enthusiastic speeches*, utopianism, routine, contradiction, discord.

Let us examine some of the acts of this government which had in its hands the greatest Revolution that had ever taken place on earth, and which miserably delivered it up to its enemies through its incapacity.

The first thing the government did was exclude the red flag. The Revolution, it cannot be denied, was made by the red flag; the provisional government decided to keep the tricolor flag. By acting in this way, it only did nothing less than eliminate the social question: every time that the People, overcome by suffering, want to express, outside of this juridical legality that assassinates them, their wishes and their complaints, they march under a red banner. Let us keep, if we wish, the tricolor flag, symbol of our nationality; but let us remember that the red flag is the sign of a revolution that will be the last. — The red flag! It is the federal standard of the human race.

After the banning of the red flag, came the decree of accusation of the ministers. To *inform*, very well; but but to *accuse* was absurd, especially after the abolition of the death penalty for political crimes. Moreover, it was insulting to the People. How! Had the provisional government not understood that the February Revolution was the end of a constitution, and not the overthrow of a ministry? On the 22nd, M. Guizot could be indicted; but only by the deputies of the left: his crime then was to play the existence of the monarchy and to compromise by a conflict the institutions of July. On the 23rd again, M. Guizot, although resigned, was responsible for the blood shed; the triumphant opposition could call him to account for his untimely resistance. The victory of the 24th had absolved M. Guizot; it had changed the terrain of legality for him as for everyone, it even honored him in a sense; because it proved that he had judged the People better than the Opposition, M. Guizot could only be accused by virtue of the Charter: the Charter destroyed, M. Guizot was only liable to his conscience and to history: he had the right to decline the jurisdiction of the republican tribunals.

Should we talk about all these incomprehensible declines in which the unintelligence of the men of the Revolution bursts forth at every moment?

And first of all, what is the point of a decree to release civil servants from their oath? What! It was not enough, for the conscience of the civil servants, a revolution that abolished the constitutional monarchy, which not only ousted the dynasty, but changed the principle! The civil servants needed the absolution of a M. Crémieux. This was not knowing the first word of the political catechism. Louis-Philippe and his race still lived, it is true; but royalty was dead. Now, royalty dead, long live the Republic! This suffered no more difficulty than passing from Louis XVII to Charles X.

And the decree that guaranteed the organization of labor? Let us note this, It was not the Republic that guaranteed; it was the provisional government. But what, we ask you, was the *guarantee* of a *provisional* plan? Was it not the same as saying: *The fine promise I made La Châtre!*³ What happened? The definitive government proved the provisional government wrong. It found that it was not its place to organize; one of its first acts was to decree the liquidation of the so-called national workshops and to declare the thought of the Revolution meaningless. By dint of wanting the idea to come from higher than the Republic, the government has accommodated the reaction.

A decree that can be considered as being the most contrary to the ideas of the Revolution was the creation of the national workshops. Socialism has always declined responsibility for this, and it has been right. Of all the acts of the Provisional Government, this is the one that can be considered as most resembling treason. What better way to put an end to the social aspirations of the People than to parody them so shamefully.

Moreover, the utopia is not exempt from criticism: its idea of social workshops was hardly more reasonable. There were 30,000 tailors without work in Paris. Luxembourg offered them scissors, needles, sewing rooms, presses for stripping... But labor?... — Half of the printers were unemployed. There was talk of creating an additional three million in equipment for the ninety printing works in the capital... But labor?... — The construction sites were closed. There is talk of establishing others alongside them, in order to compete with them. But labor?... — The bookstores, ancient and modern, classical, political, religious, medical, were full of books that did not sell. The government was talking about issuing fifty new patents... But buyers?... — Trimmings, goldsmithing, haberdashery, all trades were at a low point. There was a cure for unemployment: workers just had to band together. The provisional government offered them licenses, talked about providing them with directors, controllers, inspectors, accountants, managers, clerks! There were some left over. — But capital? But orders? But outlets?

Half of the houses were dilapidated; a quarter of the apartments empty. It was necessary to increase the value of this part of the land property. The provisional government proposed plans for the construction of barracks, hospices and national palaces to house the workers. It returned there again, under the presidency of Louis-Bonaparte.

³ “Ah, le bon billet qu’a La Châtre!” was a phrase attributed to courtesan Ninon de l’Enclos, on the occasion of taking a new lover, which became, according to Sainte-Beuve, “a proverb upon empty assurances.” — TRANSLATOR’S NOTE.

The land in use was poorly cultivated; agriculture lacked hands and capital. The provisional government was thinking of the dunes, the wastelands, the heaths, the moors, all the uncultivated and sterile lands!

These are the economic ideas France lived on for six months. Onlookers were able to admire; the outraged People have turned all these charlatans into powder.

But we could have forgiven the charlatanism and the ignorance, if alongside this there had not been a deplorable tendency to cherish the prejudices of the multitude. It is this mania that earned us the famous decree on the reduction of working hours and the abolition of tasks and bargaining.

The worker earned little and labored much. It was insinuated to him that, for his happiness, he had to labor less and earn more. In the political economy of routine, this was impeccable reasoning; but the People have a completely different logic; they find that increase in labor, decrease in wages and increase in wealth are three identical terms of one and the same series. This seems contradictory, and yet it is.

Informed that masters were having difficulty obeying its orders, the provisional government issued new decrees, sent circulars, delivered harangues stating in substance: "That production could have to suffer from the reduction of working hours; but that the will of the government was to be obeyed, and that it would be obeyed, whatever happened! That the commissioners had to take their hand, that equality and fraternity were at stake!"

This was how the provisional government understood the social problem. It took industrial entrepreneurs for feudal lords, workers for serfs, labor for drudgery; it imagined, after so much study on the subject, that the modern proletariat resulted from the oppression of a caste; it ignored or pretended to ignore that what established working hours, determined wages, divided functions, developed competition, constituted capital as a monopoly, enslaved the body and soul of the worker, is a system of fatal causes, independent of the will of the masters as well as that of the companions.

But what it understood even less was that after having thus got its hands on labor, it was obliged to intervene in all the accidents of production, to decree the rate of wages, then to force the sale, then request payment, then set the value,

Alongside this economic nonsense, philanthropic nonsense was produced. Such was the decree that had made the Tuileries the Invalides of the People! We wonder how it was possible to reconcile this civil list of misery with equality and fraternity!

Besides, the provisional government cared little for equality and fraternity. What it needed was to have an army of Praetorians devoted to it. This is why it excited the greedy passions of the worker, why it intimidated the bourgeoisie by stirring up the masses against it.

Let us remember this incredible circular from the Ministry of Public Education to the rectors, which said that for every citizen primary education was enough, but that the Republic needed *an elite* of men, and that this elite had to be chosen from all the People. An elite of men! But until then there had been a more or less real elite among the People that we called the *bourgeoisie*, and if the Revolution had been made, it was so that everyone was part of the elite. However, the circular from the Minister of Public Education gave the lie to the Revolution. It is true that the question,

like the economic problem, was quite complex. How, without harming natural superiorities, can we make citizens equal? The provisional government made a mess of the difficulties. Abilities, inabilities, mediocre subjects, elite subjects, — what does that matter?

That is not all.

The provisional government decreed that the interest on sums deposited in savings banks would be increased to 5 percent, “given,” it said, “that the interest on treasury bonds was also 5 percent; that the fruits of labor should increase more and more, and that, of all properties, the savings of the poor were the most inviolable and the most sacred.” Certainly, this was a touching testimony to its feelings of equality. No doubt, if the holders of treasury bonds alone were to perfect the interest of the savings banks, but if it was the proletarian, having neither treasury bonds nor savings account, who had to pay both interest, was it not clear that by establishing equality between the creditors of the floating debt, one had made the inequality between the creditors of the State and the debtors of the State greater than before? There was nothing but hypocritical chatter in all this.

We will not continue to examine one after the other all the decrees of this government, which had the future of humanity in its hands, and which, like the ancient Sybil, scattered its pages to all the winds. All are marked by ignorance, duplicity or, what is worse, philanthropy. The author whose opinions we have just summarized expressed his judgment on all these measures with unusual energy, when he said that the entire policy of the February dictators had consisted of shaking their fist at capital while prostrating themselves before the room. of a hundred cents.

“You want,” he told them at the end of March 1848, “you want to exterminate the Jews, the kings of the era, and you worship the golden calf! You say, or allow it to be said, that the State is going to seize the railways, the canals, the shipping industry, the haulage industry, the mines, the salt; that it will establish taxes on the rich, sumptuary tax, progressive tax, tax on servants, horses, cars; that jobs, salaries, income, property will be reduced. You cause the depreciation of all financial, industrial, commercial values; you dry up the source of all income; you freeze the blood in the veins of commerce, of industry, and then you conjure money to circulate! You beg the rich not to hold it back! Believe me, citizen dictators, if this is all your knowledge, hurry to reconcile yourselves with the Jews! Enter this conservative *status quo*, beyond which hope for nothing, and from which you should never have left.”

We cannot do better, to give readers an idea of this revolutionary period, than to put before their eyes the end of chapter 1 of *The Solution of the Social Problem*.

“No,” cried the author, addressing the men of the provisional government, “you don’t understand anything about the revolution. You know neither its principle, nor its logic, nor its justice; you don’t speak its language. What you take for the voice of the People is only the bellowing of the multitude, ignorant like you of the thoughts of the People. Repress these clamors that invade you. Respect for persons, tolerance for opinions; but disdain for the sects that creep at your feet, and which advise you only in order to compromise you better. The sects are the vipers of revolution. The People belong to no sect. Abstain, as much as you can, from requisitions, confiscations, especially from legislation; and be sober from depositions. Keep intact the repository

of the Republic, and let the light make itself on its own. You will have deserved well of the Fatherland.

“You, citizen Dupont, you are the probity in power. Stay at your post; remain there until death; you will be replaced too soon.

“You, Citizen Lamartine, you are poetry united with politics. Stay still, although you are not a diplomat. We love this grand style, and the People will prompt you.

“You, citizen Arago, you are the science in the Government. Keep the portfolio: enough fools will come after you.

“You, citizen Garnier-Pagès, you have sold, you have alienated, you have borrowed, and you gamble with the rest. You will tell the National Assembly that the State no longer owns anything, that its credit no longer has any other mortgage than patriotism, that it’s over. You will prove by your balance sheet that Government is only possible henceforth by a renovation of society, and that such is the alternative for the country: Either fraternity, or death!

“You, citizens Albert and Louis Blanc, you are a hieroglyph awaiting a Champollion. So stay as a hieroglyphic figure, until you are worked out.

“You, Flocon and Ledru-Rollin citizens, we do justice to the spirit that drives you. You are, despite your old style, the corner stone of the revolution. So stick to the intention, but don’t be so terrible in the form. We would take you for the tail of Robespierre.

“You, citizens Crémieux, Marie, Bethmont, Carnot, Marrast, you symbolize, in various forms, nationality, patriotism, the republican ideal. But you don’t come out of the negative; you are known only as democrats; your ideas have been prescribed for 50 years. Stay however: failing realities, we need symbols.

“And you, the ex-dynastics, bourgeois fearful as owls, do not regret this revolution that was long since accomplished in your ideas, which your parliamentary quarrels have perhaps brought about prematurely. A child born prematurely cannot return to its mother’s womb: it is a question of raising the revolution, not of sending it to the pillory. Listen to what I am about to tell you, and regard it as the profession of faith of the proletariat. I will speak to you frankly.

“The revolution of 1848 is the liquidation of the old society, the starting point of a new society.

“This liquidation is incompatible with the restoration of the monarchy.

“It will not happen in a day: it will last twenty-five years, fifty years, perhaps a century.

“We could do it without you, against you: we would rather it were done by you. You are, so to speak, by birthright, by the superiority of your means, by your practical skill, the natural trustees. It is up to you, par excellence, to organize labor. We do not want reform to the detriment of anyone; we want it in everyone’s interest.

“What we are asking for is a certain solidarity, not only abstract, but **OFFICIAL**, of all the producers among themselves, of all the consumers among themselves, and of the producers with the consumers. It is the conversion into public law, not of the reveries of a commission, but of the absolute laws of economic science. You are divided; we want to bring you together and to be part of the coalition with you. We attach to this pact, of which all our efforts, all our intelligence must

tend to determine the clauses, the guarantee of our well-being, the pledge of our moral and intellectual improvement.

“What can you fear?”

“The loss of your properties? Hear this well. There is no doubt that the articles of the new charter will modify your right, and that a portion of that **NAKED PROPERTY**, which is so dear to you, from being individual as it is, will become reciprocal. You can be *expropriated*, but never *dispossessed*, any more than the French people can be dispossessed of France. And that naked property, sole cause, in our opinion, of your embarrassments and our miseries, will not be taken from you without compensation: otherwise it would be confiscation, violence and theft; it would be property, not reform.

“Are you afraid that the Communists will take your children and your wives from you? As if they didn’t have enough of their own!... The community, being in essence nothing defined, is all we want. The best means that philosophy will discover of creating liberty, equality, fraternity, will be for the communists the community. To be afraid of the community is to be afraid of nothing.

“Is it the return of the old Jacobinism united to the old Babouvism that terrifies you?”

“We do not like these doctrinaires of democracy any more than you do, for whom the organization of labor is only a fantasy intended to calm popular effervescence; those Cagliostros of social science making fraternity a shameful superstition. And if our demonstrations seem to defend them, it is because they momentarily represent for us the principle that won in February.

“Conservatives, two politics, two different paths are currently available to you.

“Either you will come to an agreement directly with the proletariat, without concern for the form of government, without prior constitution of the legislative power, any more than of the executive. In matters of politics and religion, the proletariat is like you, skeptical. The state, in our eyes, is the sergeant of the city, the police valet of labor and capital. Organize it as you like, provided that instead of commanding, it is he who obeys.

“In this first case, the transaction will be entirely amicable, and its articles will be the constitution of France, the Charter of 1848.

“Or else you will rally to doctrinaire democracy, to this equivalent of royal power, a new system that seesaws between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, which is not averse to a monarchical restoration, and for which the majority of human beings are fatally condemned to sorrow and to misery.

“In this case, I tell you with sadness, nothing in fact; and as with Louis-Philippe, it will soon have to start again. You will believe yourselves skillful, but you will always have been only blind. It will still be August 10, January 21, June 2, Thermidor 9, Prairial and Vendémiaire days, July 29, February 24. You will again see the scenes at Boissy-d’Anglas: you will have to repeat the massacres of Saint-Roch and Transnonain every day: which will not prevent you from falling miserably in the end under the bullets of the People.

“Citizens, we await you with confidence: sixty centuries of misery have taught us to wait. We can, for three months, live on three pennies of bread a day and per head: it is up to you to see if your capital can last as long as our stomachs.”

*
**

This passage and what precedes it seemed a very natural introduction to us.

We have divided the fragments that make up this volume into three series, which naturally correspond to the first three periods of the Revolution.

The first begins the day after the disastrous day of April 16, and ends with the by-elections in June. This is the most dramatic part of the revolutionary era. The reaction, hitherto timid and hypocritically small, boldly enters the arena with its head held high and measures itself shamelessly with the idea that triumphed in February. The victory remains in the balance: Paris appoints Thiers and Proudhon at the same time!

The second series begins the day after the terrible battle of June and makes us witness to the terror of the state of siege. The idea of February is knocked to the ground for an instant; it struggles in the grip of its adversary, who tries to suffocate it.

The third series opens the day before the presidential election. This time the struggle seems to be no longer between socialism and capitalism, but between the Republic and the monarchy.

The Revolution appears to be in retreat; fundamentally, it advances; it becomes more widespread, it takes more and more possession of the future.

[Alfred Darimon.]

PRELIMINARIES.

March 1848.

THE REVOLUTION OF 1848

1. The revolution of February 24 is legitimate, although it was illegal.
2. The Provisional Government did not understand the revolution.

Paris, March 22, 1848.

A great act has just been accomplished, irresistible, irrevocable.

Let each, according to their inclination, mourn or celebrate, but let all prepare for the unforeseen, because — I swear it to you — the face of the world has just been changed.

Royalty, constitutional monarchy, representative system, working class and bourgeois class, and many other things of which I am by no means in a hurry to speak — from now on, all of that is as distant from us as the *Lex Burgundionum* and the capitularies of Charlemagne. The national assembly that will meet, as revolutionary as it may be, will only be, like the constitution that it must provide, a provisional one. It is not with scraps of the constitution of year VIII, that of the year III or year II, flanked by the *Social Contract* and all the declarations of rights of La Fayette, Condorcet and Robespierre, that we will translate the thought of the People. Our illusion at the moment is to believe in the possibility of a republic in the vulgar sense of the word; and it is a laughable thing to see our powerful orators arranging their armchairs for eternity. The latest revolution contains something else, without which we would have to say that it was achieved by chance, that it is an accident without cause and without roots, in a word, that it is absurd.

Such is also the idea, such is the doubt that, in the secrecy of conscience, torments the nation, those which occupy power, as well as those who have just lost it.

All the men who, yesterday, adhered to one of the political forms that have now disappeared — conservatives, dynastic legitimists, and more than the one even among the radicals, equally defeated — regard with uneasiness this Republic that is reborn, under a new standard, one half-century after its funeral. Since when, they say to themselves, do the dead come back to life? Does history retrogress? Does it turn back on itself? Does it start again? Does society have its periods of palingenesis, and will progress only be a series of restorations?.....

Then passing rapidly from doubt to despair, they add: Look at this revolution made without an idea! This drama, repeated half from '89 and half from '93, learned from novels, repeated in smoky rooms, then played out on the public square by men who do not know that that what they have just destroyed was the result of what they now begin! From whence does it come, this revolution? It has no idea. Where is it going? It doesn't know. Who is it? It hesitates over its own name, so little does it know itself, so false is its appearance, so much this word *Republic* seems a solecism in our language.

On the first day, it is the overthrow of the ministry.

On the second day, it is the fall of the opposition.

On the third day, it is the abdication of Louis-Philippe.

On the fourth day, it is universal suffrage.

On the fifth day, it is the organization of labor.

On the sixth, the seventh day, it will be community and the phalanstery!...

Oh! The Government had predicted it: we were all blind, we are all dupes. The Republic, which nobody wanted, emerged from our quarrels, trailing behind it unknown saturnalia. Do you hear the cries of Icarians, the canticles of Châtel and this horrible, confused noise from all the sects? Have you seen these men with sinister faces, full of wine from the civil list, make their rounds at midnight, with naked rag-pickers, in the royal residence? Have you counted the corpses of these hundred and thirty heroes, asphyxiated by alcohol and smoke, in the orgy of their triumph?... Where will this bloody carnival stop? What will come of this fable, in which we see a whole nation, led by a dozen mystagogues, appear like a troop of actors?...

And behold, they continue, there is the work of this Opposition which has claimed clairvoyance, which denied hostile passions, which flattered itself that it overcame the riot; which, in power for an instant, having forty thousand troops and eighty thousand national guards to enforce its mandate, did not find anything more urgent than to beat a retreat, and to leave the free field to the Republic!

That, reply others, is the fruit of that immutable thought, which, soiling all, corrupting all, reducing all to its selfishness, making any truth a lie, equally deriding God and men, after seventeen years of betrayals, claimed until the last hour to make conditions with the country, and to say to liberty: You will go no further!

That is how the usurpers end; that is how the hypocrites and the impious are taken. The revolution of February can be compared only to a vomiting. The people of Paris, expelling Louis-Philippe, were like a patient who ejects a worm from his mouth!...

And yet the People are poorer than ever: the bourgeois is ruined, the worker dies of hunger, the State races towards bankruptcy. Oh! what will become of us?

Let us leave regrets to the timid, and lamentations to the vanquished. The truth is not in these recriminations. A revolution, precipitated by universal disgust, has just occurred. It is a question, not of exploiting it, but of defining it; it is a question of formulating its dogma, of drawing legitimate consequences from it.

While our provisional statesmen, seized unexpectedly, struggle in the vacuum, look for their way and find only routine or Utopia, flatter the country rather than reassure it, propose their ideas to the People, instead of asking them for their ideas, are led into the rut of the old Jacobinism, obliged, in order to excuse their impotence, which is visible to all, to take refuge in their devotion: let us attempt to understand, or to put it better, to learn about the People.

The People, by making such a sudden revolution, imposed on themselves an immense task: the People are like those workers who produce so much more and so much better, when they are crushed with work. The People will have to suffer, undoubtedly, but they will not fail in their work: the whole danger is that its leaders do not foresee it.

1. The Revolution of February 24 is legitimate, although illegal.

And, first, who made the Revolution? Who was its true author?

Everyone has said: It is the People.

Indeed, it is not the Opposition, who, on February 22, withdrew before the veto of the ministers.

It is not the national guard, which, despite its sincere love of liberty and its disgust with the *System*, despite the support that it has given with its weapons to the revolt, dreaded a catastrophe at least as much as it hoped for the fall of the ministers.

It is not the press, since, on the morning of the 23rd, *la Reforme*, the radical party's most advanced sheet, setting down the conditions that it thought could guarantee the reestablishment of order, was far from expecting the astonishing success of the next day.

It is not socialism, which in all publications preaches patience to the workers, mistrusting a Republic in which it could only see the indefinite postponement of its utopias.

It is neither a party, nor a sect that creates the Revolution. It is the People, the People, I say, outside all parties and all sects; the true People of 89, of 92, and of 1830. It is they whose consciousness has suddenly exploded, and who, in less time than it took to cobble together the charter, formed a Republic.

So let this be our first principle: the PEOPLE. And since the People — which is to say everyone in general and no one in particular, without counsel, without direction, disowned by its speakers and writers, but carried along by an imperious enthusiasm — have done what we see, in the future let all institutions and reforms come from the people, as the victory has come from them.

But, if it is easy to recognize the actions of the People afterwards, it is not the same when it comes to evoking, in some sense, in the heart of the future, the later actions of popular sovereignty, which alone, however, can serve as rules for the government. The problem is more difficult when the resolutions of the People seem subject to laws entirely different from individual prudence.

Let us take the last revolution as an example.

How did the People rise up? Why, and for whom, did it take up arms? What, on this serious occasion, was its goal, its idea, I might even say its right?

It is here that it is necessary to study the logic of the People, superior to the logic of the philosophers, which alone can guide us in the obscurities of the future, and to reform our hearts and our intelligence. If, in these memorable days, the People had behaved as every man enamored of legality would not fail to do, there would have been no revolution. For, let us not be afraid to say it, everything done by the People has been done in violation of the law

February 20, by the manifesto of the Opposition, the law on gatherings was violated.

The law on the national guard was violated.

I do not even reply that, with regard to the right of assembly, the object of so many quarrels, law and jurisprudence were not, whatever was said, on the side of the ministry: in this regard, then, legality would have been violated again.

That's not all.

The representative minority, acting through intimidation on the royal prerogative, violated the Charter; the abdication of Louis Philippe, which the ministerial responsibility must cover, violated the charter; the law of regency was twice violated, first by the substitution of the Duchess of Orleans by the Duke of Nemours, then by the appeal made to the Nation; finally, the People, making its will prevail by force, instead of limiting itself to a legal action like the Opposition, trampled all the laws underfoot. Contrary to what happened in 1830, the government, in 1848, was totally in order; and it is not without reason that Louis-Philippe could say, placing his foot on English soil: *Charles X has been dethroned for having violated the Charter; I for having defended it.*

The People, as deprived of texts as of munitions, were in flagrant rebellion against the law: yet they did not hesitate.

What then? Is it the People who have violated their oath? Is it the case that, through the series of illegalities that made up the whole history of February 23, 23 and 24, the revolution would have been made against Right, and would find itself, in its principle, stamped null and void?

Heaven forbid that the People should ever be mistaken or lie. Take note that I say the People, one and indivisible; I do not mean by that the multitude, which is only a plurality without unity.

The people reason with a consciousness and from a point of view superior to all individual reason; it is for that reason that its conclusions are almost always different from those of the legal scholars. The People are powerful generalizers, as you will see.

The People are sovereign. We are told that this truth has sunk deep into souls, that it has become the general faith, and since 1830 no one protests against the sovereignty of the People.

The sovereign People owe nothing to anyone but itself. No one deals with it as an equal and when it rises in defense of its offended or compromised dignity it is absurd to ask if that expression of the People is legal or illegal. A constitution is not a synallagmatic contract between the King and the People, between legislators and citizens, between principals and agents. It is a system by which the People, the collective man, eternally organizes its functions, balances its powers.

So the People therefore, when they learn that their liberty is in peril and that the moment has come for them to resist, only understand, can only understand one thing, that it is up to them, not to protest, but to decide in a sovereign manner. They were quite ignorant, in truth, of the rights of the People and their logic, those ones who, taking England for an example (always England!) invite the People to come with them to sign a protestation against the government's policy. To protest! Good God, that was abdicating. The people do not need a bailiff to signify their will; it is expressed through their actions. When they assemble, it means that it is they who judge and execute.

On February 22, an appeal had been lodged by the Opposition against the arbitrariness of the Government to the reason of the People. It was a question of proving to the power that public opinion, that the whole of France, condemned the policy obstinately followed for seventeen year by

the thought of the reign. But the Opposition wanted the People to appear only to give its opinion; they wanted, they said, to show by facts that the People were worthy of the freedom of assembly that it was refused; that it was capable at the same time of respecting power and of protesting against power. The Opposition granted the People only a consultative voice; it withdrew sovereignty from them.

It is then that some citizens, whose names are known only to a few friends, said to themselves that there would be liberty; that the People could not deny its essence; that it was up to it to maintain its authority, not by a vain objection — for to whom would the People object? — but by a definitive judgment.

These men could say that they bore the thought of France. In one night, the fire that consumed them set the capital ablaze; eight days later the whole country ratified their resolution.

Now, if it is true that the act of the ministry that prohibited the banquet, legal in itself, was for the People only one occasion; if it is then true that the completely parliamentary protest of the deputies of the left was in its eyes only a cry of alarm: what caused the insurrection that followed? Was there sufficient reason to overthrow the ministry, to drive out a dynasty, to change the form of government, to revolutionize society from top to bottom? Because it is there, let us be mindful of it, that must be found the morality of the event, and the entirety of revolutionary thought.

Let's say it right away, and loudly. The February uprising was directed, not against the ministry: the question of portfolios was unworthy of the People's attention; — not against the prince: royalty was still too secondary for it; — not even against the *System*: this system, practiced and defended in turn by twenty ministries, had the sanction of the representative majority; in constitutional law, the *System* was above reproach.

What the People wanted to strike and destroy was the Constitution. This results both from the illegalities that we recalled just now and from the progress of ideas and facts over the past seventeen years.

The Revolution of 1830, a legal revolution, if there ever was one, had been the work of the Bourgeoisie; the working class had only been its instrument. As for the People itself, considered in its entirety, it does not appear that it had any other aim, in 1830, than to bring to an end the attempt at constitutional government, the great idea of '89. The Bourgeoisie could therefore to claim the July Revolution as its property. And as the Bourgeoisie, formalist par excellence, affected above all this juridical legality, the delight of statesmen, but of which the People hardly care, the whole thought of the Bourgeoisie was to make inviolable in the future a Constitution that the King had violated: the Charter was proclaimed a truth. The People, in spite of the strong protests of the parties, were silent. For what reason? We will see it presently.

Everything in this Charter was shifty, equivocal, incoherent, contradictory. It was a kind of leonine contract, where everything was for the prince, nothing for the People. On the most essential things, the Charter was silent; and always this silence was interpreted in favor either of the inertia of the Government, or of the royal prerogative, against the interest of the masses. For seventeen years, the government of Louis-Philippe found a way, without ever ostensibly deviating from legality, to always get in the way of the wishes, the ideas, the sentiments of the People. This

constitutional lie, denounced by all the men who had held power or approached it, determined the revolution.

The Charter implied that the Government, like the law itself, was and could only be the expression of the general will. The king was appointed by the nation, not to modify this will, but to ensure its sincere execution. The legislative power distributed between the king, the chamber of peers and the chamber of deputies; the executive power committed to responsible ministers, seemed a happy combination, capable of maintaining the balance. But, rightly or wrongly, it happened that the law, that the Government was always more the work of the king than of the three powers and of the ministers, so that the nation could call itself sovereign, but only on condition of being of the same opinion as the king. This is what the conservatives themselves openly confessed, attributing to the prudence of Louis-Philippe all the progress of the country,

The February revolution settled the difficulty. It would have cut it off, mark it well, even though it would have stopped at the demonstrations of the 22nd and 23rd, without going as far as the abdication of the king, as far as the expulsion of the dynasty. The Barrot-Thiers ministry overthrew the personal government forever: the Charter thus elucidated, the whole government changed its form. The question of revolution had thus been posed since 1830: In principle, and from the constitutional point of view, should the will of the prince prevail over the will of the people? And on February 22, 1848 the People answered in a definitive way: No, from now on it will be my will that will prevail.

The government was accused of corruption. And the ministers maintain that the crown was only using legitimate influence. "No influence!" cried the People.

While bowing before the sovereignty of the People, the Government, by some theory or other, had become the prerogative, the property of the middle class. I admit that the intention, if not the idea, was good; that it could, at other times, even have been useful. But the People: I don't see it that way, it said. From now on the workers, like the bourgeois, will have a share in the government.

And such was the meaning of electoral reform, supported in recent times by everyone.

Now, I will repeat here the observation that I made just now, namely, that the accession of M. Barrot to the ministry gave, on this point, almost complete satisfaction to the wishes of the People. Thus, the personal government abolished, the electoral and parliamentary reform obtained, the king remaining in the Tuileries, royalty was already only a vain title, the revolution was democratically consummated.

The events that followed were only a quick deduction, without middle terms, of the two premises that the Opposition, in spite of its dynastic devotion, that the whole country had adopted for its program, namely the abolition of personal government and the electoral reform.

It is here that we are going to see the political question become an economic question, and the People, who had silently watched the prorogation of the Charter, in July 1830, suddenly declare that the Charter was no longer anything, that it was not enough to reform the Government, that it was a question of reconstituting society.

Personal government abolished, a delicate question arose: If the king reigns and does not govern, of what use is he? All the authors of public law, and in the first line the honorable M. de Cormenin, have exhausted their dialectic in demonstrating this astonishing proposition, that the characteristic of royalty is to be and not to act; that this is the crux of constitutional guarantees, the palladium of freedom and order. M. de Lamartine, to whom I in no way intend to reproach for so little, had, until February 25, professed this opinion. And this was also the thought of M. Barrot when, on the 24th, bearing in hand the abdication of Louis-Philippe, he proposed to immediately form a council of regency.

But why, said People to itself, should a council of regency not be a council of government? — Long live the Republic !

Parasitism proscribed in its highest incarnation, the royalty that reigns; as despotism had been in its most complete expression, the royalty that governs; as venality, privilege and speculation had been in their deepest source, the royalty that corrupts: the social question was posed in fact and in right. So no one could take the change.

The People demanded, not as some utopians want, that the Government take over commerce, industry and agriculture, to add them to its attributions and make the French nation a nation of wage-earners; but that it occupy itself with matters of commerce, agriculture and industry, in such a way as to favor, according to the rules of science, which are those of justice, the development of public wealth, and to procure the material and moral improvement of the poor classes. And the Government replied that these things were not within its competence, that it would not concern itself with them. It was political absolutism serving as a safeguard against economic anarchy. — But I, cried the angry People, I want the Government to take care of it.

Thus the reform of personal government contained parliamentary reform; parliamentary reform included electoral reform; electoral reform implied constitutional reform; the reform of the Constitution involved the abolition of royalty, and the abolition of royalty was synonymous with a social revolution: once again, the only ones who understood the situation were the Government, on one side, and the People, on the other. By this simple protest of the Left, which was to take place on February 22, the whole Revolution was accomplished; the People only brought out the event that was on everyone's mind: I challenge anyone to overturn this dialectic.

Only one thing, in this great act, was not due to the People, and the responsibility for it returns entirely to the powers of the State, as to the bourgeoisie: this is the date.

It was inevitable, providential if you prefer, that a little sooner, a little later, the sovereignty of the People should be reconstituted on other bases, and abolish, if not perhaps in fact, at least in law, the monarchy. The Revolution could be as long as it was abrupt; it could be made by common accord between the crown, the working class, and the bourgeois class; it could take place, in a word, peacefully. The progress of ideas was notorious; the People could not fail one day or another to deduce the consequences: even in the Conservative party, it was generally agreed that the difficulties were no longer political, but social. The whole question was to know when and how the transition would take place.

It pleased the so-called dynastic opposition; it pleased the Royalty, the conservative party, to hasten the denouement.

Of course, it will not be disputed that if the banquet, announced for the 22nd, had been announced for the 23rd, the Revolution would have been delayed for a day, and the existence of royalty prolonged for twenty-four hours. For the same reason, if M. Barrot had been appointed minister on the 23^d, in place of M. Molé, the delay might have been six months, a year, ten years; and it is still a question, today when there is no going back, to know if it would not have been better, for the salvation of all, to do in thirty years what we have done in three days, and lengthen a glorious date, rather than exposing ourselves to the chances of an awkward solution.

I contributed as much as was in me to the success of the three days, not wanting at the hour of peril to separate myself from my brothers who fought, and disavow their heroism. But I still dreaded a victory whose consequences were unknown to me; and that is why even today, in the uncertainty of the future and although I do not admit the return of any dynasty, I make all reservations for this sovereign reason of the People, which in my opinion is infallible, and cannot be compromised. No one was in a position for the Republic: that is apparent every day from the acts of the Government. Unhappy Opposition! unhappy conservatives! You have cut the green grapes: now try to make them ripen on the straw!...

Now we can't go back; we don't have to, I don't want to, and I defy you to do it. We have to go forward. The problem of social reconstitution is posed; it must be solved. We will only learn this solution from the People. I showed you just now how, by generalizing its ideas on government, the People had suddenly concluded a revolution, and converted the monarchy into a republic: now see how it proceeds to its new work, and place yourself, if possible, at the level of its ideas.

The Revolution of February 24 was not only a negation of the monarchical principle, it was a negation of the representative principle, of the sovereignty of majorities.

The Provisional Government had declared at first that France would receive institutions analogous to those of the old Revolution, and would be constituted as a Republic, subject to the ratification of the citizens. The *National*, in a moderate, conciliatory article, which could not be more reasonable and motivated, supported this statement. What could be more just, in fact (in the judiciary of lawyers), than to reserve the adhesion of the departments? Could the good pleasure of a few hundred insurgents annul the right of 35 million men, and the proclamation made in Paris of the Republic oblige the monarchical hearts of the departments? Was there not in this a contradiction of the republican principle? Wouldn't that be a flagrant usurpation? Let the Provisional Government propose, at the right time; but that it decide, that it settle this question of the republic, at the very moment when it called the citizens to the elections: what could be more ridiculous! What is this right policy with which you honor me, if on the most important question that can be submitted to me you deprive me of the exercise? Would I love the Republic the less if you had allowed me to establish it with you?...

Such were the qualms of the Provisional Government on February 25, qualms that, either through weakness or through Machiavellianism, it silenced the next day. The establishment of the Republic, in the mind of the Provisional Government, was a surprise, a violence done to the

country. What the People had conceived in their lofty reason, the Provisional Government did in the softness, in the duplicity of its conscience.

She spoke loudly enough, however, she was quite intelligible, this voice of the People. — "If it was I," it cried, "who spoke in Paris, I cannot contradict myself in Bordeaux." The People is one and indivisible; it is not majority and minority; it is not a multitude; it is not divided. Its will cannot be counted or weighed like money, like the votes of shareholders: it is unanimous. Wherever there is division, it is no longer the People: your representative theories are a negation of its sovereignty. The People is always in agreement with itself: everything holds together, everything is linked in its decisions; all its judgments are identical. To suppose that after the event of February 24, prepared, foreseen from so far, accomplished by the competition or the antagonism of all the ideas, the proclamation of the Republic could be object of controversy, was to nullify all that the People had done during those three days, and to win the case to M. Guizot."

In fact,

If, after the declaration of the People of Paris, the Republic must be questioned before the electoral assemblies, this supposes that the will of the People is not unanimous, and that this will is none other than the will of the majority.

If it is the majority of votes that forms the basis of the Constitution, the Dynastic Opposition had no right to rise against the conservative majority; the National Guard was wrong to support the Opposition, the workers to follow the National Guard, and all together to do violence to the Government, then to break the pact, and drive out the dynasty.

If it is the majority that is the criterion of right, we must hasten to erase the traces of the barricades, restore the Tuileries, indemnify the civil list, recall Louis-Philippe, return the portfolio to M. Guizot, make amends to the chamber, and wait in silence for the decision of the voters at 200 francs.

Then you will see the majority delivered to its selfish instincts, and enlightened by the event, voting at the same time against the reform, against the banquets, against the Opposition, against the Republic.

If it is up to the majority to make the law, it must still be said that it is by the majority of the majority, and so on until we have returned to personal government; so the government belongs to the middle class, elected by the majority of the primary assemblies; that the middle class in turn owes respect to its own majority, to the majority of voters; that the majority of the electors must obey the majority of the deputies, the majority of the deputies submit to the ministry, which is bound to do the will of the king, who, by virtue of the majority, reigns and governs.

Never, with the representative theory, will we leave this circle; and it is precisely outside this circle that the People has just placed itself. The law of majority, it says, is nothing, if not as a provisional compromise between antagonistic opinions, while awaiting the solution of the People.

Thus, three general questions were resolved by the revolution of February 24, in a direction diametrically opposed to all received ideas:

1. *Question of legal resistance.* — The People have told us once and for all: to protest, for them, is synonymous with ordering; blaming is synonymous with opposing; to resist, synonymous with overthrowing the object of one's resistance.

2. *Question of reform.* — The Opposition, while demanding the same things and in the same terms as the insurrection, but considering them only separately and in detail, expressly reserved in its protest the monarchy, the charter, the constitutional institutions, at the same time that it postponed, rejected a social reform. — The People, on the contrary, embracing all the reforms, demanded in a single bundle, understood that from this bundle resulted a new idea that revoked royalty and the Charter: it reduced everything to dust, royalty and constitution.

3. *Question of the representative majority.* — All publicists agree that government, like legislative power, can only be exercised by delegation; that election being the only known mode of issuing a mandate, as voting is the only means of arriving at a conclusion, it is the majority, not of the People, but of its representatives, that makes the law. The People, on the contrary, have seen that the authority of majorities is not absolute; that it is subject to caution and exception; that, in certain cases, it may happen that the entirety of the People is condemned by the majority of the People; that there was therefore reason to revise this principle in the new constitution. The People broke the law of majority, to the cry of *Vive la République!*

The Republic! Such is, do not doubt it, the wish of the People. it had made it heard in '92; and if this ever-reviving wish has not been fulfilled, the fault, certainly, was not with the People: it was the fault with their obstetricians.

Here is that popular logic which, if every citizen took it as a rule, would infallibly lead to civil war; but which, in that superior individuality that is called the People, always leads to peace and unity. Swift as lightning, infallible as algebra, the logic of the People is the law of history, the source of right and duty, the principle of all morality, the sanction of all justice. It is the People who punishes the perjured king and the vile rogue with the same civic bullets, astonished at its own intelligence.

Let each, in these difficult days, turn to the side of the People. Let everyone study this sovereign thought, which is not that of any party, of any school, and which nevertheless allows itself to be glimpsed in all schools and in all parties; which will be able to define itself, and answer all our questions, provided that we know how to question it.

Ask the People! That is the secret of the future.

Ask the People! That is the entire science of society.

The People, apparently rising against a hated ministry, have passed over the conservatives, the dynastics, the legitimists, the democrats, mocking all theories, and planting their flag at an infinite distance, beyond all constitutional fictions.

The People will know how to tell us what these words *Republic, Equality and Fraternity* mean, which they took as their motto, and which have never had a positive meaning in any language. How much, in the spontaneity of its audacity, it surpasses the meticulous prudence of the philosophers! Philosophers, follow the People!...

2. The Provisional Government did not understand the Revolution.

Alas! No sooner has the People begun to make itself heard than the multitude usurps its name, the talkers stifle its voice, and in place of the People, the tyranny of its courtiers is established. Since the Revolution the People have stopped speaking, and we are sailing without a compass, in the wind of all madness, on an ocean without limits.

I skim through the newspapers; I look in the proclamations, at the placards; I listen at night, I listen by day, if that profound speech, which three times in three days, dominating wills and events, has astonished us with its lofty revelations, will no longer strike my ear and illuminate my heart. Never was a more solemn occasion given to initiators. Never was attention more excited, favor better won by those who knew how to make the popular word vibrate. Everything was silent, for a few moments, in front of this invisible majesty that made you shiver to the core, and whose least simulacra we adored.

Where are we today ?

I know that the honorable citizens who make up the Provisional Government have not had time to meditate on their program, and that they have had to pay with words, while waiting for the Revolution to produce its facts on its own. I know the zeal, the probity, the patriotism of these new men, who are as amazed as we are at their role. I recognize the superiority of several: I admit the good will of all. All my wishes are that they remain in power until the day when the National Assembly, by its vote, will have regularized the government. So it is to the inevitability of their situation, much more than to their persons, that my criticism is addressed. I would have forgiven the Provisional Government for one, two, three errors, and as many inconsistencies: but in the presence of rashness without motive, of systematic misinterpretation, of an absolutism that nothing justifies, of an avowed reaction, I felt that the consideration of men could not impose respect for actions on me, and I said to myself that the time for opposition had come.

Opposition, said M. Barrot, is the relish of liberty.

Opposition, answered M. Guizot, is the guarantee of the constitution.

Opposition, I will add, is the first of our rights, the holiest of our duties.

What a sight awaits us at this moment!

The Republic transformed into a doctrinaire democracy; empiricism and utopia taking the place of ideas and making the People a material for experimentation; little men, little ideas, little speeches; mediocrity, prejudice, doubt, soon perhaps anger. The will of the People, which was to increase its leaders, diminishes them. We expected that these improvised magistrates, carried on the wings of the Revolution, would restore security: they sow terror; — that they would shed light: they create chaos; — that they would know how to clarify the question, say what the People want and what they don't want: they affirm nothing, they allow everything to be believed and they make everyone fear. It was necessary, at the same time, to reassure property and give guarantees to the proletariat by reconciling their antagonism; they bring them to grips, they blow up social war. We counted on actions; they produce inertia. As if to testify to the failure of their hearts, they put *greatness of soul* on the agenda. Without faith in the future, they declare the oath abolished, for

fear that the Republic, damaged too soon, will become the occasion for new perjuries. They were asked for work, they train managers; for credit, they decree the assignats; for outlets, they refer to the attitude of the Republic. Once they tell us that the *organization of labor* cannot be *done overnight*; another time that the question is *complex*; a fortnight later, they send us back to the placement office! Completely devoted to their memories of the Mountain, instead of speaking like economists, they answer us like Jacobins. The People have withdrawn from these men: they *love* it, however; they deign to say so. But nothing, nothing, nothing reveals in them the intelligence of this People whose destinies they bear. Everywhere in their acts, instead of those universal, sublime thoughts of the People, you only find *hot speeches, warm words*, communism, routine, contradiction, discord.

The first thing the Provisional Government deals with is to exclude the red flag. Certainly, I have no desire to commit terrorism, and I care, deep down, about the red flag like all the flags in the world. But since the Provisional Government attached such great importance to emblems, it should at least try to understand this one and reconcile it with honest people. This satisfaction was owed to the men at the barricades.

The revolution, it cannot be denied, was made by the red flag: the Provisional Government decided to keep the tricolor flag. To explain this disavowal, M. de Lamartine made speeches, the *National* dissertations. Red, they say, was once the color of royalty; red is the color of the English; it is also that of the execrable Bourbon, tyrant of the Two Sicilies. Red cannot be the color of France.

We do not say that red is the color of justice, the color of sovereignty. And since all men love red, wouldn't it also be that red is the symbol of human brotherhood? Denying the red flag, the purple! But it is the social question that you eliminate. All the times that the People, overcome by suffering, wanted to express, outside of this juridical legality that murders it, its wishes and its complaints, it marched under a red banner. It is true that the red flag has not gone around the world, like its happy rival the tricolor flag. Justice, said M. de Lamartine very well, has not gone further than the Champ-de-Mars. It is so terrible, justice, that one cannot hide it too much. Poor red flag! Everyone abandons you! Well! Me, I embrace you; I hug you to my chest. Cheers to fraternity!

Let's keep, if you want, the tricolor flag, symbol of our nationality. But remember that the red flag is the sign of a revolution which will be the last. The red flag! it is the federal standard of the human race.

The second act of the Provisional Government was the abolition of the death penalty for political offences. If it thought it necessary to reassure people's minds, maybe it was right? But as a principle, it is devoid of meaning: for see the inconsistency.

On February 24, 25, and the following days, patrols of workers, spontaneously organized for the policing of the capital, shot, without any form of trial, the individuals whom they caught in the act of stealing. And this took place to universal applause, to the applause of the proprietors as well as of the proletarians. Now, tell me, where did this unanimous approval come from? Is it not that theft, in such circumstances, is something other than theft; that it is an attack on state security, a

political crime? Therefore, there are political crimes that the People deem worthy of death and that they punish with capital punishment, at the very moment when their representatives enshrine in law the abolition of this punishment. And this is how the men of terror, of bad memory, justified their executions: the slightest fault became in their eyes a betrayal of the Fatherland. God forbid we see those odious days again! But is it not clear that the Government, instead of *abolishing*, something which is not in its power, would do better to *define*, and that it is in a new determination of criminal law that we must seek the security of the citizens?

Abolish, for all kinds of crime, the death penalty: and tomorrow, the man whose father has been assassinated, whose daughter has been raped, whose reputation or fortune has been ruined, will take justice with his own hand. And how will you repress private revenge, when the death penalty is abolished? There is no philanthropy that holds: social crimes, political crimes, crimes against persons and property, everything is subject to the law of compensation: it is much less the torture that must be suppressed than the offense that it is a question of preventing.

After the prohibition of the red flag and the abolition of the death penalty for political crimes, came the decree of indictment of ex-ministers.

To *inform* is acceptable; but to *accuse* is absurd, especially after the abolition of the death penalty for political crimes. Moreover, it is offensive to the People.

How! The Provisional Government has not yet understood that the 22nd, 23rd and 24th of February are the end of a constitution, and not the overthrow of a ministry! On Tuesday, M. Guizot could be impeached, but only by the deputies of the Left: his crime then was to stake the existence of the monarchy, and to compromise, by a conflict, the institutions of July. On Wednesday again, M. Guizot, although resigned, was responsible for the blood shed: the triumphant opposition could call him to account for his untimely resistance: for the statesman must sometimes yield, even to the whims of public opinion. Thursday's victory absolves M. Guizot. It changed for him, as for everyone else, the terrain of legality. It even honors him in a sense, for it proves that he had better judged of the People than the Opposition. M. Guizot could only be accused by virtue of the Charter: the Charter destroyed, M. Guizot is no longer justiciable except by reason of his conscience and of history; he has the right to decline the jurisdiction of the Revolution.

Poor politicians! if you had not decreed it, he would have made, like MM. Thiers and Barrot, an act of adhesion to the Republic; by rallying, he would have punished himself. Do you think then of punishing by prison a man of this character? Force him to say: *I was wrong!* Prove to him that when he believed the monarchy more necessary than ever, the Republic was the only thing possible: it is the only expiation you can impose on this beautiful, but guilty intelligence.

I know that by decreeing M. Guizot, you wanted to give the people a sort of satisfaction. You understand of the People only revenge. While the People is engaged in social revolution, you believe yourself sometimes under the Terror, and you abolish the red flag and the death penalty; sometimes under the Charter, and it is the Charter that you restore by decreeing the man who knew how to defend it better than you. It is therefore written, O People, that you will never be understood!

Must I speak of all these decrees, each more incomprehensible than the other, and in which the incomprehensibility of the Revolution bursts forth at every line?

Decree releasing officials from their oath.

It is exactly as if Louis-Philippe were succeeded by Henri V or Prince Napoleon. What! It was not enough, in your opinion, for the conscience of the functionaries, of a revolution which abolished the constitutional monarchy, which not only ousted the dynasty, which changed the principle! The civil servants needed M. Crémieux's absolution! This is why the Provisional Government combined the spiritual and the temporal, attributing to itself, like Saint Peter, the power to bind and to loose! Casuistic jokers, who do not know the first word of the political catechism! If Louis-Philippe, if his race still lives, royalty, know it well, is dead. Now, royalty dead, long live the Republic! This suffers no more difficulty than going from Louis XVIII TO Charles X.

Decree that guarantees the organization of labor.

Notice this. It is not the Republic that gives the guarantee, it is the Provisional Government. The Provisional Government insisted that it should be known that the idea came from higher than the Republic. But, by dint of thinking about the idea, the writer forgot the expression: what, pray tell, is the *guarantee* of a *provisional*?

And if the definitive Government does not organize? If he finds that it is not up to him to organize? If he judges that this word *organization of labor* does not translate the thought of the Revolution, that it is meaningless? If its first act is to decree the liquidation of the so-called national workshops? If the plans of the commission are recognized as impossible?... Where will the Republic, after having made the advances, take its indemnity? What will the guarantee of the Provisional Government be for it, when it has swallowed up 50 millions?

Truly, citizens of the Provisional Government, you have done well, for the honor of the Republic, to engage only your personal guarantee; but for our finances?...

Decree ordering the creation of national workshops.

We couldn't escape it. "I have four small children who ask me for bread," exclaims Sganarelle's wife. "Give them the whip," replies the drunkard."

Our organizers do like Sganarelle. There are 36,000 tailors without work in Paris. The Provisional Government offers them scissors, needles, sewing rooms, decatizing presses... — But work?

Half of the printers are unemployed. We will create at the 90 printing works of the capital an additional material of 3 million. — But work?

Construction sites are closed. Quickly, others will be established alongside, to compete with them. — But work?

The bookstore, ancient and modern, classic, political, religious, medical, is full of books that do not sell. It is necessary to organize the library. The Provisional Government will issue fifty new patents. — But buyers?

Trimmings, silverware, hats, all trades are down. Come all, workers; quit your bosses; join forces, organize yourselves: the Provisional Government will issue you patents, provide you with

directors, controllers, inspectors, accountants, managers, clerks; there are some left over. — But capital? But demand? But outlets?

Half the houses are dilapidated; a quarter of the apartments empty. We must increase the value of this part of the landed property. — The Provisional Government proposes plans for the construction of barracks, hospices, national palaces, in order to house the workers!

The land under cultivation is badly cultivated; agriculture lacks capital and hands. — The Government is thinking of the dunes, the wastelands, the heaths, the moors, all the uncultivated and sterile lands!

That onlookers find it superb; that charlatans exploit this other Mississippi; that the public treasury, that the time of the workers are wasted: I do not oppose it. But what do the people say?

Decree that reduces working hours, abolishes tasks and haggling.

The workers think of their interests, and they are right. In this Republic corrupted from the cradle like a monarchy in the coffin, talkative like a constitutional king, where one disputes the places, the missions, the commissions, the delegations and all that makes money, the workers could not do less than ask for a reduction in working hours or a salary increase. They would be fooled! It has been proven to them that they work hard and earn little: which is true. They concluded that it would be fair if they were paid more, and worked less. In the political economy of the Provisional Government, this reasoning is irreproachable: but I do not recognize in this, I confess, the logic of my People.

Informed that masters are making it difficult to obey its orders, the Provisional Government issues new decrees, dispatches circulars, issues harangues, bearing in substance: *That production may suffer from the reduction in working hours, but that the will of the Government must be executed, and that it will be, come what may! That the prefects have to hold their hand there; that it is about equality and fraternity.*

So here you are, dictators by three cubits, socialists of the tricolor flag, cornered, in a fortnight, at pleasure, intimidation, violence! This is how you understand the social problem! And of the three thousand patriots who listen to you, there is not one who hisses at you! This benign people, so profoundly monarchized, cries *bravo!* to tyranny. So you will also decree the rate of wages! Then, you will force the sale; then, you will demand payment, you will fix the value! Really, if you didn't make me want to laugh, I would go to the Place de l'Hôtel-de-Ville, and there I would shout with all my might: Citizens! to arms! Twenty cartridges for the Provisional Government!

Can you imagine those novelists of terror who, in 1848, take industrial entrepreneurs for feudal lords, workers for serfs, work for *corvée*? who imagine, after so many studies on the subject, that the modern proletariat results from the oppression of a caste? who are unaware, or pretend to be unaware, that what has established working hours, determined wages, divided functions, developed competition, constituted capital as a monopoly, enslaved the body and soul of the worker, is a system of fatal causes, as independent of the will of the masters as of that of the compagnons?... Speak then, People! Speak, speak!

Decree making the Tuileries the Invalides du Peuple.

The Invalids of the People! The civil list of misery! Grant this, citizen reader, with equality and fraternity! But I believe I hear them, these good gentlemen of the Provisional Government: it is not equality and fraternity that they care about, it is to have, at their devotion, an army of praetorians. This is why they arouse the greedy passions of the worker, why they intimidate the bourgeoisie by stirring up the masses against it. **Come what may ! Labour, in rebellion against capital, will lend a hand to the dictatorship. Beware, then, of those who laugh, beware of those who complain, beware of those who work!

Circular from the Minister of Public Instruction to rectors on primary education.

It says, in short, that for every individual primary education is sufficient; but that the Republic requires an elite of men, and that this **elite must be chosen from among the whole people.

Is it clear that the Provisional Government does not believe a word of either equality or fraternity? We thought up to now, good people that we are, that this class of the People, more or less real, which is called the *bourgeoisie*, was something like the elite of the People, and that it was so that everyone was a part of the elite, that we had made the revolution. The minister's circular overthrows all our ideas. It is true that the question is, like that of the *organization of labor*, fairly complex: it is a question of knowing how, without harming natural superiorities, citizens can be equal. The Provisional Government slashed the difficulty; capacities, incapacities, mediocre subjects, elite subjects, what does it matter? Are we not all French, all citizens, all brothers? Let's make a good choice of aristocrats, and long live the Republic!

I appeal to the Assizes of the People.

Let us beware, however, of slandering. Hasn't the Provisional Government decreed that interest on sums deposited in savings banks should be increased to 5 per cent. 100, "Whereas the interest of the Treasury bonds is also 5 per cent. 100, that the fruits of labor must increase more and more, and that of all property, the most inviolable and the most sacred is the savings of the poor?" What more touching testimony of its sentiments of equality could the Provisional Government give?

Doubtless, if the holders of Treasury bonds were alone to perfect the interest of the savings banks. But if it is the proletarian, always the proletarian, having neither Treasury bonds nor savings accounts, who must pay both interests, is it not clear that by putting the equality between the creditors of the floating debt, the inequality between the creditors of the State and the debtors of the State has been made greater than before?

The savings of the poor! Increase in the fruits of labor! What hypocritical chatter! That is to say that you give more to the one who has more, and from the one who has less, you take away the little he has. It is economy according to the Gospel. But what the People think, is it the word of the Gospel?

The Provisional Government is no less strong on equity than on equality.

The reduction of the working day to ten hours, say the masters, causes us harm, and we cannot pay the same wages as before. — The reduction in wages, retort the workers, takes away our subsistence: our lot would be worse than before the Revolution!

The terms are clearly stated; the contradiction is flagrant. How will the Provisional Government go about resolving it?

Wages, it says, will be regulated so that, the working day remaining fixed at ten hours instead of eleven, the masters only pay half an hour more, and the workmen receive only half an hour less!

This means that the loss of an hour's work, which at first was entirely the responsibility of the masters, will be divided equally between the masters and the workers.

The Provisional Government takes a happy medium for a philosophical synthesis! But the People, who must always work more, produce more, profit more; will the People say that they win when everyone loses?...

Decree ordering the establishment of national trading posts for small businesses.

The Provisional Government does for the bank as well as for labor. Money is lacking, it makes boxes to receive it, offices to count it. That's what it calls *organizing credit!*

Decree ordering the reimbursement of sums paid to the savings bank, above 100 fr. in annuities 5 p. 100 at par.

Decree authorizing the Minister to sell Crown Diamonds, Civil List Property and State Woods.

Proclamation requesting advance payment of contributions for the year.

Decree opening a patriotic loan of 100 millions.

Decree increasing the land value by 45 centimes.

Decree extending the reimbursement of Treasury bonds and savings bank deposits.

Decree giving compulsory circulation to banknotes.

etc., etc., etc., etc.

Ah! great politicians, you shake your fist at capital, and there you are, prostrate before the hundred-sou piece! You want to exterminate the Jews, *the kings of the era*, and you worship (by swearing, it is true) the golden calf! You say, or let it be said, that the State is going to seize the railways, the canals, the inland waterways, the haulage, the mines, the salt; that taxes will be imposed on the rich, a sumptuary tax, progressive tax, tax on servants, horses, carriages; that employments, salaries, rents, property will be reduced. You provoke the depreciation of all financial, industrial and real estate values; you dry up the source of all income; you freeze the blood in the veins of commerce, of industry, and then you beseech cash to circulate! You beg the frightened rich not to keep it! Believe me, citizen dictators, if that is all your science, hasten to reconcile yourselves with the Jews; renounce these demonstrations of terrorism that make capital run after the revolution like dogs after the village policeman. Return to this conservative *status quo*, beyond which you see nothing and from which you should never have departed. For, in the equivocal situation in which you find yourself, you cannot prevent yourself from touching property; and if you lay your hands on property, you are lost. You already have one foot in bankruptcy.

Excuse my vehemence: error in power makes me indignant almost as much as venality. — No, you don't understand anything about the revolution. You know neither its principle, nor its logic, nor its justice; you don't speak its language. What you take for the voice of the People is only the

bellowing of the multitude, ignorant like you of the thoughts of the People. Repress these clamors that invade you. Respect for persons, tolerance for opinions; but disdain for the sects that creep at your feet, and which advise you only in order to compromise you better. The sects are the vipers of revolution. The People belong to no sect. Abstain, as much as you can, from requisitions, confiscations, especially from legislation; and be sober from depositions. Keep intact the repository of the Republic, and let the light make itself on its own. You will have deserved well of the Fatherland.

You, citizen Dupont, you are the probity in power. Stay at your post; remain there until death; you will be replaced too soon.

You, Citizen Lamartine, you are poetry united with politics. Stay still, although you are not a diplomat. We love this grand style, and the People will prompt you.

You, citizen Arago, you are the science in the Government. Keep the portfolio: enough fools will come after you.

You, citizen Garnier-Pagès, you have sold, you have alienated, you have borrowed, and you gamble with the rest. You will tell the National Assembly that the State no longer owns anything, that its credit no longer has any other mortgage than patriotism, that it's over. You will prove by your balance sheet that Government is only possible henceforth by a renovation of society, and that such is the alternative for the country: Either fraternity, or death!

You, citizens Albert and Louis Blanc, you are a hieroglyph awaiting a Champollion. So stay as a hieroglyphic figure, until you are worked out.

You, Flocon and Ledru-Rollin citizens, we do justice to the spirit that drives you. You are, despite your old style, the corner stone of the revolution. So stick to the intention, but don't be so terrible in the form. We would take you for the tail of Robespierre.

You, citizens Crémieux, Marie, Bethmont, Carnot, Marrast, you symbolize, in various forms, nationality, patriotism, the republican ideal. But you don't come out of the negative; you are known only as democrats; your ideas have been prescribed for 50 years. Stay however: failing realities, we need symbols.

And you, the ex-dynastics, bourgeois fearful as owls, do not regret this revolution that was long since accomplished in your ideas, which your parliamentary quarrels have perhaps brought about prematurely. A child born prematurely cannot return to its mother's womb: it is a question of raising the revolution, not of sending it to the pillory. Listen to what I am about to tell you, and regard it as the profession of faith of the proletariat. I will speak to you frankly.

The revolution of 1848 is the liquidation of the old society, the starting point of a new society.

This liquidation is incompatible with the restoration of the monarchy.

It will not happen in a day: it will last twenty-five years, fifty years, perhaps a century.

We could do it without you, against you: we would rather it were done by you. You are, so to speak, by birthright, by the superiority of your means, by your practical skill, the natural trustees. It is up to you, par excellence, to *organize labor*. We do not want reform to the detriment of anyone; we want it in everyone's interest.

What we are asking for is a certain solidarity, not only abstract, but ****official**, of all the producers among themselves, of all the consumers among themselves, and of the producers with the consumers. It is the conversion into public law, not of the reveries of a commission, but of the absolute laws of economic science. You are divided; we want to bring you together and to be part of the coalition with you. We attach to this pact, of which all our efforts, all our intelligence must tend to determine the clauses, the guarantee of our well-being, the pledge of our moral and intellectual improvement.

What can you fear?

The loss of your properties? Hear this well. There is no doubt that the articles of the new charter will modify your right, and that a portion of that ****naked property**, which is so dear to you, from being individual as it is, will become reciprocal. You can be *expropriated*, but never *dispossessed*, any more than the French people can be dispossessed of France. And that naked property, sole cause, in our opinion, of your embarrassments and our miseries, will not be taken from you without compensation: otherwise it would be confiscation, violence and theft; it would be property, not reform.

Are you afraid that the Communists will take your children and your wives from you? As if they didn't have enough of their own!... The community, being in essence nothing defined, is all we want. The best means that philosophy will discover of creating liberty, equality, fraternity, will be for the communists the community. To be afraid of the community is to be afraid of nothing.

Is it the return of the old Jacobinism united to the old Babouvism that terrifies you?

We do not like these doctrinaires of democracy any more than you do, for whom the *organization of labor* is only a fantasy intended to calm popular effervescence; those Cagliostros of social science making fraternity a shameful superstition. And if our demonstrations seem to defend them, it is because they momentarily represent for us the principle that won in February.

Conservatives, two politics, two different paths are currently available to you.

Either you will come to an agreement directly with the proletariat, without concern for the form of government, without prior constitution of the legislative power, any more than of the executive. In matters of politics and religion, the proletariat is like you, skeptical. The state, in our eyes, is the sergeant of the city, the police valet of labor and capital. Organize it as you like, provided that instead of commanding, it is he who obeys.

In this first case, the transaction will be entirely amicable, and its articles will be the constitution of France, the Charter of 1848.

Or else you will rally to doctrinaire democracy, to this equivalent of royal power, a new system that seesaws between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, which is not averse to a monarchical restoration, and for which the majority of human beings are fatally condemned to sorrow and to misery.

In this case, I tell you with sadness, nothing in fact; and as with Louis-Philippe, it will soon have to start again. You will believe yourselves skillful, but you will always have been only blind. It will still be August 10, January 21, June 2, Thermidor 9, Prairial and Vendémiaire days, July 29, February 24. You will again see the scenes at Boissy-d'Anglas: you will have to repeat the

massacres of Saint-Roch and Transnonain every day: which will not prevent you from falling miserably in the end under the bullets of the People.

Citizens, we await you with confidence: sixty centuries of misery have taught us to wait. We can, for three months, live on three pennies of bread a day and per head: it is up to you to see if your capital can last as long as our stomachs.

DEMOCRACY.

1. Problem of the sovereignty of the people.—Conditions of the solution.
2. If universal suffrage expresses the sovereignty of the people.
3. Whether social reform should proceed from political reform, or political reform from social reform.—Difference between democracy and the republic.

Paris, March 26, 1848.

Heavens, listen; Earth, give ear: the Lord has spoken!

Thus cried the prophets, when, with sparkling eyes and foaming mouth, they announced to the prevaricators and apostates the punishment of their crimes. Thus spoke the Church in the Middle Ages; and the earth, bowing with fear, crossed itself at the voice of the pontiff, at the summons of his bishops. Thus did in turn Moses, Elijah, John the Baptist, Mahomet, Luther, all the founders and reformers of religions, each new modification of dogma posing as emanating from divine authority. And always we saw the human masses prostrate themselves in the name of the Most High, and receive with submission the discipline of the revealers.

But, a philosopher says to himself in the end, if God has spoken, why haven't I heard anything?...

This word of doubt was enough to shake the Church, to annul the Scriptures, to dissipate the faith and to hasten the reign of the Antichrist!

I do not want, following the example of Hume, to prejudge either reality or the possibility of a revelation: how to reason *a priori* from a supernatural fact, from a manifestation of the Supreme Being. The whole question for me is in the experience that we can acquire of it, and I reduce the religious controversy to this single point, the authenticity of the divine word. Prove that authenticity, and I'm a Christian. Who would dare to argue with God, if he was sure that it was God who was speaking to him?

It is with the People, as with the Divinity: *Vox populi, vox Dei*.

Since the world has existed, since the human tribes began to constitute themselves into monarchies and republics, oscillating from one idea to another like wandering planets; mixing and combining, in order to organize themselves into societies, the most diverse elements; overthrowing the tribunes and the thrones as a child does a house of cards, we have seen, at each jolt of politics, the leaders of the movement invoke, in more or less explicit terms, the sovereignty of the People.

Brutus and Caesar, Cicero and Catiline, take advantage in turn of popular suffrage. If the supporters of the fallen system are to be believed, the Charter of 1830 was the expression of national sovereignty as much at least as the constitution of the year III, and Louis-Philippe, like Charles X, Napoleon and the Directory, was the elected representative of the Nation. Why not, if the Charter of 1830 was only an amendment to the constitution of Year III, as well as that of Year VIII and 1814?

The most advanced organ of the legitimist party would still tell us, if he dared, that the law results from the consent of the People and from the definition of the prince: *Lex fit consensu populi et constitutione regis*. The sovereignty of the nation is the principle of both monarchists and

democrats. Listen to this echo that reaches us from the North: on the one hand, it is a despotic king who invokes national traditions, that is to say the will of the People expressed and confirmed for centuries; on the other, they are rebellious subjects who maintain that the People no longer think what they once thought, and who ask to be questioned. Who then here shows a higher intelligence of the People, the monarch who makes it immutable in his thoughts, or the citizens who suppose it versatile? And when you would say that the contradiction is resolved by progress, in the sense that the People go through various phases to realize the same idea, you would only be pushing back the difficulty: who will judge what is progress and what is retrogression? ...

I therefore ask like Rousseau: If the people have spoken, why have I heard nothing?

You cite to me this astonishing revolution in which I too took part; of which I have alone proven the legitimacy, of which I have brought out the idea. And you say to me: Here is the People!

But first, I have only seen a tumultuous crowd without awareness of the thought that made it act, without any understanding of the revolution that was taking place through its hands. Then, what I have called the logic of the People could well be nothing other than the reason of events, especially since, once the fact has been accomplished, and everyone agrees on its meaning, opinions are again divided on the consequences. The revolution made, the People are silent! What! Would the sovereignty of the people exist only for things of the past, which no longer interest us, and not for those of the future, which alone can be the object of the decrees of the People?

All of you, enemies of despotism and its corruptions, as of anarchy and its robberies, who do not cease to invoke the People; who speak, with brow uncovered, of its sovereign reason, of its irresistible force, of its formidable voice; I summon you to tell me: Where and when did you hear the People? by which mouth, in which language does it express itself? how is this astonishing revelation accomplished? what authentic, decisive examples do you cite? what guarantee do you have of the sincerity of these laws which you say came from the People? what is the penalty? by what titles, by what signs, will I distinguish the elect whom the People sends from the apostates who take advantage of its confidence and usurp its authority? how, finally, do you establish the legitimacy of the popular word?

I believe in the existence of the People as in the existence of God.

I bow before its holy will; I submit to any order emanating from its; the word of the People is my law, my strength and my hope. But, according to the precept of Saint Paul, my obedience, to be meritorious, must be reasonable, and what misfortune for me, what ignominy, if, when I believe I am submitting only to the authority of the People, I was the toy of a vile charlatan! How then, I beg you, among so many rival apostles, contradictory opinions, obstinate parties, will I recognize the voice, the true voice of the People?

The problem of the sovereignty of the People is the fundamental problem of liberty, equality and fraternity, the principle of social organization. Governments and peoples have had no other aim, through the storms of revolutions and the detours of politics, than to establish this sovereignty. Each time they strayed from this goal, they fell into bondage and shame. It is with this view that the Provisional Government has convened a National Assembly named by all the

citizens, without distinction of fortune and capacity: the universality of suffrages appearing to it to be the closest expression of the sovereignty of the People.

Thus we first suppose that the People can be consulted; second that it can answer; third, that its will can be authentically ascertained; finally, that the government, founded on the expressed will of the People, is the only legitimate government.

Such is, in particular, the claim of Democracy, which presents itself as the form of government which best reflects the sovereignty of the People.

Now, if I prove that democracy is, like monarchy, only a symbol of sovereignty; that it does not answer any of the questions raised by this idea; that it can, for example, neither establish the authenticity of the acts that it attributes to the People, nor say what is the goal and the end of society; if I prove that democracy, far from being the most perfect of governments, is the negation of the sovereignty of the people, and the principle of its ruin, it will be demonstrated, in fact and in law, that democracy is nothing more than one constitutional arbitrariness succeeding another constitutional arbitrariness; that it possesses no scientific value, and that we must see in it only a preparation for the Republic, one and indivisible.

It is important to enlighten public opinion on this point as soon as possible, and to dispel all illusions.

I.

The People, a collective being, I almost said a being of reason, does not speak in the material sense of the word. The People do not have, any more than God, eyes to see, ears to hear or a mouth to speak. How would I know if it is endowed with a kind of soul, a divinity immanent in the masses, as certain philosophers suppose a soul of the world, which, at certain moments, moves and urges them; or if the reason of the People is nothing other than the pure idea, the most abstract, the most comprehensive, the most freed from all individual form, as other philosophers claim that God is nothing but the order in the universe, an abstraction? I do not enter into these researches of high psychology: I ask as a practical man in what way this soul, reason or will, such as it is, of the People, arises, so to speak, outside of itself, and manifests itself? Who can serve as its organ? Who has the right to say to others: It is through me that the People speak? how can I believe that someone who, from the height of a stool, harangues five hundred individuals who applaud, is the organ of the People? How does the election of citizens, even their unanimous suffrage, have the virtue of conferring this kind of privilege of serving as an intermediary for the People? And when you would show me, as if in a cenacle, nine hundred personages thus chosen by their fellow citizens, why should I believe that these nine hundred delegates, who do not get along among themselves, are inspired by the breath of the People? And to be honest, how can the law they are going to make oblige me?.....

Here is a president or a directory; personification, symbol or fiction of national sovereignty: primary power of the state.

Here is a chamber, two chambers, organs, one with the interests of conservation, the other with the instinct of development: the second power of the State.

Here is a press, eloquent, seasoned, indefatigable, which, every morning, pours in floods the millions of ideas that swarm in the millions of brains of the citizens: third power of the State.

Executive power is action; the chambers are for deliberation; the press is public opinion.

Which of these powers represents the People? Or else, if you say that it is the whole that represents the People, how does it not all agree? Put royalty in the place of the presidency, and it will be the same thing: my criticism falls equally on monarchy and democracy.

In France there are five or six hundred periodicals, emunctories of public opinion, whose titles strongly testify to the claim of the entrepreneurs to serve as interpreters of general thought: *Le Siècle, la Réforme, la Liberté, le Progrès, la Presse, le Temps, l'Opinion, la Démocratie, l'Atelier, les Ecoles, la Vérité, la France, le Monde, le Constitutionnel, le National, le Commerce, les Débats, le Courrier, le Populaire, le Peuple, la Voix du Peuple, le Peuple constituant, le Représentant, du Peuple*, etc., etc., etc.

Certainly, I am surprised that with such publicity, when we are so well matched with writers who lack neither erudition, nor ideas, nor style, we still need a representation, a National Assembly.

Now, how is it that with all this I know nothing positive regarding what interests the People, which it is the duty, the mission of the press to teach me? That instead of producing light, the crowd of publications increases darkness?

I ask: What is the best political constitution, the law of progress, the march of the century, the thought of the time, the value of opinion, the future of France and of the world? Will the Republic emerge from the workshop, the school or the corps-de-garde? Is democracy at peace or at war? What truth, what reform must emerge from all these revelations of the People? What is liberty?

On all these questions, journalism expounds, but it answers nothing, it knows nothing. What would its answer be if I were going to ask, for example, if there is a definitive form for the organization of society and what is this form? if we are at the end of revolutions, or if the revolutionary movement is eternal? how, in the latter case, to reconcile this perpetual agitation with liberty, security, well-being? whether all men should be equal despite nature, or treated according to their merit despite the motto of the Republic? what should be the wages of the worker, the profit of the entrepreneur, the contribution to be paid to the State, the credit to be granted to citizens? how, the population growing faster than subsistence, we will escape the inevitability of poverty, etc., etc.

I could extend this interrogation to infinity, and make my questions more and more pressing and difficult. Why does the press, if the press is the speaking faculty of the People, wander instead of answering? The press is so far from satisfying a positive mind that it seems to have been invented expressly to confuse reason and kill study. Ideas fall into newspapers without taking root there: newspapers are the cemeteries of ideas.

And the tribune, what does it tell us? and the Government, what does it know? Formerly it got out of trouble by declining his competence; it did not exist, it claimed, to organize work and give bread to the People. For a month, it has accepted the summons of the proletariat; for a month it has been at work: and for a month it has published every day in the *Moniteur*, this great news:

That it knows nothing, that it finds nothing! The Government divides the People; it excites hatred between the classes that compose it: but to organize the People, to create this sovereignty which is at the same time liberty and agreement, that exceeds the capacity of the Government, as that exceeded its attributions formerly. Now, in a Government that claims to be instituted by the will of the People, such ignorance is a contradiction: it is clear that it is already no longer the People who are sovereign.

Do the People, who are sometimes said to have risen as one man, also think as one man? is it thinking? does it reason? does it conclude? does it have memory, imagination, ideas? If, in fact, the People is sovereign, it is because it thinks; if it thinks, it no doubt has his own way of thinking and of formulating its thoughts. How then does the People think? What are the forms of popular reason? does it proceed by categories? does it use syllogism, induction, analysis, antinomy or analogy? is it for Aristotle or for Hegel? You must explain all this; otherwise, your respect for the sovereignty of the People is just an absurd fetishism. One might as well worship a stone.

Does the People, in its meditations, appeal to experience? Does it take its memories into account, or is its way to constantly produce new ideas? How does it reconcile respect for its traditions with the needs of its development? How does it conclude from an exhausted hypothesis to the testing of another? What is the law of its transitions and its enjambments? What pushes it, determines it on the way to progress? Why this mobility, this inconstancy? I need to know it, otherwise the law that you impose on me in the name of the People ceases to be authentic: it is no longer law, it is violence.

Does the People still think? And if it doesn't always think, how do you realize the intermittences of its thought? Supposing that the People can be represented, what will their representatives do during these intermittences?... Do the People sometimes sleep, like Jupiter in the arms of Juno? When does it dream? When is it awake? You must instruct me in all these things; otherwise, the power that you exercise by delegation of the People being only interim, and the time of the interim being unknown, this power is usurped: you incline to tyranny.

If the People thinks, if it reflects, if it reasons, sometimes *a priori*, according to the rules of pure reason, sometimes *a posteriori* on the data of experience, it runs the risk of being mistaken. It is no longer enough then, for me to accept as law the thought of the People, that its authenticity be demonstrated to me; this thought must be legitimate. Who will sort out the ideas and fancies of the People? To whom shall we appeal of its possibly erroneous, and therefore despotic, will?

On this basis, I pose this dilemma:

If the People can fail, one of two things is true. Either error is respectable in it like truth, and it has the right to be obeyed in whatever it wishes, even though it is mistaken. In this case, the People is a supremely immoral being, since it can at the same time think evil, will it and do it.

On the contrary, should the People, in its errors, be corrected? There would therefore be, in certain cases, a duty for a government to resist the People! Who will dare tell it: You are wrong! Who can straighten it, constrain it?

But what am I saying? If the People is subject to failure, what becomes of its sovereignty? Is it not obvious that the will of the People must be taken into consideration all the less the more

formidable its consequences, and that the true principle of all politics, the guarantee of the security of nations, is to consult the People only to be wary of it: any inspiration from it being able to hide an immense danger as well as an immense success; and its will to be only a thought of suicide?

No doubt, you will say, the People has only a mystical existence; it manifests only at rare intervals, at predestined times! But the People is not a phantom for that, and when it rises, no one can fail to recognize it. The People showed itself on July 14, August 10, in 1830: it has just revealed itself with more audacity than ever. The People spoke at the Jeu de Paume oath on the night of August 4: it was at Jemmapes, it fought at Mainz and Valmy...

Why stop? why choose? Was the People absent on 9 Thermidor and 18 Brumaire? Was it hiding on January 21 and December 5? Did it not make the emperor, as it had defeated the king? Didn't he worship and strike in turn Christ and Reason?... Do you want to go back higher? It is the People who produced from its blood and entrails, one day Gregory VII and another Luther; which caused Marius and Caesar to arise, after having, in a series of revolutions, driven out the Tarquins, overthrown the Decemvirs, created the tribunes to balance the consuls, and thereby gave the first example of the political seesaw, of the doctrinaire system. It was the People who adored the Caesars, after having allowed the Gracchi to be assassinated!...

Do you prefer to stay in the present? Tell me then what the People think today, March 25, 1848, or rather what they don't think?

Does the People think, with the Abbé Lacordaire, of doing penance in ashes and hair-shirt? does it think that it was born from the dust, and will return to the dust; that its destiny here below is not pleasure, but work and mortification? Or does it not think, with the Sage disillusioned with wisdom, with Saint-Simon and Fourier, that the end of man is like that of the horse, and that all is vanity on earth, except to live well? and make love?

Does the People think of the abolition of the grants, of the progressive tax, of the national workshops, of the agricultural banks, of paper money? Or does it not rather think that to impose wealth, extraordinarily, is to kill wealth; that instead of extending the powers of the State, they must be tightened; that the organization of labor is nothing other than the organization of competition, and that the greatest service to be rendered to agriculture, instead of creating a special bank for it, is to sever all its relations with the bank ?

Is the People for direct election; or for the one with two degrees? for a representation of 900 or for one of 450?

Is the People or is it not communist, phalansterian, neo-Christian, utilitarian? because, finally, there is all that in the People. Is it for Pythagoras, Morelly, Campanella or the good Icar? for the Trinity or for the Triad? Is it not the People who speaks, in these harangues that say nothing, in these placards that contradict each other, and in these acts of the Government conceived in the opposite direction of February 24? Does it ask for bread and spectacles, or liberty? Did it make the revolution only to deny it immediately, or is it intention to pursue it?

Now, if the People, at all times of history, has thought, expressed, wanted and done a multitude of opposite things; if, even today, among so many opinions which divide him, it is impossible for it

to choose one without repudiating another and consequently without putting itself in contradiction with itself, what do you expect me to think of its reason, of its morality, of the justice of its actions? What can I expect from its representatives? And what proof of authenticity will you give me in favor of an opinion, which I cannot at the same moment claim for the contrary opinion?

What I admire in the midst of the confusion of ideas is that faith in the sovereignty of the People, far from failing, seems, by this very confusion, to rise to its climax. In this obstinacy of the multitude to believe in the intelligence that lives within it, I already see a manifestation of the People that affirms itself, as well as Jehovah, and says: I am. I cannot therefore deny, on the contrary I am forced to confess the sovereignty of the People. But beyond this first affirmation, when it is a question of passing from the subject of the thought to its object, when it is a question, in other words, of applying the criterion to the acts of the Government, let me be told where are the people?

In principle, therefore, I admit that the people exist, that they are sovereign, that they assert themselves in the consciousness of the masses. But nothing so far proves to me that it can perform an act of external sovereignty, that an external revelation of the People is possible. For, in the presence of the domination of prejudices, of the contradiction of ideas and interests, of the variability of opinion; of the enthusiasm of the multitude, I will always ask what establishes the authenticity and the legitimacy of such a revelation: and this is what democracy cannot answer.

II.

But, the democrats observe, not without reason, the People were never suitably solicited. It has never been able to manifest its will except by flashes: the part it has played up to now in history is entirely subordinate. The People, so that it can express its thoughts, must be consulted democratically; that is to say that all citizens, without distinction, must participate, directly or indirectly, in the formation of the law. Now, this mode of democratic consultation has never been exercised in a consistent manner: the eternal conspiracy of privileges has not permitted it. Princes, nobles and priests, people of the pen and people of the sword, magistrates, professors, scholars, artists, industrialists, merchants, financiers, landowners, have always managed to break the democratic bundle, to change the voice of the People into a voice of monopoly. Now that we have the only and true way of making the People speak, we will know thereby what constitutes the authenticity and legitimacy of their word, and all your previous objections will vanish. The sincerity of the democratic regime guarantees us the solution.

I agree that the crux of the difficulty consists in making the People speak and act as one man. The Republic, in my opinion, is nothing else; and that too is the whole social problem. Democracy claims to solve this problem by universal suffrage applied in the greatest breadth, that is to say the substitution of the authority of the multitude for the royal authority. That is why it is called *Democracy*, government of the multitude.

It is therefore the theory of universal suffrage that we have to judge. Or, to present my whole thought straight away, it is democracy that we have to demolish, as we have demolished the monarchy: this transition will be the last, before arriving at the Republic.

1. Democracy is an aristocracy in disguise.

According to the theory of universal suffrage, experience would have proved that the middle class, which alone formerly exercised political rights, does not represent the People; far from it, that it is, with the monarchy, in constant reaction against the People.

We conclude that it is for the nation as a whole to appoint its representatives.

But, if this is the case with a class of men that the free development of society, the spontaneous development of the sciences, the arts, industry, and commerce; the necessity of institutions, the tacit consent or the notorious incapacity of the lower classes; of a class, finally, that its talents and its wealth has designated as the *natural* elite of the People: what are we to expect from a representation that, emerging from more or less complete, more or less enlightened and free comitia, acting under the influence of local passions, prejudices of state, in hatred of the people and the principles, will be, in the final analysis, only one *artificial* representation, product of the good pleasure of the electoral crush?

We will have an aristocracy of our choice, I agree, instead of an aristocracy of nature. But, aristocracy for aristocracy, I prefer, with M. Guizot, that of fatality to that of good pleasure: fatality does not bind me.

Or rather, we will only bring back, by another route, the same aristocrats; for who do you want them to appoint to represent them, these companions, these day laborers, these laborers, if not their bourgeois? Unless you want them to kill them!

Willingly or unwillingly, the preponderance in government therefore belongs to men who have the preponderance of talent and fortune; and from the first step, it becomes evident that social reform will never emerge from political reform; that it is political reform, on the contrary, which must come out of social reform.

The illusion of the democracy comes from the fact that, following the example of the constitutional monarchy, it claims to organize the government by representative means. Neither the Revolution of July nor that of February sufficed to enlighten it. What it wants is always the inequality of fortunes, always the delegation of the sovereign, always the government of notabilities. Instead of saying, like M. Thiers: *The King reigns and does not govern*; democracy says: *The People reign and do not govern*, which is to deny the Revolution.

It was not, however, because he was opposed to electoral reform that M. Guizot fell, carrying in his fall the dynasty and the throne; it is because, in the public consciousness, the constitution was worn out and no longer wanted. The set of reforms demanded by the Opposition proves, as I have shown, that it was the Charter, much more than the ministry, that was being attacked; it was to something higher still than the Charter, it was to the very constitution of society.

When, therefore, there is talk today of substituting a representative democracy for a representative monarchy, all that is done is to change the sentence, *Belle marquise, vos beaux yeux me font mourir d'amour*, into this other; *Vos yeux beaux, belle marquise, mourir d'amour me font*; and one can say, according to the expression of the *Atelier*, that the Revolution is dodged.

But, be patient! While it may seem difficult at this time to escape this governmental alternative, the difficulty will not last long. The representative has fallen into the barricades never

to rise again. Constitutional democracy is gone with the constitutional monarchy. The month of February, according to Latin etymology, is the month of burials. Social reform will bring political reform; the knowledge of the first implies the knowledge of the second. We will have the Government of the People by the People, and not by a representation of the People; we will have, I say, the Republic, or we will perish a second time by democracy.

2. Democracy is exclusive and doctrinaire.

Since, according to the ideology of the democrats, the People cannot govern itself, and it is forced to give itself representatives who govern it by delegation and subject to revision, it is supposed that the People is at least capable of being represented, that it can be represented faithfully. — Well! This assumption is radically false; there is not, there can never be, any legitimate representation of the People. All electoral systems are mechanisms for lying: it is enough to know one of them to pronounce the condemnation of all.

Take that of the Provisional Government.

When a theory is produced in the name of the People, it must, in relation to logic, justice, traditions, tendencies, the whole, as well as in relation to expression, show itself to be irrefragable. I no more recognize the voice of the People in the books of Fourier than in *Père Duchêne*.

The system of the Provisional Government claims to be universal.

But, whatever we do, there will always be, in any electoral system, exclusions, absences, invalid, erroneous or unfree votes.

The boldest innovator has not yet dared to demand suffrage for women, children, servants, convicts. These are approximately four-fifths of the People, who are not represented, who are cut off from the communion of the People. Why?

You set the electoral capacity at 21; why not at 20? why not at 19, at 18, at 17?..... What! It is a year, a day, that makes the reason of the elector! The Barra, the Viala are incapable of voting with discernment; the Fouchés, the Héberts, will vote for them!

You eliminate women. So you have solved the great problem of the inferiority of sex. What! no exception for Lucrece, Cornélie, Joan of Arc or Charlotte Corday! a Roland, a Stael, a George Sand, will not find favor with your virility! The Jacobins received knitters at their sessions; it has never been said that the presence of female citizens would have weakened the courage of the citizens!

You dismiss the servant. Who tells you that this badge of servitude does not cover a generous soul; that in this servant's heart does not beat an idea which will save the Republic! Is the race of Figaro lost? — Will you say that it is this man's fault? Why, you ask, with so many means, is he a servant? And why are there servants?

I want to see, I want to hear the People in its variety and its multitude, all ages, all sexes, all conditions, all virtues, all impoverishments: for all that is the People.

You claim that there would be serious inconvenience for good discipline, for the peace of the State and the repose of families, if women, children, and servants obtained the same rights as

husbands, fathers, and masters; that, moreover, by the solidarity of interests and by the family tie, the former are sufficiently represented by the latter.

I confess that the objection is serious, and I do not undertake to refute it. But beware: you must, for the same reason, exclude the proletarians and all workers. Seven-tenths of this category receive assistance from public charity: they will therefore go and vote for themselves a civil list, increases in wages, reductions in work; and they will not fail to do so, I assure you, provided their delegates represent them. The proletariat will be in the National Assembly like the civil servants in M. Guizot's chamber, judge in its own cause, drawing from the budget and putting nothing into it, supplementing the dictatorship, until capital being exhausted by taxes, property no longer producing anything, general bankruptcy puts an end to parliamentary begging.

And all these citizens who, for reasons of work, illness, travel, or lack of money to go to the elections, will be forced to abstain, how do you count them? Will it be according to the proverb: Who says nothing, consents? But consent to what? to the opinion of the majority, or to that of the minority?...

And those who vote only by training, convenience or interest, on the faith of the Republican committee or their parish priest; what do you do with them? It is an old maxim that in all deliberation it is necessary not only to count the votes, but to weigh them. In your elections, on the contrary, the vote of an Arago, of a Lamartine, counts no more than that of a beggar. — Will you say that the consideration due to men of merit is acquired by the influence they exercise over the electors? So the votes are not free. It is the voice of the capacities that we hear, it is not that of the People. We might as well keep the system at 200 francs.

The army was given the right to vote. Here is what that means: The soldier who does not vote like the captain will go to the police station; the captain who does not vote like the colonel will be put under arrest; and the colonel who does not vote like the Government will be dismissed.

I pass over in silence the material and moral impossibilities that abound in the method adopted by the Provisional Government. It is agreed that by doubling the national representation, and having the vote by ballot, the Provisional Government wanted to make the citizens decide, not on the men, but on the principle; precisely in the manner of the old Government, which also voted on the system, and not on men. How to discuss the choice of 10, 15, 25 deputies? How, if each citizen deposited in the ballot box a free and informed suffrage, to count such a vote? How could such elections succeed, if they were serious? Obviously that's impossible.

I am not discussing, I repeat, this purely material side of the question: I am sticking to questions of right. What we obtained before from venality, today we snatch it from impotence. They say to the elector: Here are our friends, the friends of the Republic; and here are our adversaries, who are also the adversaries of the Republic: choose. And the voter who cannot appreciate the suitability of the candidates, votes with confidence!

Instead of having the deputies named by each district, as under the deposed regime, they are elected by department. We wanted, by this measure, to destroy the spirit of locality. Now, admire how sure the democrats are of their principles!

If the deputies, they say, were named by the arrondissements, it would not be France that would be represented, it would be the arrondissements. The National Assembly would no longer be the representation of the country; it would be a congress of 459 representations.

Why then, I would reply, don't you have each elector nominate the deputies for all France?

It would be desirable, you answer: but the thing is impossible.

I observe first of all that any system which can only be true on condition of being impossible seems to me a poor system. But the democrats here seem to me singularly inconsistent and embarrassed by very little. If the representatives must represent, not the departments, nor the arrondissements, nor the towns, nor the countryside, nor industry, nor commerce, nor agriculture, nor interests—but only France ! why was it decided that there would be one deputy per 40,000 inhabitants? Why not one per 100,000 or 200,000! Wasn't ninety instead of nine hundred enough? Couldn't you, in Paris, draw up your list, while the legitimists, the conservatives, the dynastics would have drawn up theirs? Was it more difficult to vote on a list of 90 names than on one of 15?

But who does not see that deputies thus elected, outside of any interest, any specialty, any consideration of places and people, by dint of representing France, represent absolutely nothing; that they are no longer representatives, but senators, and that instead of a representative democracy, we have an elective oligarchy, the middle term between democracy and royalty?

That, citizen reader, is where I wanted to take you. From whatever side you consider democracy, you will always see it placed between two extremes, both equally contrary to its principle; condemned to oscillate between the absurd and the impossible, without ever being able to settle down. Among a million middle terms of an equally arbitrary nature, the Provisional Government did as M. Guizot did: it preferred the one that seemed to it to suit best its democratic prejudices: of the representative truth, as of the government of the People by the People, the provisional Government took no account. I don't blame it for that. Minds are not equal to the Republic; we must pass once again through democracy: now, transition for transition, I like the system of the Provisional Government as much as that of M. Duvergier de Hauranne. I don't believe the choice is worth a minute's scrutiny.

3. Democracy is ostracism.

For the deputy to represent his constituents, he must represent all the ideas that contributed to the election.

But with the electoral system, the deputy, so-called legislator, sent by the citizens to reconcile, in the name of the People, all the ideas and all the interests, never represents more than one idea, one interest; the rest are ruthlessly excluded. Because, who rules in the elections? Who decides on the choice of deputies? The majority, half plus one of the votes. Whence it follows that half less one of the voters is not represented or is so in spite of itself; that of all the opinions that divide the citizens, only one, if indeed the deputy has an opinion, reaches the legislature, and that finally the law, which should be the expression of the will of the People, is only the expression of half the People.

So that, in the theory of the democrats, the problem of the government consists in eliminating, by the mechanism of a supposed universal suffrage, all the ideas, except one, which stir the opinion, and to declare sovereign that which has the majority.

But, it will perhaps be said, the idea that succumbs in one electoral body can triumph in another, and, by this means, all ideas can be represented in the National Assembly.

Were it to be, you would only have postponed the difficulty; for the question is to know how all these ideas, divergent and antagonistic, will contribute to the law and will find themselves reconciled there.

Thus the Revolution, according to some, is only an accident, which should change nothing in the general order of society. According to others, the Revolution was even more social than political. How to satisfy such manifestly incompatible claims? How to give security to the bourgeoisie and guarantees to the proletariat at the same time? How will these contrary wishes, these opposing tendencies, come to be fused in a common resultant, in the one and universal law?

Far from democracy being able to resolve this difficulty, all its art, all its science is to avoid it. It appeals to the ballot box; the ballot box is at the same time the level, the balance and the criterion of democracy. With the electoral ballot box, it eliminates men; with the legislative ballot box, it eliminates ideas.

Barely a month ago, we were shouting in all tones, about the *cens* at 200 francs: What! It is a franc! a penny that makes the voter!...

Isn't it always the same thing? What! It is a vote that makes the representative, a vote which will make the law!... On a question on which depend the honor and the safety of the Republic, the citizens are divided into two equal fractions. Both sides bring the most serious reasons, the most serious authorities, the most positive facts. The nation is in doubt, the assembly in suspense. A representative, without appreciable reason, passes from right to left, and tilts the balance: it is he who makes the law.

And this law, expression of some whimsical will, will be deemed to be the expression of the will of the People! I will have to submit to it, defend it, die for it! I lose, through a parliamentary whim, the most precious of my rights, I lose my liberty! And the holiest of my duties, the duty to resist tyranny by force, falls before the sovereign ball of an imbecile!

Democracy is nothing but the tyranny of majorities, the most execrable tyranny of all; for it rests neither on the authority of a religion, nor on a nobility of race, nor on the prerogatives of talent and fortune: it is based on numbers, and takes for a mask the name of the People. M. de Genoude refused, under the reign of Louis-Philippe, the payment of the tax, since, he said, the tax was not voted by a real national representation. M. de Genoude was honest in stopping on such a fine road. Is it the case, by chance, that when a more democratic majority has voted for the budget, the minority will have to believe that it has also voted for it, and that consequently it is obliged to pay, when it will have voted precisely against the budget ?

I proved, in the first part of this work, the legitimacy of the Revolution and the moral necessity of the Republic, by showing that, on February 22, all opinions, all parties, whatever divergence there was between them, concluded on a set of reforms whose general formula was

invariably this: Republic. Democracy, with universal suffrage, destroys this justification, the only justification it can give for its advent. It strives to make the masses and the departments say that they adhere to the Republic; and if this adherence failed her, she would resist by force! Intimidation, here is the strongest argument of the democrats regarding the Republic! Is it clear that universal suffrage, that democracy does not express the sovereignty of the people?

I hope that the force of things, that the inflexible reason of the facts, will inspire our future National Assembly. But I would not be surprised if, formed by a government that understood the Revolution so little, it did not itself end up proving the Revolution wrong, and that we did not see the People once again disavow, by an act analogous to that of February, the policy of its representatives.

4. Democracy is a form of absolutism.

If universal suffrage, the most complete manifestation of democracy, has won so many supporters, especially among the working classes, it is because it has always been presented as an appeal to talents and capacities, as well as to common sense and the morality of the masses. How often have we returned to the insulting contrast between the speculator who, by dint of plunder, became a political influence and the man of genius whom poverty kept away from the stage! What sarcasm about capacities at 200 francs, and incapacities such as those of a Béranger, a Châteaubriant, a Lamennais!

Finally, here we are all voters; we can choose the most worthy.

We can do more; we will follow them step by step in their legislative acts and in their votes; we will send them our reasons and documents; we will tell them our will, and when we are dissatisfied, we will revoke them.

The choice of capacities, the imperative mandate, the permanent revocability, are the most immediate, the most indisputable consequences of the electoral principle. This is the inevitable program of all democracy.

Now, democracy does not accommodate itself to such a deduction from its principle, any more than constitutional monarchy.

What democracy, like monarchy, demands on are silent deputies, who do not discuss, but who vote; who, receiving the government's watchword, crush their opponents with their coarse battalions. They are passive creatures, I almost said satellites, whom the danger of a dismissal does not intimidate, whose reason is not too rebellious, whose conscience does not recoil before anything arbitrary, before any proscription.

This is, you will say, pushing the paradox to the point of calumny. — So let's prove the paradox, in fact and in law: it won't take long.

Everyone has read the circular from the Minister of Public Instruction to the rectors, relative to the elections, and everyone has noticed this passage:

“The greatest error of the populations of our comtrysides, it is that, to be representative, it is necessary to have education or fortune.

"Most of the assembly act as jurors, judging by *yes* or *no*, whether what the elite members are proposing is good or bad. It only needs honesty and common sense; it does not invent. — That is the fundamental principle of republican right."

The minister then expresses the desire that primary school teachers stand for deputation, not because they are sufficiently enlightened, but although not sufficiently enlightened. — "The more they will have started from the bottom, the greater they will be;" which, for a geometer, is indisputable.

If the Minister, convinced of the notorious ability of a large number of estimable teachers, had contented himself with indicating them like lights kept under a bushel, which the advent of democracy would bring out, I would applaud the circular. But who does not see that in the thought of the minister, the primary schoolteacher is envious mediocrity, who has *invented* nothing, who will *invent* nothing, destined to serve with their silent votes the war against the rich and democratic arbitrariness? As such, I protest against this candidacy, let us be decisive about the word, against this prostitution of teachers.

Just as constitutional monarchy, seeking to surround itself with an aristocracy of talent and fortune, appeals to notables, so democracy, which is the inverse of this system, composes its patriciate of mediocrities. And this is not, as one might think, an opinion peculiar to the minister; I will prove presently that this is the pure essence of democracy.

I cite one more fact.

All the authors on public right, in particular the democrats, come out against the imperative mandate; all, I say, unanimously consider it impolitic, abusive, leading to the oppression of the government by the country, offensive to the dignity of the deputy, &c. The imperative mandate was stricken with all anathemas. In civil right, it would be a monstrous thing for the principal to have less authority than the agent; in politics, it is quite the opposite. Here, the agent becomes judge and arbiter of the interests of his principal. What is orthodox according to the code is heretical in the order of constitutional ideas: this is one of the thousand anomalies of the human mind.

As for the duration of the mandate, revocable at will in civil right, it is, in politics, independent of the will of the voter. In all our constitutions, the duration of the mandate has varied from one year to seven, according to the convenience, not of the governed citizens, but of the governing citizens.

In fact, it is therefore well understood, it is proven by the doctrine of the authors as well as by the circulars of the ministers, that in any kind of government the deputy belongs to the government, not to the country; that it is to this end that the monarchy demands him capable or rich, and democracy incapable or indigent; that both require that he be in control of his vote, that is to say free to tamper with it and sell it; that the mandate has a determined duration, of at least one year, during which the Government, in agreement with the deputies, does what it pleases and gives force of law to the acts of its good pleasure.

Could it be otherwise? No, and the discussion of the point of law does not require a long speech.

The fallen system could be defined as the government of society by the bourgeoisie, that is to say, by the aristocracy of talent and fortune. The system that we are currently working to establish, democracy, can be defined by opposition to the government of society by the immense majority of citizens who have little talent and no fortune. The exceptions that may be found under either of these systems do nothing to the principle, neither change nor modify the tendency. It is inevitable, under representative monarchy, that the People be exploited by the bourgeoisie; and under democratic government, that it be exploited by the proletariat.

Now, whoever wants the end wants the means.

If the monarchical representation were formed of deputies having an imperative mandate, revocable at the will of the electors, the bourgeoisie would soon lose its privileges, and the royalty that personifies it would be reduced to zero. Similarly, if the Democratic Assembly were composed of bourgeois, of men powerful through science and fortune, devoted to their principle, and capable of being replaced at any moment if they betrayed it, the dictatorship of the masses would fall quickly, and the proletariat would return to his proletariat.

It is therefore necessary for each form of government to surround itself with the conditions of stability best suited to its nature: hence the resistance of M. Guizot to electoral reform; hence the universal suffrage and the circular of M. Carnot.

But as nothing that creates a split in the People cannot last, it is also inevitable that these forms of tyranny perish one after the other, and, remarkably, always from the same cause, bourgeois tyranny from the poverty of the proletariat, proletarian tyranny from the ruin of the bourgeoisie, which is universal misery.

Such was not, on February 22, 23 and 24, the tendency of minds.

The bourgeoisie, tired of the turpitudes of its own government, marched on unwittingly — to cries of *Long live reform!* — to the Republic. The working masses, repeating with enthusiasm the cry of *reform*, caressing the bourgeoisie with their eyes and their voices, were also marching, unwittingly, to the Republic. The fusion of ideas and hearts was complete, the goal was the same, although the road we were taking was unknown to anyone.

From February 25 on, the Revolution, misunderstood, was distorted. From a social revolution, as it was in everyone's mind, it was made political again; for it is always political to absorb, under the pretext of organization, labor into the State; and the line of demarcation between the bourgeoisie and the people, effaced for a moment, reappeared deeper and broader. Incapable of conceiving the republican ideal, given over to demagogic and mercantile routine, the Provisional Government worked to organize, instead of work, civil war and appalling miseries.

If the National Assembly does not put an end to this detestable policy, France will soon learn, by the most painful experience, what distance there is between the Republic and democracy.

5 Materialist and atheistic democracy.

If the monarchy is the hammer that crushes the People, democracy is the axe that divides it: both equally conclude with the death of freedom.

Universal suffrage is a kind of atomism by which the legislator, unable to make the People speak in the unity of its essence, invites the citizens to express their opinion person by person, *viritem*, absolutely as the Epicurean philosopher explains thought, will, intelligence, by combinations of atoms. It is political atheism, in the worst sense of the word. As if the addition of any number of votes could ever result in a general thought!

It is the clash of ideas that casts the light, say the ancients. This is true and false, like all proverbs. Between the shock and the light there may be a thousand years of interval. History only began to unfold for us half a century ago; the ideas that once stirred in Rome, Athens, Jerusalem, Memphis, have enlightened only the men of our time. The People has spoken, no doubt; but its word, lost through individual voices, was understood by no one. The light carried by ancient ideas has been shielded from contemporaries. It shines, for the first time, in the eyes of the Vicos, the Montesquieus, the Lessings, the Guizots, the Thierrys, and their emulators. Is it also for posterity that we must cut our own throats?

The surest way to make the People lie is to establish universal suffrage. The vote by head, in terms of government, and as a means of ascertaining the national will, is exactly the same thing as a new division of lands would be in political economy. It is agrarian law transferred from the soil to authority.

Because the authors, who were the first to deal with the origin of governments, taught that all power has its source in national sovereignty, it has been bravely concluded that the best thing was to make all the citizens vote, by voice, by *croupion* or by ballot, and that the majority of the votes thus cast were adequate to the will of the People. We have been brought back to the customs of the barbarians, who, in default of reasoning, proceed by acclamation and election. A material symbol has been taken for the true formula of sovereignty. And we said to the proletarians: when you vote, you will be free, you will be rich; you will decree the capital, the product and the wages; you will, like other Moses, cause thrushes and manna to fall from heaven; you will become like gods, for you will no longer work, or you will work so little, if you work, that it will be like nothing.

Whatever one does and whatever one says, universal suffrage, testimony to discord, can only produce discord. And it is with this miserable idea, I am ashamed of it for my country, that for 17 years, we have been agitating the poor People! This is why bourgeois and workers sang the *Marseillaise* in chorus in 70 banquets, and, after a revolution as glorious as legitimate, abandoned themselves to a sect of doctrinaires! For six months, the deputies of the opposition, like actors on leave, have traveled the province, and as a result of their representations for benefit, in the place of political privilege, they have brought us back, what? Political agrarianism! It is under this split flag that we claim to preserve the initiative of progress, to march in the vanguard of nations in the conquests of liberty, to inaugurate harmony on the globe! Yesterday, we watched with pity the Peoples who had not been able, like us, to rise to constitutional sublimity. Today, fallen a hundred times lower, we still pity them, we would go with a hundred thousand bayonets to make them share with us the benefits of democratic absolutism. And we are the great nation! Oh! shut up; and if you know neither how to do great things nor how to express great ideas, preserve for us, at least, common sense.

Have eight million voters, have eight thousand, your representation, with different qualities, will be worth neither less nor more.

Make nine hundred deputies, make ninety; and the law they will make; sometimes more plebeian, sometimes more bourgeois, will be neither better nor worse.

If I base some hope on the National Assembly, it is much less because of its origin and the number of its members, than because of the events that cannot fail to bring it advice, and the work of public reason, which will be to the National Assembly what light is to the daguerreotype.

6. Retrograde and contradictory democracy.

In a monarchy, acts of government are a display of authority; in a democracy, they are constitutive of authority. Authority, which in a monarchy is the principle of governmental action, in a democracy is the goal of government. It follows that democracy is inevitably retrograde, and that it implies contradiction.

Let us place ourselves at the starting point of democracy, at the moment of universal suffrage.

All citizens are equal, independent. Their egalitarian collection is the starting point of power: it is power itself, in its highest expression, in its fullness.

Under the democratic principle, all citizens must participate in the formation of law, the government of the state, the exercise of public functions, the discussion of the budget, the appointment of civil servants. All must be consulted and give their opinion on peace and war, commercial and alliance treaties, colonial enterprises, works of public utility, the rewards to be awarded, the penalties to be inflicted; finally, all must pay their debt to the country, as taxpayers, jurors, judges, and soldiers.

If things could happen in this way, the ideal of democracy would be achieved; it would have a normal existence, it would develop in the direct sense of its principle, like all things that have life and development. It is thus that the acorn becomes an oak, and the embryo an animal; it is thus that geometry, astronomy, chemistry, are the infinite development of a small number of elements.

It is quite another thing in democracy, which fully exists, according to the authors, only at the moment of elections, and for the formation of the legislative power. This moment passed, democracy falls back; it returns to itself, and begins its anti-democratic work; it becomes Authority. Authority was M. Guizot's idol; it is also that of the democrats.

It is not true, in fact, in any democracy that all citizens participate in the formation of the law: this prerogative is reserved for representatives.

It is not true that they deliberate on all public affairs, internal and external: this is the prerogative, no longer even of representatives, but of ministers. The citizens discuss affairs, the ministers alone deliberate on them.

It is not true that each citizen fulfills a public function: these functions being unproductive must be reduced as much as possible; by their nature, they therefore exclude vast majority of citizens. Formerly, among the Greeks, each citizen occupied a salaried employment by the treasury of the State: in this respect, the ideal of Democracy was realized in Athens and in Sparta. But the

Greeks lived on slave labor, and war filled their treasury: the abolition of slavery, the increasing difficulty of war made democracy impossible for modern nations.

It is not true that citizens participate in the appointment of officials; moreover, this participation is impossible like the previous one, since it would have the effect of creating anarchy in the bad sense of the word. It is the governmental power that appoints its subordinates, sometimes according to its good pleasure, sometimes according to certain conditions of admission or advancement, as independent of the will of the ministers as it is of that of the citizens. Unity of government, order and discipline of officials, centralization demand that it be so. Article 13 of the charter of 1830, which attributed to the king the *appointment to all posts in public administration*, is for the use of democracy as well as royalty. Everyone, in the revolution that has just been accomplished, understood it in this way, to such an extent that one could believe that it was the dynasty of the *National* which succeeded the dynasty of Orleans.

Finally, it is not true that all citizens participate in justice and in war: as judges and officers, most are eliminated; as jurors and privates, all abstain as much as they can. In a word, hierarchy in government being the first condition of government, democracy is a chimera.

The reason that all authors give for this deserves study. The People, they say, is incapable, by its ignorance, of governing itself; and when he knew, he could not. Not everyone can command and govern at the same time ; authority must belong only to a few who exercise it in the name and by delegation of all.

Ignorance or impotence, the People, according to democratic theory, is incapable of governing itself: democracy, like monarchy, after having established the sovereignty of the People as a principle, results in a declaration of the People's incapacity!

This is how it is understood by our democrats, who, once in government, only think of consolidating and fortifying authority in their own hands. Thus understood the multitude, who rushed to the gates of the Hôtel-de-Ville, asking for functions, money, work, credit, bread! And here is our nation, monarchical to the marrow, idolater of power, devoid of individual energy and republican initiative, accustomed to expecting everything from authority, to doing nothing except by authority! When the monarchy does not come to us from above, as in the past, or from the battlefield, as in 1800, or in the folds of a charter, as in 1814 or 1830, we proclaim it in the public square, between two barricades, in an electoral assembly, or in a patriotic banquet. Drink to the health of the People, and the multitude will crown you! What? Is royalty the end and democracy the means?...

Let the authors think what they will, the Republic is as opposed to democracy as it is to monarchy. In the Republic, everyone reigns and governs; the People thinks and acts as one man; the representatives are plenipotentiaries with an imperative mandate that can be revoked at will; the law is the expression of the unanimous will; there is no other hierarchy than the solidarity of functions, no other aristocracy than that of labor, no other initiative than that of the citizens.

This is the Republic, this is the sovereignty of the People!

III.

Democracy affirming the sovereignty of the People is like theology on its knees before the holy ciborium: neither can prove the Christ whom it worships, let alone manifest Him.

And when democracy, powerless to establish the legitimacy and authenticity of its principle, is asked how it can be useful for the happiness of society, democracy responds by accusing the monarchy, the arbitrariness of its government, its privileges, corruptions and squanderings; her disdain for the working class, her preferences for the bourgeois class: promising, for her part, to act differently, and to do the complete opposite of the monarchy. It is also thus that theology, when it is questioned about its positive utility, goes back to the sin of the first man, attacks idolatry and the devil, accuses the disorder of the passions, the uncertainty of reason, the vanity of the things of this world, offering to lead us to eternal life by sacraments and indulgences.

Democracy, in a word, is in its starting point a negation, in its form a negation, in its goal still a negation.

But, at least, is this negation true? Is it true that democracy, through its institutions, will benefit the people more than monarchy? that its government will cost less than that of royalty? This question is the last that remains for us to consider.

1. Democracy powerless to solve the social question.

What the Saint-Simonians called very improperly, as we will demonstrate later, *organization of labor* is nothing but the Republic.

Republic, social reform, liberty, equality, fraternity, it is all one. But look at what is happening before your eyes.

Who reigns and governs at this moment at the Hôtel-de-Ville? Who sends commissioners to the departments, who appoints and dismisses civil servants, who speaks to astonished and attentive Europe, who holds elections, dissolves the elite companies of the national guard, gives forced circulation to banknotes, adjourns reimbursements from the savings bank, creates counters, collects taxes in advance, strikes extraordinary contributions, gives comedy for free, multiplies, under the name of counters of guarantee, Mont-de-Piété, takes all the public safety measures? — democracy.

What stirs, looking for itself, without being able to formulate itself, at the Luxembourg? — the Republic.

From the day after the Revolution, democracy and the Republic, as if they had said an eternal farewell, separated. The politicians, the notabilities of science, of the bar and of the press, took democracy for themselves. The Republic fell in share to a historiographer, wise enough to judge that he received the best share, but so infected himself with democratic prejudices, that with the best will, the most enterprising character, the cooperation of the least suspect Socialists, he succeeded in a fortnight in making the Republic despair.

If I were permitted to offer the tribute of my advice to M. Blanc, I would say to him:

“The social question will remain insoluble for you as long as you treat it by the democratic, materialist and divisional method, instead of proceeding as a whole and synthetically. Because see what you're doing.

"Sometimes you stimulate competition between workers and masters, sometimes you suppress it by abolishing tasks and haggling. One day, you abolish the work of the convents and prisons, and the next day, you propose to found four large hospitals to lodge the poor workers, who will thus become workers of privilege. You want to destroy pauperism, and you consecrate it by the relief and palliatives that you bring to it in all forms. Out of consideration for the intellectual interest of the workers, you reduce the hours of work, and you compromise by this reduction their subsistence. You talk in turn about capital, wages; credit, machinery; you propose to organize a trial commune, in an unassociated environment; and you do not see that by these partial attempts, you get more and more lost in the maze. All of this might be helpful, if you just wanted to review the issues.economics, and note their opposition. But to proceed in this way, with the avowed intention of arriving at a solution, is to go against logic and turn your back on the goal you propose to achieve. You do for the *organization of labor* precisely what democracy does to express the sovereignty of the People. You ask fragmentary elements for a conclusion that they can never furnish, since the solution that you believe you have found for one is constantly invalidated by the solution that you give to the other; as in universal suffrage, half plus one of the votes proves the other half in the wrong, which is, properly speaking, a trickery of the Republic.

"You have to change course, or give up your business. If you don't have a powerful enough mind, a broad enough conception to reconcile in the same principle all the questions, all the opinions, all the interests, even antagonistic ones, you will only increase the disorder. You are doing the work of democracy, and you are betraying the Republic."

Democracy presupposes, *a priori*, the absolute independence of citizens. It only admits of solidarity between them that which they have freely consented to. The idea it has of society is that of a contract, avowed or tacit, whose clauses are the expression of a sovereign will in itself and inviolable. It understands freedom and equality only in the barbaric way, that is to say as negative rights, one of all impediments, the other of all superiority. It does not see in it, like the economist, the product of an organization in which each existence is the result of all the other existences.

As far as the State is concerned, it is, in the eyes of democracy, only a truce made permanent between implacable individualities, who never compromise except on points where there is no longer any interest for anyone to fight; or if sometimes democracy seizes the State in what is real and positive about it, it considers it only as an instrument of domination, and it consequently tends to bring in as many people as possible, which always brings back the insolidarity and anarchy.

In such a frame of mind, and with such ideas, how should democracy consider the social question? And how could it try to solve it?

Democracy could only conceive of one thing, which was that power, passing from the privileged class to the working class, became for the latter a means of emancipation at the expense of the former; that thus power was a means of freedom for the proletarian, by the reduction of work, the increase of wages, the participation in the profits of the masters, etc.; — means of equality, through the tax reform, of proportionality made progressive; by competition with contractors by means of bonuses granted by the State to so-called national workers and paid by the contractors; by applying the elective principle to all jobs; — means of fraternity by the creation of

relief funds, pensions, retreats, philanthropic establishments of all kinds maintained at the expense of the rich and for the benefit of the proletarians.

Experience and theory have demonstrated that all these means were impracticable, and that their application would be the ruin and conflagration of society. But democracy is not concerned with the lessons of science and the teaching of facts. She has the power, she reigns and governs; it inscribes at the head of all its acts the sacramental words of liberty, equality, fraternity; it has the firm resolution to apply its principles; no opposition can hold it back; everything is to be expected. Come what may! The organization of society is, for the democrat, only the reversal of established relations: this invariably results from all the programs published in the name of democracy.

Let's cite an example.

M. de Lamartine, in his declaration of principles of October 24, 1847, after having declared himself in favor of the representative and hereditary monarchy, after having expressed his admiration for the *pyramid of the three powers*, royalty, chamber of peers, chamber of deputies, proposes:

The exercised sovereignty of the People. — Exercised by whom? How? M. de Lamartine does not even suspect the immensity of the problem.

Electoral rights distributed to all citizens. — It is the agrarian law; it is more than that, it is the alienation of sovereignty.

Primary assemblies appointing electors for temporary office; voters appointing representatives for a limited time. — Representation on three stages, consequence of the pyramid. What will become of you, O People, when your sovereignty has passed through this channel?

The representatives, not given over to the corruption of the ministers, but salaried by the people, to remove any pretext for their servility. — Since every citizen is supposed to live from his work, the indemnity granted to the deputy is in itself a fair thing. But the motive given by M. de Lamartine is pitiful. How would the deputy's salary be an obstacle to ministerial corruption? As if the venal man were embarrassed to receive with both hands! To ministerial corruption is added a bonus of 25 francs per day: I do not see any reform so far.

Officials at their posts and not in the chambers where they play two incompatible roles, that of controllers and controlled. — M. de Lamartine establishes incompatibilities. So be it: I only ask him to push his principle to the end. There is, if you will, incompatibility with a public prosecutor voting on the justice budget; a military, the army budget; a prefect, the police budget; an engineer, the public works budget. But there is also incompatibility in the fact that a trader, a manufacturer, a broker, passes a management, granting or customs law; a landlord, a land tax law; a wine merchant, a liquor law; a banker, a finance law, a loan or conversion project, etc., etc., etc. There is incompatibility between all the social functions and the voting of the budget and the laws. The landed proprietors, under the pretext that agriculture is the nurse of the State, want their share to be reduced; industrialists demand protection; the valets of the franchises, like the civil servants of salary increases. Your representative system is absurd, I tell you: contradiction abounds everywhere.

A National Assembly. — Say a conjuration, unless it is a confusion.

Freedom of education, safe for policies regarding morals. — This is not organization.

Freedom of the press by revocation of the laws of September. — This is also not organization.

A standing army and a reserve army. — To do what? This is still not organization.

Free education. — Free! you mean paid for by the state. But who will pay the state? the People. You see that education is not free. — But that's not all. Who will benefit most from free education, the rich or the poor? Obviously it will be the rich: the poor are condemned to work from the cradle. Thus free education will produce exactly the same effect as scholarships given by M. Guizot to voters: what do you think, citizens?

Finally, how does M. de Lamartine reconcile free education with freedom of education? Will the State pay the primary teachers and the Ignorantins? The Jesuit colleges and those of the University? It's impossible. Now, if the State pays some and does not pay the others, freedom does not exist, since equality is destroyed. It is always exclusion; it is not organization, and even less conciliation.

Fraternity in principle and in institutions. — What do you mean? Do we decree fraternity?

The progressive liberty of commerce and trade. — Progressive freedom of commerce is like the progressive extension of electoral rights. If trade can only be conditionally free, it never will be. The inequality of means is eternal; and under the system of property, this inequality is not compensated.

Cheap living by the reduction of taxes on food. — Landed property is already overloaded; circulation overloaded; excessive transfer taxes; it is the same with all taxes. Where will you get the five hundred million produced by the taxes that weigh on food?

A tax for the poor, despite the calumnies by which the selfishness of economists seeks to discredit this institution. — I dare to affirm to M. de Lamartine that the People are of the same opinion on this point as the economists. The People asks, not a tax for the poor, a patent for the improvement of misery; it asks that there be no more poor people. The poor tax is philanthropy, not organization.

Foundlings Adopted by the State. — Philanthropy! The People ask that there be no more foundlings. They want all the girls to be wise, and you, you propose to feed the bastards of the prostitutes at the expense of the virgins. In this regime, we will soon be in full phanerogamy: then the family will become what God wills!

The Extinction of Begging. — Yes, by means of the tax.

Asylums for the infirm. — This is philanthropy.

Workshops for the able-bodied. — And probably also outlets!

Social charity promulgated by numerous laws to all the needs, to all the sufferings, to all the miseries of the People. — That is to say, to provide for all needs, all suffering, all misery, M. de Lamartine only asks for one thing: money!

A budget for the liberality of the State. — Secret funds! Money !

A Ministry of public benevolence. — Money.

A Ministry for the life of the People. — Money, money, always money, that is the sinews of democracy as of war. Give democracy a lot of money and it will do whatever you want. Money for

deputies, money for the infirm, money for beggars, money for scholars, artists, men of letters; for all those who will be friends of the government, or friends of the friends of the government; money for everyone, like sweets at a baptism. But the means of procuring all this money, M. de Lamartine does not speak of: it is the only thing he forgets.

To crown this programme, M. de Lamartine, after having said in speaking of his *Histoire des Girondins*: "I began this book *girondin*, I finished it *montagnard*," published in the *Presse* of November 16, about the socialist banquet of Autun, the following profession of faith:

"We are of the faith of Mirabeau, of Bailly, of Syeyès, of Vergniaud, of Lanjuinais, of Lafayette; we are not part of the Desmoulins schism." He observed, moreover, that Robespierre and Danton had been against the *inebriators* of the People who do not want property.

M. de Lamartine is, in a word, a democrat; he is so at heart, by ideas, by logic, by philanthropy: he is not a republican.

All the programs, all the wishes that were expressed in the seventy banquets that brought about the fall of the dynasty, fit into the program of M. de Lamartine. It is always the same representative prejudice, always the same cult of the multitude, always the same palliatives of philanthropy.

And everything that is done, prepared, meditated on, in the Luxembourg as at the Hôtel-de-Ville, is inspired by the same genius.

Democracy will encourage the savings bank, develop insurance, create a pension fund, cause some road to be paved, some ridge to be reforested, some river to be dredged, some land to be reclaimed; it will give ten million to the Fourierists to experiment with the *organization of labor* on one square league, and will lodge at the expense of the State a few hundred poor workers. — For that, it will increase the budget by 600 million francs; it will take over large, and then small industries; it will depreciate industrial and commercial stocks; it will dry up the source of capital; it will afflict free labor, disturb free trade, kill free education, threaten free consumption, proscribe free suffrage.

This is why democracy is stopping circulation at this moment, why it is closing workshops, why it is nullifying transactions, why it is fencing off the market, why it is puts commerce, and industry, and agriculture, and the State in bankruptcy. Now, in matters of government, everything that results logically from the principle is attributable to the intention.

Liberty, know it well, is incompatible with democracy and monarchy alike. Formerly, it was on the slavery of a caste that the existence of democracy was based; now it will be one everyone's slavery.

2. Democracy more expensive than monarchy. — Conclusion.

I must warn that in this section I am reasoning above all from the governmental point of view, and that I consider the State, not as the whole of the public functions, but as the bond that unites them and that, through this union, expresses the sovereignty national.

Thus the administration of public works is a certain function of the social body, which has its speciality, its utility, its own expense, but which is not the State. Likewise the ministries of justice,

of public instruction, of the navy, etc., are corporative functions, like industry, commerce and agriculture, but are not the state either.

The state, I say, is the link that gathers together in a bundle all the various functions: it is the power, the centralizing organ, the authority.

The functions that act under the immediate supervision of the State, must, like the functions that have remained free, receive, through economic reform, profound modifications and improvements. Thus the budget which, for the financial year 1848, forms a total of about 1,450 millions, including what I will call the expenses of the State, must be gradually reduced by half, by three-quarters, by five-sixths, etc. But as long as the principle of this reform remains unknown or misunderstood, the reduction of the budget, in general, as well as the extinction of pauperism, is a utopia, a chimera.

Now, what is true of free and administrative functions is equally true of the state. No reduction is possible there apart from economic reform.

I add, and this is the subject of the discussion into which I am going to enter, that if the State costs France, under the constitutional monarchy, ten times more than it should cost under the Republic, it will cost with democracy ten times more than under monarchy.

Here is, according to the budget of 1848, what are the expenditures of the State, in which I include, in addition to the civil list and the endowments of the chambers, all that, in the various ministries, concerns the central administrations, in one word, authority in all its forms.

[table]

That is, 50 million, in round numbers, which, according to the official budget of 1848, as the cost of the State, as an organ of authority, power and centralization.

The monarchy makes no expense for the *organization of labor*; it has no *ministry of progress*. Loving the *status quo* by nature, it contains, retains, stops and hinders movement as much as it can; it lets itself be killed rather than advance.

Now, royalty abolished, the national organization reduced to a single chamber, the official aristocracy suppressed, the salaries of high officials reduced by two-thirds, all purely monarchical creative employments suppressed: I dare say that the expenses of the the state would be diminished by at least nine-tenths: the sovereignty of the people would not cost, with the republican organization, any more than five million a year.

This is the bargain that all statesmen strive to obtain, and which democracy proposes to achieve. We now have to establish hitsis budget.

I divide democracy's state spending into three categories:

1° *Costs of accession*;

2° *Costs of government*;

3° *Costs of progress*.

1. The costs of establishing democracy can be assessed as follows (I assume the agitation subsided and the revolution completed after a year):

Damage caused by the material fact of the insurrection, lost, destroyed or stolen values; damage committed, suspension of public services; installation costs of the Provisional Government; dispatch of commissioners, etc., etc.,

20,000,000

Unemployment for 90 days, including the reduction of working hours, of 3 million workers, at 2 francs on average per day:

540,000,000

Material interest, on a capital of 5 billion, during the same unemployment.

180,000,000

Business unemployment, bankruptcies, or 10 per cent depreciation of a total value of 5 billion, representing half of the country's annual production:

500,000,000

Increase of 45 centimes on the land tax.

193,000,000

Interest for 6 months of 200 million tax, prepaid.

5,000,000

Prejudice to holders of treasury bonds and banknotes, as well as to depositors in the savings bank, in consequence of the decrees of the Provisional Government, 10% out of a total value of 600 million.

60,000,000

Together

1,408,000,000

Consolidated at 5%

70,400,000

Thus, by the mere fact of its accession to business, and reasoning from the most favorable hypothesis, democracy will have caused the country to bear a loss of more than 1,400 million; that is to say, by capitalizing, that it would have already burdened the budget with a sum of 70 million, assuming that the State expenses, and all the ordinary and extraordinary expenses, under the new government, were not stronger than under the constitutional monarchy.

The increase will be much greater, if it is true, as we are about to demonstrate, that the State, administration and progress, cost more under this form of government than under the other,

2. State costs of democracy.

Two causes make democratic government more expensive than monarchical government: on the one hand, the tendency to involve all the citizens incessantly in the affairs of government, contrary to the law of division of labor; on the other hand, the tendency to bring back to the State the free functions that the monarchy, by analogy of principle, left outside the State, and this contrary to the law of reduction of the general expenses.

Thus, to the 70 million whose democracy is burdened by the fact of his coming to power,

70,000,000

You must add:

Lost time of 441 deputies, which democracy adds to the 459 of the former Government, for the reason that 900 represent 35,500,000 better than 459. — At 25 francs per day and per deputy, for 250 days,

2,756,250

Salary of nine hundred deputies during the same time,

5,625,000

General elections. They cost the State, under the deposed Government, two million, to gather 250,000 electors. They cannot cost less under democracy,

2,000,000

The same elections cost the electors, travel expenses, banquets and lost time, 3 days at 10 francs for 200,000 electors, four million, or a year, 1,333,333. With democracy, six million electors, 3 francs per day and per head, 2 days of lost time, 36 million; difference

34,666,666

Miscellaneous expenses payable by citizens for the fulfillment of civic duties, municipal elections, the national guard, etc.; appointment to jobs, functions of the jury, clubs, reviews, banquets, 40 days a year. — Under the old democracies, the citizen spent his entire life in the public square, 365 days given each year to affairs of state. I reduce this expense to 12 days for modern democracy, because of the representative principle: it is less than the 30th of what it used to cost, 6 million citizens, 10 days at 3 francs per day and per head,

180,000,000

Material costs, meeting rooms, fittings and equipment, meeting services, lighting, heating, printed matter, etc. — 25 francs per head per year

150,000,000

Expenditure of the central administrations, representing, with the six million citizens, the People and the State. I count at least

5,000,000

Total installation and government fees,

450,047,916

3. Costs of the organization of labor.

Democracy is enterprising; it intends not to maintain the *status quo*; it has made immense promises to the proletariat, and its intention is to keep them.

However, with a ministry of progress,

A ministry of public welfare,

A budget of state donations,

A creation of national workshops,

Trial farms, trial communes, trial phalansteries;

With the immense staff of inspectors, directors, controllers, foremen, etc., etc., which all this presupposes, democracy will be modest, if this great initiative, of the State, costs the country only 100 million per year. I carry 60,000,000, which gives a total, for the state budget, in round numbers, of

ten times as much as under the constitutional monarchy.

But, you will say, what does the 500 million that the exercise of sovereignty will cost the country in the democratic system matter, if the administrative, economic and financial improvements that democracy promises us cover, in turn, three or four times this amount? As a result, we will have won, and we will be free; we shall have *liberty in order*, and not *liberty and order!*

The advantages that can be expected from the new *System* are of five kinds:

Reduction in the size of the army;

Reduction in the number of jobs through administrative simplification;

Suppression of venality, corruption, fraud, etc., in the administration;

Economies in expenses;

Increase in production, and increase in public wealth, through national workshops and the organization of labor.

A glance at these various heads of reform will show the illusions of those who expect democracy to bring about some improvement in the lot of humanity.

The army? You can only reduce it as long as the social question is resolved, not only for France, but for Europe. Without this solution, the army is indispensable to you, domestically to contain the proletariat and property, which are already threatening and measuring each other with their gaze; abroad, to defend your nationality and establish your influence in the councils of European diplomacy. For, supposing royalty is everywhere abolished, the nationalities remain, that is to say all the rival pretensions of the old governments. Now, democracy is powerless to resolve the social question and to constitute the republic of nations; like the monarchy, it can keep the peace only by means of more or less solid treaties; finally, like the monarchy, it reigns by the distinction of castes and the preponderance of the state. Democracy does not have a man, not an ecu of economy to make within the army.

The administration? — The newspapers have recently published the figure for the increase in salaries from 1830 to 1848: this figure is 65 million. We have not failed to conclude that the deposed government had increased the administrative staff by 65,000 employees, assuming the average state salary at 1,000 francs. But it is possible, it is almost certain, that the totality of these 65 million consists of salary increases on several hundred thousand individuals salaried by the State, which would make about 200 to 300 francs per head. Now, if the State wants to support all those it employs, and whose service is indispensable, 40,000 primary teachers, 50,000 customs officers, 20,000 postmen, 6,000 forest rangers, a host of minor employees of the public companies, bridges and roadways, prefectures, etc., whose salary does not rise to 800 francs; it is not 65 million, it is 200 million that must be added to the budget. I await our statesmen at work.

Corruption? — I like to believe that in future we won't talk of it any more. But it is mocking to blame the *onerous contracts* passed by the fallen government for the deficit we are facing.

Out of a total expenditure of 1,450 million, barely 200 million can give rise to contracts between the State and contractors. Of this mass of business, only one part produces losses for the

entrepreneurs; another returns a legitimate profit; the rest, which I suppose more or less infected with corruption, procures for the corrupters and the corrupted an increase in unjust profit. It is the compensation of the losses experienced on the first part of operations; and I do not believe that the sum of the bribes goes, per year, up to 5 million. With 5 million, one can bribe 500 civil servants each year, assuming the average price of corruption at 10,000 francs. Such venality in the army, public works, administration, etc., is incredible.

Economies in spending? — Another delusion.

If democracy could organize the State in such a way that it rendered as many services as possible at the cheapest possible price, it would thereby be able to organize society, it would be a Republic. Thus, management costs, collection of taxes, exploitation of public revenues, including the entire Ministry of Finance, cost the country more than 174 million. I will prove, in the course of this work, that this article of the budget can easily be reduced by more than 100 millions. But, to achieve this economy, it is necessary to change the tax, in its nature, its base, its distribution; the state accounts must be changed; overhaul administration, commerce, finance from top to bottom; it is necessary, in a word, to solve the social problem, and we have proven that democracy is powerless against this problem.

Far from democracy being able to reduce the current budget, the odds are ten to one that it will increase it. For, if the State properly so called costs democracy ten times more than monarchy, the same causes acting on the various administrations as on the State, an increase in expenditure is inevitable. Otherwise, democracy would retrograde; it would be a monarchy in disguise.

The organization of labor! — I have increased to 50 million only the net loss which must result for the country from this model organization, because I suppose that 24 million country people and 7 million industrialists, manufacturers, merchants, etc., etc., will not allow themselves to be absorbed by the State, and converted, in spite of their teeth, into national workers. If it should be otherwise, if the demagogic faction was influential enough to snatch from the People, with the abdication of its political sovereignty, the renunciation of its industrial liberty, it is no longer a budget of 1,900 million that we would have to pay for the services currently united in the State; it would be, for the totality of the national work, a budget of 12 billion.

However, as the annual production of France, the service of the State, administration, justice, etc., included, is not 10 billion, we would therefore be in deficit, by this fact alone, each year, one-fifth of current production, or 2 billion. But it has been proven, demonstrated, that any service performed by the State generally costs 50 percent more than it is worth, witness the bridges and roads, witness the collection of public revenues, witness the protection of national labor, in other words customs, etc. In other words, it is proven that the free worker, converted into a public functionary, becomes half as capable, works half as much, produces half as much, like the organism of which he is a part. The democratic organization of labor would therefore have this definitive result: while the national expenditure would be like 12, the receipts would be like 6. What would be the use, in this system, of the compulsory currency of banknotes, the extension of treasury bonds, the national counters, the guarantee bonds, the recognitions of the Mont-de-Piété,

the paper-money? What would the money even be used for? The organization of labor by democracy! It is the organization of misery.

The reason for this fact, besides the general increase of wages and the equally general reduction of hours of work to which democracy has condemned itself, is in the increase in general costs, costs which for society as for the State must be in inverse proportion to production; but which, by the influence of the monarchical and democratic ideas that dominate the institutions and the intelligences, are almost everywhere in direct proportion to the product.

Everyone ought to know, and unfortunately few people know, even among economists, that in any business the general expenses increase progressively with the extension that the entrepreneur gives to his business, so that there is a point where, all other things being equal, the entire profit is covered by general expenses.

For the entrepreneur of commerce, industry, agriculture, the general expenses are State expenses.

These costs, which today burden national production by more than two billion, must, under the Republic, be reduced like the State budget.

But democracy is the idea of the state extended to infinity; it is the meeting of all the farms in a single farm; of all industrial enterprises into a single industrial enterprise; of all trading houses into one trading house; of all sponsorships into a single sponsorship. It is therefore not the infinite decrease in overheads, as it should be under the Republic, but the infinitely increasing overhead...

Thirty days of dictatorship have laid bare the impotence and inanity of democracy. All it had of old memories, of philanthropic prejudices, of communist instincts, of discordant passions, of sentimental phrases, of anti-liberal leanings, in a month, was spent. It borrowed from utopia and routine; it consulted empirics and charlatans; it has held out its hand to skilled jobbers; it had herself preached to by the clerks of the bazoche; it received holy water from Monsignor. However, in all that democracy has proposed, decreed, debited, fulminated for a month, who would dare to say that the People has once recognized itself?

I conclude by reproducing my question: The sovereignty of the People is the starting point of social science. How is this sovereignty established. How is this sovereignty expressed? We cannot take a step until we have solved the problem.

Certainly, I repeat it, so that no one is mistaken. I am far from denying the workers, the proletarians, any more than the bourgeois, the enjoyment of their political rights; I only maintain that the way in which one claims to make them enjoy them is only a mystification. Universal suffrage is the symbol of the Republic; it is not its reality.

Also see with what indifference the working masses welcome this universality of suffrage! We cannot get them to register. While philosophers praise universal suffrage, popular common sense mocks universal suffrage!

The Republic is the organization by which, all opinions and all activities remaining free, the People, by the very divergence of opinions and will, think and act as a single man. In the Republic, every citizen, by doing what they want and nothing but what they want, participates directly in the legislation and in the government, as they participate in the production and circulation of

wealth. There, every citizen is king; for he has the fullness of power; he reigns and governs. The Republic is a positive anarchy. It is neither liberty subjected to order, as in the constitutional monarchy, nor liberty imprisoned in order, as the Provisional Government intends. It is liberty delivered from all its shackles: superstition, prejudice, sophistry, stock-jobbing, authority. It is reciprocal liberty, and not the liberty which restricts; liberty, not the daughter of order, but the mother of order.

This is the program of modern societies. Let it be the absolution of democracy for having, in a way, formulated it, by the spectacle of its contradictions.

REVOLUTIONARY IDEAS

FIRST SERIES

April — June 1848

The Situation.

April 17, 1848.

What we foresaw, what we have predicted is happening.

The revolution turns to bourgeois and doctrinaire democracy: the provisional government, composed of heterogeneous elements, has just carried out a kind of purification on itself. The men stay; the principles are eliminated. Serious faults accelerated this result, which was moreover inevitable. We are going to relate them in a few lines: it will be like the preamble to our profession of faith.

The victory of February 24 had brought to power three different parties, renewed from our old struggles: the Girondin or Thermidorian party, represented by the *National*, the Montagnard party, represented by the *Reforme*, and the Socialist-Communist Party, represented by Louis Blanc.

The monarchy being excluded, these three parties embraced the totality of public opinion.

It seemed therefore that the Provisional Government, by the very incoherence of its composition, should express, in the eyes of France, the conciliation of all ideas, of all interests. The bourgeoisie and the proletariat, joining their hands on the *Organization of labor*, as on the gospel of the future, we could believe that the problem of misery, put aside by the fallen government, was going to be solved by the new, amiably and peacefully.

We have just seen, for the thousandth time, what these conciliations are worth, which rest only on vague sympathies, and which no principle consolidates.

The conduct that the Provisional Government had to adopt was, however, very simple and ready-made. Resolutely pose the problem of the proletariat; occupy and feed the workers; bring back the bourgeois class; then, while waiting for the National Assembly, maintain the republican *status quo*; this is what good sense, in harmony with high politics, commanded the Provisional Government.

In such a situation, to preserve everything was to advance.

Well! What was so simple and so wise, uniting to the advantage of common sense the merit of profundity, was understood by no one.

Scarcely had the mandate, so new to it, to represent the Republic been taken on than the bourgeois part of the provisional government, abandoning itself to its old preoccupations, began to beat a retreat. — For its part, the revolutionary fraction, carried away by the enthusiasm of its memories, completely deluding itself about the power of its means, and keen, as it says, to *engage the future*, set to work with *energy* and exclusion. Finally, socialism, not content with having laid down its principle, wanted to move on to application, relying only on itself for the execution of its work.

We know what resulted from these tensions. Everything the Provisional Government did from the point of view of the old bourgeoisie was found to be retrograde ; — everything it undertook from the revolutionary point of view was counter-revolutionary; — everything it decreed in the interest of the proletariat was conceived against the interests of the proletariat.

Thus, when the Provisional Government, following the routine of bourgeois economy, opened a loan of 100 millions; when, to prove the solidity of its credit, it paid 50 millions to the rentiers; when it raised the interest of the sums deposited in the savings bank; when it continued the insurance companies, etc., etc., I say that in the presence of the socialist principle, which was to intervene in the law and which did not intervene, the government acted contrary to its right and his duty.

Likewise, when the Provisional Government began to write those dictatorial circulars which, in the year 1848, could intimidate only old women; when, being unable to dispose of a crown or a man except under the good pleasure of the departments, it spoke of authority to the departments; when, in the midst of France, republican in mind and heart — but in distrust of the Republic — it invented reaction, counter-revolution, as it was soon to invent the coalition; in all these circumstances, the Provisional Government acted like a sleepwalker. It gave us the spectacle, unique in history, of statesmen playing an old tragedy with ridiculous seriousness. By dint of retrospective radicalism, it has compromised future reforms: I want for proof of this only the electoral law.

If from the revolutionary element we pass to the socialist element, we encounter an equal series of errors and miscalculations.

How could no one be found to say to M. Blanc: The organization of work, as you understand it, is forbidden to you, not because you lack the capacity, but because your position forbids it. It is through the workshop that you claim to attack the problem, that is to say through individualism; whereas it is the social side which alone can give you the solution, that is to say credit. But, even from this point of view, you cannot undertake anything; a member of the government, you no longer represent a class of society, but the general interests of society, any initiative that would serve one party rather than the other comes out of your remit. You belong to the bourgeoisie as much as to the proletariat. Protect, encourage the emancipation of the working classes; you yourself do not intervene, don't compromise your responsibility, the government's responsibility. Wait for a higher authority to give you both credit and power.

The failure of the acts of the provisional government have been general. So the protests were not long in coming. The demonstrations of March 16 and 17; the repeated expulsions of commissioners from the departments; lastly, the April 16 uprising; all these facts accomplished to the cries of: *Long live the Republic! Long live the Provisional Government!* prove to the less clear-sighted that France is sincerely republican, but that she would not support a dictatorship; that, by revolution, she means conciliation; that she also rejects doctrinairism, Jacobinism and utopia; that if, however, after having protested against each of the factions which make up the provisional government, she maintains this government as it is, it is because she no longer wishes to suffer questions of persons, and because these rulers are, in her eyes, only the ministers of her will.

Such is, according to us, the true situation of things; the position of the Provisional Government is admirable and its strength immense; but also the difficulties it has to overcome are infinite. They are all summed up in this formula, which expresses both its role and its rule: to reconcile the divergence of interests through the generality of measures.

But, as the tree always falls on the side where it leans, the tendency of the provisional government is currently in the direction of the anti-socialist protest of April 16th. Encouragements to enter this path, unofficial advice has not been lacking.

Many people imagine, because the social question has been confused at the Luxembourg, that the social question is over; that henceforth capital is excused from reckoning with labor.

Under the impression of this idea, it is inevitable that the provisional government will march towards a bourgeois restoration, at the price of some sacrifices granted to the fervor for social ideas.

This is what was already indicated, by the hypocritical reflections of the reactionary newspapers on the difficulty, the uncertainty, the impossibility of a solution, and by the decrees by which the provisional government, at the same time as it reduces or suppresses the taxes on salt, meat, drinks, establishes other taxes on servants, dogs, quality wines, rents above 800 fr., etc.

The abolition of the tax on salt, meat and beverages, in the present economic system, is only a philanthropic exaggeration that will cost the State dearly, without improving the lot of the workers.

The establishment of lavish taxes is a utopian fantasy that will cost the workers dearly, without filling the coffers of the state.

The decrees of the provisional government displace misery, as bankruptcy displaces capital: they remedy nothing. Revolutionary pressure, blind and ignorant, is satisfied by these decrees; but by these very decrees the people are mystified. In return for apparent sacrifice, we have real restoration: People, you will soon find out.

For us, although we are as dissatisfied with April 16 as we were with March 17, we accept the *fait accompli*. We like clear positions. The triple essence of the Provisional Government embarrassed us. Now we know who to talk to. It is doctrinaire democracy that reigns and governs. We had always thought that the proletariat should emancipate itself without the help of the government: the government, since April 16, thinks the same.

We are in agreement with the government!...

How Revolutions Are Lost.

April 22, 1848.

The political economy of the deposed government inevitably led the People, by a series of impossibilities, to misery.

The political economy of the Provisional Government also leads the People, by another series of impossibilities, to misery, and the Republic to bankruptcy.

For two months now the People have not labored, they have not produced, they have made no exchange, they have acquired nothing. The People no longer live from their labor; the last decree of the provisional government teaches us that the People are going to dip into their savings. Another three months of this regime, and we find ourselves without money, without products, without capital. *Imus, imus prœcipites!* We run to the precipice with a speed accelerated every minute by the impulse of old philanthropic prejudices, by our revolutionary hallucinations, by the incompetence of the government.

We have just re-read the decree by which, pending the progressive tax, a contribution of 1 per cent is established on mortgage debts. The newspapers of the Revolution did not fail to applaud this decree, wrested by terror from the Provisional Government, in which the patriots are pleased to find an engagement for the future.

For us, we do not approve of anything in this decree, not even the intention, and we wonder if the more or less competent newspapers that welcome it are the accomplices of the reactors?

The Provisional Government reasoned in this way:

The sum of mortgage claims passes 12 billion. Now, if I levied a contribution of only 1 per cent on these 12 billions, that would produce a receipt for me of 120 millions, which would make up for the deficit left in the treasury, by the abolition of duties on meat, drinks, &c.

This tax would be fair and just: it would spare the poor, it would fall on the rich. "Up to now the producers, the consumers, the proprietors, have had the exclusive responsibility for the great sacrifices. Justice wants this inequality to end. When all the elements of wealth are attained, one should not spare the one who of all is the most powerful."

Such are the calculations, such is the policy of the Provisional Government.

Calculations of children and policy of doddering fools!

How does the Provisional Government establish the base for this tax? How does it claim to recover it? Because, it is by the mode of recovery that we are going to appreciate the usefulness of the measure.

"The owners of buildings encumbered with mortgages or privileges are required to declare, within fifteen days, to the clerk of justice, the various claims existing on their buildings."

Nothing could be simpler, in appearance, than this: *The debtors will denounce their creditors.*

But the debtors will not denounce anyone and will not make any statement:

1. Because they have no interest in it. What does it matter to them that a quarter or a fifth of the interest they pay on their mortgages, instead of going into the pockets of their creditors, goes into the fund of the Receiver General?

2. Because the declaration ordered by the provisional government is nothing less than an denunciation, and, what is worse, a gratuitous denunciation, and that denunciation is repugnant to our morals. Why did you not add, Citizen Minister, in your explanatory memorandum, that the denunciation, in this case, would be considered an act of good citizenship?

3. Because the debtors will not want to let everyone know that their property is mortgaged, and thus expose themselves to losing their credit. Rather than make such a statement, most would prefer to pay 1 percent more to their creditors. In Paris, it is possible that some statements will be made: there, everything goes unknown in the crowd. In the provinces, it is something else; the peasant, the small industrialist will keep silent; you will kill him rather than make him talk.

4. Because there is reciprocity of credit and debit between a multitude of citizens. Now, pass me the rhubarb and I'll pass you the senna: therefore, no declaration.

5. Because the debtor who makes such a declaration would immediately see himself refused credit by the capitalist, or would only obtain it at a usurious rate. Now, there is no industrial entrepreneur, agricultural owner, etc., who, placed in the alternative of undoing bankruptcy by his declaration, being able to bring about the bankruptcy of the State by his silence, does not prefer his interest to that of the State.

6. Because, finally, the decree by striking debts prior to April 15, and excluding those contracted subsequently, is unjust. It is also unjust for small rentiers who subsist only on a modest income, purchased by long savings; legitimate pension of a life consumed in toil. It is unjust with regard to creditors who are not even paid by their rents, and God knows that, in these deplorable times, the number of them is great! Finally, it is unjust, because it is exorbitant, for certain debts resulting from judgments or arrests, which, by the sequence of obligations, relate, like a bill of exchange, to a series of subscribers. Example :

By judgment of the Court of Lyons, the company l'Union took a mortgage on the company Méridionale for a sum of 100,000 francs, that is 5,000 francs to be paid to the treasury. — For its part, the Compagnie Méridionale, through its recourse in guarantee, took a mortgage on Taffe, a shipper in Marseilles; or 5,000 francs still to be paid for this mortgage. — On the other hand, the company l'Union, held responsible itself by the town of Colmar and condemned to 100,000 francs in damages for delay in transport, is mortgaged for 100,000 francs; therefore, 5,000 francs to be paid again to the State.

If you exhaust the series, there is nothing left for the mortgagees.

If you want to strike only the final creditor, you will find, instead of a creditor, a principal who has suffered prejudice: then no tax, which will constitute an exception. But one exception leads to a host of others, all of which lead to this result, that the law is absurd.

Therefore, no base, no collection possible for such a contribution. Creditors and debtors will agree to deny the reality of the debts: when this list of registrations will show 12 billion, the declarations of the debtors will answer: zero.

Will you publish the register of mortgages? Will you conflagrate the land through this universal revelation, more terrible to debtors than the trumpet of the last judgment? If the provisional government wants to make itself unpopular, let it try!

Let us now admit that the tax is practicable; that all declarations be made; that the base is established; that the tax authorities collect their 120 million. What will result from this tax?

First a general increase in interest. So, ultimately, it will always be on the producer, on the poor, that the tax will fall. — Have you ever been to the theater at Guignoles? Have you seen Polichinelle trying to knock out the devil? He takes his measurements, he adjusts his stroke, he raises his stick: then, when he thinks he has crushed the head of the angel of darkness, the devil slips away and disappears. It is the emblem of the rich pursued by the tax.

Suppose finally, because we must go all the way, that the capitalist, hit by the tax, resigns himself to pay, and does not raise the rate of his interest. Then, it is the source of savings that has dried up.

In a society constituted on the principles of property, loan at interest, labor and free trade, capital is formed only by saving. The nation has no other stewards than its rentiers. A part of the rents is consumed each year, no doubt; but another part, and certainly the largest, is converted into new capital, serving in its turn as an instrument of production for work, and producing interest.

This is the fundamental condition for the progress of society.

Now, the tax on mortgage debts, soon assisted by the progressive tax, arrests the formation of capital, arrests progress. From this point of view, the tax established by the decree of April 20 is the worst kind of tax. It places society as a whole in the same position as the state; it reduces it to no longer being able to go forward, to making ends meet, as they say; it makes it live from day to day, without advance, without wealth, without development, without future. A nation that has reached this state is a lost nation.

Before two years, assuming that we can live two years in such a situation, experience will have shown everyone:

1. That the progressive tax, the sumptuary tax, the tax on mortgage debts, and all kinds of taxes on income, are destructive of public wealth, absurd in principle, fatal in their results;
2. That consequently, those who are called rich are unassailable by taxation, on pain of danger for the Republic and aggravation of misery for the poor;
3. And, to conclude, that pauperism is as necessary to society as wealth and progress!

Then pauperism, then the proletariat, will be, like mercantile feudalism, regarded as the condition of existence of nations; misery will be an inviolable and sacrosanct thing; the February Revolution will be, in all its aims, convicted of error, and the restored bourgeoisie will whistle past the tomb of the Republic.

The Reaction.

April 29, 1848.

The social question is deferred. On April 16, the socialist candidacies were wiped out. The cause of the proletariat, announced with so much brilliancy on the barricades of February, has just been lost at the first instance, in the elections of April. The enthusiasm of the people has been succeeded by consternation: it is the bourgeoisie that will regulate, as before, the condition of the workers.

All the evil came from the inadequacy of Luxembourg and the weakness of the Ministry of the Interior. We say this for the last time.

Let MM. Blanc and Ledru-Rollin forgive themselves as we forgive them! They let France be ruined and the proletariat be sold out. But they have been brought down; therefore they are of our party. After the battle of Cannes, when Varro had lost the last year of the Republic, the senate robbed him of thanks for not having despaired of the homeland. Let MM. Blanc and Ledru-Rollin tell us that they do not despair of the emancipation of the proletariat, and we are ready to offer them our fraternal congratulations.

What matters today is to judge the situation correctly.

For some time now people have begun to suspect, in the journals of the Provisional Government, that the February revolution has hitherto been, for its representatives, only a sort of retrospective review of the first revolution. The two parties that divide the power attack each other, threaten each other under the names of *Girondins* and *Montagnards*. They accuse each other, in high places, of restoration and counter-revolution. Awareness of their retrograde hallucinations gradually reaches our improvised *monitors*. Nothing is more instructive, more significant than their mutual recriminations. If the reaction raises its head, it is within the government. If there are conspiracies against the government emerging from the barricades, it is in the antechambers of the ministers. If power, torn in all directions, by its communist manifestos and by its doctrinaire inclinations, scares away capital, kills credit, worries the workers, desolates property; if the *organization of labor* makes all of France fold its arms, the fault lies with this two-sided democracy, which reigns and governs. All the progress that, for two months, we have made back, we have done it under the inspiration of the contrary memories of the old republic. It is 93, with all its dissensions, that governs us; as for 1848, it is still the closed book of seven seals.

There is a phenomenon of social psychology here that is worth exploring. This phenomenon has occurred in all revolutionary epochs; this is what has caused all its perils and determined its catastrophes.

The democrats of 93, making a republic with their memories of college, after devouring each other, delayed the revolution for half a century. To be sure, Robespierre did not have to reproach himself for the ambition and venality of Mirabeau, nor the hesitations of La Fayette, nor the weakness of Pethion, nor the carelessness of Vergniaud, nor the vices of Danton, nor the fanaticism of Marat. But Robespierre was a Spartan: it was he who decided the counter-revolution.

The democrats of 1848, making the republic with their parliamentary memories, also set back the revolution by half a century. I accuse neither their patriotism, nor their goodwill, nor their

disinterestedness. Their entire wrong is to be only imitators; they thought they were statesmen because they copied old models!

What then is this strange preoccupation that, in times of revolution, fascinates the firmest minds and, when their ardent aspirations carry them towards the future, makes them constantly evoke the past? How does it come about that the People, at the very moment when they break with established institutions, plunge back and sink deeper into tradition? Society does not repeat itself; but one would say that it walks backwards, like the ropemaker spinning his rope. Can't it look where it is going?

This is not the place to deal in depth with this difficult problem, which touches the depths of our nature, and comes directly under the most abstract principles of metaphysics. Let us confine ourselves to saying, according to recent works of philosophy, that the phenomenon in question has its source in the constitution of our understanding, and that it is explained by the law of the identity of opposites, a law that is the basis of creation, as well as of logic. And that being said, let's get back to the point.

To organize the future, as a general rule and proven by experience, the reformers therefore always begin by looking at the past. Hence the contradiction that perpetually reveals itself in their acts; hence also the immense danger of revolutions.

Thus, the day the People overthrow a royalty, they immediately replace it with a dictatorship. There is there all at once a memory, a memory deduced from further than the overthrow of royalty; and a contradiction, since it is absolutism taken as a safeguard against absolutism.

The rest is in keeping. The Convention had its proconsuls, Napoleon his prefects. The provisional government has its commissioners. Nothing is changed in things: we only have a mutation of characters. Everyone can see today what this restored comedy costs us. The commissioners of the provisional government, precisely because they were only memories, gave the signal for reaction: they had received the watchword from their leaders.

It was to the singing of the *Marseillaise* and the old republican hymns that the February revolution was made. Remembrance again, and moreover a contradiction.

Contradiction, I say; for notice that the Revolution of 1848 did not inspire a poet. The social idea, anti-lyrical, it seems, has been forced to produce itself under the rhythm of the political idea. It's because the epic is over for us, whatever people have said; and, trivial as it may seem, we are condemned to do a job, not of heroes, but of clerks. The princes of the new Republic will not be men of the sword, but men of the plume. The Revolution of 1848, an economic revolution, is the most bourgeois. It is the workshop, the counter, the household, the cash register, the most prosaic things in the world, which lend themselves least to revolutionary energy and grand words. How to express in verse and set to music the participation of the worker in the profits, the association of labor and capital, the balance between import and export? To organize circulation and credit, to increase production, to widen the market, to determine the new forms of industrial societies, all this does not imply the temperament of 1793; whether we like it or not, we must resign ourselves to being nothing but ordinary folks.

The *Marseillaise* clashes with the idea it represents; it offends our most intimate inclinations; instead of enlightening the citizens, it stuns them. This nonsense costs the Republic enormous sums, not to mention security. To sing the *Marseillaise* is to react and provoke at the same time.

Among the causes that have accelerated the fall of the constitutional monarchy, we must count in the first line fatigue, disgust with parliamentary debates. Well! The catastrophe had scarcely been consummated, the corps-de-garde of the Palais-Royal was still smoking, and France was already covered with clubs. The parliamentary fever, instead of dying out, has become general. From one tribune, we have ten thousand, and what tribunes! Never have we seen such a confusion of the gift of tongues. The paving stones of the barricades, like the stones of Deucalion, became speakers. Everyone speaks like Demosthenes; it is true that we reason like La Palisse. I have seen a meeting of five hundred citizens decide in five minutes, with thunderous applause, the most formidable questions of political economy, questions of which I am sure no one in the honorable assembly heard a word. I have seen the craziest motions received with enthusiasm; puerile proposals pass unanimously. The Provisional Government could not fail to do so. Many have been sanctioned by its decrees.

Contradiction and reminiscence! We play at small parliaments, as at small workshops and at small war. But, O workers! It is not in the clubs that one must give battle to property; it is in your workshops, it is on the market. We will soon study this new strategy with you. Leave politics and eloquence to the bourgeois. Club rhetoric can teach you nothing. All this verbiage is an offense to practical reason, to the seriousness of labor, to the seriousness of business, to the silence of study, to the dignity of the mind. Remember that under Napoleon, this man who symbolized labor through war, there was no speech. Clubs are neither of our century, nor of our genius, nor of our mores. This factitious agitation will fall of itself through boredom and desertion; if it were otherwise, the evils that would result from it for you are incalculable.

One of the first acts of the Provisional Government, the one for which it was most applauded, was the application of universal suffrage. The very day the decree was promulgated, we wrote these own words, which could then pass for a paradox: "Universal suffrage is the counter-revolution."⁴

One can judge, according to the event, if we were mistaken. The elections of 1848 have been made, by an immense majority, by the priests, by the legitimists, by the dynastics, by all that is most conservative and retrograde in France. It couldn't be otherwise.

Was it then so difficult to understand that there exist in man two instincts, one for conservation, the other for progress; that each of these two instincts never acts except in the direction of the interests of the other; that thus each individual, judging things from the point of view of his private interest, understands by progress the development of this interest; that this interest being contrary to the collective interest, the sum of the votes, instead of expressing general progress, indicates general retreat?

⁴ See *Solution of the Social Problem*, 2nd issue. Paris, at Garnier frères, booksellers, Palais-National.

We have said it and we repeat it: the Republic is the form of government in which all wills remaining free, the nation thinks, speaks and acts as a single man. But, to realize this ideal, it is necessary that all private interests, instead of acting contrary to society, act in the direction of society, which is impossible with universal suffrage. Universal suffrage is the materialism of the Republic. The more we use this system, until the day when the economic revolution is an accomplished fact, the more we will retrograde towards royalty, despotism and barbarism, and this all the more surely as the votes will be more numerous, more reasoned, freer.

You accuse the incompetence, the indifference of the proletariat! But this is precisely what condemns your theory. What would you say of a father of a family who would hand over to his minor children the free disposal of his property, and then who, ruined by them, would blame the inexperience of their youth? And what an argument against you is the indifference of the proletariat!

Because not a speck of common sense has been found throughout the Provisional Government; because we had flattered ourselves that we supported the revolutionary fantasy by reason of the great number, here we are in full bourgeois reaction! The emancipation of the proletariat will be suspended for fifty years! We are paying dearly for our infatuation with novelists and haranguers. And if we were not the first culprits, I would say that the ministers who, without principle, without any legal reason, abusing a temporary dictatorship, delivered the salvation of the people to the hazards of this monstrous ballot should be stripped of their civic rights.

On the one hand the provisional government establishes luxury taxes; on the other, it gives the people comedy for free. Memory and contradiction.

The sumptuary tax diminishes the work of the poor by all that it takes away from the consumption of the rich; and it diminishes the receipts of the State by all that it takes away from the labor of the first and the enjoyment of the second. Triple deficit, triple misery, this is the result of the luxury tax.

The free spectacles, precisely because they are free, harm the labor and the morality of the people; moreover, they are a trap for their good faith, since the money that the spectator does not give to the office, he will take it to the collector of contributions, who will pay the actors! Ruin, always ruin.

One day, an order issued by the police headquarters ordered the names of streets and monuments to be changed. The next day, a petition, signed in the clubs, asks that the remains of Armand Carrel and Godefroi Cavaignac be deposited in the Pantheon. Contradiction and plagiarism!

Historical names are replaced by historical names; men by other men; idols by other idols. It is always, with the same idolatry, the same vandalism. Who has the right to destroy national monuments? Pères Loriguets of Jacobinism, teach your voters to write their ballots, and let the Palais-Royal be called the Palais-Royal!

It has been said, and with good reason: the retrospective farces of the Provisional Government cost us more in two months than the invasions of 1814 and 1815.

What will it be then, when from farce we have come to tragedy? The bourgeoisie will come, irritated, determined to put an end to socialism. The work of reaction, begun by the radical party, will continue in a diametrically opposed direction, and with equal energy, by the bourgeois party. We had our January 21, our May 31, our 9 Thermidor: we will have our 2 Prairial. The proletarian mass is ready to march; the national guard, aided by the army, to resist. All the actors are at their posts, full of their roles. The Rommes, the Goujons, the Duquesnois, the Soubranys are ready for the sacrifice. These are MM. Ledru-Rollin, Flocon, Albert, Louis Blanc. Boissy d'Anglas has it all figured out: it is M. de Lamartine; M. de Lamartine, who, full of his history, was first with the Mountain, and who, always faithful to his dramatic stories, now turns to the side of the Gironde.

The vague idea of a new and inevitable terror circulates in the air and stirs souls. The workers say to themselves that the revolution is to be started again; and who can foresee how the renewed revolution will end? The government, through its finance laws, which demolish property without any advantage for the proletariat, which the National Assembly will not be able to allow to subsist without danger to the country, and which it will not be able to abolish without provoking an insurrection, the provisional government seems to endeavor to make terror inevitable.

The terror, in 93, was caused only by the resistance of an imperceptible aristocratic minority. The existence of society, moreover guaranteed by the wealthy conquests of the revolution and by the general lack of solidarity of existence, had nothing to fear from the terror. In 1848, the terror would have as its cause the antagonism of the two classes of citizens, one stronger by number, more redoubtable by poverty; the other superior by wealth and intelligence. Both subsisting only by the circulation of products and the mutuality of relations, it is infallible that in such a conflict society will perish.

Let the first acts of the National Assembly reveal intentions of reaction; let an imprudent vote kindle the anger of the people; let a taking up of arms takes place; let the National Representation be violated, and then, allow, under the pressure of another dictatorship, the movement to cease altogether: France will be like a hive enveloped in flames, where the suffocated, burnt bees kill each other with their stingers.

So, when the government is destitute;

When the nation has devoured its advance;

When the country will be without production and without trade;

When starving Paris, blocked by the departments, no longer shipping, not paying, will remain without deliveries;

When the workers, demoralized by the politics of the clubs and by unemployment in the national workshops, become soldiers for a living;

When a million proletarians will be crossed against property;

When the State requires the silverware and jewels of the citizens to send them to the Mint;

When home searches will be the only method of collecting contributions;

When the peasant, for want of cash, will pay the tax in kind;

When, because of the scarcity of foodstuffs, the barriers have been removed and the last blow dealt to national industry;

When hungry bands roam the country and organize the marauding;

When vagrancy has become the common condition;

When the peasant, with his gun loaded, guarding his harvest, abandons cultivation;

When the workers, tamed by hunger, have all given themselves up;

When prostitution, sorrow, misery, will have made them furious;

When herds of women, following the columns of Mobile National Guards, will celebrate the feasts of the Republic with horrible bacchanals;

When the first sheaf has been plundered, the first house broken into, the first church desecrated, the first torch lit, the first woman raped;

When the first blood has been shed; when the first head has fallen;

When the abomination of desolation will be through all France;

Oh! Then you will know what a revolution is, provoked by lawyers, accomplished by artists, led by novelists and poets!

Nero was once an artist, a lyrical and dramatic artist, a passionate lover of the ideal, an adorer of the antique, a collector of medals, a tourist, a poet, an orator, a swordsman, a sophist, a Don Juan, a Lovelace, a gentleman full of wit, fantasy, sympathy, in whom life and voluptuousness abounded. That is why he was Nero!...

Wake up from your sleep, Montagnards, Girondins, Feuillants, Cordeliers, Muscadins, Jansenists and Babouvists! You are not six weeks away from the events that I am announcing to you. Shout: — Long live the Republic! Down with the masks! — Then turn and march!

Mystification of universal suffrage.

April 29, 1848.

How is it that the very people who, three months ago, were calling for universal suffrage with all their desire, today no longer want it.

And how do those who, three months ago, had not enough anger against universal suffrage, dare to avail themselves of it today?

The same absence of principles, the same bad faith explains this double contradiction. Some complain of a lottery in which they have lost power; the others admire a mechanism that restores their privileges. The beautiful thing, really, and moral, and greater than politics!...

For us who, well before the Cormenin law, protested against this old childishness of universal suffrage, we have the right to complain about it, and to reduce it to its just value.

Universal suffrage, we said, is a kind of atomistic theory by which the legislator, unable to make the people speak in the unity of their essence, invites the citizens to express their opinion per head, *viritem*, just as the Epicurean philosopher explains thought, will, intelligence, by combinations of atoms. As if from the addition of any quantity of votes could ever come the general idea, the idea of the People!...

The surest way to make the People lie is to establish universal suffrage. The vote by head, in terms of government, and as a means of ascertaining the national will, is exactly the same thing as a new division of lands would be in political economy. It is agrarian law, transferred from the soil to authority.

Because the authors who were the first to deal with the origin of governments taught that all power has its source in national sovereignty, it has been bravely concluded that the best thing was to have all the citizens vote, by voice, from the rump, or by ballot, and that the majority, absolute or relative, of the votes thus cast, was adequate to the will of the people. We have been brought back to the customs of the barbarians, who, in default of reasoning, proceed by acclamation and election. A material symbol has been taken for the true formula of sovereignty. The dust of votes has been considered the essence of popular reason!...

Also see the miscount. Take the Paris elections as an example.

More than 400,000 citizens had the right to vote in the department of the Seine. Barely 300,000 cast their ballots.

For whom will count the 100,000 who abstained?

By looking at them as if they did not exist, you make them, by that alone, benefit the elected candidates, while it is just as safe a bet that if they had voted, they would have tipped the scales in the opposite direction, or at least that they would have significantly modified the result of the vote.

Another discrepancy:

Of the 300,000 votes received, only 13 candidates received more than half; the others, 21 in number, were only appointed by relative majorities of 144,000 to 104,000 votes.

How can these elected representatives of the electoral minority call themselves representatives of the people? What! There are 200,000 electors protesting against the candidacy of M. Lamennais; but because they did not agree to say which man they wanted in his place, M.

Lamennais passes despite them! So it could happen, and the law provided for the case, that a candidate excluded by 298,000 votes and supported by 2,000 was a deputy! And this deputy would say he was elected by universal suffrage! What derision!

Still, if the fabricators of this marvelous electoral law had been able, by appealing to the popular votes individually expressed, to properly pose the question! If they had said to the citizens:

The working class intends to share in all the advantages of the bourgeois class. This class, the most numerous and the poorest, consequently the strongest, is master of power. Bourgeois, workers, it is a question of proceeding, by mutual agreement, to an integral economic reform. You have therefore to choose the men most capable, by their specialty, their moderation and their devotion, of regulating the interests of all.

There is no doubt that the question posed in this way before the voters would have produced quite a different result.

Instead, what did the government do?

First, by its manifestos, by its demonstrations, its decrees and its commissars, it posed the *casus belli* between the two castes that are supposed to divide the people, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Seeing this, the vast majority of the citizens began to put themselves on the defensive: the unemployed clerk and the bankrupt banker; the craftsman without work like the proprietor without income, everyone became bourgeois, no one wanted to fall into the category of proletarians. From that moment, it was easy to foresee in what direction the elections would go.

That is not all.

The provisional government, with its deplorable oscillations, sometimes towards communism, sometimes towards conservative ideas, suddenly provoked, on April 16, an uprising of all opinions, and the electoral question found itself posed again between property and the community.

It was a lost game for social reform. The mass of citizens, who would have accepted it wholeheartedly, have just, or almost, rejected it, under the name of communism.

The negation of communism, such is the true meaning of the elections of 1848. We do not want the community of work, nor the community of women, nor the community of children! The 260,000 votes given to M. de Lamartine mean nothing else. Is it an adherence to the theories of the illustrious poet, or an epigram?

Then comes the new National Assembly, with its equivocal mandate. We will be able, for our part, to bring the citizen representatives back to the question.

France, we will tell them, does not want the community: who can doubt it? We don't it any want more than you.

But, does this have anything to do with the social question?

Is it enough to protest against community to extinguish misery?

Is the privilege of property abolished?

Have the bourgeois become laborers?

Have the laborers become bourgeois?

Do we have any less a public debt of six billion, a budget of two billion—because it will be two billion—plus twelve billion in mortgage claims?

Is the crisis over?

Is circulation restored?

Is bread guaranteed inside and outside by the organization of labor?

Are we free?

Are we equal?

Are we brothers?

Good people, who are afraid of being thinned out, look twice before congratulating yourselves in your common insignificance. If you imagine that you only came to support a denial, you have not understood your mandate. We don't care about your insights. Go away !

To the Patriots.

May 3, 1848.

Tomorrow is the opening day of the National Assembly.

How do the elected representatives of the departments come to us?

How will the people of Paris receive the representatives of France?

Distrust and derision alone respond. I am looking for brothers, and I only meet conspirators everywhere! Civil war is no longer in the forecast; it is a fact. It is no longer dreaded as the most horrible of evils; it is accepted as a necessity. In the country as in the city, powder is made, bullets are melted, weapons are prepared. The chiefs give the watchword and launch their manifestos. You hear uttered on all sides only this word of death: *We must put an end to it!*

The bourgeois is determined to put an end to the proletarian, who, for his part, is resolved to put an end to the bourgeois. The worker wants to do away with the capitalist, the employee with the entrepreneur, the departments with Paris, the peasants with the workers. In all hearts, anger and hatred; in every mouth, the threat. What is the cause of this discord? The elections.

Universal suffrage lied to the People.

The February Revolution had been brought about by the opposition of all parties to the deposed government, by the general disgust for a royalty crowned with infamy, by the concurrence of all minds in the idea of a reform that was both political and social. The February Revolution, the result of eighteen years of parliamentary quarrels, reformist protests, economic criticisms, necessarily concluded in a republican organization, in a more intimate fusion of the different classes of society. We counted, and we had the right to count, on the fact that the new national representation would be the expression of the revolutionary idea: it is the pandemonium of all counter-revolutionary ideas. The good pleasure of an electoral majority wants to turn events back; men, who without the Republic would never have had the right of suffrage, in the name of the Republic and by virtue of their right of suffrage, ask for a king!...

The signal for this retreat came from the Provisional Government. The lists of the *National* are there who accuse him.

They had such a lack of understanding of the revolution, such a fear of the people, these amateur republicans, these gentlemen of democracy, that as soon as they came to power, they appealed to all the mediocrities of the country. The country sent them its mediocrities. Success surpasses their hope and already devours them with anxiety. They feel that their role is over. What party does not disdain them? They are so small, so slender, so equivocal, that between despotism and the Republic, the keenest eye cannot distinguish them. I don't even believe they are hated; and yet, they chained the destinies of France!

It is to you, patriots without intrigue, remaining such after February as you were before February, it is to you that I address myself. On the resolution you take will perhaps depend the life or death of ten million men.

Your anger is just, your indignation is legitimate. I shed, like you, tears of rage at the sight of this reaction treacherously begun, and which to the trickery adds massacre. But, citizens, it is not by bloody reprisals that you will avenge the memory of your brothers: passion must not enter into

the decisions of the statesman. For, in the universal anarchy in which we find ourselves in the absence of regular powers, of recognized principles, I say, citizens, that each of you must consider yourself a statesman.

First consider what the situation in the country is.

France, for seventy days, has not labored. Do you know what it means for a nation not to labor? Imagine a man who no longer eats, who drinks nothing, who does not digest; in whom the blood has ceased to circulate, the heart to beat, the lungs to heave, the warmth to be reborn; a man in whom the vital focus is extinguished. This man no longer exists! he is dead!

This is the image of our country! — For us, no more labor, no more production. No more traffic, no more consumption. Collective life is no longer renewed; the tax does not come in; the power is no longer listened to; the public force is demoralized; the social bond is loosened: a few more days of this disastrous state, and the movement will stop, the body of the people will fall into dissolution.

Poland and Italy, which we have sworn to defend; Poland and Italy, those two sisters of France, now crushed under the arms of their executioners, in vain stretch out their desolate hands to us. We will not go to the aid of either Italy or Poland. Do you know why? It is because we would need, with a hundred thousand soldiers, a hundred million francs, and we do not have a hundred thousand centimes with which to equip and supply an army.

We could no longer even defend ourselves if a coalition of kings came, as 60 years ago, to descend on us. Do you still know why? It is because we no longer produce by laboring enough to subsist until the day when we would have to die fighting.

Patriots, who are irritated by the reaction, would you like to assassinate the homeland? Would you like to stab your mother!... Yet that is what you will do, if you begin the barricades again. Another 70 days of immobility, and it is over for the Revolution, it's over for the people.

Have pity on France, have pity on the proletariat, have pity on this bourgeoisie itself, whose tortures you cannot conceive. Don't you see that it is her ruin that makes her furious? Ruin, bankruptcy, hideous bankruptcy, and then shame, and then misery: this is what the exasperated bourgeoisie pursues in the blood of the proletariat.

Would you then, to avenge 150 of your brothers,⁵ have the exterminating angel parade over the whole country? The funeral of the homeland! Is this the indemnity you reserve for the parents of the victims!...

This must not be your policy, citizens. Killing men is the worst method of fighting principles. It is by the idea alone that we can triumph over the idea. However, the idea, you carry it in yourselves, as you possess in yourselves the means of realizing it.

What! You know how to count yourself, you know how to organize yourself for the fight, and you don't know how to organize yourself for labor!

What! You would meet, to the number of a hundred thousand, to attack the government, and you could not meet, to the number of a hundred thousand, to attack privilege!

⁵ Allusion to recent events in Rouen. (Original editor's note.)

You are attracted only to destruction; you are without sympathy when it comes to creating!...
Citizens, the homeland is in danger!

I propose that a provisional committee be instituted for the organization of exchange, credit and circulation among the workers;

Let this committee get into touch with similar committees established between the principal towns of France;

Let, through the care of these committees, a representation of the proletariat be formed in Paris, *imperium in imperio*, in face of the bourgeois representation;

Let a new society be founded in the midst of the old society;

Let the charter of labor be immediately put on the agenda, and the main articles defined as soon as possible;

Let the bases of the republican government be fixed, and special powers delegated to the representatives of the workers.

Citizens, the Republic is at bay; the government can do nothing for you, but you can do everything for yourselves: I swear to it before God and before men!

Until we have exhausted the economic means, I protest against the means of violence. May the blood shed uselessly fall on the heads of the agitators!

Opening Session of the National Assembly.

May 4, 1848.

The National Assembly was formed, to the sound of cannon, drums and brass bands, surrounded by all the pomp of war.

In these days when the imagination is seduced by the senses, the heart carried away by the imagination, the reason absorbed by the feeling; when the mind believes itself infinite because it is empty, the soul no longer has any attraction except for the outpourings of sensibility, for the illusions of hope. Reflection seems to have lost its rights, judgment lays down its authority. It is the work of Lamourette kisses; it is the moment of perfidious reconciliations.

But soon the enthusiasm subsides; sentiment vanishes like a caress: in place of sympathetic ideas, reason returns to pose its formidable questions.

Well! What will this National Assembly do, so laboriously hatched, so impatiently awaited, on which rest so many contrary hopes? Are our deputies frankly republicans? Are they socialists? Do they have the firm resolution to renew the old social edifice from top to bottom? Has the provisional government, which has just placed its powers in their hands, had the credit of transfiguring them in the sun of the revolution!

Why hasn't it made them take an oath?...

You ask what the National Assembly will do?

First it will verify its powers, appoint its president, compose its offices, respond with an address to a speech from the crown, blame, approve, reproach, recriminate! Why can't it repeal *en masse*, at a single stroke, and without exception, all the acts of the Provisional Government, and put things back to the point where they were on February 25? But the censure of the National Assembly will not be of this strength.

Then the National Assembly will concern itself with the Constitution.

It will speak of the presidency, *veto*, responsibility, division of powers, centralization, municipalities, etc. — May it still be well enough inspired to steal, after reading, without discussion, without amendment, like a single man, from the outset and with enthusiasm, the first constitution that will be proposed to it. For as long as such a constitution will last, and for what it will be worth, the National Assembly cannot go too cheap. Representatives cost 25 fr. a day, and the people do not labor!

After that the National Assembly will discuss business.

That is to say, under the name of political economy, it will concern itself with domestic economy, shop economy applied to the State, as has been done in England, in France, everywhere for forty centuries. It will distribute land, in Algeria and elsewhere; it will create agricultural banks; it will legislate on trademarks; it will reorganize the tax, the insurances, the mines, &c. etc.; it will indulge in all sorts of obscure, confused, scabrous and ugly speculations. — May the representatives of the Republic pass over these discussions as if they were on fire! Questions of business are fatal to the conscience of the deputy: remember the railways!...

Finally, the National Assembly will concern itself with philanthropy.

Crèches, towers, asylums, hospitals, hostels for the invalids of the people, poor tax, savings banks, rewards for virtue, encouragement to artists, model farms, penitentiary systems, credit banks for workers, industrial, vocational, commercial and agricultural schools, will be the object of its most respectable concerns. To prove to the people all its good will, it went so far as to credit M. Considerant with 4 million and a square league of land for the trial of a phalanstery. What happiness, if the Republic could, at this price, be free from socialism!...

But the social question! you will say; the real social question? Would the representatives of the revolution think of putting it aside! What do the phalanstery and the social question have in common!

The social question!

I advise you to mourn it first. The social question will not be on the agenda in the National Assembly.

Would this assembly dare to look privilege in the face?

Is it strong and tall enough to lay its hands on the holy ark?

Would it have the courage to abolish the last of the kingships, the one whose abolition alone will make dynasties impossible, the kingship of gold!

Would the National Assembly decide to order the liquidation of the old society?

Could it understand, after its immense political, economic and philanthropic labors, that social reform is the abolition of politics? — that political economy is the opposite of domestic economy; — that philanthropy is a corollary of misery?

No, the National Assembly can do nothing, wants nothing, knows nothing!

It can only become something, and do the work of revolution, as much as it will be solicited, provoked, forced to do so, by a power outside itself, which takes the initiative and gives the impetus.

A legislative assembly decides on facts; it does not produce them.

In other words, the organization of labor should not start from power; it must be SPONTANEOUS.

This is why we reproduce here the proposal we made yesterday:

“Let a provisional committee be instituted in Paris, for the organization of exchange, credit and circulation among the workers;

“Let this committee get in touch with similar committees established in the principal towns;

“Let, by the care of these committees, a representation of the workers be formed, *imperium in imperio*, before the bourgeois representation;

“Let the germ of the new society be sown in the midst of the old society;

“Let the charter of labor be immediately put on the agenda, and the main articles defined as soon as possible;

“Let the bases of the republican government be fixed, and special powers granted for this purpose to the agents of the workers.”

It is only thus that we will face the reaction; that we will procure the salvation of the Republic, and the emancipation of the proletariat.

Foreign Question.

May 13, 1848.

Our diplomacy is without idea, our foreign policy without principle, without goal, without means. Our statesmen would be incapable of making a resolution, as much as of motivating it. They cannot say, regarding this multitude of questions of international right that arise, either on which side lies the interest of France or in what this interest consists; what the latest revolution brings, what it imposes on the European system. As they do not understand the people, they have nothing to communicate to the people. And what is more sad is that, were they able to define the new right, they are deprived of the means of defending it. The word of France is void in the councils of Europe, and its broken sword is feared by no one.

What are, I ask, both the formulas of enthusiasm and the figures of eloquence, in the face of the material gravity of events? What does the talent of a Lamartine matter to us, where the positivism, dare I say it, of a Talleyrand is needed? And the great motto: *Liberty, Equality, Fraternity!* draw from this, I beg you, a diplomatic solution!

Have you the right, or have you not, to demand of Austria that it withdraw its soldiers from Italy, and that it abandon its pretensions to the suzerainty of that country? What motives, what arguments do you produce?... It is not enough to say: Italy is sympathetic to us, Italy is the sister of France, Italy must be free as we are free. All this, allow me to say it, is mysticism, and of the worst kind of mysticism, for it is revolutionary mysticism, as the corruption of the best things is the worst corruption. — I ask what is, in the Italian question, your principle, your right, your interest, in a word, your motives? And when you have given reasons, I ask what are your means? No ramblings: your facts, reasons, titles. The former government did not want to intervene in Italy: why can what could be tolerated yesterday not be tolerated today? And if it is not possible for you to suffer it, are you able to prevent it?...

The February Revolution, I know, changed all politics: civil right, public right, international right are now based on new principles. To intervene in Italy, it pleases you to say that Italy is our ally. How is that? What makes an alliance? How, by what title, for what real, immediate, determined object are we, by the fact of an insurrection, the allies of a people? And, taking up the question above, what is the rule of alliances in politics?

According to some, our natural ally is England; according to the others it is Germany. Why not Russia? Why not Spain, Piedmont, Switzerland and Belgium, which gravitate around us, like a crown of satellites?... Who, finally, are our natural allies? What is a natural ally? And the peoples who are not natural allies, what will they be with regard to us? Strangers? As much to say enemies!... We therefore have as natural enemies all the peoples who are not our natural allies! What confusion! What discord! M. de Lamartine prophesied in 1840 that the Orient alone could give us the key to the European problem. Well! What does the mysterious, the fabulous Orient, reveal today to M. de Lamartine? The question of international alliances has never left the realm of routine. Princely caprices, dynastic propinities, the ambition and vanity of heads of government, the fanaticism of opinions, the infatuation of the masses, these are what govern the politics of nations. Diplomacy is one of the forms of anarchic, thieving and counterfeiting

commerce: apart from the style, it is the same charlatanism, the same spirit of chicanery, the same hypocrisy, the same bad faith.

Imagine a grocer in the rue Saint-Martin writing to his correspondent in Marseilles:

“There is a delay of twenty-four hours in the transportation of your soap cases (they should be returned in moral time.) I have retained a third of the cartage (it amounts to 300 fr.)

“I’ll leave you your rice, coffee and sugar for your account, since I noticed a deficit in the *quantities* (and I no longer have the use of them.)

“I will not discharge your mandate, because it is my custom to obtain a discount of 4 per cent on all my orders, and you have omitted to give me this discount (which had not been mentioned). I will receive your oils, but with a bonus of 10 per cent (all the more so since, since my request, this merchandise has fallen on the spot by 10 per cent.)”

That is the whole spirit of our diplomacy. Translate that into the poetic prose of M. de Lamartine or into the philosophical style of M. Guizot, and you will have a diplomatic masterpiece.

Will we have peace? Will we have war? — An insoluble question, an impenetrable mystery for our statesmen. Peace? it is impossible, because it is without roots, without guarantees. Peace is like credit: to support itself, it needs mortgages and not hypotheses; it asks for pledges, not castles in Spain. Peace is not a matter of convenience and temperament: it is the most substantial of all human things, which, consequently, requires in the highest degree reasons of fact and of right, real and positive elements.

Where are our pledges of peace with Europe? What community of ideas, of inclinations, of interests binds it to us? What necessary obligation, between the European powers, replaces for it the pact of 1815?... Our peace is more fragile than a spider’s web. I want to believe that the fallen government has a lot to do with this destruction of the elements of peace. It was the old king’s policy to speculate on confusion and disorder. But it is a question of repairing the work of M. Guizot. Now what are the ideas of his successors in this respect? Do they believe that they have greatly advanced the alliance of Prussia, Germany and Italy, because they show them to us — in painting — joining hands?... War? It is as impossible for us as peace. It is not enough to have men, horses, ammunition, money — and we have none — to wage war: war, like peace, requires principles, motives, an idea, an interest. Otherwise war is immoral, and is quick to turn into defeat by demoralization. Our fathers, in 93, knew why they were waging war, and they won; but we, could we say why we would do it? It may be that the idea, the motive, the interest; it may be that the fact and the right exist; but what are they? Define them, publish them. I question public opinion, I consult the acts of the government: instead of motives, instead of a serious and real interest, I see only the confusion of our thoughts, the despair of the situation.

There is not a sufficient reason, in my eyes, to declare a people our ally, and to begin a war of propaganda for its own profit, in the similarity of revolutions, the analogy of government and appetites, the point of honor of nationalities. These are subjects of judgment that it is good to take into account; they are not motives. Why, from the point of view of our interest, of the present, positive, immediate French interest, must we support Italy against Austria, Poland against Russia?

How does this affect us? What is our interest in these conflicts of foreign peoples? What can we gain from it? What can we lose? Because, think about it: if we have only a sympathetic interest in it; if we can only justify our intervention on the vain feeling of equality and humanitarian fraternity, we are without real interest, and our intervention is unjust. I believe, for my part, and I hasten to declare it, that the ruin of Polish nationality, and the compression of liberty in Italy, compromise the most positive interest of France. But this interest, it is necessary, before acting, to bring it to light, to demonstrate it to all eyes, to make it the subject of all your manifestos. Now, nothing in the acts of the government makes known this interest, without which, however, any armed intervention on our part in the affairs of Europe would be marked in advance with immorality, and followed infallibly by a shameful rout. Are we therefore going to play, gratuitously and for the satisfaction of humanitarian utopians, the role of Don Quixotes of civilization?...

Thus, in the total absence of principles, in our profound ignorance of our interests, peace and war are each as impossible for us as the other, and present us with an equal danger.

In this truly absurd peace, for everything that has neither principles, nor ideas, nor pledge of preservation, nor element of duration, is absurd; in this painful expectation of events, France, uncertain of itself, is consumed in its inertia, like an icicle in the July sun. We die of slow fever; we no longer produce; we don't trade; we dispose of our capital by smuggling; a few more months of this lethargy, and we will devour each other. Is it to escape starvation that we will throw ourselves abroad?

As for war, as long as a principle joined to a great interest does not come to give it the morality that it lacks, it can succeed, whatever the fortune of the battalions, only in a disastrous result. Victorious, it brings us back, as a solution to the social problem, the military government; defeated, it attracts to us, with the foreigner, a restoration. Is it for Napoleon II or Henri V, that we will have raised barricades?...

However, immolated Poland cries out for vengeance; Italy is trampled under the feet of its executioners; the King of Piedmont halts, the Pope retreats, the Emperor of Austria intrigues, the King of Prussia trades, England extends the network of its commerce over Europe, and France watches! America and Great Britain take away at a low price what remains of our products, and provide for themselves for years: unemployment, the forced importation that is the consequence, give the deathblow to our industry. On all points liberty succumbs, there by war, here by the strike!

To put an end to this deplorable situation, the old revolutionary routine has decided to do what? A demonstration for Poland!

A demonstration! And what will this demonstration prove? What will be its program, its idea, its means, its formula, its solution? What will it teach the representatives? What conviction, what faith will it pass through their souls?

Patriots, I tell you for the second time: circumstances have made statesmen of you all. You are not allowed to speak like bland humanitarians, nor act like brainless club-goers.

Back to the principles.

To wage war, as well as to keep the peace, you need *motives*.

The motives, you will know them by the *means*.

What are the means of war? What are the means of peace?

Wealth, capital.

Now, capital is formed by labor;

Labour, divided and interconnected as it is in the economy of modern societies, is based on circulation;

Circulation is conditional on reciprocal credit.

Organize circulation by the reciprocity of credit, and you will have labor and capital; you will have the instruments of peace and war.

You will be invincible in peace; you will have nothing to fear either from competition without, or from stagnation within; because competition organized on the principle of reciprocity opens up an infinite outlet within yourselves, so that your production becomes infinite, and your capitalization infinite.

You will be invincible in war: 1. on the side of means, because your capital being formed by collective circulation and no longer by individual savings, and circulation always increasing, even wealth will be inexhaustible; — 2. on the side of principles, because by organizing the circulation in your country through the reciprocity of credit and the equality of exchange, you resolve, by that very fact, the question of international trade, and you create for yourself, by this solution, a positive interest in foreign affairs, as you create abroad a positive interest in yours.

And when all the States, carried along by your example, forced by necessity, more powerful than the canon and the protocols, will have organized the circulation among them, and by the fact, created with your example liberty and equality between their citizens; — when, by this organization, they will have become, like you, unassailable in their countries, invincible to peace and war, then the ALLIANCE will be universal, peace will be incorruptible, and war impossible.

What the Revolution Owes to Literature.

May 27, 1848.

About two months ago, when the revolution, now given over to intrigue, was at the height of utopia, a deputation from the society of men of letters went to the Hôtel-de-Ville to find M. Bûchez, then fulfilling the functions of mayor, and made this speech to him: The society of men of letters demands that the Republic organize the men of intelligence.

— Very well, replied M. Bûchez; the men of intelligence will be organized.

The honorable writers who thought of this astonishing petition did not belong to high literature; I say high literature, as we say high finance, meaning by that this category of writers with the privilege of corrupting reason and public mores, with annual emoluments of 10 to 100,000 fr. They were brave workers, as deprived of fame as of fortune, but who vaguely understood that, knowing how to read and write, they could, in a socialist republic, be good for something. They weren't *roués*, for sure; they were *litterateurs* in good faith.

Today, Messrs. Alexandre Dumas and Victor Hugo, who know better than anyone what to believe about the value of the literary specialty, and who do not bode well for the organization of literature, come, under the republican mask, with the help of calumnies picked up in the sewers of the civil list, to protest against any kind of organization. Sending the Socialists to Charenton is the least thing for the notable gentlemen of the phraseurgy. On the subject of homeland, family, property, these great patriots, these types of the father of a family, these paragons of modesty, after having pointed us out to the citizens' bullets, condemn us to the execration of posterity.

Is this not the place to ask what there is in common between the revolution and literature, what has been done for the Republic by this species of parasites vulgarly called *men of letters*, and of what utility it can be to society in the future?

And first of all, what is literature in our time? Is it not true that the vogue which it still enjoys owes it to our traditional mores, to our cult of memories? Literature is broken. It is no longer the scepter once carried by poetic souls, it is a patent long since fallen into the public domain, disdained by all men of positive intelligence, but exploited by a few knights of industry who strive to make people believe in the superiority of their talent, by this consideration that they are fit for nothing.

Under pain of ignorance and rudeness, everyone knows how to write, everyone is a writer. Also, looking closely, we find that literary notabilities have admirers only among the illiterate or the imbeciles. They themselves are careful not to take themselves seriously. Find me writers who esteem themselves. Ask Messrs. Guizot and Thiers, positive historians, seeking above all philosophy and fidelity in history, what they think of the stories of MM. Michelet and Lamartine? Ask V. Cousin what he thinks of Lamennais? Ask Ponsard what he thinks of Hugo? Ask Sainte-Beuve what case he make for J. Janin? Ask Scribe what is his opinion of A. Dumas?

These gentlemen pay each other compliments, when by chance it occurs to them, only in the interest of the corporation. But isn't it time we weren't taken in by these mimes anymore? Isn't the profession of *men of letters* of all the professions, the one that requires the least apprenticeship? And, for anyone who has tried it, isn't it true that in this exercise intellectual development is

inversely related to phrasal skill? Get that right there, workers: it takes a hundred times more intelligence to build a steam engine than to write a hundred chapters of *Balsamo*; and such a patron of the Rhone who cannot read expends more wit by running an errand, than there are in all the *Orientales*.

Literature is only the art of arranging words and periods. By itself, it possesses neither idea nor power: it is an instrument incapable, on its own, of producing anything whatsoever. I know of only one kind of merit in literature, as in the art of oratory: it is to give effrontery in an assembly. It is also remarkable that all the writers who have had the good faith to recognize the void of the art of writing have all thrown themselves, some into history and chronicles, some into philosophy, some into political economy. There is not an honest man, today less than formerly, who esteems the profession of man of letters.

Studious workmen, in recent times, have thought they would do wonders to prove that the worker was as capable of literature as of industry. The people quote with pride the Poneys, the Rebouls, the Savinien Lapointes and a crowd of others, whose poetic recreations are worth, in my opinion, as much as the masterpieces of the masters. If these proletarian muses had no other pretension than to prove the insignificance of literature, I wholeheartedly applaud their efforts; but if we mean that literary ability is the summit of intelligence, I protest against this unworthy prostitution. Whoever works with his hands, thinks, speaks and writes all at the same time; and if, in the republic of the mind, there exist places reserved for higher intelligences, the man of style must give way to the man of action.

I would very much like someone to define for me the value, either in utility or in exchange, and apart from the ideas that he must express, of an artist of style. What is a writer, I say of the first order, who, in politics, does not know how to express anything positive and immediate; who, in political economy, knows neither how to count nor account for himself, and everywhere puts brilliant analogies in the place of facts; who, in history, succeeds only in moving you, and who, by dint of emotions, tires and bores you; who, in philosophy, only gives you sonorous sentences instead of real laws, deduced from observation and analysis; who, in matters of art, judges only under the inspiration of fantasy, without ever being able to understand that fantasy itself must always be reduced to the idea?

We distinguish, to escape the rigor of the consequences, serious literature, whose products generally do not find a flow, from shoddy literature, the only one capable of enriching its operators. We ask for the first the gratifications of the State; we leave the other to the entrepreneurs of journalism.

We do not see that this distinction is the very negation of literature. What, in fact, is serious literature? It is history, philosophy, morals, natural sciences, politics, social economy, jurisprudence, archaeology, grammar; it is all that human reason agitates and discovers, everything, I say, apart from literature. Formerly, when reason, drawing its knowledge from itself instead of asking for it from experience, swarmed with prejudices and errors, the form dominating over the substance, literature was sovereign. Today the world has turned; reason subjugates the imagination; substance prevails in everything over form; literature is treated like a courtesan. The

severity of science no longer tolerates this adornment of language, these subtleties of diction from all these marvels of oratorical art, which were the delights of the Greeks and the Latins, and with which the youth of our schools are stupefied.

And that is why literature, expelled by the higher sciences; fallen from the finest part of her domain, was forced to descend to trivial and ignoble things; why she seeks new resources in the details, in the housework, in the kitchen, the boudoir, the prison, the orgy, the penal colony, the bad place. What some deplore as the humiliation and corruption of literature is only the proof of fact of its nullity.

Thus, what literature claims to add to science, science disdains; what it does to raise the object of its new predilections completes the degradation. The romantic, mystical and sophistical story is as despised as the historical, magnetic and philanthropic novel. We no longer understand anything about history since it was written by rhymers and playwrights; we no longer understand anything about society since serial writers and novelists began to describe it.

For a century and a half, literature has oscillated from the *descriptive* genre to the *passionate* genre, sinking deeper and deeper into chatter. It dares not become a logician and scholar: it would be something, it would no longer be. So we see that women excel in literature, as it loses in reality and in depth. To prolong its miserable existence, this effeminate literature calls to its aid paradox and scandal; it rolls around in the horrible, the impure and the false; it searches the mysteries by turns obscene and atrocious of the League, of the Regency, of Louis XV, of 93, of 1840. It seeks artificial effects by transforming words, reversing ideas, turning proverbs upside down, confusing characters, associating opposites, uniting impiety with the Gospel, Fénelon with Voltaire, Gassendi with Descartes, flesh with spirit. The literary men of good faith cry out against the decadence, profanation, abuse. They protest against the *innovators* in favor of the old religion of Parnassus. Poor men of letters! who do not see that these so-called innovators have much more of an instinct for conservation than they do: for it is to preserve literature that they make it serve as an expression of all that is most disgusting in humanity.

When society had few ideas, when the sum of ideas was, so to speak, equal to that of words, literature was the expression, I almost said the legislator of society.

Now that the sum of ideas exceeds both the number of words, and that of the graphic or syntactic combinations to which they can give rise, literature can no longer serve to express society except in its nakedness, to show its turpitude.

Take the February Revolution as an example.

Is it literature that prepared this revolution?

Is it literature that will express its aim, its tendencies, its law?

Is it literature that will come to justify it, that will avenge it on its enemies?

When did M. Victor Hugo take up the defense of the rights of labor?

When did M. Alexandre Dumas make himself known for his ideas, for his republican mores?

What have they both done for the revolution, if not to slander the revolutionaries? And what do they want from us today, these rhyme aligners, these dialogue stringers?

Social science has been studied by others for twenty years;

The revolution was made in spite of them;
The right to work is claimed at this time against them;
The family has not yet washed away the impurities with which they covered her.
And they come to talk to us about homeland, family, labor, property!...

Let us recognize, by this supreme villainy, modern literature! By dint of crushing corruption, it ended up corrupting the literati. Show me somewhere more venal consciences, more indifferent spirits, more rotten souls than in the educated caste! How many do you know whose virtue has remained beyond reach? Who, for the past three years, has poured out on us laxity of morals, contempt for labor, disgust with duty, outrage to the family, if not the literary people? Who had drawn most immodesty from the fund of secret materials? Who has most seduced women, softened youth, excited the nation to all kinds of debauchery? Who gave the spectacle of the most shameless apostasies? Who has abandoned princes in the most cowardly manner, after begging their favors? Who rallies most eagerly today to the counter-revolution? Literary men, always the literary men!

What do they care about the sanctity of religion, the gravity of history, the severity of morals? They pass, like lost girls, from legitimacy to usurpation, from the monarchy to the republic, from politics to socialism, from atheism to religion. Anything suits them, as long as they get fashion and money out of it. What a thirst for distinction! What fury to enjoy! But above all what hypocrisy! Name them, Parisians, name them for your representatives. Flatterers of the people, flatterers of the bourgeoisie, flatterers of kings, flatterers of all powers, always ready to salute the host where they dine; what they ask of you, in the name of the fatherland, of labor, of the family, of property, is gold, luxury, pleasures, honors and your wives.

Revolutionary Program

TO THE VOTERS OF THE SEINE

Paris, May 30, 1848.

Citizens,

Since my political and socialist friends desire it, I again consent to try my fortune in the elections, and I address to you my profession of faith. It will summarize without equivocation, and in an fashion intelligible to all, my ideas on the Revolution and my hopes for the future. You will not appoint me, citizens: neither you, whom I solicit for the vote, nor the government, which might support my candidacy, have the time to understand me. But, voters of Paris, you are nonetheless the first jury of the earth, and what your prudence will not grant at first sight, I do not despair, will elicit your wisdom on the second examination.

The revolution of February put all of society into question. In such a solemn moment, a profession of faith, in order to be sincere, must be complete; it is not even enough that it is complete, it is necessary that it be justified. You will excuse then, citizens, the length of these explanations. I am not one of those for whom a profession is only a diplomatic act, where, with vague formulas, one appears to promise much, while in reality one promises nothing.

The social system, that which it is a question of reforming and refounding, embraces three orders of ideas:

The family, public economy, and the form of government.

On each of these points, I will tell you what I think.

I. — THE FAMILY

I wrote two years ago, speaking of the relations of the family and property:

But it is above all in the family that the profound sense of property is discovered. The family and property advance side by side, supported by one another, both having significance and of value only through the relation that unites them.

With property, the role of woman begins. The household, that ideal thing, which one strives in vain to render ridiculous: the household is the kingdom of the woman, the monument of the family. Take away the household, take away that cornerstone, center of attraction for the spouses, there will remain couples, but there are no longer families. See, in the great cities, the working classes fall little by little, through the instability of residence, the futility of the household and the lack of property, into cohabitation and villainy! Beings who possess nothing, who hold onto nothing and live from day to day, being able to guarantee nothing, no longer have any need to marry: better not to commit than to commit with nothing. Thus the working class is given over to infamy: it is this that was expressed in the Middle Ages the right of the seigneur, and among the Romans the interdiction of marriage to the proletarians.

Now, what is the household in relation to the surrounding society, if not at once the rudiment and the fortress of property? The household is the first thing that the young girl dreams of: those

who speak so much of attraction and who want to abolish the household, must explain well this depravity of the instinct of the sex. For me, the more I think about it, the less I can account, outside of the family and the household, for the destiny of woman. Concubine or housewife (housewife, I say, and not servant), I see no middle ground: what is then so humiliating about this alternative? In what way is the role of the woman, charged with the conduct of the household, of all that is related to consumption and saving, inferior to that of the man, whose proper function is the command of the workshop, that is, the government of production and exchange? (*System of Economic Contradictions*, Volume II, chap. X.)

The family is in progress in humanity, like industry, art, science and moral philosophy. It rises from the community or promiscuity of the sexes, the primitive condition of society, to a polygamy that is already exclusive, then from this polygamy to monogamous marriage, the basic character of which, whatever one may say of it, is one of perpetuity and inviolability. Death, and certain severe cases, the determination of which is the most delicate and difficult matter that moral philosophy presents, can alone break a marriage.

The revolution of 1848 therefore does not touch the family, cannot touch it. Its entire influence in this regard is to elicit the ideal more and more from the family, reforming the economic base on which it rests.

So I would protest against any law, civil or tax, that would aim to restrict or limit parental authority, the principle of inheritance, the ability to give gifts and testaments. Equality and fraternity do not need, in my view, such safeguards. The budget can and must obtain other resources. And as for divorce, I do not believe that, in our present state of moral corruption, it suits us to prejudge anything concerning this scabrous issue; I view all divorce law as an encouragement to libertinism and a step backwards.

II. — PUBLIC ECONOMY

I am, as you are well aware, citizens, the man who wrote these words: *Property is theft!*

I do not come to retract them, heaven forbid! I persist in regarding this provocative definition as the greatest truth of the century. I have no desire to insult your convictions either: all that I ask, is to tell you how I — partisan of the family and the household, and adversary of communism that I am — understand that the negation of property is necessary for the abolition of poverty, for the emancipation of the proletariat. It is by its fruits that one must judge a doctrine: judge then my theory by my practice.

When I say, *Property is theft!* I do not propose a principle; I do nothing but express one conclusion. You will understand the enormous difference presently. However, if the definition of property that I state is only the conclusion, or rather the general formula of the economic system, what is the principle of that system, what is its practice, and what are its forms?

My principle, which will appear astonishing to you, citizens, my principle is yours; it is property itself.

I have no other symbol, no other principle than those of the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen: *Liberty, equality, security, property.*

Like the Declaration of Rights, I define liberty as *the right to do anything that does not harm others.*

Again, like the Declaration of Rights, I define property, provisionally, as *the right to dispose freely of one's income, the fruits of one's labor and industry.*

Here is the entirety of my system: liberty of conscience, liberty of the press, liberty of labor, free trade, liberty in education, free competition, free disposition of the fruits of labor and industry, liberty *ad infinitum*, absolute liberty, liberty for all and always.

It is the system of 89 and 93; the system of Quesnay, of Turgot, of J.-B. Say; the system that is always professed, with more or less intelligence and good faith, by the various organs of the political parties, the system of the *Débats*, of the *Presse*, of the *Constitutionnel*, of the *Siècle*, of the *Nationale*, of the *Rèforme*, of the *Gazette*; in the end it is your system, voters.

Simple as unity, vast as infinity, this system serves for itself and for others as a criterion. In a word it is understood and compels adhesion; nobody wants a system in which liberty is the least bit undermined. One word identifies and wards off all errors: what could be easier than to say what is or is not liberty?

Liberty then, nothing more, nothing less. *Laissez faire, laissez passer*, in the broadest and most literal sense; consequently property, as it rises legitimately from this liberty, is my principle. No other solidarity between citizens than that which rises accidentally from force majeure: for all that which relates to free acts, and manifestations of reflective thought, complete and absolute insolidarity.

This is not communism, certainly;

This is not the government of Mehmet-Ali;

This is not a dictatorship;

This is not state intervention in all civil functions and even in the family;

This has nothing to do with Babeuf or Saint-Simon, nor with Fourier.

This is the faith of Franklin, Washington, La Fayette, Mirabeau, Manuel, Casimir Perier, Odilon Barrot, Thiers. Does this seem reassuring or compromising to you?

But, you say, from this point of view, how to solve the problem posed by the revolution of February? That is to say: What is it, in the economic order, that still restricts the exercise of freedom, individual as well as general?

My answer will be frank and categorical. I shall tell you what are the barriers of which it is a matter, I believe, of ridding liberty — because it is clear that we do not feel free — and what are the means to achieve this: what I would propose to do, if I were to represent the people; what would I do if I was minister; what it is that I understand as the political system, domestic and foreign; if I were in government, what I would advise the people to ask the National Assembly, at their first opportunity to visit, if my counsels should prevail with the people; what, finally, I would wish that all friends of the people should study, discuss, develop and spread, and what I will continue trying to implement until I see that I am wrong and that there are other, more direct,

more timely, more specific, more decisive, more revolutionary means for pulling ourselves out of the abyss.

First of all, let us not act as do those doctors of etiology, who, in their drive to seek the cause of the disease, eventually forget the diseases themselves, and let their patients die. Let us not revisit the endless chain of causes and effects; let us consider the fact in itself and say: the cause of the disease is the disease. The cause of the crisis is the crisis. Labor is suspended, the workshops are closed, the shops remain empty, the market no longer calls for the product, capital flees, currency hides itself, commerce falls, no more income tax comes in, the State approaches bankruptcy, the hungry worker twists in despair; in a word, CIRCULATION is null: that is the crisis.

Society no longer lives, as in other times, on individual property; it lives on a more generic fact, it lives on circulation. All the maladies that today afflict the body politic can be traced to a cessation, to a disturbance in the circulatory function. Thus, if the circulation is poor, if it is cut off, if the least political accident suffices to make everything grind to a halt, it is because the apparatus is poorly established, it is because the circulation is restricted in its movement, it is the victim of its own organization.

On what does circulation in the economy of society depend? On currency, on money.

What is the motor? — Money.

Who is the king of exchange, the standard of commerce, the model of values? — Money.

Is money thus necessary, indispensable to circulation?

Routine, to this question, says yes; science says no.

Products exchange for products, says economic science. That is to say, exchange must be free, direct, immediate, equal.

Products exchange for money, says routine. That is to say, money is nothing but an intermediary, an instrument of agiotage, a hindrance to the liberty of exchange. Moreover, as money no longer functions for anything, circulation, in this system, is subject to a continual loss of value, producing simultaneous starvation and plenty in the different parts of the body politic.

Money is thus an obstacle to circulation, an obstacle to the liberty of commerce and industry; in itself, a superfluous organ and a parasitic function; and in what it costs, a cause of loss. To do without cash, to abolish the interest on circulating capital: such is the first obstacle to freedom that I propose to destroy by the establishment of a Bank of Exchange.

I have explained elsewhere,⁶ at great length, the principles and theory of the Bank, whose formula or mother-idea is the generalization of the bill of exchange. I have said what would be the agency, the mode, the pledge, and the guarantee of circulation in the new credit system. I have proven that the savings that would result for the country, on the discounts alone, would be at least 400 million. I will not dwell on this project, for which I have asked nothing more than to have it subjected to the most rigorous critique.

But the Bank of Exchange can only exist by the will of all citizens, as it relies for its power on their voluntary membership. However, this voluntary membership of all producers and consumers,

⁶ See *Summary of the Social Question (Bank of Exchange)*. 1 vol, in-18, chez Garnier frères, Palais-National.

the mutual consent of 35 million citizens, which propaganda might not achieve in twenty years, it remains only for the government to obtain in a week; it remains, I say, for the government to complete the Revolution in a week.

May the government render, on behalf of the people, the following decrees:

1st DECREE. — *Banking reform.*

“Whereas direct exchange, without cash, without interest, is of natural right and of public utility;

“1. The Banque de France adds to its powers those of Bank of Exchange.

“2. The discount commission for all merchants, contractors, etc., who adhere to the statutes of the Exchange Bank, is provisionally fixed at 1 per cent.

“3. The commission, interest included, for all merchants, etc., who prefer the old mode of exchange and circulation under the guarantee of money, is and remains fixed at 5 per cent.”

Is this creating a paper currency? Is this forcing the price of bills without pledge? Is it communism, expropriation, confiscation, bankruptcy? Is not a hundred times better than the counters of guarantee, and the fraudulent conversion of deposits made in the savings bank into annuities on the State, and the adjournment of treasury bonds, and the extensions of maturities, and the sumptuary tax, and the confiscation of collateral estates, and all those laws of extortion and financial speculation, of which our conservative government has been guilty since the 24th of February?

Holders of cash will keep their crowns: we will not take them from them; we do not want them. Whether they dispose of them as they please, whether they sell them, exchange them, melt them, no one will find fault with them. It is the fruit of their labor and their industry! But as trade is free, as the Republic does not recognize feudal rights, as competition is the natural remedy for monopoly, could the capitalists find it wrong that the producers abstain from their intervention? We do not prevent them from exercising their industry; we are not advocating lending at interest; we do not suppress the use of money; we infringe neither liberty nor property. We only ask that competition be opened between the monarchical and individualistic principle represented by money, and the republican and mutualist principle, represented by the Bank of Exchange. We ask that those who no longer want to pay tribute to the capitalists for the circulation of their products, not be forced to pay it, when they can do otherwise.

2nd DECREE. — *Conversion and repayment of debt.*

The state represents all of the citizens.

Moreover, from the point of view of the budget, the State is the administrator of a considerable part of the public fortune.

There is therefore an obligation for the State to seek, in the interest of the citizens it represents, the most economical means of government, and also to make all possible reductions in its expenditure.

Now, the State finding in the Bank of Exchange, on its debt securities, securities that would cost it nothing in interest, it is its duty to advise on the reimbursement of the public debt, or at least on the conversion of the rents, the amount of which will soon exceed 400 millions. On the other hand, would it not be just that, while the capitalists, who had their capitals engaged in commerce, should lose the income thereof, or at least be compelled by the competition of the Bank of Exchange to lower the rate of interest to 1 per cent.

There is therefore here for the State the need for economy and the need for justice to put the rents on the State in line with the rate of the discounts, pending final reimbursement.

I would therefore like the government to issue the following decree, which is only a corollary of the first:

“Whereas by the organization of the direct exchange of products without the intermediary of money and without interest, the State, like any citizen, has the faculty of procuring funds at 1 per cent commission, at most;

“Considering that it is just to give taxpayers, whose capital, hitherto engaged in commercial and industrial operations, is henceforth out of service, a legitimate compensation;

“Whereas the law must be equal for all:

“The annuities paid by the State at the various rates of 3, 4, 4 1/2 and 5 will be converted into 1 per cent annuities, at the rate of the Exchange Bank, until final reimbursement.

“The execution of this decree is entrusted to the Minister of Finance.”

I ask you again, voters, is that bankruptcy? Is it expropriation, community, phalanstery? Are you quite sure that the present government, by substituting in the old rut, instead of reimbursing the debt or at least reducing the rent, as it has the option and as I propose, will not arrive at a bankruptcy in which everything will perish at once, commerce, capital, labor and the State?

Rentiers, depositors in the savings bank, communes, holders of treasury bonds, instead of interest at 5 per cent, will only have interest of 1 per cent!... Who can doubt it? And what is wrong with that? So are we obligated to borrow at 5 when we can borrow at 1? Do we have to pay 5 per cent interest to savings passbook holders for the trouble the state takes to keep their savings? And since, by the organization of the exchange, without intermediary and without interest, we find ourselves in the position of a borrower to whom two capitalists would offer their funds, one at 5 per cent, the other at 1 per cent, can we be taxed with injustice because we give preference to the cheapest?

That the pensioners, the depositors of the savings bank, the holders of treasury bonds, and all the creditors of the floating debt, be reimbursed, fully reimbursed, we can do it without doing ourselves wrong: far from it, by this reimbursement, we enrich ourselves. Let there be no restraint; let property be respected, but let labor be free.

3rd DECREE. — *Land-credit.*

If the State, if all the citizens have the indisputable right to exonerate themselves from their debts, or even to change creditors, when it finds it advantageous, each citizen who is in the same situation also has the same right.

Let us add, as before, that the capital lent to the State and that engaged in commerce no longer having to produce, after the establishment of the Bank of Exchange, but an interest of 1 per cent, it is only fair that the capital engaged in industry and agriculture, and lent on mortgages, should be reduced to the same rate. What would be unfair would be if the mortgage creditors, enjoying like all citizens the benefit obtained by the reduction in the rate of discounts and the relief of the tax, they should not, in their turn, give any compensation out of their own income. I would therefore still propose to issue the following decree:

“Whereas property is sacred and inviolable;

“Whereas bankruptcy must be removed from the French vocabulary;

“Considering that the rate of the discount and that of the State annuities have been fixed provisionally, at the most, at 1 per cent; —That this figure must be considered as the legal rate of interest, until further reduction; — That an immense improvement must result from it for commerce and consumption; —That mortgage lenders enjoy, like all citizens, this important improvement; “That it is right, therefore, that they contribute their share to the public fortune.”

“The State guarantees all mortgage creditors the repayment of their capital.

“This repayment will be made either in installments of 5 per cent, or in full at once, at the convenience of the borrower.

“Until full repayment, it will be paid to the creditor, each year, as interest, 1 per cent on the sum due.

“The execution of this decree is entrusted to the care of citizens burdened with mortgages, who will adhere to the statutes of the Bank of Exchange.”

The conversion of mortgage debts into debts repayable by annual installments and except interest of 1 per cent, would produce for the whole country a saving of more than 1,200 millions.

Well! Is there a shadow of injustice here? Would creditors have the right to complain? Are the debtors people in bad faith? Can we, producers, be condemned to eternally submit to the suzerainty of cash, to forever pay the windfall of capital?... Through the Bank of Exchange, exchange, freed from any toll, itself functions as capital, as cash.

Now, competition has been free since 1789, not only between industrialists, but between capitalists: what law, divine or human, could deprive us of the benefit of this competition? And when this beneficent competition, like an unexpected discovery, like an engine whose power would be infinite and whose expense would be expense zero, changes all the conditions of production and exchange, and upsets the economy of society; in the name of what principle would we be made to lose, for a single minute, the benefit of invention?

Compare now, in its morality and in its effects, the decree that I deposit here with that returned by M. Garnier-Pagès on the hypothecary debts. M. Garnier-Pagès acted precisely as Barbes wanted: he undertook to levy a tax on the rich; he only proved his incapacity by folly and injustice. The rich, as a capitalist, is invulnerable to taxes: this is now known to all economists. But there are no more rich people, and by organizing denunciation between creditors and debtors, M. Garnier-Pagès has only succeeded in demoralizing consciences, making capital more untraceable and randomly striking creditors who are unskilled in evading the census. However, M. Garnier-Pagès is in power, and Barbes, the loyal Barbes is in prison!

Compare again the effect that the conversion of mortgage debts by means of the Bank of Exchange would produce on the population of the countryside, with that obtained by another decree of the same Garnier-Pagès, I mean that which increased the land tax by 45 centimes. The hostility of the peasants towards the Republic is there to answer. And then notice the contradiction. It is at the same time that we deal with agricultural credit that we increase the agricultural tax!...

And M. Garnier-Pagès, this elected representative of the bourgeoisie, this routine finance man, who more than anyone, more than the theories of M. Louis Blanc, more than the circulars of M. Ledru-Rollin, has disorganized the Republic, discredited the Revolution, compromised property, accelerated bankruptcy, M. Garnier-Pagès is a conservative! And we, who think only of reimbursing property, we came out of the partisans of the agrarian law, of the communists!...

4th DECREE. — *Maturities and repayments.*

“The Bank discounts cash at the rate of 5 per cent; — in vouchers at 4 per cent.

“Consequently, and by the same considerations, previously developed, any member of the Exchange Bank shall enjoy on all payments and reimbursements of obligations by him subscribed prior to the existence of the Bank, a discount equal to the difference between the interest stipulated for the benefit of the creditor and the commission received by the Exchange Bank, for all the time which would have elapsed until the end of the obligation, since the installation of the Bank.”

Precisely the same thing happens here as in the case of a duty reduction. Suppose a government decree suddenly abolishes, as happened in 1847 for cereals, the rights of transit at the frontier, of navigation, of circulation, all management rights, in a word, Every consumer would have the right, whatever his commitments with the contractor and the manufacturer, to obtain a proportional reduction in the price of products and services.

The organization of the Bank of Exchange is an event beyond the forecasts of the parties, which comes to lower everywhere the royalty of capital, and which, consequently, must immediately benefit all the citizens lessors of capital, acquirers of cash, buyers on term, even speculators on public funds, etc. Where would be the injustice? How would property be violated? How would the family, public morality be outraged?

For the execution of this decree, the diligence of the debtors will depend on it.

If the February government, on taking possession of power, had found in the cellars of the Hôtel-de-Ville, in the underground passages of the Tuileries, in the casemates of Vincennes and Mont Valérien, a capital of 100 billion:

If, with the help of this capital, it had created a Bank where all commercial securities, bearing two signatures and representing real value, accepted and delivered, would have been received at a discount at the rate of 1 per cent, including interest and commission;

If, not content with restoring commerce and industry, threatened with perishing by the desertion of capital and the treachery of cash, it had repaid the debt of the State and relieved the budget of 400 million annual rents;

If, then putting itself in the place and place of the mortgage creditors, he had repaid their 14 billion in claims, founded agricultural credit on new bases, and reduced the interest on loans on mortgages, like that on discounts, to 1 per cent;

If, by this unexpected fortune, lowering on all points the rent of capital, it had ordered that all debtors should be forgiven by their creditors of the obligations and repayments falling due, beyond the difference of interest, from the day of institution of the Bank of Exchange until the term of the obligations;

Would the government, by each of these provisions, have done the right thing? Would it have compromised the public fortune? Would its policy have been reckless or disloyal? And because, without asking anything of anyone, without extraordinary taxes, without exceptional contributions, without loans, without coercive measures, without confiscation, without bankruptcy, without infringement of property, without governmental trickery, by the mere fact of the discovery of an immense treasure, it would have poured out wealth, well-being, security and liberty with both hands, on the nation; because it would have destroyed mercantile feudalism, financial aristocracy, the pleasure of money; because it would have liberated labor, rid circulation of its shackles, leveled, by dint of wealth, all fortunes, would one have the right to accuse it of communism, terrorism and anarchy?

Now, such is precisely the situation in which I propose to put the government, by the institution of the Bank of Exchange.

The organization of exchange acts on economic relations exactly as capital does, which would increase more the more one borrowed from it. Exchange is, like labor, a way of creating wealth out of nothing. This is why exchange is the rival of capital, as far as circulation, sponsorship and all credit operations are concerned.

To organize exchange is to organize the indefinite reduction, until extinction, of the rent of capital; it is to organize the victory of labor over capital, whatever form it takes, money capital and instrument capital, movable capital and real estate capital, material capital and moral or metaphysical capital.

And since the organization of exchange in the economic order entails an analogous organization of functions in the political order, it follows that the form of government still results from the form of credit, so that to organize credit, mutuality, exchange, is to organize the Republic.

The Revolution is there entirely. And the ruin of the old system is so complete, we have come so low in this fall, that anyone can be boldly challenged to raise credit on its old basis and save the country by the known means.

I have said how, through the Bank of Exchange, circulation was instantly re-established, rent converted or repaid, agricultural credit founded, the interests of debtors, for their obligations to fall due, safeguarded.

Let us continue this series of reductions, and by contemplating the benefits of the principle that conquered in February, let us learn to defend the Revolution, let us learn to love the Republic.

To the decrees of which I have given the analysis, I would therefore propose to add the following.

5th DECREE. — *Interest and dividends from joint-stock companies.*

“Considering that the capitalist-shareholders, forming part of public limited companies and in limited partnerships for the exploitation of the various branches of commerce and industry, profit, like other citizens, from the reduction in taxes, and from the reduction of the charges that weighed previously on agriculture and commerce; — That it is right, consequently, that they should contribute their part to this relief, by an analogous reduction on the interest of the shares which have subscribed; — That to act otherwise would be to create, in favor of the said shareholders, a privilege without right; — That, moreover, nothing would be easier in many cases than to establish, alongside these societies, rival enterprises, sponsored by the Bank of Exchange;

“Whereas relatedness and identity of species;

“Interest and dividends are reduced, in any joint-stock company, to 1 per cent, together, of the paid-up capital, and will be paid at this rate, if necessary, until final reimbursement.

“This decree, applicable to all companies formed by shares for the exploitation of mines, canals, railways, transport, couriers, constructions, saltworks, chemical products, spinning mills, glassworks, etc., etc., is entrusted for execution to the diligence of the directors, managers, accountants, partners, and holders of industrial shares of the said companies.”

I ask you again, readers, and I will ask you until the end, where is the spoliation here? Where is the communism? Is this the system of absorption and exploitation by the State, the threat of which was madness, the realization of which is impossible? To make joint-stock companies enjoy the benefits of direct exchange, mutual credit, without cash and without interest; to relieve large and small industry, high and low commerce, from the tributes that crush them, in the form of discounts, and in the form of taxes, and in the form of agiotage; to give impetus to work and life to factories by constantly reducing the fixed costs of production, is this not the true formula of progress, the true theory of liberty?

6th DECREE. — *House rents.*

Civil law distinguished movable and immovable property.

Political economy, which considers goods, not in their external form, but from the point of view of production, confounds them all in the same category, under the name of capitals.

The identity of the capitals, compared with each other from the point of view of production and of the right which they give to the owner to derive a revenue from them, is perceptible, notably between the houses and the shares of the limited partnership. — A joint-stock company is formed for the construction of a street, an entire district, and for the rental and operation of buildings. According to article 518 of the Civil Code, these buildings are immovable by nature, and each owner can and must, consequently, be considered owners of immovables. But according to article 529, the action, which is here the title deed, is also movable by nature, so that the same owner can, with good right, and with respect to the same object, be considered as owner of movable and immovable.

The Civil Code therefore contains, at least in the case which occupies us, an unfortunate distinction, against which the Commercial Code protests in vain. The Bank of Exchange comes about to put an end to this misunderstanding.

“Whereas, the Government would say, there is identity between the shares of a company formed for the exploitation of a mine and the shares of a company for the construction of a building; between the capital engaged in machines and the capital engaged in houses;

“Whereas the construction of a building is nothing but an act of exchange between architects, stonemasons, masons, carpenters, joiners, plasterers, tinsmiths, brickmakers, glaziers, locksmiths, etc., and the capitalist who buys their services;

“Whereas by means of the Bank of Exchange, all producers can and must consider themselves as capitalists; that it is thus optional for them to acquire, individually or collectively, by means of credit on surety, advances on consignments, discount of their invoices, etc., the work of the building workers, and to procure convenient and low-priced dwellings;

“Considering that the reduction in interest on the instrument of circulation has successively led to an equivalent reduction on the State pension, on the mortgage bonds and the limited partnership shares; that a similar reduction on the interest of the capital engaged in the built properties is the necessary consequence of it; that it would be unjust if it were otherwise;

“For these reasons:

“The price of rents throughout the territory of the Republic is reduced to 1 per cent of the current value of the houses, after deducting the depreciation of maintenance costs and contributions.

“An expert assessment will be made, by the agent-surveyors, architects and engineers of the cities and the departments, accompanied by the mayors, and in the presence of the owners, to the effect of recognizing the value of the built properties, in the state that they are; to fix the legal income, and to assign to each compartment its rental value.

“The interest or rent thus fixed will be paid by the tenant until liquidation and full reimbursement of the building, after which it will be provided by the State, on a new plan, for its final restoration.

“Expired leases are extended for two years, at the convenience of the tenants.

“This decree will come into effect from February 24, 1848. Its execution is entrusted to the diligence of the tenants, who must all prove their membership of the Bank of Exchange, on pain of being deprived of the benefit guaranteed to them by this decree.

“The owners who have not adhered to the statutes of the Bank of Exchange, in addition to the fact that they cannot demand rents higher than those fixed by the report of the assessment, cannot either demand payment in cash of their terms only up to the amount of half.

“The tenants will be informed of the sums that they will have paid in excess for the days of rental elapsed since February 24, 1848 until the promulgation of this law.”

This decree speaks for itself and needs no justification.

Out of 400,000 merchants, merchants, manufacturers, workmen, producers of all kinds, travellers, rentiers, etc., who live in the department of the Seine, the owners are not 15,000, not 1 in 30. If it were a question of sacrifices to be made in the general interest, certainly, one could not accuse the decree of striking the great number for the profit of a few, as so often happens in budgetary matters. Far from it, it would be an imperceptible minority sacrificed to the interest of the immense majority.

But it is not a question here of sacrifice, it is only a question of justice.

Built property, instead of continuing its suction-pump game on production, only takes its own amortization. Rents fall everywhere by 25 to 30 percent, the entire population is relieved of an enormous burden; and the proprietor has no more to complain about, no more than the capitalist, no more than the rentier, no more than the bearer of shares. He benefits, like everyone else, from the general good market; he must consequently undergo, like everyone else, and as far as he is concerned, the effects of the competition that exchange makes for capital.

Do you think, citizens, that your affairs would be worse off if tomorrow the legislator, at the same time as he would reopen credit and outlets to you, at the same time as he would make you enjoy an immense reduction in the price of all things, taught you that from February 24, instead of 12 months' rent which you have to pay each year, you will only have 8? This reduction coming to you like a refreshment to a sick person, would it not be an immense relief to you in this dreadful crisis? Would you believe in a community of household with the Icarians, the Phalansterians, the Egalitarians, because you would enjoy, like them, a reduction on your rent? Would you say that it is the ruin of France, the signal of the bankruptcy and the distress of the country? Would you prefer, to this munificence of the exchange bank, an increase in your patent, in your personal, movable, rental contribution, with all the anguish of a dynastic restoration? Believe me: those who deny property, who know what they deny and what they affirm, want nothing other than liberty of labor through the abolition of interest on capital.

7th DECREE. — *Farm rent or ground rent.*

When the reform of taxes and tolls that burden production, that stop circulation, that make consumption impossible, will have been largely inaugurated: 1st, by lowering the discount from 8 to 1 per cent; 2nd, by the repayment of the public debt; 3rd, by extinguishing or converting mortgage

claims; 4th, by discounts on repayments at maturity; 5th, by setting interest and dividends on limited partnership shares at 1 per cent; 6th, by the scaling of rents: then the time will have come to also reduce the price of agricultural leases, to extinguish land rent, in a word to buy back the land, to reimburse property.

The reimbursement of property, such is the legitimate, inevitable consequence of a credit institution based on the absence of cash and the nullity of interest.

Neither could the farmer be left in a worse condition than that done to the tradesman and the industrialist; nor could the landowner retain a privilege henceforth incompatible with the general economy; nor should the country allow agriculture to be abandoned any longer to the misery of share-cropping, to the hazard of small-scale farming, to the good pleasure of routine.

Thus, without prejudging anything about the subsequent organization of agriculture, and confining myself exclusively to the transition period, I would propose to decree by law:

That the rate of rent for land, meadows, vineyards, etc., of any quality, be reduced by 25 per cent on the average of the last twenty years;

That the leases be extended for three years, at the convenience of the tenants;

That the value of the leased properties should be calculated by taking the rent allocated as a per cent of the capital;

That when, by the accumulation of the annuities, the owner would have returned in the value of his building, increased by a premium of 20 per cent, by way of indemnity, the property returned to the central society of agriculture, charged with providing, by the creation of local companies, for the agricultural organization;

That the obligation to cultivate being the *sine qua non* condition of the right of property, all uncultivated land would likewise return to society;

That the rents currently due would be paid half in exchange notes, half in cash, at the convenience of the farmers;

That at the expiration of the repayment, the proprietors, and after them the tenants, would have privilege of management and direction on the property;

That the execution of this law be entrusted to the diligence of the interested parties.

What does this redemption operation, made inevitable by the immediacy of the exchange and by the resulting consequences, the demonetization of money; the depreciation of cash, the abolition of taxes levied on capital, the reimbursement of the public debt, the extinction of mortgage usury, the new system of aedility; what, I say, does this redemption of the soil, the sole aim of which is to decentralize agricultural exploitation and to make the various parts of the territory more united, without taking anything away from the freedom and responsibility of the laborer, — have in common with community and the agrarian law? What can the family have to fear? What can the principle of heredity, the right to bequeath, suffer?

Do you want agriculture to double its products? Would you give your workmen bread, meat, wine, all articles of consumption, in a word, cheaply? Abolish the taxes that crush the peasant; organize the agricultural credit through the exchange bank, and centralize the exploitation of the

territory by repurchase. Then you will see the arms turning themselves towards agriculture: the peasant, assured of living in the open air and in the sun, will not come to seek the shade of our cities. Then you will have balance between functions, equivalence between products, equality between fortunes. You will understand that property, thus reduced to its proper measure, is nothing other than the right of consumption; and without being more communist than myself, you will agree with me that property, the toll collected in the name of capital, the last of the feudal rights, is a theft!

Oh you, Montagnards, who have only ever had intentions, and not an idea, learn your trade as revolutionaries at last! You are seeking liberty, equality, fraternity! You want to organize labor! And you have no instrument but force, no authority but dictatorship, no principle but terror, no theory but bayonets!... From February 25 to April 23, you had power, and you knew how to use it only to lose it. You wanted to tax capital, and your routine taxation only managed to touch labor. You didn't know where to get the capital. You were in front of it like a pack thirsty for blood in the presence of a hedgehog. Trust things, once, to a skilled person. Organize exchange, direct exchange, cashless; without interest: and all those tolls that stop traffic, all these taxes that, in a thousand forms, aspire to the profit of the purest parasitism of social wealth fall irretrievably. Instead of attacking the publican in his safe, attack him in his industry. Lower the barriers, untie the arms of the laborer, trim the nails for privilege, cut off the provisions for the monopoly, and then let the producer enjoy his product, dispose as he pleases of the fruit of his labor and his industry. *Laissez faire, laissez passer*, make room for liberty: the rest will be given to you in addition.

Is it then so difficult to understand that it is by money, by this fatal chain of cash, that labor is subjugated to capital, and society materialized? That once labor has been made free like thought by the organization of exchange, all causes of inequality, all privileges, all monopolies disappear? That this first problem solved gives us the key to all the others, from the problem of taxation to that of value, from the problem of sovereignty to that of certainty?

If, by an organization that common sense calls for, that theory affirms, that experience attests, the exchange of products for products took place in a direct manner, without intermediary and without deduction, the mutuality of credit operating as capital, as inexhaustible and free capital, circulation would not have to support a tax of 400 million on its discounts, and financial usury would be impossible.

The State being able to discount its receipts free of charge, would not be in the need to increase its debt indefinitely and to pay 400 million rents, and budgetary wear and tear would be impossible.

Industry and agriculture, finding funds at 1 percent at the most and all expenses included, would not be crushed under a permanent and ever increasing debt of 14 billions, and mortgage usury would be impossible.

Joint-stock companies, having to pay no more for all interest and dividends than 1 per cent, would take a new impetus and would make the country enjoy all the profits announced by their programs, and mortgage usury would be impossible.

The inhabitants of the towns and the countryside, thanks to the ease of construction, would see their rents reduced by 50 and 80 per cent, their homes restored and embellished, and rental wear and tear would be impossible.

The farmer, putting the market in hand to the owner whom the law would oblige to exploit or have exploited under penalty of withdrawal of the property, would obtain a reduction of one-third, one-half, three-quarters, on the rent, and territorial usury would be impossible.

And as the abolition of usury would be common to all, to the capitalist banker, to the rentier of the State, to the mortgage creditor, to the bearer of shares, to the owner of houses and lands; that each of them would profit, like all the others, from the good market which would result from it on all the products; that, moreover, the abolition of interest and tolls established on circulation would imply immediate reimbursement and in annual installments of all capital loaned or rented for usury: the Bank of Exchange, by making the worker enjoy his incontestable rights, would not bankrupt the capitalist, would not ruin anyone.

Now, usury, that is, the royalty paid to capital, thus abolished in the discount, the rent, the land credit, the sponsorship, the rents and the rents; any other kind of privilege, accumulation, monopoly, salary, sinecure or parasitism, is henceforth found without pretext and becomes impossible.

Customs, for example, would be impossible, the 25 million it costs each year would be saved, and smuggling would no longer be an offence, because there would be no more smuggling. In fact, national production being reduced by more than 3 billion 200 million for general circulation costs, loans on mortgages, taxes, rents, sponsorships and rents, that is to say approximately 30 per cent, it would no longer have anything to fear from foreign competition; in any case, our imports all having to be paid for in paper exchange, that is to say, in products, our capital would no longer have to fear being damaged by usury from outside, and its integrity would be assured. The balance of trade problem would be solved. Moreover, customs employees would have nothing to fear for their existence from the reform: commerce, agriculture and industry, more prosperous than ever, would soon be absorbed.

With customs, all analogous rights of *navigation, circulation, transit, attributions*, etc., should also be abrogated, or at least reduced to a large extent. This would be the subject of an 8th decree, which I would like to entrust, for the execution, to the citizens least suspected of softness against the customs, to the free traders.

9th DECREE. — *Salaries and accumulations.*

The government, under the Republic as well as under the monarchy, has always recoiled before repeated demands for a reduction in the salaries of its civil servants. Why is that? Because it would not be just, because it is not possible that the functionaries of the State, each according to his merit and his dignity, enjoy an existence inferior to that of workmen, merchants, manufacturers and owners, having equal faculties and an analogous position.

Otherwise, no one would want to serve the state, and the government would be delivered to slaves. Can a rural postman earn less than a tailor? Can a director of the Post Office, of Sèvres, of the Régie, of the Gobelins, a prefect be paid less than a director of a railway company or a mine? Should a president of a court of appeal be below a lawyer? A minister worse off than a banker?...

In the current system, savings on salaries are impossible: with the Bank of Exchange, these considerations no longer exist. The capitalists, rentiers, proprietors, merchants, industrialists and others, who derived the greater part of their income from the interest on their capital, would no longer be an object of envy and an argument for ambition. On the contrary, it would be they who would come to claim compensation for their lost royalties; and as, this time, the interest of the bourgeois would agree with that of the people, the government would be forced to carry out the general will.

It is in anticipation of this inevitable result of the Bank of Exchange, that I would propose to the Assembly to issue the following decree:

“Whereas, by the organization of exchange, the capitalists having funds engaged in trade, the rentiers of the State, the lenders on mortgages, the holders of shares, and the owners of buildings have seen successively diminish and annihilate the productivity of their capitals; — That all together have been put under the necessity of exploiting and asserting their properties themselves, on pain of eating up the fund and losing the revenue, or even being stripped of their title; — That industrial entrepreneurs have been forced, in their turn, to lower the price of their products by competition from abroad; — That from this progressive reduction of interest, rents, rents, rents, dividends and profits, as well as of the labor of the capitalists and proprietors, there has resulted an increase, considerable in public wealth and in the well-being of individuals; — That this improvement has benefited the functionaries of the State, as well as all citizens; — That it is right, therefore, that the said officials contribute to it, especially since their functions are essentially unproductive:

“The maximum salary of civil servants is fixed at 40,000 francs.

“Salaries of less than 40,000 francs existing to date will be reduced in the following proportions:

From 25 francs to 20 francs,	per day,	1/3
From 20 francs to 15 francs,	—	1/4
From 15 francs to 10 francs,	—	1/5
From 10 francs to 7 francs 50 centimes,	—	1/6
From 7 francs 50 centimes to 5 francs,	—	1/7
From 5 francs to 4 francs,	—	1/8
From 4 francs to 3 francs 50 centimes,	—	1/10
From 3 francs 50 centimes to 3 francs,	—	1/12
From 3 francs to 2 francs 50 centimes,	—	1/15
From 2 francs 50 centimes to 2 francs,	—	1/20

“Pensions will be reduced on the same scale of proportion.

“Any combination of jobs, when the sum of the combined salaries exceeds 2,400 francs, is prohibited.

“The figure fixed for each salary and wage can never be raised,

“The reduction on wages will only go down temporarily to 2 francs. But the State does not guarantee its employees any minimum: it admits in principle, and everywhere, with equality of exchange, free competition, underbidding and bargaining, in a word, reduction to infinity.”

10th DECREE. — *Ministerial offices and tariffs.*

To reduce the salaries of the employees of the State, just as to diminish the discounts, the taxes, the interest on capital, the profits of monopolies, is the same thing as to diminish the general costs of production, and consequently to increase the public wealth. According to this principle, and for all the reasons previously expressed, the State or the society that it represents would therefore still be entitled to seek and demand a similar economy on the fees, commissions and tariffs of ministerial offices, notaries, attorneys, bailiffs, clerks, stockbrokers, commercial brokers, auctioneers and other positions whose holders, although personally responsible and independent of the State, nevertheless come under the State.

For the same reason again, the State should impose an equal reduction on railway companies, locksmiths, moderators, on all corporations exercising, by privilege, public services or free functions. The thing is easy, and it would be justice.

I would therefore like a decree to be issued reducing all these tariffs by 20, 25 and even 50 per cent, depending on the case; and I have the science and the consciousness that the government would have done something useful, just and of good example.

11th DECREE. — *Salaries and wages.*

If it is true that to reduce the interests of capital and the budget of the State is to diminish the general costs of production, and that to reduce the general costs of production is to increase general wealth; it must also be said, and this is the corollary of all the preceding propositions, that in this regime of equality of exchange, where neither capital, nor privilege, nor parasitism levy anything, where the State is reduced to what is strictly necessary, and taxation is reduced to its fairest and simplest expression, where the producer receives the equivalent of his product, in this situation, I say, it must be said that the more the wages decrease, the richer the worker becomes.

In fact, a decrease in wages is synonymous with an increase in work: since, if you express by 5 francs or by 5 shillings, or by 80 batz, or by 25 grams of silver, or what amounts to the same, but which is much more exact and which never varies, per ten hours of work, the same quantity of cloth, linen or calico, which you previously expressed by 6 francs, or 6 shillings, or 40 batz, or 30 grams of silver, or twelve hours of labour, it is clear that to this reduction in the quantity that is called *wages*, corresponds an equivalent increase in that other quantity that is called *product*. And if the reduction takes place for everyone and without exception, it is still evident that to this

general reduction of wages will correspond a general increase in collective production; that if, for example, the sum of the reductions thus effected on wages is one billion, the increase in the national product will be one billion.

What produces misery, therefore, is not the general fall in wages, it is their unequal and partial lowering. It is in this sense that one can say that certain classes of workers earn *too much*, while others earn *too little*; the inequality, or to speak more correctly, the lack of proportion that results from privileges, monopolies, speculation, overproduction, etc., making some exploiters of others, just as the capitalist is the exploiter of the industrialist.

It is therefore to the workers that I am appealing at this moment: it is to their justice, to their patriotism that I am addressing myself. They, for whom the February Revolution was made; will they who raised the old republican banner, with the motto Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, want in their turn to become exploiters, and, out of selfishness, hypocrisy, bad faith, and, out of a stupid calculation, will they want to stop the Revolution? Let them say it as soon as possible, because on their answer depends the future of their children, the future of society; and I attest, for my part, that their refusal would make any improvement of the working class impossible.

I would therefore propose that the measure indicated by the two preceding decrees, relative to the employees of the State, as well as to the ministerial officers and to the privileged corporations, should be generalized and extended to all classes of workers;

That consequently, INVITATION be addressed by the government to all entrepreneurs, manufacturers, traders, extractors, artisans, workers, producers of all kinds, to spontaneously reduce their salaries and wages, according to the scale proposed for the employees of the State.

Reduced wages could never be raised: society admits in principle that the reduction of wages, being synonymous with an increase in product, must be irrevocable and indefinite.

It would be indispensable, for good order and good rule, that the workshops, factories, industrial establishments, etc., publish the comparative statement of their salaries and wages, before and after the decree.

Failing by the manufacturers, industrialists, merchants, entrepreneurs, farmers, artisans, clerks, foremen, workmen of every kind and every species, to yield to its fraternal invitation, the government should declare the social question insoluble, and the February Revolution void.

12th DECREE. — *Fixing of prices.* — *Trademarks.*

If, as there can be no doubt, the working class and its leaders, currently the bourgeois, answered the call of the government on the question of wages, then it would be the case to officially establish, by a general scaling of prices, the discount to which each citizen and society as a whole are entitled on the sale of the various products by the reductions in wages and interest that they have suffered.

In technical terms, it would be necessary, after having determined the *debit* of each citizen towards society, by fixing salaries and wages, to determine his *credit* by fixing the price of things.

We touch on the most delicate question in all of political economy. It is a question of carrying out on the *price* of commodities the same operation of mutualism that we have carried out on their *exchange*.

Through the Bank of Exchange, through the principle of reciprocity that forms its basis, we have organized the exchange of products, directly, and free of charge. But these products, according to the laws of the Bank, must be invoiced, delivered, accepted, and their reimbursement agreed on by both sides; that is to say that the exchange value of these contradictorily debated products had to receive its prior and definitive expression. Without this prior fixing of the price, the commercial note is void, consequently the discount and the circulation of it is impracticable, for this legal reason that the sale, as well as the exchange, only exists *when the thing and the price have been agreed upon*.

At present it is a question, by a measure of mutual guarantee, of determining the price of things, so that the reduction of the price to be paid for each object assures a compensation at least equal to the reduction made to the wages

I say that the State must proceed here only with prudence and circumspection, not to demand anything by constraint, to limit its initiative to enlightening the citizens, to invite them to contribute freely to its views, by organizing the sale and purchase themselves on the principle of mutuality, to finally wait, from the free adhesion of the producers, or, failing that, from their duly solicited competition, the production of new facts, which will have to serve as premises for the positive part of the reforms.

Here is an overview of what this new pact of mutuality would consist of, the statutes of which should be presented *in extenso* in the decree.

A *Mutual Society for sales and purchases* would be formed between all manufacturers, craftsmen, contractors, workers, company directors, company managers, any producers, who would adhere to the statutes of the society.

The requirements for admission into the society would be as follows?

1. The partner undertakes to make known the cost-price of its products according to their qualities and species, broken down as follows:

- a.* Raw materials. Indication of their nature and price.
- b.* Labor or wages, including salaries of the contractor;
- c.* Overheads (taxes, discount commissions, depreciation and maintenance of machinery and utensils, rent, office costs, damage, etc.)
- d.* Deduction or insurance premium for fire, bad weather, flood, navigational risks, hail, frost, epizootic disease, illness, old age, unemployment, incapacity for work, in a word, all accidents of force majeure whatsoever.

The savings obtained by personal skill, as well as by the methods, processes, inventions and applications peculiar to the exploiter, would remain *outside*.

The list of prices thus broken down for each product would be posted in the stores of the contractor and each product would bear a mark indicating the name of the manufacturer, the place of manufacture, the nature, the quality, and the price of the goods.

2. This publication having been made, the manufacturer or entrepreneur would further undertake to deliver, at the cost price thus established, to all consumers who, like him, are part of the mutual society for sales and purchases, and at any request, his products and services: all reservations made, in favor of the operator, of the profits obtained by his skill and his particular method, and in favor of the co-partners, to give preference to all producers, whether or not part of the society, whose prices would offer more advantage.

A special law would regulate, in this system, the rights and privileges of inventors who would place their discoveries at the disposal of the Society.

Undoubtedly, after the general reduction of the interest on capital and wages of workmen, the decrease would be made *naturally* on all the products, and one can believe that the formation of the new company of which I speak will hardly add to the safety of the public and the consumers. But I will point out that it is not enough to obtain a reduction as such in the price of products, that on this point it is necessary to arrive at an exact and official reduction, as we have arrived at an official reduction in wages; that the aim of the social revolution is to reveal society to itself, by forcing it to realize everything by weight and measure; that it is time to emerge from the mercantile chaos, in which the laborer has ventured as into a death-trap, and which only profits speculation and fraud.

I would add that the legalization of price, or the constitution of value, the highest expression of freedom and mutuality, forms the necessary transition between the *negative* laws and the *positive* laws of the social economy. This brings me to the third part of this program, the form of government.

III.—FORM OF GOVERNMENT.

It is up to you, citizen-voters, to see in this profession of faith, this revolutionary program, which I regret having made so long, an economic charter.

The first decree proposed to your votes, that relating to the establishment of the Bank of Exchange, which, by its consequences, leads to all the others, would be from this point of view, the *organic* section of the new charter.

The following decrees from No. 2 to No. 12, all of which involve reduction or repeal of some part of the old economic system, we would call *resolutive* articles.

The last of these articles, moreover, is essentially *transitory*.

The following decrees would be for us the *constitutive* articles; it will suffice for now for me to state their general spirit, purpose and object.

Who does not see that the mutualist organization of exchange, of circulation, of credit, of buying and selling, the abolition of taxes and tolls of every nature that place burdens on production and bans on goods, irresistibly pushes the producers, each following his specialty, towards a centralization analogous with that of the State, but in which no one obeys, no one is dependent, and everyone is free and sovereign?

The primary cause of this centralizing movement is in the inequality of industrial faculties as means of production.

Thus, it is inevitable that, free discount bringing the extinction of mortgages, the gradual reduction of rents, rents and wages, and ultimately the disposition of properties, the entire society, a being of reason, is suddenly, by the mere posting of trade and industry, substituted for the former holders of capital and proprietors. The public economy will thus incline to communism, namely to industrial-agricultural dictatorship, if the State, continuing its groundbreaking initiative, still developing its principle of free labor and that of free trade, did not consolidate the results obtained previously by a superior principle of mutuality.

If, for example, the State, at the same time as it procured for agriculturists the extinction of their debts, the reduction of their rents, the reimbursement of the soil, demanded of all agricultural exploitations, private or corporative, that they mutually insure themselves against inequalities in the quality of the soil and against all the disadvantages of cultivation, as well as against the accidents of temperature and the ravages of fire, water, and insects; if it made this mutual insurance the condition of the advantages that it offered through the Bank of Exchange; it is evident that, in this system, all the exploitations remaining independent and free, the responsibility being complete, the solidarity existing only for the inequalities of nature and the accidents of force majeure, the wages, salaries and profits could be uniform without the State intervening in the exploitation, and that the agricultural industry could be as strongly centralized as the administration is today, but with this difference, that here the centralization is still hierarchical, while there it would be completely liberal, it would be egalitarian.

What I say regarding agriculture is also important for other industries, mining, industrial, commercial. The same movement, the same law governs all forms of human activity:

It develops from this, what I mean when I propose to record in the Bulletin of Acts the following decrees, of which it is only a matter of developing the motives and writing the articles:

13th DECREE. — *Centralization of extractive industry.*

14th DECREE. — *Centralization of manufacturing.*

15th DECREE. — *Centralization of commercial industry.*

16th DECREE. — *Centralization of agricultural industry.*

17th DECREE. — *Centralization of the sciences, humanities and arts.*

Each of these broad categories would appoint its minister, form its central administration, and bear its own costs, which would be charged by the Bank. The State itself could not intervene in these; it appears nowhere in them.

The organization in each of these five major categories, mainly democratic appointments, would be made by majority vote, either by relative or absolute majorities or higher, depending on the purpose and circumstances. Salaries and wages, from the salary of an apprentice up to that of a minister, would be subject to constant revision.

It now remains to regulate, by so many special laws, the objects of public utility that concern the whole nation, and do not relate, in particular, any more to one than to the other of the industrial categories.

These objects are:

1st. *Education*, which I would wish to be free, combined with the apprenticeship of which it is only an auxiliary, made less abstract by constant application and submitted to the election of citizens.

2nd. *Public works*, where I would demand more knowledge, and above all more responsibility.

3rd. *Statistics*, which barely exist, without which the State and society have only an instinctive existence and, in their inability to render account of anything, navigate from one pitfall to the next, from one shipwreck to the next.

4th. *Justice*, unique in form, and with only two degrees of jurisdiction. Economic science proves how false, and experience how disastrous is this distinction between civil justice, administrative justice, and commercial justice. Instead of twenty different courts, a mere two, I think, would suffice: the Court of Magistrates and the Court of Cassation. Moreover, with the economic simplification of the new charter, we have nothing to do with these varieties of chicanery.

In fact of Criminal Justice, I would defer, provisionally, abolition of the death penalty.

5th. *Cults*. — I believe in the truth of Christianity neither more nor less than that of Buddhism and Mahometism. Religion has emerged from the bowels of humanity, it is popular, it belongs to the people. It is the system of social ideas presented in a symbolic form, some of which are beyond even our intelligence. While religion has life in the people, I want it to be respected externally and politically. I therefore vote against the abolition of the salary of ministers of religion. Eh! Why, with this beautiful argument, that only those who want religion to have to pay, do we not deduct it from all social budget allocations for public works! Why does the Burgundian farmer pay for roads in Bretagne, and the amateur subventions to the Lyon Opera!... I do not speak of the political considerations, much more powerful yet, that do not escape anyone.

But as I do not want the salary assigned to worship to be a motive for hypocrisy, imbecility, laziness, I would ask 1. that any ecclesiastic who wishes to contract marriage and leave orders be admitted to civil marriage; 2. that any cure and branch of which the parishioners, by a majority of four-fifths of the citizens and fathers of families, would request the suppression, be irrevocably suppressed; — That no new cult should be salaried by the State.

By these two means would be brought about the progressive extinction of the cults and the definitive reign of the true religion of humanity, which is reason and justice.

6th. *Public Health*. — I need not explain that. There should be nothing common about the salary, between doctor and patient, nor between the priest and the secular, between teacher and student. To submit doctors to the generosity of patients is to make them their murderers.

7th. *The Army*. — Immediate abolition of conscription and replacements; obligation of every citizen to make, for one or two years military service, implementation of the military services and administrative work of public utility.

8th. The *police* is the function that, without intervening in any other, without interfering or budget or spending or the appointment of officials or public administration or external affairs, monitors, warns, denounces, pursues, and punishes. The police, the public ministry, is the State.

The State, in a well organized society, must be reduced gradually to represent nothing more than itself, to nothing.

During the time of the sessions of the National Assembly, in which then resides all sovereignty, the State, represented by its advocates general, attends all the deliberations and responds, as interim representative of the Assembly, to all the interpellations that are made to it. Statesmen do not deal as equals with representatives, they are only their proxies for the time when the Assembly is not in session, and are therefore required to render an account of their management and to present their reports on the progress of public powers and industrial corporations.

The appropriations allocated to these different services are voted by the nation or by its delegates, meeting in general assembly, and on the statements of expenditure provided by each office or ministry. Their administration is organized on the democratic principle, and independent of the State, which must confine itself exclusively to its attributions. Convergence and independence, such is the universal law of society, for the functions of public utility, as for the various categories of production and exchange.

Members of the National Assembly are appointed by each category of producers and officials, in proportion to the number of their members. The election by territorial district is eliminated. It can only serve as a means to achieve corporate and professional representation.

It is not necessary, as has been said, that the delegate to the National Assembly represent only the People; this abstract representation would correspond to nothing real; it would always make us fall back into the alienation of sovereignty, into aristocracy.

The representative of the People must represent a positive interest, it must have character and specialty.

It is when the representative of the people is the expression of organized labor, that the People will have a real representation, a true elite. Apart from that, you never find anything but disappointment, impotence, waste, corruption, arbitrariness.

Voters, National Guardsmen and bourgeois:

It is socialism that made the Revolution of February.

Socialism, in making this revolution, has proven that it intended to operate peacefully. Before overthrowing the State of July, elected by the bourgeoisie, socialism began by expanding its base of operations and planting its flag across Europe. The social issue is raised in Paris, London, Rome, Milan, Geneva, Berlin, Vienna, Munich, Breslau, in Krakow; from Cadiz to Moscow, on the Seine, Rhine, the Danube. Thanks to socialism, you have no war. The old coalition is grappling with the organization of labor; the proletariat, insurgent everywhere, no longer leaves a chance for war. This policy is just as good as that of Guizot and Talleyrand!...

MEMBERSHIP IN THE BANQUE D'ÉCHANGE

The following citizens have subscribed to the draft constitution of the Banque d'Échange:

Émile de Girardin, editor-in-chief of *La Presse*;
Victor Considerant, editor-in-chief of the *Démocratie pacifique*;
Frédéric Bastiat, editor of *Libre échange*;
Le National;
La France libre;
L'Organisation du travail;
La Commune de Paris;
La Tribune nationale;
Le Représentant du peuple.

Citizens who have expressed their refusal to join:

Auguste Barbet, editor of the *Peuple constituant*, whose old experience does not approve of our young ideas;

Chambolle, editor of *Le Siècle*, who declared that there could be nothing in common between him and the man who wrote: *Property is theft*;

Michel Chevalier, editor of the *Débats*, who will undoubtedly make his reasons known later.

Among the newspaper editors designated to be part of the committee, these citizens have not yet spoken out:

Ribeyrolles, editor-in-chief of *La Réforme*;
Marie Augier, economist, editor of *La Réforme*;
Thoré, editor of the *Vraie République*;
Cabet, editor of the *Populaire*;
Merruau, editor of the *Constitutionnel*;
De Genoude, editor of the *Gazette de France*.

We do not think that our friends from *La Réforme*, the *Vraie République* and the *Populaire*, whose ideas and intentions are known to us, are rejecting our project, and we only attribute the delay in their support to the serious concerns of the moment. As for the *Constitutionnel* and the *Gazette de France*, whose editors we do not have the honor of knowing personally, the first will undoubtedly not disavow a system based on the purest data of economic science; the second would not dare to champion usury, condemned by all councils...

In any case, we sincerely thank those of our colleagues who were kind enough to let us know of their assent, and we ask them to accept the expression of our sincere gratitude. But we believe that the time has come to act, and that the propaganda of ideas must now be combined with the authority of actions.

This is why we will say to M. Émile de Girardin:

You are the most positive, the most practical, the most simplifying, and therefore the most extensive, mind in the Parisian press; you possess to a higher degree the essential faculty of the statesman, common sense. The influence that you exercise on the public, in the countryside as in the city, in the workshop as in the living room, is enormous, and increases constantly with the very number of your opponents and your enemies. If your life is a struggle, on the other hand, success almost always crowns your efforts. To the most eminent qualities of the mind, you add this other advantage, so esteemed by I don't know which diplomat, you are happy. Almighty over opinion, showered with the favors of fortune, what are you lacking?... It is here, sir, that you yourself seem to us to have lacked intelligence and misunderstood your character. You lacked awareness of your mission; you lack being revolutionary. Did you soon wear your dynastic mourning? Is it to tell us, one day, that *you are not a Republican of the day before*; another time, that you are *reactionary*, and that you brag about it? — Is it to amuse the public with these very personal puns, which are as easy to hear from Louis-Philippe as from the *National*? — Is it finally to knock out these poor montagnards, already so bruised, that it was given to you to speak to three hundred thousand men every day! So what do you owe to Louis-Philippe? What do you have to envy of the *National*? What! Have the barricades taught you nothing? A revolution has taken place, and you are starting again, against Crémieux, Ledru-Rollin and Garnier-Pagès, the same war that you waged against Guizot? Really, one would think that you want to be prefect of police or president of the Republic!...

Be revolutionary, we will tell you, for this is your vocation, which you persist in not understanding. We don't want you in the National Assembly, nor in the ministry, nor in the provisional quintumvirate! The Girondins hate you as much as the montagnards. Government, under representative democracy as under constitutional monarchy, has no place for you. Well! Conspire with us to demolish the government; become a revolutionary for the workers, who ask for labor and to whom no one knows how to give employment; become a revolutionary for the transformation of Europe and the world, and remain a journalist. A man of speculation as much as a man of action, you grasped at a glance all the economic truth and reforming power contained in the idea of a Bank of Exchange, and you spontaneously associated yourself with it. Why don't you grab this lever, a thousand times more powerful than authority of a portfolio subject in turn to the control of the master and the pasquinades of the servants? When you want it, the Bank of Exchange will exist, and when we have the Bank of Exchange, we will quickly move on the path of liberty and equality. Will that not be better for your memory than having passed through the stirrups of a parliamentary opposition and leaving a dubious reputation as a statesman?

So tell this middle class, docile and timid, with whom you have so much credit, and prove to them by your initiative, that the Bank of Exchange is not a vain utopia; that it is the expression,

the summary of the practice of all the centuries. And the middle class, abandoning politics and statesmen, will follow those who talk to them about labor, exchange, liberty and cheap prices; the middle class, returning to the work, will complete the Revolution and save itself.

We will say to M. Considerant:

You are the leader, always listened to, of an elite school, which today counts its members by the thousands and hundreds of thousands. You are speaking to minds shaped and disciplined over a long period of time, to hearts devoted to social reform. Whatever your ideas about property and capital, it is obvious, and you yourself have understood it, that the distinction between laborer and capitalist, and the difference of interests that results from it, a true fiction of modern civilization, is in no way essential to the Fourier system; that the question of capital, so far as the rights of the capitalist are concerned, is only a question of *distribution*, while Fourier's system has *production* primarily in view. Fourier said it in many places in his works: The series of contrasting groups is my entire system. Now, the series of contrasting groups has no other aim, can have no other effect, than to develop, among workers, aptitude, emulation, the attraction of labor, talent and intelligence, and, consequently, to constantly procure the increase and improvement of products. In all this, the role of capital, as a productive force, is zero.

If it were then possible, by a purely economic combination, to provide free of charge to the series of contrasting groups the capital that must serve as material and field for its operations; to identify, in the person of each worker, to the same degree, the two hitherto divergent qualities of laborer and capitalist; to free, in a word, the producer from the royalties of the proprietor, in what way would the passionate growth of the series be compressed? How would the Fourier system be affected? In what way would the passionate theory and the learned or ingenious analogies that serve as a principle for the phalansterian organization be compromised?...

The question of system thus put aside, we will ask you if you do not think it appropriate to proceed immediately with the emancipation of the worker, to clear the ground of the first model commune, and, since the encumbered Republic can do nothing do for our organizational utopias, to create by ourselves the credit and the capital that are necessary for us to organize? Time is running out, the house is burning, skepticism begins to spread among the masses and, as a result of skepticism, despair. We are counting on your enlightenment and your dedication: a few words from you, in the *Démocratie pacifique*, would teach us if we can also count on the help of your friends and on the publicity of your newspaper to undertake, urgently and quickly, without waiting for late and insufficient help from those in power, the most decisive of reforms.

We will finally say to the *National*:

We will not argue with you. We give thanks to the liberalism of your ideas, to the benevolence of your sympathies; we thank you for your encouragement. You can count on the fact that, until our last breath, our propaganda will not fail social ideas. Now you are edified about the speculative value of our project; only the application gives you worries and maintains your distrust. But how could the application ever convince you if the application never arrives? And what good is faith without works? No doubt it is not permissible for a government to venture lightly into such theories. We don't like government getting involved in anything except the police any more than

you do. But there are cases where initiative is a right for the State, and exception a duty; there are circumstances where public safety requires the dictator to use dictatorship. Where would the danger be for the government and for public wealth if the Bank of France, at the same time as it continued to operate on the old basis of discounting in cash and at 5 percent, discounted commercial values to citizens who adhere to the statutes of the Exchange Bank at 1 percent. Will it not always have the same guarantees? Would it stop surrounding itself with the same precautions? Wouldn't it keep its secret police? Would it be obliged to exceed, with respect to its new customers, the ordinary credit limits? Would it not find ever stronger guarantees, both in the work of agricultural and commercial statistics that must be the subject of one of the most important institutions of the Republic, and in the movement to centralize the various industries? Is it not obvious that one reform does not go without another, and that as much as commercial relations are anarchic under the despotism of cash, they would have that much convergence and unity under that of the Bank of Exchange?

But if you fear such an initiative so much for the government, entrust it to a special company, formed of the most commendable and competent men, and placed under the immediate supervision of the State. You know our statutes, our draft constitution. Let us submit it to arbitrators, let us remake it, let us reform it. Let us be asked for a detailed explanation of the procedure we intend to follow for each type of operation; let the government itself preside over the start-up of the enterprise; that it appoints the cashier, the director and the head of accounting; and then, let us allocate to the Company, from the Treasury and under the guarantee of the citizen members, a credit of ONE MILLION. Only one million to install the new Bank, prepare the transition, provide support, and compete with five hundred counters serving a circulation of 20 billion. A million to solve the social question!

So you can't go back. Because, take note of what I am going to tell you:

Credit is dead, really dead and, we do not disguise our hopes, credit, under the conditions of the old regime, will no longer recover. A new institution is needed.

Now, the Bank of Exchange, we have demonstrated, and we will demonstrate it more and more every day, is the abolition of all the tolls that affect the circulation of products, under the various names of interests, annuities, rents, rents, dividends, profits, etc. When this idea has become popular, when it has captured the imagination, when it has inflamed consciences, when children and old women will repeat everywhere: "It is up to the government to increase national production by 10 billion per year, and the income of each father by a thousand francs, and the government does not want it!..." When we say to ourselves that the discount interest is unfair, but that the government does not want to deliver us from it, because it would mean abolishing at the same time all the rights of privilege, so all it takes is one word, one spark to send this word of dissolution through the towns and countryside: We don't pay anymore!

We no longer pay rent, and the farmer will find that just.

We no longer pay rent, and the tenants will say, like the peasant: It is just.

We no longer pay interest, and the debtors will in turn repeat It is just.

We no longer pay dividends, and company directors will agree that this is just.

We no longer pay duties, we no longer pay taxes, and the tax collector himself will recognize that it is still just.

We no longer obey justice, because, one might say, justice is not just.

We make fun of the bailiffs and the police, because they do not represent justice, but privilege.

We no longer do military service, because order is disorder.

When, we say, the people, rising from their lethargy, shake off these millions of insects that devour them, and the capitalist debacle has begun, then, men of power, you will recognize, but a little late, the necessity of organizing exchange.

(No. 68. June 8, 1848.)

Mr. Émile de Girardin, vice-president of the committee to establish the Banque d'Échange, published, in *La Presse* this morning, his response to our questions yesterday. He refuses to concern himself any further with our project. We note the refusal of M. de Girardin to actively cooperate in our work, as we noted and welcomed his support. But since M. de Girardin was kind enough to give us the reasons for his refusal, he will find it good for us to make known to him the reasons for our blame, because M. de Girardin's explanations call for nothing less than a reprimand on our part.

With this liveliness of mind that characterizes him, with that impulsive good faith of lucid intelligences, M. de Girardin had at first smiled on our idea. He had joined in spontaneously; he had asked to be part of the establishing committee; he had expressed the desire to be vice-president of that committee. Certainly, such a small honor was nothing to M. de Girardin, but the less importance the thing had, the more considerable the support of a man so highly placed in the press became, the more serious the step was.

Mr. de Girardin, urged by us to put his hand to work, instead of responding with a simple refusal, as he could have done, if he did not think it appropriate to explain himself, takes a sidetrack. He wraps himself in puns, equivocations, personalities, all this to explain a NO that, being essentially free, did not need the least of reasons.

Could it therefore be true that in M. de Girardin the heart is not up to the height of the intelligence? Our readers will judge.

So let us explain; we owe it to our *readers*, we could say our *voters*, because the editor of a newspaper is in reality the elect of his subscribers.

He represents them!

I will say to M. Proudhon:

Let us first begin by agreeing on this word: *revolutionary*.

There are two ways, in my opinion, of being revolutionary:

From above: it is revolution through initiative, through intelligence, through progress, through ideas!

From below: it is revolution by insurrection, by force, by despair, by the paving stones! I was always, I still am, a revolutionary *from above*; I have never been and never will be a revolutionary *from below*.

I am revolutionary in my office; I am not of the public square.

I observe; I do not conspire.

I love the people; I don't like the multitude.

I believe in the power of isolation; I am wary of the danger of influence.

I don't believe in the duration of revolutions made by the people. The intoxication that victory gives them does not take long to make them lose its fruit. Despotism is always at the bottom of the cup that they empty, mistaking it for that of liberty.

Every revolution from below ends in ruin, bankruptcy, misery, external and civil war, impotence, disavowal of itself and the condemnation of its blind authors.

Wait, before declaring that I am wrong, for the new test that dates back to February 24.

I only believe in the duration of reforms accomplished by governments that are up to their task. But, you will tell me, it is rare that they ever get there. I answer: This is what gives revolutions legitimacy.

“Everything for the people, if not everything by them,” is an admirable phrase that should always be present in the minds of statesmen. If M. Guizot had not forgotten this maxim in power, borrowed from one of his books, he would not be in London! France would be happy and great.

Everything for the people, everything by them, is a fatal error that only the blind, the ignorant, the cowards or the traitors can establish as a system.

The people, abandoned to themselves, are mobility in the immensity: they are the Ocean whose ebb carries away what the flow brought.

The people know how to overthrow; they do not know how to found.

If I am wrong, let M. Ledru-Rollin and his colleagues prove it to me; it will cost me nothing to admit my error.

I have faith in governments, but I do not idolize them. I don't care what their shapes are! Monarchical, oligarchic, republican, aristocratic or democratic, if the people are happy, if they think they are great, I say that the government is good.

I only hate anarchy and arbitrariness: I hate them equally.

Arbitrariness is anarchy in power.

Anarchy is arbitrariness among the people.

Are you asking me if I'm almost finished wearing dynastic mourning? I answer you:

I am not in any mourning.

I would have given, without hesitation, my life to save the last government, as soon as I saw it rescued from its fatal blindness; I would not have given a hair to save it at the price of the last of our liberties.

I am devoted to the Republic on the same conditions: no less, no more. Let it be glorious, and I will be neither less proud nor less happy about its glory than those who claim that the Republic is exclusively their work.

I defend myself, I do not boast, when I declare that I am not an *Republican of the day before*, and that I accept the nickname *reactionary*.

Who invented these titles of republican nobility and revolutionary proscription? Was it me? Certainly not. I have too deep a contempt for big words. I judge parties, not on their principles, but on their works; it is in the harvest that I value the seed.

Agree that the seed of February 24 gives, on June 6, very little hope!

Also agree that if I am reduced to making to MM. Ledru-Rollin and Garnier-Pagès the same opposition as to M. Guizot, it is not my fault. What reception did M. Garnier-Pagès give to the letter I sent him on March 20? With what superb disdain did the *National* hasten to extinguish every spark in me, as if there was a danger that it would set it ablaze? There was no risk, however, that its ideas would catch fire.

“They don't want me,” you say, “neither in the National Assembly, nor in the ministry, nor in the provisional quintumvirate;” but it seems to me that no one wants more from you.

Why?

I'll leave you to find the cause.

“The Girondins,” you add, “hate me as much as the Montagnards.”

Neither one nor the other is wrong, because I am as far from the first as from the second. There is as much distance from violence to strength as from strength to weakness; from the coward to the brave than from the brave to the braggart.

The Girondins are afraid;

The Montagnards are afraid;

This is the only difference I see between them. They know it and they hate me; it's justice.

So you address me this exhortation:

“Well! Conspire with us to demolish the government; become a revolutionary for the transformation of Europe and the world, and remain a journalist.”

Candor for candor, I answer you:

Do not count on me to ever plot the demolition of any government. My mind would refuse it; it is only accessible to a single thought to improve the established government, to legitimize it by the number of its benefits, to glorify it by the greatness its his works.

One of these days, when I will have more space and more time, I will tell you, if you continue this debate, how I understand the propaganda of France and the transformation of Europe. The power is to journalism what a camp is to a sentry box, what the army that fights is to a sentry that warns. I certainly don't disdain my position, but I don't exaggerate its importance. Ten years of journalism are not worth ten hours of power, believe me!

When you have written a hundred in-depth articles on the mechanism of your Banque d'Échange, you will be less advanced on the last day than on the first. Do you know what people will say about you? They will say: Oh! he is unbearable with his idea; it's always the same. But if your baggage is not limited to a single idea, it will be even worse, people will say: What does he want us to do with all his ideas?

Journalism is a balance, but the nature of the scale is to lower what weighs more and to raise what weighs less. This explains how M. Duclerc is at the Ministry of Finance, while you will only receive sterile sympathies for your project of the Banque d'Échange, starting with mine. I am sorry to tell you this, but common sense rules out any illusion. Now, as you said, I am a man of common sense.

All I am missing is a jacket; we do not believe in a common sense that has lapels and tails.

ÉMILE DE GIRARDIN.

Mr. de Girardin is revolutionary *from above*; he never was, it never will be *from below*.

That is to say, M. de Girardin is of the worst kind of revolutionary.

The Revolution *from above* is the intervention of power in everything, it is the absolutist initiative of the State, the pure governmentalism of Méhémet-Ali and Louis Blanc. The Revolution *from above* is the negation of collective activity, of popular spontaneity, from which it must be recognized that everything comes, through which everything subsists and everything is moved, royalty like democracy, religion like free inquiry.

The Revolution *from above* is interim tyranny, a solution of continuity in progress. The Revolution *from below*, on the contrary, is eternal. What serious and lasting revolution has not been made from below, by the people? How did the Revolution of 89 happen? How did that of February come about?

The Revolution *from above* has never been anything other than the oppression of the wills *from below*: we reject the Revolution as M. de Girardin understands it.

Consistent with this first idea, M. de Girardin then said: “*Everything for the people* (it never costs anything to give everything to the people), *but nothing by the people*. Everything by the people is a fatal error that only the blind, the ignorant, the cowards or the traitors can establish as a system.”

M. de Girardin pretends inappropriately to confuse republican government with demagogic anarchy, as contrary to the sovereignty of the people as dynastic good pleasure. M. de Girardin does not need us to insist on the difference. Why then does he seek to create an illusion? Republican government is one where the legislator and the magistrate act in accordance with popular instincts and tendencies, where the popular will, authentically recognized, is taken as law and rule. And the most perfect of republics is the one where each citizen, aware of the true will of the people, is in fact a legislator and magistrate. We are therefore among those who want everything FOR the people, everything BY the people and nothing except BY the people. But we

do not call the will of the people the first fantasy that a rhetorician pleases to circulate among the multitude: the will of the people, in our opinion, has other signs. Questioning the people, making them express and then execute their intimate and authentic will is, in our eyes, the whole science of government; this is what we call the abolition of government.

Mr. de Girardin believes that he is making an immense effort at liberalism, saying that he does not idolize governments: — “The forms matter little to me: monarchical, oligarchic, republican, aristocratic or democratic; if the people are happy, if the people are great, I say that the government is good.

It is too easy to say to satisfy anyone. I would even say that it is cheating. I would like to get married, said Sganarelle to Marphurius. — It is possible. — What do you advise me to do? — Whatever you like. — Doubtless, but I would like your opinion. — It depends! — Will I do well? — Maybe. — Will I do evil? — Perhaps!

Thus speaks M. de Girardin. We want equality, liberty, fraternity, well-being. To achieve this goal, what path must we follow! The monarchy? — I will agree to it, says M. de Girardin. — The Republic? — Okey. — But one is the opposite of the other. — That doesn't matter, as long as you have well-being, liberty, equality and fraternity!...

Mr. de Girardin says that the journalist is the *elect* of his subscribers. Who are M. de Girardin's *readers* or *voters* that he dares to fool them with impunity?

Are you or are you not a Republican? we ask him. You are not allowed to prevaricate. Answer without pyrrhonism, unequivocally. You are not a Republican from the day before, so be it. By your admission, on February 22, you were not indifferent to the Republic! Are you a Republican of the day after? That's what needs to be said. And since you call yourself a *reactionary*, are you reacting out of love for the Republic, or out of disgust for the Republic?

M. de Girardin has too much sense not to feel that he could avoid answering such clear-cut questions. So he answers, and very intelligibly, for anyone who knows what speaking means.

“I judge the parties,” he told us, “not on their principles, but on their works; it is in the harvest that I value the seed.”

Well! We will reply to M. de Girardin that this is a detestable way of judging. And since he uses the metaphor, we will tell him, continuing the metaphor, that the best seed can give a poor harvest, and of poor quality, if the land is bad, if it is poorly manured, poorly plowed, poorly prepared, if the farmer does not know his trade or does not do his duty. Isn't that what MM. Thiers, Barrot, Dupin, and M. de Girardin himself have done, when, despite the experience of 92, despite that of 1830 and 1848, they persist in saying that the constitutional seed was good, but that it was the sowers who were nowhere as good as Louis XVI, Charles X, and Louis-Philippe?

And this is also why we, Republicans, maintain, despite the Terror, despite the Directory, despite the mistakes of MM. Lamartine, Garnier-Pagès, Ledru-Rollin and Company, that the republican principle is excellent.

Principles are immortal, like seeds; but the offspring can be, depending on the circumstances, stunted and nasty. To deny principles is to fall into fatalism, into something even more stupid than fatalism, into empiricism, because fatalism has at least one idea, while empiricism has none.

It is at the harvest, you say, that you value the seed? But it is at least certain, however skeptical you may be, that, following the parable of the Gospel, one cannot make figs come from thorns; and, as we want liberty, equality and wealth, we will ask you the question again: Do you think that equality can come from the monarchy as well as from the Republic? Are you, once again, or are you not a Republican?

“Agree,” observes M. de Girardin on this, “that the seed of February gives little hope!”

So, you do not want the Republic! Why beat around the bush so much, and why not say everything straight away: I don't want the Republic?

M. de Girardin has this in common with the princes, that no one dares to tell him the truth about himself. Now, the greatest truth about M. de Girardin is that dissimulation is impossible for him; it is, to put it bluntly, that with all his wit, his good sense, his rare faculties, despite his reputation, M. de Girardin is not a clever man, and we compliment him for that. There is no one, among our contemporaries, with as great a sincerity as M. de Girardin. We see clearly into his heart as through a glass. In him, ideas always have proper names, and as he wages war on people, he ends up waging war on ideas. M. de Girardin takes MM. Ledru-Rollin and Garnier-Pagès for the republican seed planted in February! They who, on the eve of the Revolution, were, like M. de Girardin, only bourgeois; they whose principles we do not yet know; they who, by their reactionary and anti-socialist acts, have compromised the Republic as much as M. de Girardin has injured it with his polemic, here, for M. de Girardin, is the personification of republican ideas, here is the seed of February. Here is the Republic! What reception did M. Garnier-Pagès give to his letter of March 20? Under what superb disdain did the *National* hasten to extinguish every spark within it?

Thus, because the Republic is poorly represented, because the government rejects M. de Girardin, M. de Girardin, new Coriolanus, will kill the Republic! What reasoning!

But would M. de Girardin tell us how he reconciles his reactionary behavior with the feelings he expresses a little further down?!

“Do not count on me to ever plot the demolition of any government. My mind would refuse it; it is only accessible to a single thought to improve the established government, to legitimize it by the number of its benefits, to glorify it by the greatness its his works.”

A style of profession of faith that only imposes on simpletons.

What! Are you not plotting, at this very moment, the demolition of the Republic? Are you not trying, with all your efforts, to uproot this seed, which gives such sad hopes! Well! What are you doing then? But you would not agree with yourself, and the skepticism that you profess on principles is a sure guarantee to us that your secret feelings are, in this respect, entirely in agreement with the personality of your critics.

Furthermore, you are aware that, in our thinking, the word *conspiracy* has a completely different meaning than that which inspired this fine movement in you. When we speak of *demolishing the government*, we have in mind the progressive constitution of equality, which develops and is achieved, according to us, in the diametrically opposite direction to the extension and force of the attributions given to the State. You don't want to be involved in this conspiracy in any way: for the fourth time we have caught you blatantly avowing royalism. Is it true?

M. de Girardin ends with a joke, which would never have escaped what we call a clever man.

“Ten years of journalism are not worth ten hours of power, believe me!”

Here then is M. de Girardin revealed by himself.

A pen! What does that mean for M. de Girardin? What he needs is power. Power for a day, for an hour, and then die! Like Cleopatra's lovers, who wanted to be killed if they possessed the Circe of the emperors for one night.

Mr. de Girardin believes in the power of man; he does not believe in that of the people. This is why he wants the Revolution *from above*, not the Revolution *from below*; for this reason he wants everything done by authority, and nothing by the masses; for this reason he does not want the February Republic, where his services have not yet been approved; why, while plotting the ruin of this Republic, he wants to maintain the power. There is something of Napoleon in M. de

Girardin. And woe to us, if there were only a dozen men like him in the Republic! We would be very sure of being Bonapartized, monarchized and tyrannized. Fortunately we have Napoleons by the thousands.

“Journalism is a balance. Now, the nature of the scale is to lower that which weighs more and to raise that which weighs less. This is why M. Duclerc is a minister...” and M. de Girardin nothing at all!... O good sense of M. de Girardin, what have you become?

“We do not believe in a common sense which has lapels and coattails.”

This being the address of common sense in blouses, we leave it to the *pleasant suburbs* to relaunch the epigram. But we warn M. de Girardin that if he attacks the people he will not have the last word.

In summary, M. de Girardin clearly tells us and explains to us through his response:

That he is too much a man of government to want to act outside the government;

Too disdainful of popular initiative to appeal to this initiative;

Too much in love with authority to seek the triumph of equality;

Too much of an enemy of the Republic to take care of an institution that, in the order of credit, is the type of the Republic.

Why then, for what purpose, for what purpose did M. de Girardin first adhere to our project? Why did he patronize it? Why did he want to be its representative? Had he not first measured its full scope, all its consequences?...

To abandon an idea at the moment when it calls for its realization is an apostasy. Let M. de Girardin think about it: he who plays with principles will perish by principles. We had believed this athlete of journalism was with us; we are forced to declare today that we were wrong: M. de Girardin is against us!

We will always respect the person of M. de Girardin; we will do justice to his rare talents, to the variety of his knowledge, to the tireless activity of his mind, to the fecundity of his resources. But, judging his intentions by his explanations, we entirely separate ourselves from the opposition of M. de Girardin.

M. de Girardin is the enemy of the Republic.

(No. 88. June 30, 1848.)

To the editor of the Représentant du peuple.

Monsieur Editor,

You were kind enough to send me an extract from *L'Ere nouvelle*, the journal of the Reverend Father Lacordaire, and you ask me what I intend to say in response.

Let us first quote the passage:

“M. the President reads to the Assembly a draft proclamation addressed to the nation, and this proclamation, written in the best terms, recognizes rights, reminds the citizens of duty, condemns the theories that could have prepared the misfortunes which we groan, and warmly addresses well-deserved thanks to the army, the national guards, the mobile guard, and to all those who fought for order and for liberty.

“The feeling of the great guardian principles of civilization is there in every word expressed; they are energetically condemned, those men who had risen to destroy society itself, who undermined it at its foundations, and for whom *the family was only a name, and property a theft.*

“At these last words, the entire room turned its gaze towards the bench where M. Proudhon sits.”

What I intend to respond to this, M. Editor, is like the provocations addressed to me over the past two weeks from the platform: nothing.

When a journalist, obliged by his profession to know the theories of which he speaks, knowingly, coldly, stupidly slanders these theories, he deserves no other response than that which Pascal gave to the Jesuits: *Mentiris impudentissime*, you are a slanderer.

When the president of a representative assembly, speaking in the name of this assembly, turns personally against one of his colleagues the collective thought that he is responsible for expressing, he no longer has the right to anything other than to pity and disdain.

I did not protest against M. Sénart's writing, because it would have been to offend the National Assembly to appear offended myself.

But, alone, I did not stand up to vote for the proclamation, because I could neither accept with my vote a condemnation that seemed aimed at me, nor applaud this masterpiece of chauvinism!...

I therefore do not intend to respond further to the denunciation of the *Ere nouvelle*.

From the moment that, instead of discussing principles, they appeal to passions, all I have to do is remain silent, and I will let myself be shot before a single word of justification escapes me.

And on this, M. Editor, I beg you to announce, by inserting this letter, that I am not hiding, that I go out unarmed, that I often come back very late, and that, if the minions of the *Ere nouvelle* have decided to make a bad move against me, they can do it without running the slightest danger to their persons.

A man of discussion, peace and order, and known for such, if I have to pay with my blood for too generous paradoxes, I want above all not to die a seditious man; I want to fall victim to a cowardly assassination.

Fraternal greetings,

P.-J. PROUDHON.

SECOND SERIES
July — August 1848

To the Editor-in-Chief of the Représentant du peuple.

Paris, July 5, 1848.

Dear Editor,

I find in your number yesterday, among many excellent things, unfortunate words with which I find it impossible to associate myself.

You say, responding to the *Journal des Débats*:

“And don’t go pretending that we’re trying to excuse the insurrection; we declare, on the contrary, this insurrection culpable, because it had no legitimate motives, because, etc. So the government did its duty by *suppressing the insurgency right from the start and without any hesitation*. — But, while condemning the insurgents, we do not wish to be unjust, etc.”

Such words, M. Editor, exceed the measure of blame that I believe possible to lay down on the events of June 23, 24, 25 and 26.

It is with an insurrection as with a homicide. It may, according to the circumstances, be legitimate or criminal; but it can also be neither, that is to say, it can be, to speak like the law, excusable.

Homicide committed in war, in defense of the country, is a legitimate act that even honors its author.

Homicide committed for personal revenge or greed is a crime punishable by law.

Homicide that happens as a result of provocation, in the case of self-defense, etc., is excusable. Neither law nor morality approves of it: they do not pursue it, they forgive it.

This is how I judge recent events.

Did the insurrection, of which so many citizens on both sides were victims, have as its motive a flagrant violation, on the part of the government or of the National Assembly, of the republican principle? No. So this insurrection, which no sufficient reason justifies, was not legitimate. This is a first point.

Was it the result of foreign instigation, conducted for a dynastic purpose and directed against the Republic? In this case, the insurrection would have been a crime, an attack against which one would have to call the vindictiveness of the law. However, we do not yet know that such was the true character of this deplorable collision.

But, if the revolt of June 23, 24, 25 and 26 arose suddenly like an accident of misery; if the struggle, sustained during these four unhappy days, was only a flash of despair; if the investigation proves that, in spite of the widespread gold, in spite of the dynastic hirings, the immense majority of the insurgents was composed of workmen demoralized by unemployment, led astray by hunger, disappointed in their hopes, irritated, rightly or wrongly, against the power: if it were finally true, that the government, that the National Assembly itself, deceived at first on the true meaning of the riot, had carried to the climax, by a fatal policy, the exasperation of these men, whose rallying cry was: *Bread or lead!* Oh! Then it would be necessary to recognize that the civil war which has just

bloodied the cradle of the Republic was a frightful misfortune, but that, — thanks to heaven! — there are no culprits, only victims.

Four months of unemployment suddenly turned into a *casus belli*, an insurrection against the government of the Republic: here, in a few words, is the whole truth about those funereal days. But, whatever has been said, whatever selfish and pitiless calumny still spreads every day, the generosity, the high morality of the working classes have not perished in fratricide. The destitution of the insurgents, the misery of the prisoners, the respect for property, which, if numerous reports are to be believed, would not have always been as great on the side of repression as on the side of the riot, are there to attest to this.

The English proletarian lives nobly on the poor man's tax, the German *compagnon*, laden with money and clothes, does not blush to beg, from workshop to workshop, the *viaticum*, the *passade*; the Spanish *lazarille* does more, he asks for the *caritad* at the end of his *escopette*. The French worker asks for work; and if, in the workplace, you offer him alms, he rebels, he shoots you. I prefer the French workman, and I pride myself on belonging to that proud race, inaccessible to dishonor.

Please, M. Editor, let's not sprinkle salt and vinegar on bleeding wounds; let us not bring despair to those darkened consciences, whose error has been deplorable, but who, after all, are not criminal. Let us have pity on these poor wounded, who hide and die on the straw, prey to gangrene, cared for by children without bread, and wives mad with misery. Tomorrow, Thursday, will be a day of public mourning, dedicated to the funeral of the victims of the insurrection. Let us not hesitate to mix in our regrets, under this common name of victims, those who died in the defense of order, and those who fell fighting against poverty. If right was on this side of the barricades, it was also on that side. The terrible carnage that we have witnessed resembled those ancient tragedies, where duty and right were in opposition, and which divided the gods. Let us weep for our brothers in the National Guard, let us weep for our brothers in the insurrection, and condemn no one. Let us hope that justice, once enlightened on the facts that preceded, accompanied and followed the insurrection, will relax from the severity of the law, and that the decree of deportation henceforth without object, as without morality, will be revoked.

Accept, Mr Editor, my fraternal greeting.

P.-J. PROUDHON.

The 15th of July.

July 8, 1848.

The term! Here is the term! How are we going to pay what is due?...

We haven't done anything for five months? We have received nothing, delivered nothing, sold nothing! Industry is down! Trade down! Credit down! Labor down!...

More work, more money, more resources! The term has expired; the accounts are full; the silver cutlery, the women's jewelry, the husband's watch, the finest linen, everything is at the pawnshop! How could we still pay the term? How will we live?...

Let the authors of ruthless orders; let the great politicians who have taken up the execrated tradition of Saint-Merri and Transnonain; let those who have said that it would be better, for the dignity of the National Assembly, instead of a peaceful conciliation, to massacre ten thousand citizens; let those *honest* republicans, as they call themselves, who came to the Republic in perjury, who serve it in perjury, who will leave it in perjury; let these respond today to the complaint of the desperate bourgeoisie, if they can!

Go, then, now, misguided National Guardsmen, go and ask your so-called conservatives for work, credit, bread! What they have to offer you, for you, for your wives and your children, is blood and corpses!...

And what do they care? Will they not be ministers in a fortnight?...

It is no longer a question of saving the proletariat: the proletariat no longer exists, they have been thrown into the garbage. The bourgeoisie must be saved: the petty bourgeoisie from hunger, the middle bourgeoisie from ruin, the upper bourgeoisie from its infernal selfishness. The question is today, for the bourgeoisie, what it was on June 23 for the proletariat.

We will not fail in our principles. The force of things, the greatest of the ancient divinities, the inflexible Nemesis, made these principles an absolute order for the salvation of the people.

When the State, surprised by a revolution whose true character it made the mistake of not immediately recognizing, found itself unable to pay the floating debt, to reimburse the treasury bonds and the passbooks of the savings bank, what did it do? It resorted to consolidation; it converted into annuities the bonds that it could no longer pay, the deposits that he could no longer return. The National Assembly is today discussing the two decrees relating to this operation. That is to say that the State, an insolvent debtor, asks for the remission of part of the debt and a credit for the surplus. No one found it bad; necessity made it a law.

When the Banque de France found itself unable to meet all the demands for reimbursement of its banknotes and saw itself for a moment in the yawning abyss of bankruptcy, what else did it do? It obtained a decree that gave its paper legal tender, that is to say, instead of giving credit to the citizens, it demanded it from them. No one complained of the decree that saved the bank: public safety, necessity made it a law.

It is no longer the State alone, it is no longer the Bank of France which is unable to fulfill its commitments: it is the entire mass of tenants, throughout France.

Would it therefore be unjust for tenants to obtain from landlords: 1) an adjournment of the due date; 2) a discount on the amount of rent?

I dare to say it: not only would that not be unjust, it is of public necessity.

The cessation of trade and industry resulting from an event of force majeure, has placed us all, tenants and owners, in exceptional conditions, provided for elsewhere and explained in all the treatises of jurisprudence.

We have produced nothing; we owe nothing.

For 400,000 tenants domiciled in the Seine department, there are not 20,000 owners, 1 in 20.

When the State reduces its debt and suspends its payments; when the bank stops its repayments; when the merchant, the manufacturer, the entrepreneur no longer sells their products, no longer finds use for their services, would the owners of houses really come to demand, as in ordinary times, the payment of their rents? Shouldn't the Revolution and the consequences of the Revolution weigh equally on everyone? And if, to the general stagnation of business, is added the universal depreciation of values, is it not obvious that tenants are entitled, not only to an extension of term, but to a reduction in the price of rent?...

Is this communism or simple fairness?

And if the landlord dared to complain that he was being bankrupted, would we not be entitled to answer him that it is not us, tenants, who are going bankrupt, that it is the force of things?... Now, what is true of the tenant is also true, and in the same way, of the farmer. The farmer no longer sells his commodities or sells them at a low price. Wheat is at 10 francs per hectolitre, wine at 3 centimes per litre. Wheat and wine production costs are not covered by the selling prices. How, then, could the farmer pay the landlord and discharge the tax? Is it his fault if the Revolution came to interrupt all transactions?...

But if, finally, the owners of buildings cannot, in good justice, first refuse an extension of payment, then a reduction of the leases in favor of the tenants and farmers; If the State, by consolidating the floating debt, by giving forced circulation to the notes of the Banque de France, by striking a contribution on mortgage claims, and raising the tariff of transfer duties for large inheritances, was the first to give the signal for this universal reduction, or, to put it better, for this reciprocity of credit, why should the rentiers of the State, so exactly paid up to now, remain the only privileged ones? Would it therefore be doing them wrong to ask them in their turn, in the name of the taxpayers of tenants, farmers and landowners, for the credit of a fraction of their rents?...

But if all the citizens give each other credit for something; the house owner, part of his rents; the landowner, part of the rent; the hypothecary creditor, of part of his interest; the annuitant of the State, of a fraction of his annuity; Is it not obvious that this mutuality is equivalent to a kind of organization of credit, and that if we entered frankly on this road, we would end up with the immediate resumption of work and business?...

Let the National Guard, which devoted itself to order in these disastrous days, think about it: it is its salvation that we offer it, in these few lines.

We therefore urge all tenants and tenants to agree and present to the National Assembly a strongly reasoned petition, a petition that is not a petition, but an order.

This petition, drawn up in the form of a decree, so that the National Assembly had nothing to do but to attach its sanction to it, would say in substance:

Considering the urgency and the imminent danger;

Considering that the salvation of the people is the supreme law;

Considering that land rent is a gratuitous privilege, which it is up to society to revoke;

Considering that it is the right of the State to regulate the rate of usury and the income from capital;

Considering that the interests of the State, of farmers, tenants, borrowers on pledge or mortgage, are identical and solidary;

Considering that the only means of escaping the peril of the situation, of reviving work, of saving family and property, is in a vast operation of reciprocal credit;

The National Assembly decrees:

Art. 1st — From July 15, 1848 until July 15, 1851, all owners of houses shall be remitted one-third of the sums due on the price of their rents, namely: one-sixth for the tenant, and one-sixth for the State.

Art. 2. — From the same period, and during the same period of time, all the landed proprietors will be given back a third of their rents, namely: one-sixth for the tenant, and one-sixth for the State.

Art. 3. — From July 15, 1848, to July 15, 1851, all mortgage creditors shall remit one-third of the interest due to them, namely: one-sixth for the debtor, and one-sixth for the State.

Art. 4 — Farmers, tenants and debtors who wish to enjoy the reduction granted to them by the decree on the price of rents and rents, must make known their leases to the collectors of their cantons and receivers, who will be responsible for establishing the state of the discounts. The deduction of one-third will be made by the tenant farmers, tenants and debtors, on each due term of their obligations and contracts, and the sixth due to the State will be paid by them to the tax offices.

Art. 5. — Independent of the above-mentioned deduction, the payment of the terms due or due from July 15 to October 15, 1848 is postponed for three months, and will be divided by quarter over the following terms, from January 15, 1849.

Art. 6. — The farm and rental leases, as well as the mortgage obligations subject to the withholding stipulated above, are extended until July 15, 1851.

Art. 7. — There shall be deducted from State pensioners, for each quarter falling from July 15, 1848, to July 15, 1854, one-third of their pension.

Art. 8. — The property tax of 45 centimes and that on mortgage claims are abolished.

Beverage duties will be cut by three-quarters, and brought back to a single form.

Art. 9. — The State, by means of the sums which will be paid to it during the three years to run from July 15, 1848 to July 15, 1851, as a result of the deductions to be made from farm rents, house rents, mortgage debts and public funds, sums that will amount to several billions, will be charged with reorganizing on new bases public credit, insurance, circulation, transport and mines.

National Guards, nothing is easier for you than to save your fortune, to restore your business, to ensure the well-being of your families, the emancipation of the worker: it is only a question of temporarily establishing a tax on the income, by interesting the farmer, the tenant, the debtor. National Guards, take these wishes to the National Assembly, and you will soon see who your friends and your enemies are.

To the Editor of the Représentant du peuple.

11 July, 1848.

Mr Editor,

In its issue of the 6th instant, the newspaper the *Union* reproduces the letter that I had the honor of writing to you the day before, a letter which had as its object the excusability of the insurrection of June 23, 24, 25 and 26.

But, while associating itself with my pain, the *Union* repudiates my doctrine. Here are its words:

“No, the worst and most desperate situation of the worker can never be an excuse for revolt with gunshots. M. Proudhon’s doctrine is nothing but a permanent declaration of social war. In questions of this nature, more or less misery or well-being cannot be a rule of moral conduct. Ultimately, it is free will that decides; and if misery is in itself a right to kill, the one who suffers is the judge of the moment when he can in sure of conscience exercise this right. Make any society whatsoever, republic or monarchy, with this principle!...”

Certainly, if I had expressed ideas like those imputed to me by the newspaper to which I am replying, I would be an abominable man. Fortunately it costs me nothing to disavow such horrible thoughts. The critic is quite out of the question.

I said, in the letter reproduced by the *Union*: *If right was on this side of the barricades, it was also on that side.* And completely filled with the pain that the ills of my country inspire in me, I stopped there. I neglected to say what was this right which, in my eyes, made the insurrection if not justifiable, at least excusable. It is this omission on my part that makes all the value of my antagonist’s arguments.

No doubt, and it costs me nothing to admit it, the doctrine that I profess on the sad events of June is a permanent declaration of social war, as my critic says. But what is this doctrine? Where did I find it? Who first proclaimed it? Who is the author? Who made himself the responsible publisher?

I call the reader’s attention to all this: I do not fear his judgment.

Is it not true that, since February 24, the *right to work* has become a constitutional right, in the same way as the freedom of the press, the tax vote, the right to meet without arms, universal suffrage; like liberty and property.

The Provisional Government has formally recognized this: it was only able to constitute itself, support itself, create a little order, prepare for the elections, protect the National Assembly, remain conservative, despite its revolutionary origins.

What the Provisional Government did, the country ratified; the National Assembly proclaims it.

Article 2 of the draft Constitution, submitted at this moment to the deliberations of the Assembly, bears expressly: “The Constitution guarantees to all citizens liberty, equality, security, instruction, LABOR, property, assistance.”

Notice the order in which these guarantees are listed: *property* comes after LABOR, where it has its source and legitimacy.

Article 7 confirms Article 2;

“The RIGHT TO WORK is that which every man has to live by working. — Society must, by the productive and general means at its disposal, and which will be organized later, provide work for able-bodied men who cannot obtain it otherwise.”

Who are, after the Provisional Government, after the country, after the February Revolution, the authors of these two articles? Are they socialists? Are they citizens Pierre Leroux, Louis Blanc, Proudhon or Caussidière?

Not at all. The authors of these articles are Messrs. Cormenin, A. Marrast, Lamennais, Vivien, de Tocqueville, Dufaure, Martin (from Strasbourg), Coquerel, Gorbon, Turret, Voirhayé, Dupin aîné, Gustave de Beaumont, Vaulabelle, O. Barrot, Pages (from Ariège), Dornès, Considerant.

Certainly, from M. de Cormenin, the anti-socialist, the anti-democrat, the anti-university, the anti-Gallican, down to M. Considerant, the eternal defender, the defender come what may of capital and property, it was impossible to form a meeting of men animated by sentiments more pacific, more conservative, more on guard against progress, more timorous in matters of revolution.

And yet it is this commission, organ of the National Assembly, organ of the thought of February, that passed, in the new declaration of the rights and the duties, the *right to work*; it is even solely with a view to this right that the declaration was made; and I defy the National Assembly, with its 400,000 bayonets, to suppress it.

It is therefore no longer a question today, as the *Union* seems to believe, of knowing whether the poor man who asks for alms has the right to kill the rich man who refuses them; such a proposition is so monstrous that any protest in this respect is superfluous. It is a question of knowing whether one hundred thousand citizens, whose right to work you have recognized CONSTITUTIONALLY, are excusable for having taken up arms to maintain this right, violated or distorted. In this respect, I have only the embarrassment of examples.

When, under the last government, M. de Genoude refused the tax, let himself be seized, incited the citizens to do as he did, on the ground that the tax not being voted freely by all the citizens, the tax was illegal, M. de Genoude organized the insurrection, and that with complete security of conscience. It may be that M. de Genoude was in error; but it will be agreed that if his reasons had been true, if, as he claimed, the constitution was violated, it will be agreed, I say, that the refusal of the tax would have been right, and, if the government had sent a hundred thousand men to constrain the citizens, that the insurrection would have been excusable.

Yet that was only a question of the tax.

When, on February 22, M. Barrot summoned the National Guard of Paris, that 12th legion which is now being disarmed, to a meeting that the minister declared illicit, and which he, Barrot, maintained was legal, he was organizing the insurrection. The National Guard rose up at the voice

of M. Barrot; out of this insurrection sprang the Republic: would anyone dare to maintain that the insurrection was condemnable?

And yet, the right of assembly, claimed by M. Barrot, was not even a constitutional right; it was a simple right of nature, limited by the police, and over which hovered the most serious doubts.

When in 1830, MM. Thiers, Guizot, Laffitte, Dupont (de l'Eure) and their friends protested against the ordinances that suspended public liberties, guaranteed by the charter, they were preparing, as the event demonstrated, an insurrection. From this insurrection came the Revolution of July: will it be said that this Revolution was illegitimate?

And yet, Article 14 of the Charter, on which Charles X relied, was doubtful, so much so that this article has since been reformed.

All these insurrections have been in turn justified, glorified, applauded: victory has given them legitimacy.

I am less absolute, less enthusiastic in my judgments.

I believe that in February, as in 1830, the patience of an excess of power would have been just as meritorious for our country, and above all of a better policy. I believe that by supporting M. de Polignac a few more years first, and later M. Guizot, France would have lost nothing in the development of her wealth and her liberties; I believe, I say, that the advantages of the July Revolution are not worth what the government of July caused us to lose; and I am also not far from thinking that a little more patience on the part of M. Barrot would have been better for us than the sudden outburst of February 24th. I therefore do not justify the two revolutions, I excuse them. But once accomplished, I agree with their principles; that's why I'm a republican, and a socialist republican, you must understand, inflexible and intractable.

Well! I reason in absolutely the same way about the insurrection of June. I would not have approved of it, even if it were victorious: I am not sure that in the tumult that followed, the good the insurgents hoped for would not have been balanced by still greater evils. But also I do not condemn this insurrection any more than I condemn the insurrection of February and July: I excuse it.

I excuse it, I say, and why? Because the *right to work*, a constitutional right, guaranteed by the Provisional Government, laid down by the National Assembly, has been shamefully violated for four months.

Was it respecting the right to work to have a hundred thousand men stir up mud, to enlist twenty-five thousand others under the pretext that the State, being unable and unwilling to be either agriculturist, carrier, industrialist or merchant, had no work to give to the workers?

Was it respecting the *right to work* to call a *disguised alms* the salary of a hundred thousand workers employed in the national workshops, when this salary, according to the formal text of the constitution, which guarantees work, was in reality only a just indemnity.

Yes, I affirm it boldly, and woe to whoever could misunderstand it, the right to work, conquered by the revolution of February, recognized by all the people, promised by the government and the constitution, has been violated for four months.

Either strike it out of the social pact, or pity those whom you have reduced to claiming it with arms in hand, and after having shot them, do not slander them.

Oh! I know it as well as you: it is difficult to lead a society, republic or monarchy, in which one recognizes rights like these:

- Freedom of conscience,
- Freedom of examination,
- Freedom of press,
- Universal suffrage,
- Vote on taxation,
- Equality before the law,
- Participation in all jobs,
- Right of assembly,
- Right to education,
- Right to work,
- Right to property,
- Right to assistance.

The guarantee of all these rights is, like their reconciliation, an immense problem, which will kill more than one legislator. And when we consider that each of these rights implies, as penal sanction, the right of insurrection, we are tempted to despair of the salvation of our poor humanity.

But, I tell you: against philosophy, against liberty and equality, against constitutions and insurrections, you have no refuge except in the absolutism of the Church and the State: if you, as editor of the *Union*, had drawn this conclusion and posed this alternative, your argument would have been valid against society, but not against me. Me! I am only a reasoner who weighs every day, at the trebuchet of dialectics, ideas and events. I tell you the truth: You come here, and you go there; you can neither stop nor backslide, and your right, your morals, change and change with every step you take on your inevitable road. It is strange that you make me responsible for the decrees of this Providence which you confess and which I adore.

Law on the Clubs and the Press.

August 9, 1848.

Is this doing right? Is that how we judge? cried Chicaneau in a rage.

We can well say now: Is this how we legislate?

A few days ago, the National Assembly had to pass a law on the clubs.

The reaction demanded that the clubs be abolished: the government, moreover, under the orders of the reaction, also wanted it. But the revolution was there, which demanded the maintenance of the clubs.

How then to annihilate the clubs, while appearing to maintain them?

The Dupin, Coquerel et Compagnie commission took on the task of solving the problem.

The commission proposed, the National Assembly adopted the decree, the contents of which can be summarized as follows:

Article 2 takes away from the clubs the liberty, the quality, the place.

Section 3 takes away their privacy.

Article 4 places them under the surveillance of the high police.

Article 5 deprives them of security, by imposing on them, as a guarantee of order, *sui-dénonciation*, suicide.

Article 6 prohibits them from speaking.

Article 7 forbids them the action.

A society is a moral being, or it is not. As a moral being, it subsists, it lives only through the conditions that make the life of man himself; liberty, quality, individuality, place, time, security, thought, word and deed.

What then is a society that can only be constituted under the good pleasure of authority; to which it is forbidden to take a name and qualify itself; which has no right to appear in public places, and which nevertheless is obliged to admit the public to its sittings; a society that has no privacy; that deliberates only under the eye of the police; that cannot discuss anything that overshadows power; who, after having deliberated, cannot come to any conclusions; a society that does not think, speak or act?

Such a society is less than a gathering in the public squares; it is a pantomime without idea, played by blind-mutes. Here are the clubs, such as the National Assembly has made them, carried along by the eloquence of the Sénards, the Coquerels.

Lies, bad faith, buffoonery in the law! This is what democracy was reserved to teach us...

Today, it was about the freedom of the press, the freedom of the press, always the first to be questioned, following the revolutionary jugglery.

Do you believe that the government of February is so ungrateful as to have a grudge against the freedom of the press! Oh, no! What it asks for are GUARANTEES against the license of the press.

Guarantees, you say? What? Is the penal code abolished? Are not the laws of 1819 and 1830 there? What else is needed but to change its style, and to adapt its articles to republican demands?

The guarantees that the government asks for against the press is first of all a security deposit.

— See, said M. Sénard, we only ask for security for the fine that the journalist may incur, 24,000 francs! — But security is like customs, a prohibition, it is not a guarantee; — but 24,000 francs are more difficult to find today than 100,000 francs on February 22; — but the heaviest of the fines should not, according to you, exceed 6,000 francs; — but you are guaranteed the fine by imprisonment; — but you cannot posit in a law that the law will be violated!

There is something else, Minister, in these 24,000 francs, than a guarantee! Tell the truth.

— We ask, said the minister then, for a guarantee against the anarchic press, against the socialist press, against this bad press that demands the right to work; against the 5-cent press, which is aimed especially at men who don't have enough money to subscribe! As for the serious press, the serious press, which constitutes a capital of 4 or 500,000 francs; for this press which is honored as much by its morality as by its patriotism, we do not dream of disturbing it.

Look at the *Constitutionnel*, the *Siècle*, the *Débats*, the *Gazette de France*, all the dynastic, legitimist, and anti-socialist journals. Do you hear them complaining about the government? Are the attorneys general bothering them? Do we distrust their tendencies? Are they conspiring? Do they deceive the proletariat with false hopes?

A newspaper that could not find credit for 24,000 francs, we regard it as an anarchic, impious newspaper, an enemy of the family and of property.

24,000 francs! — Here, for us, is the criterion of genius, virtue and patriotism!

24,000 francs! — We declare as an enemy of society and of the Republic any newspaper that, before existing, will not deposit 24,000 francs in consignments in our fund!

24,000 francs! — It is, under the Republic, the electoral quota of the press. From 100,000 francs it was under the monarchy, we have lowered it to 24,000 francs, and you complain!...

To us, then, the workers, the laborers, the proletarians! To us the poor! To us the denier of the widow! To us the ragged founders of the Republic! To us the heroes, now disarmed, of the barricades! To us the slandered of February, March, April, May, June!...

It is a question of proving that you are honest people, by contributing yourselves to form a deposit of 24,000 francs for the journal of the *Peuple*.

You thought you were brave citizens, generous hearts, true patriots! — But know this well, all of you who ask nothing of the Republic but liberty, of property nothing but labor: you will not be a serious party, honest, worthy of consideration, esteemed by the government, until you have formed between you all 24,000 francs.

It is a minister of February 24, it is the citizen SÉNARD, who declares it to you in the name of the Republic.

The Malthusians.

August 10, 1848.

Doctor Malthus, an economist, an Englishman, wrote these words:

“A man who is born in a world already occupied, if his family has no means of supporting him or if society has no need of his work, this man, I say, has not the least right to claim any portion of nourishment: he is really too many on earth. At the great banquet of nature, there is no place set for him. Nature commands him to go away, and will not be long in carrying out this order herself.”

In consequence of this great principle, Malthus recommends, under the most terrible threats, to every man who has neither work nor income to live on, to *go away*, above all not to have children. The family, that is to say love, like bread, are, by Malthus, forbidden to this man.

Doctor Malthus was, during his lifetime, a minister of the Holy Gospel, of gentle morals, a philanthropist, a good husband, a good father, a good bourgeois, believing in God as much as any man of France. He died in 1834. Heaven give him peace! We can say that he was the first, without suspecting it, to reduce the whole of political economy to absurdity, and to pose the great revolutionary question, the issue between labor and capital.

At home, where faith in Providence has remained strong, despite the indifference of the century, the people say, by way of a proverb, and it is in this that we differ from the English, *Everyone must live!* — And our people, saying that, think they are as good Christians, as conservative of good morals and of the family, as the late Malthus.

Now, what the people say in France, the economists deny, the lawyers and the men of letters deny; the Church, which claims to be Christian, and moreover Gallican, denies it; the press denies it, the high bourgeoisie denies it, the government, which strives to represent it, denies it.

The press, the government, the Church, literature, the economists, the large estates, everything in France has become English; everything is Malthusian. It is in the name of God and of his holy providence, in the name of morality, in the name of the sacred interests of the family, that it is maintained that there is no place, in the country, for all children of the country, and that it is insinuated that our women should be less fertile. In France, despite the wishes of the people, despite national beliefs, food and drink are considered privileges, labor a privilege, family a privilege, homeland a privilege.

M. Antony Thouret said the other day that property, — without which there is neither country, nor family, nor work, nor morality, — would be irreproachable the day when it ceased to be a privilege. This was to say quite clearly that in order to abolish all privileges, which put a part of the people, so to speak, outside the law, apart from humanity, it was necessary, above all, to abolish the fundamental privilege and to change the constitution of property.

M. A. Thouret expressed himself in this like ourselves, like the people. The State, the press, and political economy do not understand things in this way: they agree in wanting that property, — without which, according to M. Thouret, there is no labor, no family, no Republic, — to remain what it has always been, a privilege.

Everything that is done, that is said, that is printed today, and for the last twenty years, is done, said and printed as a consequence of the theory of Malthus.

The theory of Malthus is the theory of political assassination, of assassination for philanthropy, for the love of God. — There are too many people in the world: here is the first article of faith of all those who, at this moment, in the name of the People, reign and govern. That is why they are working their best to diminish the world. Those who discharge this duty best, who practice with piety, courage and fraternity the maxims of Malthus, are the good citizens, the religious men; — those who protest are anarchists, socialists, atheists.

The inexpiable crime of the February Revolution is that it was the product of this protest. So, we will be taught to live with this revolution that promised to make everyone live. — The original, indelible mark of the Republic is to have been proclaimed anti-Malthusian by the people. This is why the Republic is so particularly odious to those who were and who want to become again complacent, the accomplices of kings, *great eaters of men*, as Cato said. We will make your Republic a monarchy, we will make it devour its children.

There lies the whole secret of the sufferings, agitations and contradictions of our country.

The economists were the first among us, by an inconceivable blasphemy, to erect the theory of Malthus into a dogma of Providence. I neither accuse them nor slander them. The economists have the best faith in this, as well as the best intention in the world. They would like nothing better than to make the human race happy; but they do not conceive how, without some organization of homicide, the balance between population and subsistence could exist.

Ask the Academy of Moral Sciences. One of its most honorable members, whom I will not name, although he prides himself on his opinions, as every honest man ought to do, being prefect of I don't know what department, took it into his head one day, in a proclamation, to recommend to his constituents not to have so many children with their wives. Great scandal among the priests and the gossips, who treated this academic morality as the morality of pigs! The scholar of whom I speak was nonetheless, like all his colleagues, a zealous defender of the family and of morals: but, he observed with Malthus, at the banquet of nature there is no place for everyone.

M. Thiers, also a member of the Academy of Moral Sciences, said recently to the finance committee that if he were a minister, he would limit himself to *getting through the crisis courageously, stoically*, confining himself to the expenditure of his budget, instilling respect for order, and guarding carefully against any financial innovation, any socialist idea, such as in particular the right to work, as well as any revolutionary expedient. And the whole committee applauded.

In reporting this statement by the famous historian and statesman, I have no desire, as one can well sense, to incriminate his intentions. In the present disposition of minds, I would only succeed in serving the ambition of M. Thiers, if he had any left. What I want to point out is that M. Thiers, in expressing himself in this way, testified, perhaps without thinking about it, to his faith in Malthus.

Understand this, please. — Two million, four million men will perish of misery and hunger if we don't find a way to make them work. It is a great misfortune, assuredly, and we are all the first

to groan about it, the Malthusians will tell you. But what are we to do about it? It is better that four million men perish than to compromise privilege; it is not the fault of capital if labor is unemployed; at the banquet of credit, there is no room for everyone.

They are brave, they are stoic, the statesmen of the school of Malthus, when it comes to sacrificing workers by the millions. — You murdered the poor man, said the prophet Elijah to the king of Israel, and then you seized his inheritance. *Oecidisti and possessedisti*. Today we must reverse the phrase, and say to those who possess and who govern: You have the privilege of labor, the privilege of credit, the privilege of property, as M. Thouret says; and it is because you did not want to part with it that you spilled the life of the poor like water: *Possedisti et occidisti!*

And the people, under the pressure of the bayonets, are slowly consumed; they die without a sigh or a murmur: the sacrifice is accomplished in silence. Courage, workers! support each other. Providence will eventually overcome fate. Courage! Your fathers, the soldiers of the Republic, were worse off than you at the sieges of Genoa and Mainz.

M. Léon Faucher, fighting for the security of newspapers, for the maintenance of customs on the press, also reasoned like Malthus. — The serious newspaper, he said, the newspaper that deserves consideration and esteem, is the one that establishes itself with a capital of 4 to 500,000 francs. The journalist who has only his pen is like the worker who has only his arms. If he cannot find a way to have his services purchased or his enterprise credited, it is a sign that public opinion condemns him: he has not the slightest right to speak before the country: at the banquet of publicity, there is not room for everyone.

Listen to Lacordaire, that torch of the Church, that chosen vessel of Catholicism. He will tell you that socialism is the antichrist. — And why is socialism the antichrist? — Because socialism is the enemy of Malthus, and because Catholicism, by a final transformation, has become Malthusian.

The Gospel tells us, exclaims the tonsured, that there will always be poor people: *Pauperes semper habebitis vobiscum*; and that consequently property, insofar as it is a privilege and makes poor people, is sacred. The poor are necessary for the exercise of evangelical charity: at the banquet here below, there cannot be room for everyone.

He pretends to be unaware, the infidel, that *poverty*, in the holy language, means every kind of affliction and pain, and not unemployment and the proletariat. And how he who went all over Judea, crying: *Woe to the rich!* could he have heard it otherwise? Woe to the rich! in the mind of Jesus Christ, it was woe to the Malthusians.

If Christ lived today, he would say to the Lacordaires and their associates: “You are of the race of those who, in all times, shed the blood of the just, from Abel to Zacharias. Your law is not my law; your God is not my God!” And the Lacordaires would crucify the Christ as seditious and as atheist.

Almost all journalism is infected with the same ideas. Let the *National*, for example, tell us if it has not always believed, if it still does not believe, that pauperism in civilization is eternal; that the enslavement of one part of humanity is necessary for the glory of the other; that those who claim otherwise are dangerous dreamers who deserve to be shot; that such is the reason of state?

For, if such is not the secret thought of the *National*, if the *National* sincerely and resolutely wants the emancipation of the workers, why these anathemas, why this anger against the pure socialists, against those who, for ten or twenty years, have been demanding this emancipation?

Let them also deign, so that the People may know them, to make their profession of economic faith, these bohemians of literature, today henchmen of journalism, slanderers at a fixed price, courtiers of all privileges, panegyrists of all vices, parasites living at the expense of other parasites, who speak so much of God only to conceal their materialism; of the family only to cover their adulteries; and that one would see, out of disgust for marriage, caressing apes, if they no longer find themselves Malthusians.

Make girls, we love them, sing these infamous characters, parodying the poet. But refrain from making boys: at the banquet of voluptuousness there is no place for everyone.

The government was inspired by Malthus, when having a hundred thousand workers available to whom it gave a free salary, it refused to employ them in useful work; — when afterwards, after the civil war, it asked for a law of transportation for them. With the expenses of the so-called national workshops, with the expenses of war, of procedure, of prison, of transport, we could give the insurgents work for six months, and change our entire economic system. But labor is a monopoly; but we didn't want revolutionary industry to compete with the industry of privilege: at the building site of the nation, there is no place for everyone.

Big industry leaves little to do: it is the law of capital, it is Malthus.

Wholesale trade is gradually taking over retail trade: it is Malthus.

Large estates invaded and agglomerated the poorest plots: it is Malthus.

Soon half the people will say to the other:

The earth and its products are my property;

Industry and its products are my property;

Trade and transport are my property;

The state is my property.

You who own neither reserve nor property; who are not a public functionary, and whose work is useless to us, AWAY WITH YOU! You are really too many on earth: in the sun of the Republic, there is no place for everyone.

Who will tell me that the right to work and to live is not the whole of the Revolution?

Who will tell me that the principle of Malthus is not the whole of the counter-revolution?

And it is for having published such things, it is for having energetically pointed out the evil, and sought the remedy in good faith, that my speech was taken from me by order of the government, of the government that represents the Revolution!

This is why I saw pass over me, mute, the deluge of calumnies, betrayals, cowardice, hypocrisies, outrages, desertions and failures of all those who hated or who loved the people! That's why I was, for a whole month, given over to the jackals of the press and the owls of the gallery! Never a man, neither in the past nor in the present, was the object of so much execration as I have become, for the sole fact that I make war on cannibals.

To slander who could not answer was to shoot a prisoner. Carnivores of Malthus, I recognize you there! Continue then; we have more than one score to settle yet. And if slander is not enough for you, use iron and lead. You can kill me: no one can avoid his fate, and I am at your discretion. But you will not defeat me: you will not persuade the people, while I am alive, while I hold a pen, that, apart from you, there is someone who is too many on earth. I swear it before the People and before the Republic!

The Calumny.

August 12, 1848.

Readers, rest assured. I'm not talking about myself; it is not my reputation, my honor dragged on the hurdle that I want to avenge. Let me be the successor of Cartouche, of Mandrin, of Lacenaire, as my biographers say; let the *Constitutionnel* and its followers call me the *theoretician of theft*; let the great Coquerel, by his first name Athanase, declare my proposals worthy of the court of assizes and the penal colony; let this one make me a bastard and that one the pimp of a prostitute; let those who enjoy both the mother, and the daughter, and the sister, and the niece, and the servant, denounce me as a destroyer of the family; let libertines and renegades drive public horror to its height by signaling me as a materialist and atheist: it is indeed a question of these miseries! When the Revolution is in danger, when hunger decimates the People, I have no time to entertain the public with my personal insults. The flood of calumny will pass: the ideas that I defend will not pass.

Calumny to the Republic: this is the object of my preoccupations and my terrors.

Calumny from above and calumny from below; calumny from the left and calumny from the right; calumny in the crossfire, in skirmishers, by platoons and by grapeshot! it is calumny that kills us, republicans, calumny that damages us, in soul and in body.

The slanderers of the Republic are at the same time those who govern it without understanding it; those who tear it up, because they understand it; those who betray it and who exploit it, because they make fun of everything, the Republic, as well as the monarchy and religion.

Credit where credit is due: I begin with the *National*.

In addressing myself to the *National*, I will know how to distinguish people from things, to separate writers from the printed word, journalists from the paper that is their collective organ, as M. Léon Faucher says. The conspiracy of calumny that is hounding me will not prevent me from being just, even towards enemies.

The *National* has been a breeding ground for celebrities for twenty years.

Literary France will always be honored by Thiers and Mignet: for my part, I owe more than one kind of recognition to their works.

The Republic is proud of Armand Carrel, of his talent as much as of his bravery and character.

The Magnins, the Taillefers, the Génins, the Bastides, although with less brilliance, do honor to the country as much as to the newspaper that brought them to light. — M. Armand Marrast, after having been the prince of the daily press for ten years, promises the Republic a man of as much character as wit. I admit, however, that I would like him even better behind his journalist's desk than in the chair of the presidency... If there is a writer whom I honor with the approval of my conscience and my reason, it is this philosopher, as profound as he is modest, as eminent in style as in science, M. Littré. — The death of Dornes, finally, cast upon the *National* an imperishable reflection of patriotism.

How then is it that with so many resources, with such powerful minds, the *National* has never been, since its existence, from the point of view of ideas, anything but the most unintelligent and the most unintelligible of newspapers?

Ah! it is that the *National* is not the organ of a doctrine: it is a collection of sentiments, an eclecticism of opinions. The *National* is like the Academy, a company of fine minds and superior geniuses, but which, by itself and precisely because it is only a company, is incapable of producing an idea.

That is why the *National* and its party never knew the first word of the Republic for which it was working before February, and which it has not ceased to demolish since February; — that is why the advent of the *National*, of its opinions and of its men, to the government of the Republic, seemed to the people a misconception, a usurpation: why, in short, the *National*, usurper of the Republic, has become the slanderer of the Republic.

I do not know the present editors of the *National*: I suppose that they are in every way worthy of their predecessors. But I affirm, without wanting to incriminate their intentions, that their paper, by concealing, disguising as it does every day, the revolutionary question, is doing a work of slander and destroying the Republic.

The Republic, prepared, founded by twenty years of economic and social discussions, in which the *National* never wanted to take the slightest part, the Republic is one thing: the *National* wants it to be something else.

The *National* does not understand the Republic as a positive idea: it sees in it, has never seen in it, anything but a negation, the Constitutional Charter, minus the king. — When M. Thiers, standing in the sphere of principles, laid down his famous axiom: *The king reigns and does not govern*, he was defining the republic of the *National*. More materialistic than M. Thiers, the *National*, after suppressing the principle, also wanted to suppress the symbol; but as, apart from the destruction of monarchical symbolism, the system of the *National* does not differ essentially in any way from that of M. Thiers, hardly has royalty been expelled, than the *National* has made itself a partisan of what most resembles royalty, it made itself a partisan of the presidency, and the Republic, for it, was constituted. Take away the royal person, take away the royal prerogative, and the *National*, which Louis-Philippe loved, because he had figured it out, is just as middle-ground, as doctrinaire, as conservative and retrograde as M. Guizot.

Since 1830, we have never ceased to tell it: The Republic is socialism. And the People, whose voice consecrates all truths, the People ended up shouting, like us, in February and since February: *Long live the democratic and social Republic!*

To this decisive demonstration, what did the *National* oppose? It had a ten-line letter written to him by a famous man, beloved of the People, defender of property in the interest of doctrine, as we are its adversary in the interest of doctrine; a letter in which this famous man, M. de Lamennais, declared that he was not a communist! To evade the judgment of the People, the *National* calls into question a great reputation; when you talk to it about social economy, it answers metaphysics; it opposes definition to definition, and it thinks that it is done with criticism! The People were not

taken in by the sophism: they demanded with renewed energy the organization of labor, the democratic and social Republic.

How many times, figures in hand, have we not said to the National: Take care, society is established on an error of accounting. What engenders pauperism is the application to the nation, to the collective being, of the principles of domestic economy; it is that we suppose in society a benefit which does not exist; it is that the worker, frp, whom capital and privilege take this profit, cannot redeem his product, and because the worker not redeeming his product, there is necessarily stagnation, strikes, then depreciation, failures and bankruptcy; it is, in a word, because by the rent and the interest of capital, without anyone being guilty of witchcraft and bad faith, the worker is robbed!...

Instead of verifying the fact, the *National*, which knows little, it seems, of accounting, and whose spiritualism would blush to descend to these villainies of net product and gross product, the *National* has at first enclosed itself in a superb silence; and when it finally deigned to concern itself with economic questions, it was purely and simply to consecrate the productivity of capital, precisely the cause of pauperism, a fiction, a lie!

The whole revolution, in our view, consists in removing one word, one word, from Article 8 of the Bill of Rights:

“Property consists in the right to enjoy and dispose of one’s goods, OF ONE’S INCOME, of the fruits of one’s labor, of one’s intelligence and of one’s industry.”

Income, we say, is only a hypothesis, the falsity of which is demonstrated by economic analysis, and the republicanization of credit inevitably leads to its abolition. Either the Revolution is absurd and the Republic nonsense, or else by the right of property you can no longer mean anything other than *the right to dispose of the fruits of one’s labor, intelligence and industry*, which is all that the People hear, all that the People ask for. It was by mistake and surprise that the word income slipped into Robespierre’s declaration of rights, it is this error that has made, which will always make the Republic abort.

The *National*, which is Girondin, Thermidorian, Malthusian, partisan of the net product, which does not want free credit, which will be royalist, when it has been shown that between royalty and socialism there is no middle term, the *National* limits itself to answering that we are anarchists, ambitious; that we legitimize theft, that we destroy family and property!...

Calumny, always calumny!

We Republicans, we who for twenty years have hoisted our flag, proclaimed our principles, published our profession of faith, it is we who the *National*, which has neither foreseen nor understood the Republic, tax with exaggeration, false policy, culpable intrigues, anti-social tendencies! It is we who doom the cause of the People, who compromise the right to work, by our definitions and our manifestos! It is we who produce public distress! It is we who stir up civil war! If the Republic is suspect to the bourgeoisie, to capital, to property, it is we who have done the wrong, by announcing to everyone the principle, the object and the meaning of the Republic! If the pretenders succeeded in their plots, we would have brought them back!...

It must be admitted, however, that it is a question of much more today than a revision of the charter.

The principle of the Republic, as the National Assembly has just recognized by a unanimous vote, is the principle of the sovereignty of the people and of universal suffrage.

This means that, under the Republic, there are no other rights than those that have been guaranteed by the people, no other government than that of the people, no other justice than that of the people, no other power than the people, no other civil servants than the elected representatives of the people.

And since the people are truly sovereign and legislator only insofar as all citizens participate equally in the law and in the exercise of power, it follows that equality, the essential condition of sovereignty, is the second republican principle. In the system that must arise from such principles, inequality of conditions, monopoly, venality of office, distinction of castes are impossible; and it is true to say that either privilege, if it is tolerated somewhere, will kill the Republic, or the Republic, if it follows its principle, will take away the privilege.

So then, to use less abstract terms, labor, as a right and as a duty, for everyone; property, as an instrument of labor and as remuneration, for everyone: this is what the Republic wants, what must be. It is again the National Assembly that, in the same vote, so decided. Some theorists, thinking that property necessarily implied privilege, denied property and therefore demanded that property should not exist for anyone. The National Assembly solved the problem in another way: it thought it better that the privilege of property should be extended to all; that each citizen should become, *de facto* as well as *de jure*, a proprietor; that everyone was interested in property. Consequently, it declared the principle of inviolable property, reserving to define it during the vote on the constitution.

But, so that labor is at the same time guaranteed and made compulsory for all; so that each citizen acquires property, and, after having acquired it, cannot lose it any more: it is necessary to remodel our economic system from top to bottom; we must remake, not only our political constitution, but our social constitution.

On what principles and according to what laws should this reorganization take place?

This is what socialism has been seeking for twenty years, and what raises the curses of the *National*.

The work that, under the name of socialism, was accomplished in ideas even before the revolution of 1830, had no other aim than to define the republican regime, to determine its conditions, to lay down the basics. Many times we have informed the *National*, the so-called organ of the republic under the last reign. The *National* never wanted to listen to us; it persisted in its constitutional eclecticism; it rejected any discussion.

In vain we said to it: The question today is no longer political; it is economical. Mercantile feudalism, the worst of aristocracies, invades society and makes civilization retreat even beyond Charlemagne. In this France, where equality is indigenous, capital crushes, absorbs small industry, small trade, small fortunes, a people of citizens is transformed, visibly, into a people of slaves. The more we produce, the poorer we are and when, after having worked for a long time, produced for a

long time, we no longer possess anything, then capital stops, dismisses the workers, and says: We no longer work. Our activity, so intelligent, so fruitful, makes our life more and more laborious, more and more precarious, more and more miserable. We lose in turn, by this mechanism, property, security, equality, labor, family, even love. What will you do then, men of the *National*, after you have expelled Louis-Philippe and suppressed an article of the charter?

To these repeated positive interpellations, the *National* has never deigned to respond, or if it has responded, it was to reproach us for corrupting the minds of the people by speaking to them only of *material interests!*

And today, surprised by an event that it provoked, but which it did not produce, put on notice to organize the Republic, summoned by all parties to declare its thoughts, it stutters, it murmurs, it exchanges protocols with its dynastic colleagues, sometimes it accuses the reactionaries, more often, almost always, it slanders the republicans.

The *National*, which has not given, in twenty years, a quarter of an hour to the social question, a quarter of an hour to the Republic, declares us, from the height of its incapacity, enemies of the Republic! It would like to dissemble, to trick public opinion, to pursue socialism and privilege at the same time; playing seesaw with labor and capital, granting Christ and Belial, persuading the robbed that they themselves are thieves, eternalizing ambiguity and misery! As if the revolutionary question had not been posed for twenty years; as if the February Revolution were not the end of a regime of privilege, corruption and waste, and the beginning of a regime based on science and equality; as if the main idea of this revolution were something new; as if, in such circumstances, dissimulation were not treason!

Please tell us, people of the *National*, what you mean by this word republic? Please define the right to work, the right to property, the sovereignty of the people, universal suffrage, democracy, liberty and equality? Do not waste time; we have already waited too long: What is the Republic? Why did you make the Republic?

The Republic shouts to the *National*: March! March! And the *National* responds to the Republic: Stop! Stop! The Republic is going too fast for the *National*. It had not expected this passion. It finds that we are impatient; it has just put the question to itself, it is only beginning its studies! Hasn't it already had a workers' committee appointed? Ordered an investigation of the workers? Sent M. Blanqui, with several economists, on a tour of the departments, to report on the situation of the workers? Doesn't it try its hand at reform every day? Was it not it or its heirs who gave forced circulation to banknotes, converted treasury bonds and savings bank passbooks into annuities; invented the tax of forty-five centimes; done, undone and redone the beverage tax; tried the progressive tax and the sumptuary tax; proposed, withdrawn and re-announced the income tax; postponed the salt tax reduction; pledged or sold state forests? Did it not, on all occasions, protest against assignats and paper money, prepare the law on insurance? Isn't it buying up the railroads? Didn't it take out the loan at 65? — At 65! Certainly the lenders hardly expose themselves! Bankruptcy will come: we will find a way to obtain, from our fortunate country, a concordat at 65!...

And the Republic does not want to wait! the Republic, in the anguish of strikes and hunger, dares to raise its head! National guards and soldiers, fire! on the Democratic and Social Republic!

It asked us yesterday if we had anything to add to the amenities we gave it seven years ago in a brochure entitled: *Warning to the Proprietors!*

This reminds us that the *National*, at a time when it did not have the police force, was content to report us for our republican ideas, to the king's prosecutor. We would find the parts if necessary. The *National* making itself a scout for the prosecution for the salvation of privilege, and pointing with his finger, like divine justice in Prudhon's picture, the adversaries of net revenue! What memory do you remember there!

Ah! Republicans of the *National*, we did not think we were prophets when, deploring your fatal blindness, and therefore foreseeing the despair of a bewildered multitude, we wrote in 1839:

"Opulence and poverty, inseparable companions, will increase in an endless progression; capital will invade everywhere. The bankrupt peasant will sell his inheritance... The misery and brutalization of the proletarians will be at its height: they will not be prevented from learning; but they will not be able to live without working, and when they do not work, they will eat nothing... The merit of women will no longer be anything but an evaluation of their beauty, their most sacred right, to be surrendered to the highest bidder. The wealthy will possess them all, because they alone can pay; the poor will be left with the disgraced and the cast-offs of luxury...

However, they will sometimes encounter some proud souls, men who refuse to bow down before the golden calf. Those will want to compare accounts with the favorites of fortune. — Why are you so rich and we are so poor? — We have labored, respond the rich; we have saved, and we have acquired. — We labor as much as you, how is it that we never acquire anything? — We have inherited from our fathers. — Ah! You invoke possession, transmission, prescription. Well! We call on force. Proprietors, defend yourselves !

And there will be combats and massacres; and when force has again been established as *law*, when the *rebels* have been destroyed, they will write on their tombs ASSASSINS, while their victims will be glorified as MARTYRS. (*Of the Celebration of Sunday*)

And in this *Warning to the Proprietors* that you dare to quote, did we not say, in 1842, to the already irritated proletarians:

"Now that the system of representative monarchy draws to an end, it is the turn of a bourgeois, incoherent, quarrelsome, talkative democracy... — Destroy the present government, and instead of that equality to which your generous hearts yearn, you will only obtain a repetition of conventional or managerial democracy, itself violently interrupted forty-four years ago, on 18 Brumaire. And as every government wishes to maintain itself and believes itself to be legitimate, you will encounter new resistance, more pitiless and fiercer, so that after having escaped the dynastic bullets, you will fall under the republican bullets. Destinies must be fulfilled..."

Then we added, inviting the workers to patience and peace, and repeating with them the faubourian song;

"Forward, courage!

"Let us go first:

“From the heart to the work,

“Brave workers!”

“March, singing, to conquer the new world, predestined race! Labor, educate one another, brave workers! Your refrain is more beautiful than that of Rouget de l’Isle!”

Alas! Today we can no longer say to the workers: *March singing to conquer the new world, predestined race!* No more work, no more songs!

Instead, we will tell them:

Go in mourning, crepe on the arm, black flag waving, women in tears, children repeating in chorus the romance of poverty: *Five sous!* Go to the *National*, desperate race! Go ask it what it has done with the Republic.

The haymaking was fine, the harvest is rich, the vines luxuriant, the countryside joyful. The pretty peasant woman asks only to exchange her fruits, her cheeses, her poultry, for the fashions and trimmings of your workers. The plowman, the vine-grower, abounding in the good, is ready to pay you with the gifts of nature for the products of your industry and your arts. But privilege, withdrawing its crowns, has placed a ban on labor and on exchange; communications are cut between the city and the countryside. This is why abundance ruins the peasant, while the strike kills the worker. Go to the *National*, ask it when it pleases it to give you the Republic!

O Cavaignac! We all love you from the bottom of our hearts, for your brother, for you! We do not accuse you: you were the instrument of fate; you are no more guilty of the murder of our brothers than the bullets of your soldiers. So be the Washington of socialist and republican France, and take care not to make yourself the Monck of these selfish people. Beware: something tells us that treason surrounds you, that around you are plots against the People and against the workers. Remember that suitors are now impossible. Well! Which of them would be strong enough to guarantee us labor and property?...

Labor! It is not a gift from a king. It is a present from the Republic.

The National.

August 15, 1848.

My soul is sad to death, said Christ in the Garden of Olives: *take away this bitter chalice!*

This is the feeling we felt this morning, reading the *National*. — This, of course, without any comparison of us with the Man-God, any more than of the *National* with Judas.

The brave newspaper makes the joke. The idea of a *general liquidation* of society makes it laugh: the Republic is so prosperous! Its credit so well established!... It sneers at socialism, at Proudhonism, without noticing that *ism* is no better attached to our name than to our ideas, and that this unfortunate attempt at barbarism is already a justification for us. — It quibbles, the poor *National*, like a prosecutor's clerk:

"If," it said, "we are working to destroy the Republic, then it exists! But if it exists, why ask us when it pleases us to give it? So it doesn't exist yet? But if it does not yet exist, we have therefore not worked to establish it! And if we have not worked to establish it, then we are not destroying it!..."

You are no doubt familiar, dear reader, with this famous syllogism, a type of the genre: *It is raining; now, it is not raining; thus, it is raining!* You have the whole secret of the dialectic of the *National*.

What annoys our too witty colleague is that, in I don't know what paragraph, we should have spoken, perhaps thoughtlessly, of *certain facts* likely to compromise the dignity of the *National*, and offensive to his person. It is up to us to make known these *certain facts*. Would the *National* concoct a small lawsuit against us for defamation and slander? This would be a little more serious than the incredible episyllogism just now. Because, notice well: If we do not articulate certain facts with which we have threatened it, the *National* pursues us for slander. And if we articulate the aforementioned *facts*, the *National* pursues us, for all the more reason, for slander. How to escape from that? The *National* is such a terrible reasoner!

The facts! The facts! — Certainly we are to be pitied if we have to give the balance sheet of the actions of the *National!* The quotation would be long, and long the string. However, we will try to say something about it, at the risk of the king's prosecutor, sorry, of the public prosecutor. We would make bigger mistakes with the *National*.

Since 1830, the *National* has pursued socialism with its reprobation, its hatred. Is this true, yes or no? This is a first fact. And yet socialism is the Republic. What does the *National* say?

In 1842, we reproached the *National* with pushing back the colonization of Algeria, and, by a necessary consequence, with dreaming of abandoning our conquest. We quoted, on this occasion, its issues of June 1, 4, 16 and 22, 1841. Here is a second fact. — Does the *National* persist today in its opinion of 1841, or does it repudiate it? It will be our pleasure to tell us: we would be happy to withdraw this article from the chapter of our grievances.

Thee *National*, in 1841, was against the freedom of the press. It denounced us on several occasions, notably during the Quénisset trial, for our social criticism; he applauded the condemnation of Thore. And it was under the influence, under the government of the National, that the Constituent Assembly had just voted, in 1848, a press code which in no way yielded to

that of September. These are facts. Will the *National* tell us if it approves of this inquisitor's legislation, consequently if it retracts its intolerance of 1841 vis-à-vis socialist ideas? — Once again, we would like nothing better than to record the *National*'s explanations; we do not want to judge him without hearing him, as his military commissions do with the June insurgents.

We reproached the *National*, in 1842, with making the sovereignty of the people and universal suffrage serve as a stepping stone to military despotism. We quoted to it its own words on the death of Armand Carrel, whom it had, it said, *greeted as First Consul*. — We reminded it that in June 1841, when questioned by the *Gazette de France*, if, in the event that the people, gathered in primary assemblies, elected a king, it, the *National*, would accept this election, it had replied, Yes! — These are facts. At present the *National* is the great promoter of the presidency, and, thank God, there is no lack of generals in the government. Will the *National* tell us where it intends to stop on this monarchico-military slope? What we say to it about it is to avoid all calumny: in a word, is the *National* still royalist or is it no longer?

One of the most serious reproaches that the democracy has the right to make to the *National* is the *embastillement* of Paris. M. Bastide, by a generosity of feelings that honors him, claimed for himself alone the responsibility for this act; M. Armand Marrast, by a no less laudable generosity, never, although innocent, thought of declining this responsibility. M. Marrast understood that what comes out of the newspaper belongs to the newspaper; that criticism should stop at the office door, and never, under the sheet, look for proper names. We will do like M. Marrast. The detached forts have served, since February, as prisons for the Socialists and as barracks for the armies of the bourgeoisie: still facts! — Will the *National* tell us what use it foresees having to make of the fortifications of Paris in the future?

We asked the *National* what was its system of politics and social regeneration? And we answered, in 1842, that the *National*, thinking, with Hobbes, that *war is the natural state of the human race*, had no other system than the sword, no other government than the councils of war. Nothing could be simpler, we said. All the workers, farmers, messengers, teachers, etc., form either special arms or non-ranking companies. The repugnant and painful works are carried out by pioneers, who are multiplied at will by reinforcing discipline. The girls and women are regimented as *vivandières*. Every morning an agenda assigns the rights and duties of man and citizen; military discipline is the moral rule, and an energetic penal code, with an expeditious procedure, crowns the work!...

In writing this, we were prophesying, what? Good Lord! These *national workshops*, following which came the military commissions. However, the national workshops are not, it is shown today, the act of Louis Blanc; the idea of national workshops did not come out of the Luxembourg. Louis Blanc, the delegates, the workers *en masse* never ceased to protest against these so-called workshops, organized under the ministry and with the permission of M. Marie, then minister of public works. — Who invented the national workshops, since it wasn't Louis Blanc? Who? Those apparently who later created the military commissions. Would the *National* want to enlighten us on this double fact?...

The French economists, excited by the example of Cobden, began to preach free trade. What part did the *National* take in this great controversy, which concerned commerce, industry, and the capital of the country all at once? We have seen it, and our edification has been great! The *National*, without hearing anything about it, secretly leaned towards the suppression of the barriers; but Louis-Philippe and several ministers shared the same opinion: from then on the *National* turned around; it became unfaithful to its conviction, and this conviction was a mistake! The whole public has seen the fact. — Would the *National* now be in a position to tell us whether or not it supports free trade, and why?

It is the absolute lack of social and economic ideas which has led the *National*, and the Republic with it, into this abyss of contradictions, blood and shame into which we are plunged!

Before February, the *National* was Voltairian: this was a fact. Since then, we have seen it daily become *ignorantin*: that is another fact. Which of the two is the National? Voltairean or *ignorantin*? We, who are neither, and who slander no one, would be happy to hear the response from the *National*.

Trade stopped, work suspended, the Republic ruined, the public treasury filled only with loans, the State delivered to usurers, the *National*, which formerly summed up its revolutionary policy in this energetic phrase: *To concentrate the revolution in Paris, and to throw France on the Rhine*, the *National* was forced to deny its theories and its promises; it found itself, in the presence of attentive Europe, as impotent, as cowardly as Louis-Philippe.

In 1848, as in 1830, Poland was abandoned: the *National*, which had torn up the treaties of 1815, began to stitch them back together. Will it tell us, at least, as Louis-Philippe did for eighteen years, whether the Polish nationality will perish or not?

Italy is abandoned: the *National* offers the Milanese, jointly with England, its mediation. What a shame! M. Guizot is in London; Metternich is in London; the blood of the Italians cries out for vengeance against the King of Piedmont and against the Emperor; the *National* is in power!... and the treaties of 1815 still stand!

Democratic Spain is only waiting for a word, a sign from us, to expel Isabelle, Christine, Montpensier and the Englishman forever from its territory. Between the Iberian Republic and the French Republic, if we want, more Pyrenees! It only depends on the *National*. Has the *National* become a supporter of Spanish marriages?

No, no, never, never in France.

Never will the English reign!

This was the song of the *National* before February. Since February, the *National* has been a supporter of the English alliance: the lion speaks like a sheep!... Could M. Thiers be then president of the council?... Alas! Yes. M. Thiers and the *National* have made a morganatic marriage together. It is for this that the social question is shot, liberty strangled, the government handed over to the dynastics, and the Republic sold to the Hebrews! That's why we borrow at 65!...

Why! So they say on the finance committee, when you have no money and you can't do without money, you make good conditions for the capitalists and you get money!...

What does the *National* think?

Listen to this, people of the *National*. We do not know who will liquidate society, whether it will be Citizen Proudhon or Citizen Cabet. But what is certain is that you are pushing hard to declare bankruptcy. However, you will allow us to tell you: one of two things will occur, either the *National* betrays the Republic, or it is only the understudy of the *Représentant du Peuple*.

The Press Trials.

August 20, 1848.

You thunder, Jupiter, so you are wrong.

What all the religions have lost, one after another, is the imbecility of the gods, we mean the absurdity of dogma and the fanaticism of the priest.

What destroys all states is the blindness of power.

The *Représentant du peuple* has been seized this morning for the third time in three days! Seized why? Listen to this, reader!

The first seizure, that of our issue of the 16th, would have had for pretext or reason, according to what the commissioner of police told us, an attack on property, resulting from the publication of a letter signed J. ETEX, sculptor and painter, member of the Institute, in which it is said:

“Yes, I repeat it with you, any property that is not the fruit of the labor of the one who owns it, and which one enjoys without having earned it with his sweat, his pains, is a theft made from society.”

Citizen Etex does not deny, attack, or discuss property. He limits himself to defining it. In his opinion, there is no other property than that which is the *fruit of labor*. Property thus conditioned, he declares it inviolable, he defends it: all other property, the origin of which does not come down to labor, seems to him a theft!

The citizen public prosecutor saw in this an anarchic preaching, detrimental to property. There are therefore two properties for him: a property that is the fruit of labor, and which no doubt he allows us to advocate, and another property that is not the fruit of work, and the discussion of which, according to the case law of the prosecution, is prohibited. And it is because the citizen Etex took it into his head to qualify this last species of property, that we are seized!

But you, who defend *property acquired without labor*, who do not want it to be qualified, to be discussed, could you show us the titles? Would you dare to tell us what is this property that does not come from labor, that comes from elsewhere than from labor? Are you quite sure that by defending it you are not betraying justice, you are not compromising the public peace? We appoint you to the bar of the National Assembly on the day when the declaration of rights and the definition of property will be discussed.

We shall know if you have not abused your power, if you have not violated the law and outraged public morality, by seizing a newspaper which, discussing the law before it was made, believed it could say what it meant by theft what it meant by property! Certainly, we knew that the February revolution had been made BY the workers: but you are proving to us today that in the opinion of certain people, it does not exist FOR the workers. There are properties that do not come from labor: *Sic vos non vobis*.

The second seizure executed against us was caused by the insertion of a written letter from the Conciergerie. We are reproached for having, by this insertion, excited the hatred of one of the classes of society. We reread this letter, and we found that if it excited anything, it was pity for the unfortunates imprisoned in the aftermath of the June insurrection. We wept over their suffering, over their destitution and despair, we painted their sublime resignation, their heroic courage: this

is our offense. But admire the profound sagacity of the parquet. There are, it says, two classes of citizens just as there are two kinds of property: the class of those who own without laboring and the class of those who, while laboring, do not own.

The February Revolution was made to extend the benefit of property, through labor, to everyone.

The June uprising was the product of the same idea.

But the socialists, partisans of the universalization of property, were vanquished: and those of their partisans who were not shot were condemned to transportation.

When, therefore, the *Représentant du Peuple*, a known organ of the democratic and social Republic, arouses pity in favor of those transported, it indirectly excites hatred against the victors, against all those who have the privilege of possessing something. When the *Représentant du Peuple* reveals the atrocities and infamies of a few wretches mixed up among the ranks of the National Guard, it is as if it were accusing all the National Guards, all the bourgeois, of these atrocities. So there is excitement.

Gutless prosecutor! And who are those whom the *Représentant du Peuple* excites to pity, to compassion, if not you and your equals? So, to conclude your reasoning, it is your own hatred that we seek to excite against you! Feel the absurdity, now!

Yes, at this moment there are proletarians who are suffering and crying, and aristocrats who are enjoying and triumphing; yes, we pity the first, and we implore for them the pity of the others: you, you do not know anything but to push them all, those to the despair, and these to hardness.

What a republic, that where it is forbidden to cry!

The third offense of which we are accused, and which motivated the seizure this morning, is also justified.

In an article entitled: *Enquête sur les événements de juin*, — and why shouldn't we, too, make an inquiry? — we would again have EXCITED to hatred several classes of citizens, more to hatred and contempt of the government. How convenient, in the hands of an expert prosecutor, that excitement! But here is what is instructive.

According to the precise terms of the incriminated article, the *classes* of citizens whom we would have aroused to hatred of one another are the Legitimists, the Bonapartists, the Orleanists, the leaders of financial feudalism, of whom our *inquiry* points out the action is present everywhere, under the socialist flag, in the events of June. The Carlists, the Bonapartists, the Orleanists, *classes of citizens!* Classes having a recognized existence, a legal existence! Honest classes, whom it is forbidden to disturb in the accomplishment of their plots; parliamentary classes, who get on best with the public prosecutors, and who have the upper hand in the government!...

The Legitimists, the Bonapartists, the Orleanists, the capitalists, the egoists: all those who conspire to ruin the Republic, these are those whom the public prosecutor protects from his indictments; these are the ones who are forbidden to attack, on pain of incitement to the hatred of the government!...

It is just ; you are right, citizen prosecutor. We are not in the Republic; this is all just an interim. FRANCE WANTS A KING: it will be Henri V, Bonaparte or Joinville, it does not matter, provided that the newly elected swears, on the holy Gospels, to exterminate the socialists, the last of the Christians. And that is why, until the bargain is concluded, the Bonapartists, the Legitimists, the Orleanists, having equal rights, are three equally respectable classes of citizens, to whose contempt and hatred all excitement must be, by the law of the Republic, severely repressed.

Excuse me, once again, future king's prosecutor: you can now discontinue your pursuits. A good hearer, half-word. We will no longer fight your Orleanists, your Bonapartists, your Henriquinquists; we will discuss them!

But hurry. — At the rate things are going, we are very much afraid that your new monarchy will pass even more quickly than the dictatorship of Cavaignac. February 24 had brought us back, in one leap, to August 10, 1792. Since then, we have had, one after the other, our May 31, our 9 Thermidor, our 2 Prairial, our 18 Brumaire.

A poster on town criers, signed Ducoux, and which we have just read, takes us back to 1834. We still have fourteen years to go to reach February 24: will we have fourteen days?

Proposal for a National Loan.

AND FOR THE JOINING OF THE BANQUE DE FRANCE TO THE PUBLIC DOMAIN,
PRESENTED ON AUGUST 22, 1848 TO THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY.

Citizen Representatives,

Order reigns in Paris and throughout France. It will reign there, despite the reactionary plots, as long as it pleases us and the government.

And yet confidence does not return.

Business remains stagnant; work decreases every day; the collapse becomes widespread; capital, whether it is frightened or conspiring, persists in hiding.

Poverty is at its height: the people are literally dying of hunger. The relief distributed by the exhausted administration is 12 and a half cents per day and per person.

And winter is just around the corner!

The audacity of the factions increases with the public distress. From all sides we only hear of plots; the supporters of the monarchy based the hope of the pretenders on the despair of the People!

The nations friendly to France are dying under the sword, or struggling under oppression, without us being able to lend them aid. The same charm that holds back the arms of our workers, chains the feet of our soldiers at the border. We who should serve the People as avengers and guides, are nailed to the pillory of our powerlessness.

The February Revolution was to be an era of moral, political, economic regeneration: thanks to a handful of sectarians whose retrograde influence keeps the government and public opinion in the realm of routine, the February Revolution, for six months, has failed to fulfill its promises.

A nation can and must only borrow from itself: the prejudice of monopoly leaves us to the usurers.

A nation that borrows from itself, that makes an advance to itself, can lend itself ALL that it wants and WITHOUT INTEREST. We pay 7 percent rent on the money lent to us, and we cannot find a tenth of what we need.

Whoever says, in relation to a nation, loan or borrowing, says increase of labor, consequently increase of credit. With the regime of usury, the more we borrow, the more we discredit ourselves; the more, by an inevitable consequence, labor is reduced among us.

Credit, circulation and discounting are essentially social functions, which have remained anarchic to this day, and which the February Revolution had promised to organize and centralize democratically. How is it that these functions are still at the mercy of a few holders of cash, of an imperceptible caste of men of money? — Society, — a monstrous thing! — is like a body that would have no center of gravity and would be given over to antagonistic attractions; and as the Revolution was made precisely against this antagonism, the anarchic tendencies suppressed, and the central action not existing, society finds itself both without direction and without movement.

We have exhausted it — it had to be, it was written! —all known means of usury and taxation; the practice of the financiers is exhausted; all we have to do is resign ourselves and join hands!...

Citizens, THE HOMELAND IS IN DANGER! However, a desperate situation requires a heroic remedy.

I am proposing a measure capable, in my opinion, of saving the homeland, of putting an end to the crisis, to this deadly and dishonorable inertia of our commerce;,of our industry, of our politics, capable finally of putting and launching the Revolution back into its rut!....

That the National Assembly sanctions the following two decrees:

I. — LOAN OF TWO BILLION.

Art. 1. — A nation that lends or gives credit to itself, in reality only increases its production. According to this principle:

Art. 2.— The French people, represented by the State, borrow from the French people, represented by all the citizens, a sum of several billion francs, in the following form and conditions.

Art. 3.— The loan will be carried out by means of an issue of credit-paper, which will be made by the State, successively and up to two billion.

Art. 4. — The credit-paper thus issued will be representative of a sum to be paid by taxpayers, in the following manner.

Method of payment.

Art. 5.—Any taxpayer whose direct contributions rate a tax of 45 centimes and additional centimes not included, exceeds 40 francs, will be subject to the loan.

Any taxpayer whose direct contributions rate below 40 francs will be exempt from the loan.

Art. 6. — The payments to be made by taxpayers subject to the loan will be: For the ratings of

10	to	25 francs,	twice the amount of the contribution.		
25	to	50 —	3 times	id.	id.
50	to	75 —	4 times	id.	id.
75	to	400 —	5 times	id.	id.
100	to	450 —	6 times	id.	id.
150	to	200 —	7 times	id.	id.
200	to	300 —	8 times	id.	id.
300	to	500 —	9 times	id.	id.
500	and above,		10 times	id.	id.

Art. 7.—Payments will be made at least half in cash, within four years from the promulgation of this decree, and in eight equal terms, payable every six months.

It will be optional for taxpayers subject to the loan to release themselves in one or more payments, before the expiration of the fourth year,

Art. 8.— Until full release, interest on the amount due or remaining to be paid will be paid by the taxpayer at the rate of 5 percent, and added to his contributions.

Conversely, on the payments made, the same interest will be paid to the taxpayer by the State, and deducted from the rating of his contributions.

Art. 9.—All taxpayers subject to the loan, who prove mortgage, unsecured or sponsorship debts and obligations, will obtain discharge of the loan, in the ratio of their liabilities to their assets, said assets estimated one hundred times the amount of the loan. contribution.

Art. 10.—The portion of the loan thus deducted will be attributable to the creditor, and the debtor who has obtained discharge will remain guarantor of the difference and will receive a receipt for the payment for the creditor.

If the sum of the debts equals or exceeds the value of the property, estimated as stated in Article 9, the creditor or creditors will bear the loan alone, in accordance with Article 5.

Art. 11.—Any taxpayer, subject or subject to borrowing, who proves mortgage, unsecured, or sponsorship debts, will be discharged from the amount of his direct contribution, in the ratio: of his liabilities to his assets, said assets estimated at one hundred times the amount of the contribution.

The portion thus deducted will be attributable to the creditors, and the debtor will remain guarantor and will receive receipt of payment for them.

However, the deduction, and, consequently, the imputation to be made to creditors on the direct contribution, can never exceed three-quarters of this contribution.

This provision will only have effect for the four years, to run from the day of the decree.

Art. 12.—All holders of annuities registered before the promulgation of this decree will be freed from the loan, but subject to a tax of a quarter of the annuity, for the four years from the decree. — 150 —

Issue of the notes.

Art. 13.—The credit notes issued by the State will bear the title of *Loan voucher*.

They will be in denominations of 40, 20, 60, 100, 200, 500, 4,000 francs.

Art. 14.—The issue will take place monthly, during the three years from the promulgation of the decree, up to the sum of *two billion*.

This issue will be, for each of the first four months of the series, 400 million; for the other months, 50 million.

Art. 15.—The loan vouchers will all be paid by the State, and in current account, to the Banque de France, i.e. the *Banque Nationale de France*, as stated in the attached decree.

Art. 16.—Loan vouchers issued by the State, mortgaged on the property and revenues of the State; stamped, signed and endorsed by the National Bank, pledged by the recoveries of the loan, will be deemed Bank notes, and, as such, paid into general circulation, by the ordinary route of discount and credit, or against good commercial values, or against authentic title deeds.

Commercial papers, representing products sold and delivered and title deeds serving as mortgages, thus adding to the metallic security of the notes, will complete their solidity.

Art. 17. — The interest on discounts and credits made in loan bonds at the National Bank will be 3 percent per year, commission included, without however the discount being able to be less, for short-term securities, of 1/2 percent.

Art. 18.—Loan vouchers will not have compulsory tender.

They will be, at any request from the holders, reimbursable by the Bank, in cash, except withholding of 5 percent.

Art. 19.— After the expiration of the fourth year, from present decree, the loan bonds will be withdrawn from circulation as they enter the counters, and replaced by the ordinary blocks of the Bank, which, from this moment, will fix the rate of its interest for the credits and discounts in notes at 3 percent, and for those in cash 3 and a half percent.

Art. 20.—From the same period, the interest to be paid by the State, for the funds resulting from the loan, will be reduced from 5 percent to 3 percent, Bank rate.

Repayment of the loan.

Art. 21. —The repayment of the sums paid for the loan will take place in three different ways, which may, depending on the circumstances, be either successively or simultaneously used.

1. Conversion into annuities;
2. Discount on tax;
3. Reimbursement by the Bank.

Art. 22.—The conversion into annuities of 3 percent of the sums paid on the loan will be granted to any creditor of the State who requests it.

Art. 23.— All payments less than 25 francs will be reimbursed by means of an annual reduction on the direct contribution, calculated so that full reimbursement takes place, at the latest, within four years from the last payment.

Art. 24. — On payments greater than 25 francs, such sum will first be deducted from the amount of the payment and reimbursed in four annual installments, by the tax rebate, as stated in the previous article.

Art. 25. — The surplus of the sums paid, and which will not have been converted into annuities, or reimbursed through tax, will be reimbursed by the National Bank, in four annual installments, so that the total reimbursement of the loan is made, at the latest at the end of the eighth year following the last payment.

Art. 26. — To favor, as much as possible, the creditors of the State who would like to return promptly to their funds, and to increase the circulation of values, the State will distribute to its creditors, after the last payment, securities of registered loan and stub, subject to endorsement, and payable to the National Bank at the due dates provided for in Article 85.

Art. 27. — Owners, entrepreneurs, industrialists, traders, manufacturers, etc., subject to one of the four direct contributions and holders of loan securities, remain guarantors towards their

creditors of the reimbursement of the sums advanced for them by the latter, in execution of articles 9 and 40 of this decree.

Use of funds and purpose of the loan.

Art. 28.— The sums paid in cash, for the loan, will be delivered to the National Bank and to the counters of the departments, and added to the metallic capital of the Bank, to serve as security for the loan bonds, and ensure their acceptance by crazy citizens.

Art. 29. — As for the two billion values resulting from the very fact of the issue and acceptance of loan bonds; the application will be determined as follows:

1. Deficit to be expected on the budgets of 1848 and 1849.	300,000,000
2. Reductions on various contributions, 100 million per year, during the four years of the loan.	400,000,000
3. Bonuses and incentives for industry, 40 percent on the salaries of workers of both sexes employed in workshops, construction sites, factories, mills and plants, for the three months following the promulgation of the decree.	50,000,000
4. Purchase of canals, railways and mines; reforestation work, damming, etc.	350,000,000
5. Credits on rural buildings, according to the conditions which will be fixed by the law on mortgage credit and the statutes of the National Bank, 450 million per year for four years.	600,000,000
6. Credit to commerce and industry, 50 million per year for four years. .	200,000,000
7. Available.	100,000,000
Total.	2,000,000,000

II. — JOINING OF THE BANK OF FRANCE TO THE PUBLIC DOMAIN.

Art. 1st, The circulation of values is an essentially social function.

Anarchy in this function is the sole cause of financial, commercial and industrial crises.

Consequently:

Art. 2. — The Banque de France is declared a public utility institution.

It is united in the domain of the nation, and operates on its own account. It takes the title of *Banque Nationale de France*.

Art. 3.— A commission, appointed by the National Assembly and taken from within it, will immediately proceed with the liquidation of the Banque de France.

The shares will be reimbursed according to the average price of the last twelve months, in government annuities.

Art. 4. — The administration of the Banque de France, reformed by the National Assembly, is placed under the supervision of each of the Representatives of the People and the Paris Chamber of Commerce.

In the departments, chambers of commerce and municipal councils have the right to supervise the operations of the counters.

Art. 5.—The Bank is independent of the central government, and placed outside its action.

No minister or public official may be part of either the board of directors of the National Bank or the supervisory board, '°

Art. 6. — The operations of the National Bank embrace agricultural and industrial credit, as well as discounting and circulation.

Art. 7. — The rate of interest, for credits and discounts, will be fixed provisionally at the National Bank, from the recovery of the loan, at 3 percent, on the sums paid in notes, and 3 and a half for hundred on those paid in cash.

Art. 8.—The number of annuities by which it will be optional for mortgage borrowers to free themselves, not including the first year, for which interest alone will be collected and retained in advance, cannot exceed twenty.

Art. 9.— A special law, as well as the new statutes of the National Bank, will determine the rules and conditions of land credit.

Art. 10.— The profits made by the National Bank will be added to its capital, until this capital, in currency and ingots, has reached the figure of at least 4,500 million, and is sufficient for all the circulation of the country.

This capital realized, the proceeds of the Bank can be applied to public expenditure, or the interest rate can be reduced to administrative costs.

THIRD SERIES
September — December 1848

Manifesto of the PEUPLE.⁷

PATRIOTS,

We are those elected by your votes;

We come to you like supplicants, olive branch in hand, dismay in our hearts.

What did we do with this revolution that you entrusted to our care, so full of hope and so pure, during the elections of April and June?

The press muzzled, the worker demoralized, the People of the barricades slandered, the National Assembly decimated, the republicans of the day before brought before the war tribunals, condemned, deported, banished, suspects; the reign of the sword replaced the reign of the law; a sardonic and cold word replacing in the man of power a pompous and empty word; a prolonged state of siege, which will only end by the will of the People, and the People are in irons! A monarchical constitution whose entire thought is summed up in these words: *refusal of labor to the worker!* Poverty, despair, the blood of fathers, the tears of mothers, the cries of orphans; next door, reactionary and conspiratorial capital that laughs and triumphs... answers you!

Ah! no doubt we only form an imperceptible minority in the National Assembly; we could not prevent anything, we can do nothing, and, faced with the conspiracy of selfishness, all our protests will remain powerless. But a great responsibility nonetheless weighs on our celebrations; and we would believe we had deserved the Republic and your esteem, patriots, if in these decisive circumstances, where union and discipline alone are our strength, we did not think of getting closer to you.

The success of the counter-revolution has thrown us back onto the defensive: it is the defense that we need to organize at the moment, while we wait until we can organize victory. And it is as a pledge of battle that we come to demand of your patriotism one last effort, the supreme act of virtue of the Christian and the citizen, PATIENCE!

Patience is the whole of man: patience in work and patience in study, patience in war, patience in persecution. It is patience that breeds heroes and geniuses, that gives victory to right over force, to poverty over fortune. It is patience that makes free peoples, great peoples. Plots, provocations to revolt surround you: may the People be, like God, patient because they are all-powerful and immortal, *patiens quia aeternus*, says the Scripture.

⁷ The newspaper *Le Peuple*, for which this Manifesto served as a specimen, published its first issue on September 2. This Manifesto should have been signed by several representatives of the people who backed away from the circumstances. (*Editor's note.*)

Give us then, O workers, our brothers, give us patience for a little longer; listen to our words of peace and sacrifice, and we promise in return justice for you, shame and condemnation for your enemies.

We come, against a government which does not know its origin and its end, but which we do not despair of bringing back again, to resume the work begun, eighteen years ago, by Godefroy Cavaignac, against the forever infamous government of Louis-Philippe.

By founding LE PEUPLE, an organ of workers' thought, we come to constitute the unity of workers in the face of the anarchy of privileges, to pose the revolutionary idea, the progressive idea, in the face of reactionary projects, retrograde ideas. The February Revolution, which was to satisfy all the wishes of the People deceived in July, the February Revolution is already, like that of 1830, like that of 89 and 92, only a stage on the road to our emancipation; it will be the last.

We are of no sect, of no school: we swear by the authority of no one. We are of the People. It is up to the People alone, said Plato, to create words and formulas: every expression, every individual conception is a prison for the thought of the People.

The People have named the *Democratic and Social Republic*:

We are of the Democratic and Social Republic.

We, like the People, have *liberty* as a principle, *equality* as a means and *fraternity* as our goal.

Liberty, that is to say the soul, life, movement, spontaneity, progressive in its development, infinite, absolute in its essence and its ideal;

Equality, progressive and absolute;

Fraternity, progressive and absolute. All our science consists of watching out for the demonstrations of the People, of soliciting their words, of interpreting their actions. Questioning the People is for us the whole of philosophy, the whole of politics.

We want family, and we want it for everyone. Who among us, men of the People, has ever attacked the family? Who does not know that the man of toil is also, and par excellence, the man of love?... Our eyes sought the enemies of the family, and we found that these enemies of the family were precisely ours.

You, whose ambition is to earn enough to feed a wife and make her happy, do you want to know who the enemies of the family are? Carry the torch to your neighbor, the capitalist, the rentier, the stockbroker, the big earner, the parasite, the intriguer, the idler; penetrate into his intimate life; question his wife, his maid, his little boy, and you will know who it is who, through his miserly selfishness, through his disordered loves, corrupts public morals and dissolves the family. It is poverty that makes the worker a libertine and fornicator; in him there is a natural horror of vice and training towards virtue. It is luxury that makes the rich incestuous and adulterous: satiety and laziness are indomitable agents of disorder in him.

We want monogamous marriage, inviolable and without stain, contracted in complete freedom of love, free from sordid motives, resolvable only by death or betrayal. Where will you find this ideal of marriage, if not among yourselves, workers? The rich, no more than the kings, know love in marriage.

We want labor, as a right and as a duty, and under the guarantee of the Constitution, for everyone. The right to assistance, which we are told with hypocritical philanthropy, is only the corollary, the sanction of the right to work, is unemployment compensation.

Isn't it strange that we are reduced to such professions of faith?

The Savage makes war on the Savage in order not to labor. The greatest evil he wishes upon his enemy is to cultivate a field. And we, because we ask to labor, we are called Savages!...

The Greek and the Roman, great workers at the beginning, but infatuated with politics, placed the nations in servitude in order to unload the labor on them, and to attend without distraction to their parliamentary exercises. Politics, says Virgil, was the profession of the she-wolf's children: *Tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento; hae tibi erunt artes*. It was a principle, among the publicists of antiquity, that the working man could not be a political man: therefore, far from refusing work to the proletarian, they imposed it on him by force. — Today, our politicians neither want to work nor give us work. They would like everything for themselves, work and government.

In the Middle Ages, the system, the point of view, the ideas, everything changed. The feudal caste, takes no more active part in the work than the patrician caste did previously: it leaves it to the villein. But, instead of coercing, it gets paid. By letters patent (this is the origin of what we call *patents*), and for a fee, to all those who want to work the lord gives credit for the land, credit for commerce, industry and the arts, credit, in in a word, for labor: absolutely as the Jew and the Lombard gave credit for their money. The working people, after a long slavery, had acquired such a taste for labor that the idle caste had come to think that instead of demanding work from them, it could sell it to them! This is the principle of all feudal right.

Nowadays, under this regime of bankocracy, no everyone who wishes can labor, even if they pay. The worker may leave his exploiter 10, 20 and 50 percent of his legitimate salary: he does not get work. Labor, once the privilege of the slave, has become the privilege of the owner. We used to fight not to labor, it was social war; today we are fighting to labor, it is social war. Civilization went from one pole to the other: people were first killing each other because there was no leisure for everyone, and that could be understood; we are now killing ourselves because there is no labor for everyone, and that is no longer understandable.

Our capitalist legislators refuse to recognize the right to work: People, once again, we ask you for patience!...

To conform to the common language, and in order to avoid any slander, any ambiguity, we will say that we want property, property, that is to say the free disposition by each of the fruits of his labor, of his industry and his intelligence.

But we want property, like work, for everyone, because, in society, the faculty of production is like the faculty of acquisition, infinite.

We want property, without usury, because usury is the obstacle to the development of production, to the increase and universalization of property.

It has been said that property thus understood, thus stripped of what makes it privilege and abuse, was no longer property. — Men of practice even more than of theory, we leave this

discussion to the scholars; it is enough for us, by maintaining individual possession, to free it from all inequality and monopoly.

We want, during this period of transition, which the revolution of February inaugurated, respect for acquired property, except for the progressive reduction of privilege. Who among us is there who preaches confiscation and theft? The boldest doctrines on property have circulated among the People: how many plunderers have they made?... We searched for thieves, and we found them, with the harlots and adulterers, in the court of the ex-king, in the peerage, in the chamber of deputies, in ministries, everywhere, except among the workers. No one is more hostile to theft than he who labors. It was against privileged theft that the February revolution was made: notice to the instigators and makers of counter-revolution.

We want to maintain the principle of heredity, that is to say the natural transmission from father to son of the instruments and products of labor, not the transmission of monopoly, of the right of the lord. How will the principle of heredity, which links generations and gives strength to the family, be contrary to equality and fraternity, when it is no longer used to transmit and accumulate privileges?

Family, labor, property without usury and without abuse, in other words, free credit, identification of the worker and the capitalist; inheritance of rights, not privileges; these are the elements of our public law, of our social science.

Now, the economic base of society thus modified, everything turns around, everything changes in society. The causes of misery become the cause of wealth; agents of inequality and antagonism, become agents of harmony and fraternity. Under this new horizon, ideas and philosophy are expanding and reforming; science and art take on another meaning, another style; religion is explained.

France has shown, in recent times, how religious it is, religious in heart and in reason. Religion, in our incomparable country, is the secret leaven of everything that has life, authority and duration. Economic questions, however vast they arise, are not enough for our contemplative and tender intelligence; the great problems of philosophy leave us indifferent and sad; the pure idea cannot delight us. Our soul needs something more than number and measure, something beyond even the idea.

Where are, among us, the materialists and the atheists? We looked around us, and we found them only among those who slander us and persecute us. Do you see this cold and ugly being, subtle and supple like the snake, mocking, ciphering, without shame, who in a silvery voice always concludes with pitiless measures; who does not want the right to work; who speaks to you of Providence, and who adores fatality; who sees in religion only a political instrument, in the law only a convention, in the Revolution only a fact! This man is a materialist, he is impious;

Yes, we want religion: but let no one be deceived. Religion, for us, is not the symbolism: it is the content, the word of the symbolism. To discover true religion, we must start our exegesis again, showing philosophically, with the help of new social data, supernaturalism in nature, heaven in society, God in man. It is when civilization will appear to us as a perpetual apocalypse, and history as an endless miracle; when, through the reform of society, Christianity has been

raised to its second power, we will know religion. Then also our slanderers, torn from their myths, will know what our God is, what our faith is...

We want the Republic as a form of government and society. We are the irreconcilable enemies of royalty, of everything related to it, of everything that resembles it. Royalty is an old fiction whose meaning has long been known, the restoration of which would be an outrage to public reason, to national dignity. Royalty is the opposite of everything we want and expect from the Republic.

The Republic is the coordinated equality of functions and people: royalty is only hierarchy and subalternization.

The Republic excludes the distinction of castes: royalty cannot do without castes. For noble feudalism, it substituted mercantile feudalism: why would we have expelled Louis-Philippe, the type, the chosen one of the bourgeois caste, if we had to preserve a bourgeoisie, if we wanted to cultivate this seed from which arose the worst kind of royalty, constitutional royalty?

The Republic is the organization of universal suffrage: with royalty, this suffrage is only a lottery. — We will say later what we mean by these words: *Organization of universal suffrage*.

The Republic supposes, with the division of functions, the indivisibility of power. — We will prove that the firmest support of despotism, the cornerstone of monarchies, is found precisely in this distinction of legislative, executive and judicial powers; a distinction where liberty, equality, responsibility, universal suffrage, popular sovereignty, the principles of justice and order, all perish.

The Republic is the centralization of credit, commerce, industry, agriculture, as well as the police and education: royalty is only anarchy or vassalage.

The Republic is a regime of responsibility and law: royalty only exists through favor and corruption.

The Republic is, like religion, essentially expansive and universal, embracing the world and eternity; — Royalty, always personal, local, stationary, living at home and for itself, royalty is the enemy of humankind and progress.

The Republic would say to the Austrian: "I want you to leave Italy!" And the Austrian would leave. She would say to the Scythian: "I want you to leave my darling Poland!" And the Scythian would return to the desert road. — Royalty says to the tyrants: "Brothers, how much will you give me, and I will hand over Italy and Poland to you?..."

By the bourgeois tendencies of the government and the National Assembly; restrictions placed on the exercise of the right to vote; by the restrictions placed on freedom of association and freedom of the press; by the draft monarchical constitution submitted to the deliberations of the representatives of the People; by the war against social ideas; by the pacts concluded with usurers; the abandonment of Polish and Italian nationalities; by the transactions initiated with the aristocratic governments of Europe, it is easy to judge that our country is in the midst of a royalist restoration. The popular Hercules has barely cut off the head of a dynasty when from this execrated trunk new ones emerge, *repullulat hydra!* This is the danger at this moment; this is where the effort of our resistance must be directed.

Republicans, count on us!... But if you want our dedication to be useful, let us in turn count on your support. And what is this support? we repeat to you in closing, this support, what makes your strength and ours, is patience.

Be careful not to give in to the perfidious instigations of those who push you to revolt and civil war: civil war is the only means of success that royalty has at the moment. Things, by the providential combination of events, have reached this point that if the People remain immobile for some time, royalty, with its infernal procession, is lost forever.

Patience therefore, citizens; no truth about men and things will be hidden from you by us, no timid resolution suggested. But, once again, be patient! it is the entire future of the People, and the salvation of the Republic.

Toast to the Revolution

October 17, 1848

Citizens,

When our friends of the democratic republic, apprehensive about our ideas and inclinations, cry out against the qualification of *socialist* which we add to that of democrat, for what do they reproach us?—They reproach us for not being revolutionaries.

Let us see then if they or we belong in the tradition, whether they or we have the true revolutionary practice.

And when our adversaries in the middle class, concerned for their privileges, pour calumny and insult upon us, what is the pretext for their charges? It is that we want to totally destroy property, the family, and civilization.

Again, let us see whether we or our adversaries better deserve the title of conservatives.

Revolutions are the successive manifestation of justice in human history.—It is for this reason that all revolutions have their origins in a previous revolution.

Whoever talks about revolution necessarily talks about *progress*, but just as necessarily about *conservation*. From this it follows that the revolution is always at work in history and that, strictly speaking, there are not several revolutions, but only one permanent revolution.

The revolution, eighteen centuries ago, called itself the gospel, the *Good News*. Its fundamental dogma was the *Unity of God*; its motto, the *equality of all men before God*. Ancient slavery rested on the antagonism and inequality of gods, which represented the relative inferiority of races in the state of war. Christianity created the rights of peoples, the brotherhood of nations; at the same time, it abolished idolatry and slavery.

Certainly no one denies today that the Christians, revolutionaries who fought by testimony and by martyrdom, were men of progress. They were also conservatives.

The polytheist initiation, after civilizing the first humans, after converting these men of the woods—*sylvestres homine*, as the poet says—into men of the towns, became itself, through sensualism and privilege, a principle of corruption and enslavement. Humanity was lost, when it was saved by the Christ, who received from that glorious mission the double title of *Savior* and *Redeemer*, or, as we put it in our political language, conservative and revolutionary.

That was the character of the first and greatest of revolutions. It renewed the world, and by renewing it conserved it.

But, supernatural and spiritual as it was, that revolution only expressed the more material side of justice, the enfranchisement of bodies and the abolition of slavery. Established on faith, it left thought enslaved; it was not sufficient for the emancipation of man, who is body and spirit, matter and intelligence. It called for another revolution. A thousand years after the coming of Christ, a new upheaval began within the religion the first revolution founded, a prelude to new progress. Scholasticism carried within it, along with the authority of the Church and the scripture, the authority of reason! In about the 16th century, the revolution burst forth.

The revolution, in that epoch, without abandoning its first given, took another name, which was already celebrated. It called itself philosophy. Its dogma was the *liberty of reason*, and its motto, which follows from that, was the *equality of all before reason*.

Here then is man, declared inviolable and free in his double essence, as soul and as body. Was this progress? Who but a tyrant could deny it? Was it an act of conservation? The question does not even merit a response.

The destiny of man, a wise man once said, is to contemplate the works of God. Having known God in his heart, by faith, the time had come for man to know him with his reason. The Gospel had been for man like a primary education; now grown to adulthood, he needed a higher teaching, lest he stagnate in idiocy and the servitude that follows it.

In this way, the likes of Galileo, Arnaud de Bresce, Giordano Bruno, Descartes, Luther—that whole elite of thinkers, wise men and artists, who shone in the 15th, 16th and 17th centuries as great revolutionaries—were at the same time the conservatives of society, the heralds of civilization. They continued, in opposition to the representatives of Christ, the movement started by Christ, and they suffered no lack of persecution and martyrdom for it!

This was the second great revolution, the second great manifestation of justice. It too renewed the world—and saved it.

But philosophy, adding its conquests to those of the Gospel, did not fulfill the program of that eternal justice. Liberty, called forth from the heart of God by Christ, was still only individual: it had to be established in the tribunal. Conscience was needed to make it pass into law.

About the middle of the last century a new development began, and, as the first revolution had been religious and the second philosophical, the third revolution was political. It called itself the social contract.

It took for its dogma the *sovereignty of the people*. It was the counterpart of the Christian dogma of the *unity of god*.

Its motto was *equality before the law*, the corollary of those that it had previously inscribed on its flag: equality before God and equality before reason.

Thus, with each revolution, liberty appeared to us always as the instrument of justice, with equality as its criterion. The third term—the aim of justice, the goal it always pursues, and the end it approaches—is brotherhood.

Let us never lose sight of this order of revolutionary development. History testifies that brotherhood, the supreme end of revolutions, does not impose itself. Its conditions are, first, liberty, and then equality. It is as if justice said to us all: Men, be free; citizens, become equal; brothers, embrace one another.

Who dares deny that the revolution undertaken sixty years ago by our fathers, the heroic memory of which makes our hearts beat with such force that we almost forget our own sense of duty—who denies, I ask, that this revolution was a progress? Nobody. Very well, then. But was it not both progressive and conservative? Could society have survived with its time-worn despotism, its degraded nobility, and its corrupt clergy, with its egotistical and undisciplined parliament, so given to intrigue, with a people in rags, a race which can be exploited at will?

Is it necessary to blot out the sun, in order to make the case? The revolution of '89 was the salvation of humanity; it is for that reason that it deserves the title of revolution.

But, citizens, if our fathers have done much for liberty and fraternity, and have even more profoundly opened up the road of brotherhood, they have left it to us to do even more.

Justice did not speak its last word in '89, and who knows when it will speak it.

Are we not witnesses, our generation of 1848, to a corruption worse than that of the worst days of history, to a misery comparable to that of feudal times, to an oppression of spirit and of conscience, and a degradation of all human faculties, which exceeds all that was seen in the epochs of most dreadful cruelty? Of what use are the conquests of the past, of religion and philosophy, and the constitutions and codes, when by virtue of the same rights that are guaranteed to us by those constitutions and codes, we find ourselves dispossessed of nature, excommunicated from the human species? What is politics, when we lack bread, when even the work which might give bread is taken from us? What to us is the freedom to go or to become, the liberty to think or not to think, the guarantees of the law, and the spectacles of the marvels of civilization? What is the meager education which is given to us, when by the withdrawal of all those objects on which we might practice human activity, we are ourselves plunged into an absolute void; when to the appeal of our senses, our hearts, and our reason, the universe and civilization reply: *Néant!* Nothing!

Citizens, I swear it by Christ and by our fathers! Justice has sounded its fourth hour, and misfortune to those who have not heard the call!

—Revolution of 1848, what do you call yourself?

—I am the *right to work!*

—What is your flag?

—*Association!*

—And your motto?

—*Equality before fortune!*

—Where are you taking us?

—*To Brotherhood!*

—Salute to you, Revolution! I will serve you as I have served God, as I have served Philosophy and Liberty, with all my heart, with all my soul, with all my intelligence and my courage, and I will have no other sovereign and ruler than you!

Thus the revolution, having been by turns religious, philosophical and political, has become economic. And like all its predecessors, it brings us nothing less than a contradiction of the past, a sort of reversal of the established order! Without this complete reversal of principles and beliefs, there is no revolution; there is only mystification. Let us continue to interrogate history, citizens.

Within the empire of polytheism, slavery had established and perpetuated itself—in the name of what principle? In the name of religion.—Christ appeared, and slavery was abolished, precisely in the name of religion.

Christianity, in its turn, made reason subject to faith; philosophy reversed that order, and subordinated faith to reason.

Feudalism, in the name of politics, controlled everything, subjecting the laborer to the bourgeois, the bourgeois to the noble, the noble to the king, the king to the priest, and the priest to a dead letter.—In the name of politics again, '89 subjected everyone to the law, and recognized among men only citizens.

Today labor is at the discretion of capital. Well, then! The revolution tells you to change that order. It is time for capital to recognize the predominance of labor, for the tool to put itself at the disposition of the worker.

Such is this revolution, which has suffered sarcasm, calumny and persecution, just like any other. But, like the others, the Revolution of 1848 becomes more fertile from the blood of its martyrs. *Sanguis martyrū, semen christianorū!* exclaimed one of the greatest revolutionaries of times past, the indomitable Tertullien. Blood of republicans, seed of republicans.

Whoever does not dare to acknowledge this faith, sealed with the blood of our brothers, is not a revolutionary. The failure is an infidelity. He who dissembles regarding it is a renegade. To separate the Republic from socialism is to willfully confuse the freedom of mind and spirit with the slavery of the senses, the exercise of political rights with the deprivation of civil rights. It is contradictory, absurd.

Here, citizens, is the genealogy of social ideas: are we, or are we not, in the revolutionary tradition? It is a question of knowing if we are at present also engaged in revolutionary practice, if, like our fathers, we will be at once men of conservation and of progress, since it is only by this double title that we will be men of revolution.

We have the revolutionary principle, the revolutionary dogma, and the revolutionary motto. What do we lack in order to accomplish the work entrusted to our hands by Providence? One thing only: revolutionary practice!

But what is the practice which distinguishes the epochs of revolution from ordinary times?

What constitutes revolutionary practice is that it no longer proceeds by details and distinctions, or by imperceptible transitions, but by simplifications and enjambments. It passes over, by broad equations, the middle terms proposed by the spirit of routine, which would normally have been applied in the past, but which the selfishness of the privileged or the inertia of the governments has dismissed.

These great equitations of principles, these enormous shifts in mores, also have their laws, and they are not at all arbitrary. They are no more a matter of chance than the practice of revolutions.

But what, in the end, is that practice?

Suppose that the statesmen we have seen in power since February 24, these short-sighted politicians of small means, of narrow and meticulous routines, had been in the place of the apostles. I ask you, citizens, what would they have done?

They would have fallen into agreement with the innovators of the various conferences, concluding, in secret consultations, that the plurality of gods was an absurdity. They would have said, like Cicero, that it is inconceivable that two augurs could look at one another without laughter. They would have condemned slavery very philosophically, and in a deep voice.

But they would also have cried out against the bold propaganda which, denying the gods and all that society has sanctified, raised superstition and all the interests against it; they would have trusted in good policy, rather than attacking the old beliefs, instead of interpreting them. Instead of abolishing the worship, they would have purified it. They would have knelt before Mercury the thief, before impudent Venus and incestuous Jupiter. They would have spoken with respect and esteem for the Floralia and the Bacchanalia. They would have made a philosophy of polytheism, retold the history of the gods, renewed the personnel of the temples, published the payments for sacrifices and public ceremonies, granting, as far as it was in them, reason and morality to the impure traditions of their fathers. By dint of attention, kindness and human respect, instead of saving the world, they would have caused it to perish.

There was, in the first centuries of the Christian era, a sect, a party powerful in genius and eloquence, which, in the face of the Christian revolution, undertook to continue the idolatry in the form of a moderate and progressive republic; they were the Neo-Platonists, to whom Apollonius of Tyana and the Emperor Julian attached themselves. It is in this fashion that we have seen with our own eyes certain preachers attempt the renovation of Catholicism, by interpreting its symbols from the point of view of modern ideas.

A vain attempt! Christian preaching, which is to say revolutionary practice, swept away all the gods and their hypocritical admirers; and Julian, the greatest politician and most beautiful spirit of his time, bears in the histories the name of *apostate*, for having been madly opposed to evangelical justice.

Let us cite one more example.

Let us suppose that in '89, the prudent counselors of despotism, the well-advised spirits of the nobility, the tolerant clergy, the wise men of the middle class, the most patient of the people—let us suppose, I say, that this elite of citizens, with the most upright vision and the most philanthropic views, but convinced of the dangers of abrupt innovations, had agreed to manage, according to the rules of politics, the transition from despotism to liberty. What would they have done?

They would have passed the promised charter, after long discussion and mature deliberation, letting at least ten years elapse between each article. They would have negotiated with the pope, and with all manner of submissiveness, the civil constitution of the clergy. They would have negotiated with the convents, by amicable agreement, the repurchase of their goods. They would have opened an investigation into the value of feudal rights, and the compensation to be accorded to the lords. They would have sought compensation to the privileged for the rights accorded to the people. They would have made the work of a thousand years what revolutionary practice might accomplish overnight.

All of this is not just empty talk: there was no lack of men in '89 willing to connect themselves to this false wisdom of revolution. The first of all was Louis XVI, who was as revolutionary at heart and in theory as anyone, but who did not understand that the revolution must also be practiced. Louis XVI set himself to haggle and quibble over everything, so much and so well, that the revolution, growing impatient, swept him away!

Here then is what I mean, today, by revolutionary practice.

The revolution of February proclaimed the *right to work*, the predominance of labor over capital.

On the basis of that principle, I say that before overriding all reforms, we have to occupy ourselves with a generalizing institution, which expresses, on all the points of social economy, the subordination of capital to labor; which, in lieu of making, as has been the case, the capitalist the sponsor of the laborer, makes the laborer the arbiter and commander of the capitalist; an institution which changes the relation between the two great economic powers, labor and property, and from which follows, consequently, all other reforms.

Will it then be revolutionary to propose here an agricultural bank serving, as always, the monopolizers of money; and to create there a certified loan office, a monument to stagnation and unemployment; and elsewhere, to found an asylum, a pawn-shop, a hospital, a nursery, a penitentiary, or a prison, to increase pauperism by multiplying its sources?

Will it be a work of Revolution to sponsor a few million workers, sometimes a company of tailors, and sometimes of masons; to reduce the tax on drink and increase it on properties; to convert obligations into losses; to vote seeds and pick-axes for twelve thousand colonists leaving for Algeria, or to subsidize a *trial* phalanstery?

Will it be the speech or act of a revolutionary to argue for four months whether the people will work or will not, if capital hides or if it flees the country, if it awaits confidence or if it is confidence that awaits it, if the powers will be divided or only the functions, if the president will be the superior, the subordinate or the equal of the national assembly, if the first who will fill this role will be the nephew of the emperor or the son of the king, or if it would not be better, for that good purpose, to have a soldier or a poet, if the new sovereign will be named by the people or by the representatives, if the ministry of *reaction* which goes out merits more confidence than the ministry of *conciliation* which comes, if the Republic will be blue, white, red, or tricolor?

Will it be revolutionary, when it is a question of returning to labor the fictive production of capital, to declare the net revenue inviolable, rather than to seize it by a progressive tax; when it is necessary to organize equality in the acquisition of goods, to lay the blame on the mode of transmission; when 25,000 tradesmen implore a legal settlement, to answer them by bankruptcy; when property no longer receives rent or farm rent, to refuse it further credit; when the country demands the centralization of the banks, to deliver that credit to a financial oligarchy which only knows how to make a void in circulation and to maintain the crisis, while waiting for the discouragement of the people to bring back confidence?

Citizens, I accuse no one.

I know that to all except for us social democrats, who have envisioned and prepared for it, the Revolution of February has been a surprise; and if it is difficult for the old constitutionals to pass in so short a time from the monarchical faith to a republican conviction, it is still more so for the politicians of the old century to comprehend anything of the practice of the new Revolution. Other times have other ideas. The great maneuvers of '93, good for their time, do not suit us now any

more than the parliamentary tactics of the last thirty years; and if we want to abort the revolution, we have no surer means than to take up again these errors.

Citizens, you are still only a minority in this country. But already the revolutionary flood grows with the speed of the idea, with the majesty of the ocean. Exercise again some of that patience that made your success, and the triumph of the Revolution is assured. You have proven, since June, by your discipline, that you are politicians. From now on you will prove, by your acts, that you are organizers. The government will be enough, I hope, with the National Assembly, to maintain the republican form: such at least is my conviction. But the revolutionary power, the power of conservation and of progress, is no longer today in the hands of the government; it is not in the National Assembly: it is in you. The people alone, acting upon themselves without intermediary, can achieve the economic Revolution begun in February. The people alone can save civilization and advance humanity!

THE CONSTITUTION AND THE PRESIDENCY

Since the *Représentant du Peuple* ceased to appear, seventy days ago, only two facts have been accomplished, one in the social world, the other in the political world. The story will not be long: a few lines will be enough for us to reconnect the interrupted chain of events, from August 21 to October 31.

The first of these facts is the invasion, at all points in the civilized world, of social ideas. The idea of an economic revolution is winning and spreading, internally, in our least advanced departments; outside, in the most despotic States, with the speed of a fire that, in the torrid zone, travels and burns immense spans in a few hours. All the ideas of the day before, supposedly political, are forced to bow before the social idea and borrow its flag in order to still be something.

The social revolution, inaugurated in Paris on February 25, baptized with blood baptism in the funeral days of June, the revolution of labor and capital is now irresistible, in France and throughout Europe. Everywhere the populations, to whom the slander had presented this revolution as the ruin of liberty and the destruction of the family, enlightened by the discussion, by the slander itself, welcome the social revolution as the pledge of liberty and the palladium of the family. Seeing the triumphant march of the idea, we can predict that it will not have to sustain an armed struggle; it will soon only have to present itself, with the mass of its supporters, to command respect and officially establish itself in all its authority.

A few more weeks of suffering, workers, and you will have changed the face of the world in fewer days than it took years for Christ to establish his religion.

The second fact that we have to record is the vote on the constitution.

The National Assembly completed its constituent work on October 23, at least with regard to the new constitutional act. This act can be summarized in four articles:

- 1, The right to work;
2. Universal suffrage;
3. The division of powers;
4. The faculty of revision.

The *right to work*, rejected after long debates during the discussion of article 8, was reproduced in more or less explicit terms in article 13.

What, in fact, is the *right to assistance*, recognized by the constitution in all cases where work is lacking, if not unemployment compensation?

And what is the promise of developing labor through primary and vocational education, through credit institutions, through association, through the organization of public works, if not still the guarantee of labor to the extent of human power, of the powers of society?...

As for *universal suffrage*, the constitution has done little more than declare it; it does not organize it. Universal suffrage, applied as we have done until now — and we have seen it, we know

it from experience — is an excellent institution for making the people say, not what they think, but what we want from them. With universal suffrage, defined as it is in the Constitution, the people will vote in turn for monarchy and republic, religion and atheism, liberty and servitude, equality and privilege. Everything still needs to be done on this front: patriots take note!

The *division of powers* is a remnant of what we call POLITICS, and which is only the eternal disappointment of liberty. It is the splitting of what is most radically indivisible, of that of which the division implies contradiction, the will of the sovereign. In society, as in man, the functions are diverse, but the will is essentially one: this is what the National Assembly has not understood. The fear of despotism threw it into antagonism, into anarchy.

Now, after having caused division in the State and confusion in universal suffrage, the best thing the National Assembly had to do was to reserve for itself the permanent faculty of *revision*. Thanks to this faculty, we can now carry out all social, political, legislative reforms, without collision or catastrophe.

Once the Constitution had been passed, the time of its implementation remained to be determined. This is what the National Assembly did, by setting December 10 for the election of the President of the Republic. This is the object that preoccupies public opinion at the moment, which agitates all heads, which sets all intrigues in motion, which seems to keep the Revolution, the PRESIDENCY breathless!

The candidacies present themselves, some officially, before the nation and in full Parliament; others, with more modesty, in the narrow circle of bourgeois, dynastic or popular nuances.

The names circulating at the moment are those of the citizens:

Louis-Napoléon Bonaparte, son of Louis Bonaparte and nephew of the emperor;

Napoleon Bonaparte, son of Jérôme Bonaparte, nephew of the emperor.

And why not also Pierre-Napoléon Bonaparte, son of Lucien Bonaparte and nephew of the emperor?

General Cavaignac, head of the executive power;

General Bugeaud, victor at Isly;

De Lamartine, member of the provisional government;

Ledru-Rollin, member of the provisional government;

Dufaure, Minister of the Interior;

Molé, president of the council under Louis-Philippe;

Thiers, president of the council under Louis-Philippe.

We will not talk about the Duke of Chambord and the Prince of Joinville, whose candidacies are, by law, declared unconstitutional.

Prince Louis-Napoléon Bonaparte presents his NAME as the title of his candidacy. We would have preferred that he presented something else; but since this NAME is enough for him, we declare, for our part, that logically and politically there is no reason to concern ourselves with this candidate. Reason and the Constitution also prevent the inheritance of a name from ever becoming, in France, a title to the inheritance of a function in the Republic.

The second of the Bonapartes offers more than a distant resemblance to the uncle. Nevertheless, of all the titles that can recommend him to voters, the greatest is still his name, the name of NAPOLEON.

As for Pierre-Napoléon Bonaparte, we can say of him that, as the son of Louis is the ambitious one of the family, and the son of Jérôme the diplomat, he is the Hercules. This is how the emperor's inheritance was distributed. To be a president, who should I prefer?

General Cavaignac cannot count on the votes of the working class. We do not accuse him, certainly; but the days of June brought bad luck to him, just as the repression of the Champ de Mars brought bad luck to Bailly and Lafayette. Let the people of the country unite to elect General Cavaignac: they owe it to the most sacred title, to the title of recognition.

Marshal Bugeaud is in the same position with regard to the people as Cavaignac. To the laurels of Isly he joins the cypress of the Transnonain. It is a candidacy that can only interest the bourgeoisie, to whom, in his intemperance of language, the marshal previously promised, if he was elected representative, to rush against the socialists.

M. de Lamartine is like the daughter of Ramsinith who built a pyramid of stones, which each of her lovers brought to her. M. de Lamartine, if we do justice to his innumerable contradictions, will be elected by everyone.

M. Ledru-Rollin owes it to the progressive nature of his mind to always be at the head of the most advanced opinions: he is the designated candidate of the extreme left and a part of socialism.

M. Dufaure is the man of the honest people, who, giving short shrift to parties and systems, demands above all of a statesman that he work and be honest. It was said of M. Dufaure that he was a transitional minister; he will be an immovable minister on the day we understand that history is a perpetual transition. We are not yet revolutionary enough for that.

M. Molé does not solicit for himself; he solicits for M. de Joinville: that is enough to say,

M. Thiers!... We have lost the right to speak about him. We only allow our readers to believe as much good about this character as they wish.

And now, Democratic Republicans and Socialists, who are we going to choose among all these candidates? And first, will we have a candidate? Should we vote? Should we abstain? On the one hand, the country is impatient to leave behind the provisional; on the other, the parties are eager to count themselves. Everyone wants to move forward, the *status quo* irritates the nation and kills it. What will our attitude be?

This is the question addressed to us from all sides.

We do not hesitate to answer, and we will try to prove this:

The presidency is the violation of principles; the presidency is royalty.

The presidency is the subordination of labor to capital;

The presidency is the antagonism of interests;

The presidency is the mystification of the people;

The presidency is the counter-revolution;

The presidency is financial feudalism;

The presidency is the conflict between powers;
The presidency is civil war.

We conclude that the people must abstain, so that the National Assembly is obliged to appoint the President of the Republic itself; because, if the President of the Republic is appointed by the Assembly, he is only the organ of the Assembly, the head of the ministry formed by the majority of the Assembly, and thus we enter into the truth of the principle, which is the undivided power.

And as it is to be presumed that the majority of the people, carried away by monarchical and reactionary intrigues, will not abstain, the minority, using the right given to it by article 109 of the Constitution, must address the National Assembly a petition to demand that the Constitution be immediately re-established referred to, and the part relating to the presidency deleted.

This is how, in our opinion, the people must respond to the question asked by the National Assembly by asking for a president.

In a future issue, we will deal in more depth with this imposing question of the presidency.

October 31.

PEOPLE'S BANK. — PREAMBLE

Today we are publishing our *Draft Statutes of the People's Bank*.

We will publish later, with the definitive and authentic act, the *Statement of Principles* that must form its complement. In the meantime, we deliver our thoughts to the meditations of all, friends and enemies. Whatever the criticism, and from wherever it comes to us, we solicit it in good faith. We will take advantage of the observations addressed to us, either to modify our statutes or to better elucidate their spirit and economy.

We do not claim to have guessed everything the first time; much less do we think that a banking reform embraces the reform of society itself and fulfills the program of the February Revolution. Nor do we think that it is impossible for philosophical speculation, starting from completely different points of view, to arrive at a complete understanding of this reform, now irrevocably inaugurated in the world. *By various paths*, says the proverb, *we arrive at such an end*, and we would be happy, for our part, to see bold thinkers undertaking by other paths the accomplishment of the work that we pursue by the arduous paths of the economic science.

But there are two things of which we are deeply and unshakably convinced: the first is that the specific character of the February Revolution is to be an economic revolution and, consequently, that it is through the economic problem that our generation must address the social problem; the second is that the economic problem is none other than the problem of centralization and free credit, according to the principle of direct and mutual exchange.

The demonstration of these two truths will form the substance of the *Statement of Principles* that we will have to publish shortly; and we have the firm hope that this declaration will be such that every mind of good faith will say to itself after reading it: The February Revolution is over, because it is defined in its idea; and the idea is the fact.

We hope, I say, using only the light provided by the economic principle of mutuality of services and free credit, to show everything that, in the sphere of social institutions, it is possible to achieve for the well-being of the people, and to provide for the future of humanity.

All our ideas about religion, metaphysics, morality, right, government, association, art itself; all our controversies, in a word all our philosophy, will flow from this great principle of *equality of functions*, a principle whose first corollary is the unproductivity of capital; the first application, free credit, corresponding to the abolition of all parasitism and all privileges; the first and greatest result, the formation of the individual in the image of society.

Now, if ancient religion, if the hackneyed systems of philosophy, if the old political constitutions, if judicial routine, if the old forms of community and association, as well as of literature and art, were only particular formulas of the material state of societies, is it no obvious that, this state coming to change, in other words, the public economy being revolutionized from top to bottom by the change of relationship between the two great forces of production, labor and capital, everything changes in society, religion, philosophy, politics, literature and the arts.

It is therefore on economic reform that we must focus, as the great revolutionary lever of the 19th century. And since, in matters of revolution, the legislator must always act by the integral method and avoid detailed procedures, it is by general circulation, not by the organization of this or that workshop, of this or that commune; It is through credit institutions, not through the association of this or that category of producers, that we must begin our work as socialists and revolutionaries.

(There follows the draft statutes of the Banque du Peuple, which can be read in volume VI of the Complete Works.)

We are overtaken, overwhelmed; we are defeated! Here comes, on the one hand, M. Mathieu (from Drôme) with a project of 400 million assignats with state *buildings* as security and *forced tender*.

We had believed until now, poor ignoramuses that we are, that a credit paper must have a stock, not instruments of labor, but products (currency or others), and draw its guarantee of payment, not from the force of bayonets, but from the prior acceptance of the citizens. It is according to these principles that the project of the *Bank of the People*, the statutes of which we are publishing today, was designed. The democrats of yesterday, the socialists of tomorrow, are more advanced than us, and their ideas, — my goodness! — give a hundred blows to our own. 400 million assignats, 400 million notes without pledge or acceptance! Good God! We are in full Jacobinism!

Here comes, on the other hand, M. Portalis, a Republican, conservative regarding the family and property, with a tax system that ruins property, that abolishes inheritance and consequently the family, that cuts off the billion of compensation, that *breaks the pipe and cuts the plug* of all the tobacco consumers!

We thought, we miserable socialists, that it was not by stealthily stripping the proprietor of his income, but by gradually changing the very principle of income, that we should work towards the establishment of equality of fortune; — we imagined that, heredity not being the *effective cause* of the inequality of property, but a simple mode of *transmission*, born from the constitution of the family, it was not necessary to attack heredity, but the very origin of property; — we supposed that the inequality of tax being only the corollary of the inequality of fortune, it was this inequality that had to be attacked, and that, without this, all changes in the system of taxation would do nothing about it; — we were of the opinion, finally, that all the governments that succeed one another in a country are in solidarity with each other, and that one of them is no longer permitted to renounce the commitments of its predecessors for a debtor to pay his debts by going bankrupt.

We were wrong about all of this. M. Portalis, like M. Mathieu (from Drôme), proved to us that we were only children when it came to revolution. May the good Lord reward M. Mathieu (from Drôme) and M. Portalis! We were considered *partageux*, plunderers, anarchists, destroyers of the family, because we wanted an amicable liquidation which, changing everything, would save everything; who granted all legitimate claims, guaranteed acquired positions, reconciled all interests! Thanks to M. Portalis, thanks to M. Mathieu (from Drôme), we are now nothing more than conservatives, moderates; we will soon be honest people!

We are avenged!

The Presidency.

November.

Muse of the pamphlet, of the revolutionary pamphlet, put on your Phrygian cap, brandish your pike, and let's sing the Marseillaise! To me Desmoulins, to me Rouget de l'Isle, to me Chénier, Paul-Louis, Béranger, Cormenin! lend me your features and your flames. Old Lamennais, don't you still have a few words for believers? Come too, young poet who put the misery of the worker into bloody rhymes. The counter-revolution approaches, seated on a sack of crowns, full of the wine of the wrath of kings. Faubouriens, to arms! Mountaineers, gird your scarves!... And you, Lagrange, my friend, who swore to die for the sovereignty of the People, take your capsules and your rifle! Let the tocsin ring! let the lanterns, the lanterns light up like in the February nights! may the Choir of the Girondins, may the Song of Departure resound, may the voice of the cornet fill my heart with holy enthusiasm! I hear the cries of the monarchists, the lackeys of capital, the exploiters of the proletariat: Let us celebrate, let us celebrate, slaves, the coming of our master! Christmas, Christmas, we are going to appoint the PRESIDENT! Christmas, Christmas, LONG LIVE THE KING!....

But no, friends, no emotion! It's the dynastic carnival. Let's stay at home, blushing and blue! and since God willed it, and men allow it, let us look out of the window, with crossed arms, at this descent of the Courtille!

I. That the presidency is the monarchy.

You said it, Cavaignac, and I heard it with my ears: France will prove, by the choice of its president, whether it is republican or not.

So you people believed that the question of the Republic was resolved by the February sweep? — Poor fools!

Did you think it was resolved by the demonstration of March 17? — Fools !

Did you think it was resolved by the April elections, the first application of universal suffrage? — Tasteless!

Did you believe it was resolved, on May 5, by the accession of the People's Plenipotentiaries? — Who ? gentlemen of the National Assembly? your representatives? Are they committed to something? did they take an oath?...

Did you believe the question of the Republic was judged, confirmed by the vote on the Constitution? — But the Constitution is the question.

The Constitution, I tell you, has only posed to the country the question of the Republic. Now it is up to the country and the peasant to resolve it. We will know in six weeks if France is republican or not!...

Well done, constituents! You want your daughter to remain a virgin, and you start by marrying her off? Do you then take the Republic for a Victoria, which you put as a condition which will make it a monarchy? And you pretend that we loved her, your matron! May we, sons of Liberty, have faith in her virtue! that we take his wedding cloth for our flag? Have you forgotten what La Vivandière sang on her return from Moscow:

When it came to numbers it was necessary to give in

The unfaithful victory, What did I not have to guide you
What the MAID had!

Ah! citizen representatives, that your Constitution feels like places you have frequented for too long!... I mean the Charles school, nothing else. You excite, in the country, the monarchical craving; the country will answer you with a monarchy.

Every country, every taste. In France, the People, who care little about parliamentary subtleties, but who have keen hearing and a sharp tongue, the People only know and understand one thing: it is that he who commands others, who acts, who executes, in a word who governs, he is the master of the house. And when we talk to her about a young lady from a good house who needs a protector, a friend, to keep her company, manage and administer her property, lead her out into the world, watch over her at night, the People immediately understand that they must marry her! Marion cries, Marion screams, Marion wants to be married off!

Your president will be king, I tell you, or will be nothing at all. And if you want to chat for a moment, I promise to show it to you, crystal clear.

Would you have by any chance imagined, our Solons and our Lycurgies, that the People having to marry off their daughter, the Republic, would go and give her a manant such as you or me? — Cavaignac, Lamartine, Ledru-Rollin or Thomas Diafoirus? — Who, a soldier, a rhymist, a bachelor! President of the Republic ! Crazy as you are! Do the People know this world? Does he worry about their stripes or their diplomas?... What the People need, for the Republic, what they ask for, is a good male, of strong neck and noble race .

The People are little worried, believe me, about the distinction between the legislative and the executive. The executive, for him, is everything. Another will undoubtedly be the notary, another the fiancé. Provided that the president acts quickly and well, he will, in the judgment of the People, have enough spirit. His virility will make his merit, and habet mea mentula mentem! Your legislature is a eunuch, something below nothing!

Hey! tell me: Has a despot ever lacked legislation, constitutions and traditions to contain his ardor and moderate his youth? This, however, never did the slightest harm to despotism.

The laws of Moses, the charter of the Jewish people, were written long before they had kings. This did not prevent the Hebrew melks from being kings in the full force of the term, and despot kings. However, the bourgeoisie of Israel had only heard orders from the executive power; they had reserved the registry for themselves.

The law of the XII tables and the entire Roman Constitution had existed for a long time when the Caesars came, who only added the title, ancient in the Republic, of emperor, to that of consul, which had previously been borne by the heads of the executive power. . Were the Caesars any less AUTOCRATS, very good, very pious, very clement, very august, I want that; but finally autocrats? Now, autocracy, the fullness of executive power, was the same thing as autonomy, the fullness of legislative power: the magnanimous emperors made this clear!

Doesn't Russia have its institutions, its laws, its castes, etc., against which the genius of Peter the Great, Catherine and Nicholas has been fighting for two centuries? – Well ! Nicolas is an absolute monarch, or despot.

Do you believe that in France, before 89, there was no constitution, no parliament, no law? And yet the king, because he did things, because he alone had the right to do them to do, was deemed the living law. If the king wants, if the law wants! he was still a despot. And when the semi-republican Constitution of 1790 was made, Louis XVI, head of the executive power by this Constitution, was still so completely the master, despite the paraphernal contract which bound him, that it was enough for him to be right to the Republic, to respond to her, when she made some loving request to him: I don't want to! and hold still!...

Didn't the constitutional system exist ready-made, and weren't the materials of the codes, the principles of administration there, when Bonaparte arrived? Was the Constitution of Year VIII, which the general swore to observe, the work of Sieyès, not the summary of ideas and previous experience? Didn't Bonaparte, all in all, govern solely by virtue of laws, customs, and institutions that he had not made, and that he had found?—But he had executive power, and well Although he had initially been given to the Republic only as a guardian, he did with it everything he wanted... He was emperor and despot.

Were not the Charter of 1814, and that of 1830, in turn the necessary preliminary to the advent of the last two dynasties? Had we not taken care to stipulate that the king could not do anything that was not provided for in the contract? But it was also said that the head of state would exercise conjugal rights; and what is left for the girl's father when the husband and wife sleep together? . I maintain that the royal power was even greater, under the last two dynasties, than it had been under the old regime. Don't you know that every obligation presupposes reciprocity? The more you hinder the stallion, the more you inflame his virtue.

You think you're pissing off your president because you're putting obstacles in his way! I tell you that you only irritate his passion and make it more irresistible. Have I not heard you all say, about the presidency, as was formerly said about the constitutional monarchy, that the president, omnipotent for good, would be powerless for evil? as if, in matters of government, any more than in matters of marriage, man could answer for his works!... Do you know, by chance, the secret of having boys or girls at will?...

Your president will be all-powerful, that is enough. The People, who know very well that in such a matter who can think, the People laugh at your distinctions. The future will be vigorous, I warn you. That's not all, he will be noble. Do not be afraid that the People, who know their stuff, will make a misalliance for their ward.

We declaim, we joke wildly, about Louis Bonaparte. Some, like Antony Thouret, go as far as indignation. For me, after thinking about it, I am of the prince's opinion: I find that his true title to the presidency is precisely to be nothing of what his envious people ask of him, neither a man of war, nor a man of businessman, nor statesman. His title is to be Napoleon. France, monarchical to the core, asks for nothing more. So don't forget that the President of the Republic is above all the husband of the Republic: the rest will come to him with marriage. Those are very wrong, in my opinion, who, confusing, as the proverb says, the good Lord with the plums, go to search the life of the candidate, slander his intentions, prejudice his principles, or even ask him a program !...

What ! this brainless person wants to reign over France! exclaims an onlooker Republican, who would need a great man to govern the State! he who entered Strasbourg one morning, in yellow breeches and a little hat, to the cries of Long live the emperor! let himself be caught in a dead end like a badger in a burrow!

He who almost started war between two friendly nations, as a price for the hospitality that one gave him, and the forgiveness that the other had disdainfully granted him!

He who, guilty of the same crime as the Duke of Enghien, should have been treated like the Duke of Enghien, if the Swiss government and the French government had done justice!

Him whom we later saw returning to France via Boulogne, an eaglet on his fist, like a falconry varlet!

He whom the court of peers sent for his health to the fort of Ham, to the whistles and bursts of laughter of all the Parisians!

He who, thanks to some connivance of those in power, escaped from prison, disguised in a blouse, with a board on his shoulder, and broke his pipe while passing over the drawbridge, as he recounted in the story of his escape, written by himself, Temblaire edition, price a penny!...

He who has since been a town sergeant in London!

Who played the comedy at Eglington!

Who, twice, mounted the platform of the National Assembly, got away with it like Madame Mansion, Who said neither yes nor no!

Napoleon is funny, with his broken pipe! with his eagle! with her skin panties!...

But, continues another, in more parliamentary language, undoubtedly his highness is like the parrot of Normandy, who, if he does not sing, thinks no less. In the absence of an Italian campaign, a treaty of Gampo-Formio, an Egyptian expedition, will we at least have a program?

We know the ideas of M. de Lamartine; we know, more or less, what citizen Ledru-Rollin wants, what Messrs. Thiers and Mole want. Cavaignac Bugeaud, if their policy leaves something to be desired, can invoke their service records. But Louis Bonaparte?...

I ask Louis Bonaparte:

If he renounces the rights conferred on him by certain senatus-consulte of 1804, invoked by him against Louis-Philippe, during the Strasbourg expedition? consequently, if he claims to base his candidacy on something other than the will of the People?

If, having not voted on the main articles of the Constitution, he believes he can, with security of conscience, take an oath to the Constitution?

If he accepts the Democratic Republic, one and indivisible, as defined by the Constitution; or if he is for the democratic and social Republic?

If it is true that he lets himself be called Monseigneur?

If he believes in the duration of peace in Europe, and why? If he would be in favor of intervention in Italy, in Poland and elsewhere, and on what would he base, in view of the opinion of the country and European diplomacy, the usefulness for us and the legitimacy of this intervention?

If it is true that he took advice from England and Russia regarding his candidacy, as is rumored; or if he sticks to the pleasure of French voters? If he has a system of credit to substitute for the present system, which, in the moment of peril, betrays both the country and the State, and what is this system?

If he considers all kinds of paper money as a counterfeit of assignats, and how does he think he will solve the problem of agricultural credit?

If he believes it is possible to reduce the strength of the army, to reduce the budget figure, and how?

If he admits the right to work, or if he rejects it? What are his ideas on recruitment, colonization, judicial organization, the council of state, municipal and departmental freedoms, freedom of the press, freedom of education, progressive taxation? etc., etc.

If, after having seen the men of the left, the right, the center, we even say socialists! — does he intend to create a government of conciliation, or a government of exclusion? In either case, where are his sympathies, his preferences?...

— Well ! interrupts a republican of the next day, well known to Charivari, Jérôme Paturot, on this point, you ask Prince Louis his program! You have this program; it is the Extinction of Pauperism, a volume in-32, Paris, rue Neuve-des-Petits-Champs, n° 36. — The Extinction of Pauperism, do you hear? What more do you want? The Emperor dreamed about it for twenty years, without being able to resolve the problem. Now, what Napoleon the Great could not do, Napoleon the Younger will accomplish. Because Napoleon the Younger is a socialist, even a communist, no offense. Here is his system.

He posits, page 5, that the prosperity of a country depends on general prosperity.

Alongside this luminous, fruitful principle, he poses this minor, no less marvelous, pages 6, 7, 8, 9, — that commerce, industry, agriculture, administration, are undermined by an organic vice , which organic vice consists mainly in the egalitarian division of properties.

He concludes with the necessity, to save the. country, to recreate large property, and to organize work on new bases.

This organization, according to the Napoleonic reformer, will be as follows:

In each department and commune, workers and proletarians will appoint industrial tribunals, at the rate of one industrial tribunal per ten workers;

There will be one director for every ten industrial tribunals; And for ten directors a governor. The industrial tribunal will have the rank of non-commissioned officer; the directors that of captain; governors that of colonel.

The workers will be considered simple soldiers. — They will be organized militarily. (Page 28.)

Agricultural colonies will be formed by them, to which the 6 million 127,000 hectares of currently uncultivated land will be delivered. These colonies will serve both as reservoirs for free industry, which will take the workers it needs, and as outlets for the overflow of the population. (Page 26.)

The industrial tribunals will be responsible, jointly with the mayors of the communes, for sending to these colonies the men that free industry cannot employ; and conversely to provide the industry with the subjects it may need. (Page 27.)

The settlers will be housed in 4 m cob and wattle barracks. 60 by 2 m. 90. Discipline will be severe there; life HEALTHY (sic), but harsh; the simplest possible maintenance. Accommodation, pay, food, clothing, regulated according to army rates (page 30), and limited to what is strictly necessary. (Page 96.)

Individuals without work will find in these establishments to use their strengths and their intelligence for the benefit of the community. (Page 23.)

The colonies, when they are in full production, must give, thanks to the modest pay, immense profits, these profits will be used to buy new lands; because, observes the author with sovereign reason, any system which does not contain within itself a means of continual growth is defective. (Page 32.)

Agricultural colonies will therefore have the ease of extending their domain, of multiplying their establishments, (page 33), to the detriment, of course, of private property, which will gradually have to disappear.

Thus, while through our egalitarian law properties are divided more and more – which brings us closer and closer to the democratic regime – Napoleonic communism will rebuild great property and great culture. (Page 33.)

And when there will no longer be any land left in France to buy and property to invade, the company will establish branches in Algeria, in America itself (page 34): the entire globe will pass through. Wherever there is a hectare of land to clear and acquire, the community of Louis-Napoléon will be there with its capital, with its army of workers, with its incessant activity. (ibid.)

To organize the work in this way, and convert the country into military communities, it will cost, all rectifications made to the calculations of Prince Louis, approximately 160 MILLION PER YEAR to the country (see the estimate of his imperial highness, pages 35 to 43.)—This sum of 160 million will be paid, as a matter of justice and reason, by rural and industrial property, since it is for the benefit of this property, and to rid it of the proletariat, that agricultural colonies must be founded .

Do you ask Napoleon-Louis Bonaparte about his program, his system? There is, I repeat, this program; Last September, it was in its fourth edition. Abducted as it is by the inhabitants of the countryside, who all applaud the ideas of the future emperor, it is not surprising that the representatives of the People, in Paris, are unaware of it.

Ah! you didn't want Louis Blanc's innocuous organization! Well ! You will be organized, hands down, by M. Constable.

Ah! you didn't want the phalanstery! Well ! Napoleon the Younger will have you housed in barracks!

Ah! you didn't want the community any more than you wanted conscription! Well ! you will all be soldiers, soldiers for life, just as Napoleon will be president. Your women will be

canteenkeepers; your boys, drums; your daughters, at twelve years old, will make eyes at the tourlourous.

Ah! you were complaining about the 48 cents of the Republic! You will pay 90 with the emperor.

Ah! you thought it was too heavy, a budget of 1840 million! You'll get it for two billion, plus the mess community.

Ah! ah! fellows! we will teach you what freedom, equality and fraternity are!

So says Jérôme Paturot.

Shame on France! shouts a mountain man with a red beard and flat hair at these words: shame and curse! We are still the same race, vain, hypocritical and cowardly! And we dare to take the initiative for civilization and progress! We who for fourteen centuries have kissed the soles of 60 tyrants; we who massacred our brothers the Albigensians and the Huguenots, guilty of having demanded freedom of conscience; we who proscribed the industry of our country, because it protested against the Pope; we whom avarice alone made revolutionaries in 89, and who, fed up with national goods, quickly returned to despotism; we who abandoned the Vaubans and the Turgots, while we caressed the Louvois and the Abbots Terray; we who let our inventors and our artists die of hunger; we who subsist only on counterfeits and plagiarisms: we who today have no national constitution, no national philosophy, no national art, who have allowed even our national literature to perish; we who have adored and condemned in turn Legitimacy, the Republic, the Empire, the Restoration, the Quasi-Restoration, as incapable of living with our kings as of doing without kings; we who have never known how to play hide and seek with freedom!—What good does it do us to have produced Montaigne, Rabelais, Bayle, Descartes, Molière, Montesquieu, Voltaire, Rousseau, Buffon, Diderot, Dalember, Condillac, Condorcet, Volney, the richest, most dazzling series of free thinkers? For us, philosophical agitation has never been anything other than a dispute between churchwardens, the political movement nothing more than a quarrel between robins and gentlemen. The first soldiers of freedom, in the street: by the fireside, court servants and church rats.

Come then, Napoleon, come and take possession of this race of tartufes, of this people of courtiers. They say you're just a moron, an adventurer, a madman. You acted as police and acted; you have all the makings, except for the ferocity which is no longer of our age, of Nero and Caligula. Come, I tell you, you are the man we need. Come and bring these bourgeois to reason; come and take their last child and their last crown! Come and avenge socialism, communism, Fourierism, cabetism! Come: the apostates of all kingdoms are there waiting for you, ready to make you a litter of their consciences as of their women! Your uncle Jérôme said, in his petition to Louis-Philippe, that he only asked, upon returning to France, to live and die as a French citizen. But you understood it: your family was reserved for greater things; there was a lack of glory in the name of the Bonapartes. Come and end our discord by taking our liberties! Come and consume the shame of the French people! Come, come, come!...

To these invectives, to these sarcasms, Napoleon-Louis has only one thing to say, but to which I defy anyone to find a reply: France is mad; she needs a MAN!.. In the absence of a man, she would not back down for a donkey!...

What are you talking about titles, programs, financial solutions, the right to work, respect for property? – Napoleon falls to us like Priapus in the War of the Gods. As soon as he appears, the others are nothing but pranks around him

Now would you like me to tell you the reason for all this, why at this moment we feel such a great need to give ourselves a king! I will satisfy you. But first, let me tell you an apologue.

II. That the principle of monarchy, like anarchy, is politics.

At the end of the Middle Ages, a book appeared, a strange book, written in Latin, with the title *De auctoritate papae*, that is to say, on the possibility for Christians to do without a pope.

In this writing, conscientious, impartial, learned, strong in logic and authority, the author placing himself from the point of view of certain sectarians, examined what would become of the Roman church, of Catholicism as a whole, and, as a result of religion itself, if, as Jean Hus and the others wanted, the pope was removed.

And he proved, and he arrived at this conclusion, which is the basis of all the controversy that the great Bossuet later maintained against the Protestant churches:

That if the authority of the pope were shaken, the Church of Rome, of which the pope is the particular bishop, would immediately lose its primacy among the churches:

That then Catholicism, lacking visible center and unity, would be nothing more than an assembly of independent churches, equal in authority and jurisdiction;

Since none of these churches could be judged, reproached or condemned by the others, the faith would lose its character of universality, and as a necessary and universal thing, would become an individual and local thing;

That through the incessant movement and indiscreet curiosity of the human spirit, the Christian faith, no longer having either government or traditional paradigm, would be given over to change, to instability, to innovations, and consequently would tend towards inevitable dissolution;

That the ecclesiastical bond coming to be broken, and the spirits no longer having a guide, Christian dogma, running through the entire chain of heresies, would end, through an imperceptible degradation, in deism;

That deism led inevitably to pantheism;

That pantheism was only a step on the road to atheism;

That atheism was resolved in Pyrrhonism, and finally Pyrrhonism in nihilism, in the negation of God, man and the universe!

So that, following the reasoning of this theologian, on the recognition of the pope and his sandals, depended the existence, not only of Catholicism, not alone. still of the Christian faith, but of natural religion, but of reason and philosophy.

So finally, that between the belief in the infallibility of the Pope and the most absolute, the most absurd Pyrrhonism, there was no middle ground where reason could be established; that it

was necessary to choose between one or the other, on pain of remaining in libertinage, that is to say of being only a bad joker and a reasoner in bad faith.

And singularly, the event justified this theologian's prediction. Wherever the spirit has rebelled against the pope, either in the name of local spiritual authority, as the Gallicans did in France; either in the name of free examination, as happened for the Protestants; either by a distinction between fact and law, as the Jansenists wanted; we have seen the Catholic and Christian faith resolve little by little into a pure deism; and as deism is, like all middle-ground opinions, nothing more than a hypocrisy, the immense majority of nations were suddenly plunged into indifference and libertinism. There is not a minister of the Augsburg confession who recognizes the divinity of Christ: ask M. Athanase Coquerel! — there is not one who has the courage to declare himself a Pyrrhonian. It's the same thing for Catholics. We talk about religion, we invoke Christ, we pray to God, we commend ourselves to the Eternal, we hope in the Supreme Being. Hypocrisy! hypocrisy! we no longer believe in anything; we only adore our fantasy and our good pleasure; there is no more faith than good faith, neither on this side of the Rhine nor beyond.

And what is true in Europe of the pope, is true in Asia of the great lama, true of the muphti, true of every priesthood and every religion. Wherever you suppress visible authority, you destroy faith; and, with faith destroyed, you either arrive at nothingness, or you create arbitrariness, libertinage.

However, as it is equally repugnant to reason to rush into absolute doubt, or to admit the infallibility of the pope, and as on the other hand experience and logic have demonstrated millions of times that between these extremes there is no honorable course, no possible station, that this is a truth which has become *res judicata*, the first dogma of all philosophy, it was necessary to seek, OUTSIDE this fatal line, a solid point where could hold on to reason.

And here is what we discovered.

We realized that this logical fatality, which invincibly leads reason to slavery through superstition, or to suicide through doubt, had its cause in a certain disease or hallucination of thought, known in the school under the name ONTOLOGY. Ontology is what caused the despair of poor Christians as well as free thinkers: it was the nightmare of reason and societies. What, you will ask me, is ontology?

Ontology is this hypothesis that no one had thought to challenge until now, because it seems so natural! and which consists of affirming the substantial distinction between matter and spirit!... I have no desire, believe me, to bog you down in this metaphysical rut; I have already said too much for a pamphlet. I only repeat, and I attest to the experience of the last four centuries, and the libertinism of ours, that for anyone who believes in ontology, for anyone who admits the reality, whether of matter, or of spirit, or of these two natures together, but separated, for this one, there is no middle ground: either he is the servant of the Pope, or he is the disciple of Pyrrho.

For those, on the contrary, who do not recognize the authority of ontology, who consider matter and spirit, no longer as real substances, but as the two general faces of BEING; for these, I say, the emancipation is complete. They no longer have anything to fear from the indulgences of the Pope, nor from the seductions of Mephistopheles. Their dialectic, established on solid ground,

works unflinchingly towards the construction of human science, the understanding of religion and progress.

In another order of ideas, the one with which we are concerned today, something quite similar happens.

For fourteen centuries, France has asked itself the question of *auféribilitate régis* — whether it is possible to do without a king? — without having been able to resolve it until now.

The secret inclination of the country, the indocility of the national character constantly pushes minds towards democracy; experience and theory continually bring them back to despotism, to the authority of a single person. It is demonstrated, for anyone who wanted to see it, that between monarchical good pleasure and universal anarchy, two equally inadmissible extremes, there is no tenable position: those who believed it were hit with the nickname of *doctrinaires*; they have already lost the Republic once, and the Monarchy three or four times.

So, on the one hand, we continue to demolish royalty; on the other, anarchy, the last term of democracy, horrifies us. Monarchy in France is impossible; the republic impossible; all adjacent terms impossible; we can neither live nor die, and as if to attest to our indelible contradiction, we take as our motto both freedom and order! — Get out of there!!!

It is a poor philosophy to accuse in turn of the revolutionary oscillations of our unfortunate country, sometimes the stupidity, sometimes the Machiavellianism of princes, or the corruption of ministers, as well as to attack the violence of democratic passions and to the division of demagogues. It is always to allege the fact in explanation of the

fact, prove revolution by revolution. What brings about the tyranny and bad faith of the monarch is the organic impossibility of the system; which produces the anarchy of the democrats, which means that at this very moment the French people, republican in heart and spirit, will appoint, swearing and grumbling, a President of the Republic, and begin again the restoration of the royalty is still the same impossibility. Could we then, once, escape from this fatal alternative, much more interesting for the People than the quarrel between the Papists and the Protestants?

I know your impatience, dear reader, and I don't want to keep you waiting.

What produces the unfortunate situation in which we find ourselves at the moment, after having already fallen into it so many times, is a certain disease of opinion, known since ancient times, and which Aristotle, great philosopher, great historian, great naturalist, named POLITICS.

Politics is in human affairs what we believe in the question of salvation: it is a hypothesis which makes government a thing, not of reason, but of skill; not of science, but of feeling (call this feeling what you will, ambition, pride, dedication or patriotism), continually tends to distinguish in the State two people, two wills, one who thinks the other who executes.

Now, if there is one thing proven in philosophy and in history, it is that, whatever way the division is made, whatever balance we put between the attributions; that we make the entire nation legislator and sovereign, and the king simple agent of its wishes; or the despot alone wishes and orders what all the citizens will then have to carry out; or, finally, that legislative power be entrusted to one or more assemblies of representatives, and executive power to a council of directors or ministers; always, because there will be distinction, there will be opposition,

antagonism, impossibility, there will always be revolution and catastrophe. Thought and action must be indivisibly united in government, as in man: this is the starting point of the new criticism. As a result of this principle, the National Assembly, representing the nation, exercises all powers, the executive power as well as the legislative power, not by delegation to ministers, as assumed by both the Grévy amendment and the Flocon amendment, as most democrats still suppose, but by itself, by dividing the work between its committees, which each appoint their minister and their agents, unless ratified and controlled by the Assembly.

Moreover, all citizens being equal, all being supposed, consequently, to participate in the government and the law, it follows that the government and the law must arise from an exact and mathematical science, which no longer has anything personal, occasional, circumstantial, but which, absolute in its principles and conclusions, implies the consent and adhesion of all citizens, this mode of participation in government and in the law being the only one possible in a democracy of 36 millions of men!

This, once again, is what the new reformers, generally known as socialists, said about politics.

Socialists are opposed to politicians, just as idealists, those who deny ontology, are to materialists and psychologists. For the former, politics is alternately and indifferently anarchy or arbitrary; as ontology is for idealists, alternately and indifferently, the cult of indulgences or absolute doubt. As for politicians, arbitrariness is all they want: without arbitrariness, in fact, it is obvious that they would be nothing.

Socialism aspires to govern society through positive science: politics is just fantasy.

Socialism says, for example: As long as the worker's salary is not equal to his product, the worker will be robbed, and production, instead of providing wealth, will create misery. This is demonstrated, this is as certain as two and two make four. We must therefore find a formula for industrial operation which, while respecting all freedoms, taking into account all abilities, provides a means of balancing work and salary. — It's possible, said the politician, but these things are not good to say; we must refer to revolutionary tradition. Let's take care of getting rid of the ministers and changing the prefects!

Socialism says: The true and real brotherhood of nations consists in the free communication of their ideas, in the circulation of their products and in the just balance of their exchanges. As long as you have not, at once and through the same general economic operation, abolished customs and guaranteed national work, the people, whatever you do, will be divided by interests, separated by barriers. : they will be enemies. "It's still possible," replies the politician; but I know nothing about your balance of trade, and I worry about it like that. Let's start by tearing up the treaties of 1815; let us march to the aid of Italy and Poland; let's send a garrison to Ancona!...

Socialism also says: We must centralize credit, reduce the interest rate, organize direct and mutual exchange.

Because the right to work is nothing other than the right to capital;

The right to capital, today that everything is appropriated, can only be exercised, for those who own nothing, through credit;

And credit, where mortgage lacks, is exchange.

As long as you have not found a way to create wealth for all through ease of circulation, the extension of markets, free exchange, the people will be miserable, poorly fed, poorly housed, poorly clothed, vicious, villainous, ignorant, subject to all infirmities of body and soul. This is proven by A plus B, sure as an algebra proposition. .

—And what do algebra and me have in common? Politics cries out at this point. I don't know anything about your x's. I'm going to decree 400 million assignats, too bad for the last bearers! take a billion from the rich, too bad for the citizens who will not be poor! abolish heredity, too bad for the poor who have rich parents! tax luxury items, too bad for luxury workers! do national workshops, too bad for free industry! freedom is not national. I know a lot about political economy! Doesn't it have my name? am I not his godmother?...

Socialism resumes: The affairs of a nation must be administered like those of a limited company, following the rules of economic science and accounting, by agents whose attributions are rigorously defined, reporting directly to the assembly of shareholders, and controlled at all times by a supervisory board. Authority must remain one, impersonal; functions be separated, work divided, jobs coordinated...

— I tell you that political economy is the servant of politics, replies the latter, and you, you are a sleeper of the people, you are not revolutionary. I'm talking to you about the constitution, the constitution, do you hear? that is to say separation of powers, and you answer me with the separation of jobs!... It is about government, and you are concerned with balance! We are in the hierarchy, and you are saving money!... So, dreamy socialism, let the world go as it goes, and mind your own business!

—Ah! then cries socialism, lying politics, hypocritical politics, I know you, I know what you are asking!

You are today what you were sixty years ago; you always want to start the story again; under the name of democracy, it is royalty that you call for. Hey, do you recognize yourself in this prophetic painting? Look at :

Parallel eras of French history. 1789-1800 1848.

Louis XVI, king LOUIS-PHILIPPE, king.

Mirabeau Lamartine.

Lafayette Cavaignac.

Robespierre Ledru-Kollin.

Banas. Thiers.

BONAPARTE, emperor. BONAPARTE, emperor.

Is it clear now that by voting for the presidency you are voting for the monarchy? Is it clear that Lamartine, Cavaignac and Ledru-Rollin, who hardly suspect it, are leading you straight to Bonaparte? Do you want, yes or no, cursed politics, to be of the People? do you want to be a socialist?...

There are two things that the less enlightened people understand: on the one hand, the presidency is the cornerstone of the monarchy, all democrats admit it; on the other hand, that to bring about a revolution, principles are needed. In 89, the revolution was more especially political;

it had its political principles which still govern us. In 1848, the revolution was more particularly economic and social; the political idea being exhausted, it is therefore necessary to discover new principles, absolute in theory, but which society will apply according to the measure of its strengths and its needs.

The Democrats, led by their political lantern, are not there yet.

Thus, after repeated votes against the presidency, they vote for the Constitution, that is to say the presidency, since without distinction of powers, in a word without presidency, there is no Constitution; — that is to say, they vote for the monarchy.

Those who do not vote abstain; that is to say that on the monarchical question, clearly posed by the Constitution, they have no say, they are indifferent.

And those, in very small numbers — ten or twelve! — who voted against the Constitution, nevertheless find it very good, very legitimate, very democratic, to then apply for the presidency, that is to say, to adhere to the Constitution! The principle is sacrificed to man, politics immolated to politics!

As for the principles which should govern the new society, the democrats are little worried about them, or rather they deny them. They declare that they are above all politicians, that they want to make a living in politics. Only, as the People are not quite of the same feeling, they say, murmuring, that it would be IMPOLITIC to openly reject socialism, and quickly they publish a manifesto, the most socialist, according to them, of all the manifestos.

Read instead:

Organization of work by the State;

Item of banks by state; State operation of railways;

Item of channels by state;

Item of mines by State;

State insurance item; Colonization by the State; State learning; Etc., etc., etc. by the State. Nothing by the citizens, everything by the State!

In vain socialism shouts to them that what they want is pure monarchy, pure despotism: they do not hear. The State, by itself, is unproductive; he doesn't work: it doesn't matter, we'll make him an organizer. The State is burdened: it is he who will give credit. The work entrusted to the State costs 50 percent more than it is worth: the State will be responsible for the most difficult operations.

Add to this system inventions like these:

Abolition of grants, — which will be replaced by another tax:

Abolition of indirect tax — precisely the only normal one, the only one consistent with principles, the only democratic and egalitarian one, when it has been established on its true basis.

Substitution of direct and progressive tax for all others: — which is precisely still recognizing the suzerainty of capital and consecrating the privilege.

Socialism says that we must make the People PRODUCE, through economic reform, liberty, equality and fraternity, just as they produce, through work, wealth. Politics confiscates freedom,

takes with one hand from property what it gives with the other to the proletariat; j and she calls it socialism.

How is it possible that the People, dazed, demoralized, torn in all directions, do not in the end take a disastrous resolution?

How, to speak here only of politics, when prudence and principles would dictate abstaining en masse, and referring the nomination of the President of the Republic to the National Assembly, how could the nation not fall into the trap set for his good faith? How could she escape the contradiction? How, after having voted for the Republic in April, could it not vote for the Monarchy in December? How, to a poorly asked question, would she give a reasonable answer?...

It is in vain that socialism, which seeks peace above all, which only wants to triumph through discussion, which addresses itself only to reason, shows the disastrous consequences of the political vote on the presidency, the boost given to royalist hopes, the coups d'état, the civil war!

Politics doesn't want to hear anything. According to her, agitation is necessary for political life; it needs brilliance, demonstrations, movement. When she doesn't find something to talk about, she finds something to talk about: she has what she wants, she's satisfied.

What politics seeks, alas, unless popular common sense comes to thwart its intrigues, it will obtain. The Constitution will pass there. Let us, please, examine this masterpiece of politics.

III. — That the Constitution, by organizing power, has organized discord.

In making the Constitution, the National Assembly, it must be done justice, showed more good will than judgment. She took every precaution imaginable to prevent the usurpation of the president. She embraced, swaddled, garrotted the head of the executive power, so as to make him a passive, docile and obedient instrument. Unfortunately, the National Assembly did not realize that its precautions were turning against itself, and that by virtue of the principles it itself laid down, if the President of the Republic, on the day of his arrival in power, seizes authority and throws representatives out the window, he would, after all, only conform to the Constitution, violated in its own articles and by its own authors.

If I were President of the Republic, here is the speech I would make to welcome me to the National Assembly:

a Citizen representatives,

“The Constitution is entirely contained in articles 20 and 43, which I will remind you of:

” Art. 20. The French people delegate LEGISLATIVE POWER to a single assembly.

” Art. 43. The French people delegate EXECUTIVE POWER to a citizen who receives the title of President of the Republic.

“These two articles pre-existed your mandate. They resulted, in fact, from the will of the People who demanded a Constitution and who sent you to create one; in law, from the principle recognized by you, article 19, and outside of which there is no Constitution, namely, that the separation of powers is the first condition of a free government.

“However, the Constitution that you have made, citizen representatives, is from start to finish the violation of this principle, this right and this fact. And the first act of my authority will be to claim vis-à-vis you the rights that I held from the People before I was designated by their votes,

even before you had proclaimed the Constitution, rights that you have arbitrarily, abusively, fraudulently sacrificed and unrecognized.

o By your article 49, you oblige the President of the Republic to take an oath, to the Constitution, in the presence of the National Assembly.

“I am ready to swear before God and men, but on condition that you in turn take the oath before my hands. Because the powers of the State are equal, both emanating from universal suffrage, equally subject to the Constitution, and reciprocally responsible, as a double manifestation of the sovereignty of the People. Why, I ask you, would the President of the Republic be required to swear when the representatives do not swear?

“By your article 48, you limit the duration of the presidency to four years, just as, by article 31, you limited the duration of your own mandate to three years. To that I have nothing to say. But you add that the President of the Republic can only be re-elected after four more years, while the representatives remain always and indefinitely re-electable.

“I would be unworthy of the votes of the People if I did not oppose this inequality of conditions between the powers, this insulting contradiction. Either I am your equal, citizen representatives, or I am nothing: I refer to article 19.

“You say, article 50: The president has the armed force without ever being able to command it in person.

“I will ask you, citizens, how you grant together free will and deprivation of authority; the prohibition of command and the quality of head of the executive power, and, what is more, of responsible head? Who will order, if I do not order? Will it be you, citizens? will it be the legislative power? Between you and me, there does not exist, there cannot exist any joint authority: I ask for the reform of this article.

“Article 53 states:

“The President of the Republic negotiates and RATIFIES the treaties. — BUT, he immediately adds, no treaty is final until it has been approved by the National Assembly,

“What difference, please, do you put between approval and ratification?... Obviously, it is no longer the executive power which executes here, it is the Assembly. Because approval is everything. What would you say about a supervisory board which, in a limited partnership, would act as administrator? You would say that in this society the powers are not divided, but combined; that *suisreilr* launch and management being the same thing, are no longer nothing... I ask, on article 53, that the second paragraph be deleted.

” Art. 54. He sees to the defense of the State, BUT he cannot undertake any war without the consent of the National Assembly.

a So again, it is the National Assembly which ensures the defense of the State; it is not the President of the Republic, who is nothing more than a sentinel on guard before the enemy.

“Or retain all powers before you, citizen Representatives; or, if the burden seems too heavy to you, and you value the Constitution, you will delete the second member of this article, which, without it, would be a flagrant violation of the constitutional principle.

” Art. 55. He has the right to pardon, BUT he can only exercise this right after having obtained the opinion of the Council of State. — Amnesties can only be granted by law.

“Always buts!” — But the Council of State is your creature, Citizen Representatives; but the Council of State is an office established by you, in order to assist you in your work; but if the President of the Republic must, for the exercise of his authority, take the opinion of the Council of State, the President of the Republic is no more than the prosecutor of the National Assembly! Trust me, scratch that but and what follows.

“By articles 57 and 58, under the pretext that you alone have the right to legislate, you deprive the President of the Republic of the right to oppose your decrees, even if he finds them unenforceable, and grant him only one month for promulgation.

o This is tyranny, Citizen Representatives. If you thought that the head of the executive power had to answer for the execution of laws that he had not made, while the very authors of the law remained irresponsible, you had to hold the executive as well as the legislative, and abolish the Constitution. Citizens, you will do one of two things: either you will grant the veto to the President of the Republic; or, failing the veto, you will give yourself a second Chamber for checks and balances; without this, we cannot walk in agreement and I declare today that I am opposed to the promulgation of your laws, I will not execute them.

“Art. 59. — In the absence of promulgation by the President of the Republic, within the period determined by the preceding article, it will be provided for by the President of the National Assembly.

“Usurpation of powers, conflict of authorities. I forbid you, citizen Representatives, from promulgating anything; otherwise, I object to your deliberations.

” Art. 65. He has the right to suspend, for a period which may not exceed three months, the agents of the executive power elected by the citizens.

“Am I then the head of the executive power, or am I only its instrument? Am I responsible or not?... I formally request the deletion of this incident, for a period which cannot exceed three months.

“He can only revoke them in the opinion of the Council of State.

“I forbid you, once and for all, to you and your Council of State from interfering in my attributions.

“Art. 68. The President of the Republic, ministers, etc., are responsible.

“I remind you, citizen Representatives, of the principle of separation and equality of powers. — Or the President of the Republic will only answer for the execution as the National Assembly answers for the legislation; that is to say, his person will be declared constitutionally inviolable, and elevated above all effective responsibility; or he will participate in the making of the law, and the law will result from the collaboration of the two powers, as our ancient public law said: *Lex fit consensu populi et constitutione régis*. You cannot want it otherwise without injustice, without danger to presidential authority and public order.

“Any measure by which the President of the Republic dissolves the National Assembly, prorogues it, or prevents the exercise of his mandate is a crime of high treason.

“Add then, citizen Representatives:

“Any encroachment on the part of the National Assembly “in the powers of the President of the Republic; “any usurpation of its powers, any impediment to the exercise of its authority, is a crime of high treason. »

“By this fact alone, the President is deposed,... executive power returns by right to the National Assembly.

“I request the deletion of these words: The executive power returns by right to the National Assembly, as unconstitutional, and implying this anarchic idea that the executive power is a delegation of the legislative.

Art. 75. The Council of State is consulted on government bills.

“Yes, if it is the pleasure of the President of the Republic. »

ail (I Council of State) proposes public administration regulations.

“Yes, again, when required by the President. »

“He alone makes those of these regulations with regard to which the National Assembly has given him a special delegation.

“I renew to your Council of State, all inhibitions and prohibitions against intervening in any way in the administration, of which I am the sole plenipotentiary head and responsible.

“These are the main articles of the Constitution for which I require immediate revision, with the modifications indicated by me.

a But that’s not all, Citizens,

“The decree of October 28, by which you fixed the day of my election, and to which I owe the signal honor of representing the French people before you, this decree contains a series of nullities to which I draw your patriotic attention .

a The day you voted for the Constitution, Citizen Representatives, that day, although not yet called, although not elected, I existed. I existed, I say, with the fullness of my rights, as the child in his mother’s breast exists with the fullness of the rights of the son of a family. You were then, while awaiting my arrival, only the depositaries of my authority, which you had to keep intact, and restore me to its integrity. How then were you able, by voting the decree for the appointment of the President of the Republic and the implementation of the national pact, to reserve for an indefinite time, the exercise of part of my powers? How were you able to give and withhold? make both provisional and definitive; on the one hand diminish my authority, and then confiscate the rest?

“You say in your decree:

” Art. 6. As soon as he has been proclaimed by the National Assembly, the President of the Republic will exercise the powers conferred on him by the Constitution, with the exception, however, of the rights attributed to him by articles 55, 56, 57 and 58, the right of promulgation being reserved to the President of the National Assembly.

“Usurpation!”

“The National Constituent Assembly will retain, until the installation of the next legislative assembly, all the powers with which it is seized today, except the executive power, entrusted to the president.

“Usurpation!”

” Art. 7. Until the definitive constitution of the Council of State, a commission of thirty members, elected by the Assembly, in the offices, by secret ballot and by relative majority, will exercise the powers attributed to the Council of State by the articles 54, 64 and 79 of the Constitution“

Constitution“!

“In vain do you claim that organic laws are an integral part of the Constitution, that until these laws are passed, your mission is not fulfilled, and that you retain the fullness of your powers.

“Organic laws are laws like any other, as a man who understands them, the honorable M. Barrot, told you. All laws are organic in nature, I tell you, look more closely, and you will remain convinced.

“They are so organic that it is not possible for you to rationally determine the number, the object or the importance of those to which you claim to reserve this qualification, and that the provisional that you have arbitrarily created could never end !

“Or rather, the only thing that is truly organic is the separation of our respective powers. Beyond that, every law is law, without distinction, and as such must be deliberated jointly between the National Assembly which votes for it, and the President of the Republic, who is solely responsible for its execution.

“By seizing the power entrusted to me by the Constitution, I therefore solemnly declare, to the National Assembly and the People, that as of this day the Constitution is in force, and that your powers have expired. I therefore invite you, Citizens, to dissolve yourselves, and to make way for the Legislative Assembly which must succeed you immediately. Orders are given to close the place of your sessions!..”

Do we believe that the National Constituent Assembly had anything to respond to this? And if politics, which is nothing other than the tactic of the arbitrary, which lives only by division of powers and conflicts of authority; if this policy which, after six months of chatter, finally gave birth to the Marrast Charter, worthy sister of the Bérard Charter, were to prevail in the councils of the country, it is believed that the People had to protest against the pretensions of the president and move a stone in defense of this masterpiece?

God forbid that I incite the People to contempt, nor to riot, for this scrap of paper which today they call their CONSTITUTION! And since we are condemned, by politics, to take sides on this ridiculous question of the presidency, since our hand is forced, God forbid that I advise citizens to remain in inaction.

Politics wanted it: we must vote! Let us therefore vote, not to choose, but to protest. Let's vote, since the monarchy is at our doors, and each vote that slips away gives one more chance to the monarchical candidate. Let us vote, out of consideration for our legislators, out of respect for order and public peace! Let us vote: but let us not forget that if, under the terms of the Constitution, the

presidency, the royalty, would have every right against the National Assembly, this right falls before the sovereignty of the People, who alone can say to what extent they intend to give its power and confer its authority.

(No. 3. — No date.)

Proudhon, in the vote on the entire Constitution, which took place on Saturday November 4, had spoken out *against* it. He justified his vote with this letter addressed the same day to the *Moniteur*:

Monsieur Editor,

The National Assembly has just proclaimed the constitution to prolonged cries of *Long live the Republic!*

I took part in the wishes of my colleagues for the Republic; I placed a blue ticket in the ballot box against the Constitution. I would not have understood how, in such a solemn circumstance and after four months of discussion, I could abstain; I would not understand, after my vote, why I would not be allowed explain it.

I voted against the Constitution, not out of a vain spirit of opposition or revolutionary agitation, because the Constitution contains things that I would like to remove or because others are not there that I would like to see there. But if such reasons could prevail over the mind of a representative, there would never be a vote on any law.

I voted against the Constitution, because it is a constitution.

What constitutes the essence of a constitution, — I mean a *political constitution*, there can be no question here of any other, — is the division of sovereignty, in other words the separation of powers in two, legislative and executive. This is the principle and essence of any political Constitution; outside of this, there is no longer a constitution, in the current sense of the term. There is only one sovereign authority, making laws, and executing them through its committees and ministers. We are not accustomed to such an organization of sovereignty; in my opinion, republican government is nothing else. I therefore find that a constitution, in a Republic, is a perfectly useless thing; I think that the provisional plan that we had for eight months could very well, with a little more regularity, a little less respect for monarchical traditions, be made definitive; I am convinced that the constitution, whose first act will be to create this presidency, with its prerogatives, its ambitions, its guilty hopes, will be rather a danger than a guarantee for liberty!

You will oblige me infinitely, M. Editor, to insert this letter in your next issue.

Fraternal greetings!

P.-J. PROUDHON,
Representative of the Seine.

Paris, November 4, 1848

Electoral Manifesto of *Le Peuple*.

The central electoral committee, made up of delegates from the fourteen districts of the Seine, to prepare the election of the President of the Republic, has just completed its operations.

Citizen Raspail, representative of the People, was unanimously nominated for the presidential candidate of the Republican, Democratic and Social Party.

The central committee will shortly publish its circular to voters.

For us, who have joined in mind and heart to this candidacy; who, in this circumstance, have deemed it necessary, for the dignity of our opinions, to separate ourselves from other less advanced fractions of the democracy, we believe we must recall here what our principles are: this will be the best way to justify our conduct.

Our principles!

Throughout time, men who, to achieve power, have sought popular suffrage, have deceived the masses with so-called declarations of principles which, in essence, have never been anything other than declarations of promises!

The ambitious and the intriguers have always promised the People, in more or less sonorous sentences:

Liberty, equality, fraternity;

Labor, family, property, progress;

Credit, education, association, order and peace;

Participation in government, equitable distribution of taxes, honest and cheap administration, just justice, progressive equality of fortunes, emancipation of the proletariat, extinction of poverty!

They promised so much that after them, it must be admitted, there is nothing left to promise.

But also what did they hold? It is up to the People to respond: Nothing!

The true friends of the People must change their approach from now on. What the People expect from their candidates, what they ask of them, are no longer promises, they are means.

It is by the means they propose that we must judge men: this is how we ask to be judged.

Socialist democrats, we are, to tell the truth, of no sect, of no school! Or rather, if we had to completely classify ourselves, we would say that we belong to the critical school. Socialism is not a system for us; it is simply a protest. However, we believe that from the socialist work a set of principles and ideas emerged in opposition to economic routine, which have passed into popular faith: and this is why we call ourselves socialists. To profess socialism, and to accept nothing of socialism, as the most clever do, would be to mock the people and abuse their credulity... It is not everything to be a Republican; it is not everything to recognize that the Republic must surround itself with social institutions; it is not enough to write on your flag: Democratic and Social Republic, we must clearly mark the difference between the old society and the new; we must say what positive things socialism has produced; how and why the February revolution, which is its expression, is a social revolution.

Let us first recall the fundamental dogma, the pure dogma of socialism.

The aim of socialism is the emancipation of the proletariat and the extinction of poverty, that is to say, effective equality of conditions among men. Without equality, there will always be poverty, always a proletariat.

Socialism, egalitarian above all, is therefore the democratic formula par excellence. If less sincere politicians feel any reluctance to admit it, we respect their reservation; but they must know that in our eyes they are not democrats.

Now, what is the cause of inequality?

This cause, in our opinion, has been highlighted by all the socialist critiques that have followed one another, particularly since Jean-Jacques; this cause is the realization in society of this triple abstraction: Capital, — labor, — talent.

It is because society has divided itself into three categories of citizens corresponding to the three terms of this formula; that is to say because we have created a class of capitalists or proprietors, another class of workers, and a third class of capacities, that we have constantly arrived at the distinction of castes, and that one half of the human race has been enslaved to the other. Wherever one has claimed to separate in fact, organically, these three things, capital, work and talent, the worker has been enslaved: he has been called in turn slave, serf, pariah, plebeian, proletarian; — the capitalist was an exploiter: he was sometimes called a patrician or noble, sometimes an owner or bourgeois; — the man of talent was a parasite, an agent of corruption and servitude; first it was the priest, later the cleric, today the public official, all kinds of capacity and monopoly.

The fundamental dogma of socialism therefore consists of resolving the aristocratic formula: Capital-Labor-Talent into this simpler one: labor! — to ensure, therefore, that every citizen is at the same time, in the same way and to the same degree, capitalist, worker, and scholar or artist.

The producer and the consumer, in the reality of things as in economic science, are always the same character, considered only from two different points of view. Why should it not be the same for the capitalist and the worker? For the worker and the artist? Separate these qualities in the social organization, you inevitably create castes, inequality, poverty; unite them, on the contrary, in each individual: you have equality, you have the Republic.

This is also how in the political order all these distinctions between rulers and ruled, administrators and administered, public functionaries and taxpayers, etc. must one day be erased. It is necessary, through the development of the social idea, that each citizen be everything: because, if he is not everything, he is not free; he suffers oppression and exploitation in some place.

So what is the MEANS of bringing about this great merger? The means is indicated by the evil itself. And first, let us try to define the evil even better, if possible.

Since the proletariat and poverty have as their organic cause the division of society into two classes — one that labors and does not own; the other that owns and does not labor, that, consequently, consumes without producing — it follows that the evil from which society suffers consists in this singular fiction, that capital is, in itself, productive; while labor, by itself, is not. Indeed, for the conditions to be equal, in this hypothesis of the separation of labor and capital, it would be necessary that, as the capitalist collects through his capital, without labor; in the same

way the worker could collect through his labor, without capital. But that is not happening. Therefore equality, liberty, fraternity are impossible in the current regime; therefore poverty and the proletariat are the fatal consequence of the present constitution of property.

Anyone who knows it and does not admit it is also lying to the bourgeoisie and the proletariat;

Anyone who solicits the votes of the People and dissembles with them is neither a socialist nor a democrat.

We repeat:

The productivity of capital, what Christianity condemned under the name usury, is the true cause of poverty, the true principle of the proletariat, the eternal obstacle to the establishment of the Republic. No ambiguity, no imbroglio, no evasion! Let those who call themselves socialist-democrats sign this profession of faith with us; let them adhere to our communion: by this sign, but by this sign only, we will recognize in them as brothers, true friends of the People; we will subscribe to all their actions.

And now, what is the means to eradicate the evil, to put an end to usury? Will it be to attack the net product, to seize the income? Will it be, by professing the greatest respect for property, to deprive property by tax, as it is acquired by labor and consecrated by law?

It is here above all that the true friends of the People distinguish themselves from those who only want to command the People; it is here that true socialists separate themselves from their perfidious imitators.

The way to destroy usury is not, once again, to confiscate usury; it is to oppose principle to principle. It is, in short, to organize credit.

To organize credit, for socialism, does not mean borrowing at interest, since this would always recognize the suzerainty of capital; it is to organize the solidarity of workers among themselves, it is to create their mutual guarantee, according to this principle of vulgar economics, that everything that has an exchange value can be an object of exchange, can, consequently, provide material for credit.

Just as the banker gives credit of his crowns to his merchant who pays him interest;

The landowner credits his land to the peasant who pays him rent;

The owner of the house lends accommodation to the tenant who pays rent;

The merchant credits his merchandise to the client who buys on time; .

Likewise, the worker gives credit for his work to the boss who pays him at the end of the month or at the end of the week. We all give each other credit for something: don't we say: sell on credit, labor on credit, drink, eat on credit?

Therefore, labor can give credit for itself, it can be a creditor like capital.

So two or more workers can still give each other credit for their respective products, and if they agreed on continued operations of this kind, they would have organized the credit between them.

This is what the workers' associations have admirably understood, which spontaneously, without sponsorship, without capital, are formed in Paris and Lyon, and by the sole fact that they put themselves in contact with each other, that they give one another credit, organize, as they say,

the labor. So that organization of credit, organization of labor, association, it is one and the same thing. It is not a school, it is not a theoretician who says this: it is the current fact, the revolutionary fact that proves it. Thus the application of one principle leads the People to the discovery of another; a solution obtained always leads to another solution.

If it happened that the workers agreed at all points in the Republic, organized themselves in the same way, it is obvious that, masters of labor, and constantly producing, through labor, new capital, they would soon have reconquered, by their organization and their competition, alienated capital; they would attract to themselves, first of all, small property, small commerce and small industry; then large property and large companies; then the largest exploitations, mines, canals, railways: they would become masters of everything through the successive accession of producers and the liquidation of properties, without spoliation or ransom of the proprietors.

Through this organization of labor and credit, the alliance of agriculture and industry, now in perpetual antagonism, would take place. For who can give credit to the plowman if not the industrialist? And what will be the outlet for agriculture, if not industry?

Such is the work begun spontaneously before our eyes by the People, a work that it continues with admirable energy, through all the difficulties of chicanery and the most terrible privations. And we must never tire of saying it, it was not the leaders of the schools who started this movement, it was not the State that gave the first impetus, it was the People. We are here only its interpreters. Our faith, the democratic and social faith, is no longer a utopia, it is a reality. It is not our doctrine that we preach; these are the popular ideas that we take as themes of our developments. Those who ignore it, who talk to us about association and the Republic, and who do not dare to recognize as their brothers the true socialists, the true republicans, are not our people.

Devoted for ten years to this idea, we did not wait for the triumph of the People to side with them; we did not wait for the resurrection of Christ to believe in the divinity of his mission.

Let the government, the National Assembly, the bourgeoisie itself protect us and assist us in the accomplishment of our work; we will be grateful, but let no one any longer seek to distract ourselves from what we consider to be the true interests of the People; let no one try to deceive us with vain pretenses of reform. We are too enlightened to still be fooled; we know better how the world is going than the politicians who honor us with their remonstrances.

We would be happy if the State, through allocations taken from the budget, contributed to the emancipation of workers: we would only view with suspicion what is called the organization of credit by the State, and which is, in our opinion, only the last form of exploitation of man by man. We reject the credit of the State, because the State, in eight billions of debt, does not have a cent with which it can give credit; because its sponsorship is based only on forced paper currency; because the forced price inevitably leads to depreciation, and depreciation always affects the worker in preference to the owner; — because we, associated producers or in the process of association, we need neither the State nor forced exchange to organize our exchanges; because finally credit by the State is always credit by capital, not credit by labor, always monarchy, not democracy.

In the system that is proposed to us, which we reject with all the energy of our convictions, the State, to provide credit, must first obtain capital. It must demand this capital from property, through taxes. It is therefore always a return to the principle, whereas it is a question of destroying it; it is displacing wealth when it should be created; it is to withdraw property, after having declared it inviolable by the Constitution. If others, with less advanced and less suspect ideas, with less meticulous morality, support such ideas, we will not accuse their tactics. As for us, who do not wage war against the rich, but against principles; we, whom the counter-revolution continues to slander, must be more rigorous. We are socialists; we are not despoilers.

We do not want progressive tax, because progressive tax is the consecration of the net product, and we want to abolish, through association, the net product; — because if the progressive tax does not take away from the rich all of his income, it is only a concession made to the proletariat, a sort of redemption of the right of usury, in a word a disappointment; and because if it takes all the income, it is the confiscation of property, expropriation without prior compensation and without public utility.

Let those who call themselves, above all, politicians, invoke the progressive tax as a reprisal against property, as a punishment for bourgeois selfishness: we respect their intentions, and if ever it given to them to apply their principles, we will let God's justice prevail. For us, representatives of those who have lost everything to the regime of capital, the progressive tax, precisely because it is a forced restitution, is forbidden to us; we will never propose it to the People. We are socialists, men of reconciliation and progress; we are not asking for any reaction or agrarian law.

We do not want the tax on State annuities, because this tax is, like the progressive tax, with respect to the annuitants, only a confiscation, and with respect to the People, only a compromise, a deception. We believe that the State has the right to repay its debts, consequently to borrow at lower interest: we do not think that it is allowed, under the pretext of taxes, to fail in its commitments. We are socialists, we are not bankrupts.

We do not want the inheritance tax, because this tax is also only a withdrawal of property, and since property is a constitutional right recognized by everyone, we must respect in it the wish of the majority; because it would be an attack on the family; because we have nothing to make, in order to emancipate the proletariat, from this new hypocrisy. The transmission of property, under the law of association, not applying to instruments of labor, cannot become a cause of inequality. So let the fortune of the deceased owner go to his most distant relatives, often the poorest. We are socialists, we are not harvesters of inheritances.

We do not want taxes on luxury items, because that would hit luxury industries; because luxury products are the very expression of progress; because, under the empire of labor and with the subordination of capital, luxury must descend to all citizens without exception. Why, after having encouraged property, should we punish the proprietors for their enjoyment? We are socialists, we are not envious people.

The tax is the contribution of each laborer to the costs of the community: the tax therefore has for its natural basis the product. It is a few centimes per hundred to add to the cost price of everything that circulates and is consumed. As for land and capital, they can only be taxed to the

extent that they are appropriated: the direct contribution is nothing other than the price of the tolerance granted to the owner. Since in the universal association property in land and in the instruments of labor is a social property, it follows that direct taxation must be more or less abolished, as the consecration of privilege, a sign of feudalism and usury. This is the complete opposite of what the neophytes of social democracy are offering us.

Tax costs of collection currently cost the State more than 50 million. — With association, as the People conceived it and as they execute it, these costs can and must be reduced to nothing. What do the new socialists, unofficial but not very intelligent defenders of property, say about it?

Customs, that is to say the protection of national labor, costs the country twenty-six million. With the organization of credit, as the socialist principle supposes, the People would have both free trade and equal exchange. Labor would be protected simply by the fact that it could only be given in exchange for labor: protection would cost zero. It is not a simple revision of customs tariffs that socialism demands, following the example of its young friends: it is their complete abolition.

We do not want state exploitation of mines, canals and railways: this is still monarchy, still wage labor. We want the mines, the canals, the railways to be handed over to workers' associations, democratically organized, working under the supervision of the State, on the conditions established by the State, and under their own responsibility. We want these associations to be models offered to agriculture, industry and commerce, the first core of this vast federation of companies and societies, united in the common bond of the democratic and social Republic.

We do not want the government of man by man any more than we want the exploitation of man by man. Have those who are so quick to adopt the socialist formula thought about it?

We want economy in state spending, just as we want the complete fusion, in the worker, of the right of the man and citizen, of the attributes of capital and talent. This is why we demand certain things that socialism indicates, and which men who claim to be more particularly political do not understand.

Politics tends to specialize and multiply jobs indefinitely; socialism tends to blend them into one another.

Thus, we believe that almost all public works can and should be carried out by the army; that this participation in public works is the first tribute that republican youth must pay to the homeland; that consequently the war budget and that of public works duplicate each other. This is a saving of over 100 million; politics doesn't care.

There is talk about vocational education. — We believe that the school of agriculture is agriculture; the school of arts, crafts and manufacturing is the workshop; the school of commerce is the counter; the school of mines is the mine; the school of navigation is the ship; the school of administration is administration, etc.

The apprentice is as necessary for work as the journeyman. Why set him aside in a school? We want the same education for everyone. What is the point of these schools, which, for the People, are only schools for aristocrats, and for our finances a duplication? Organize association, and at the same time, every workshop becomes a school, every worker is a master, every student an apprentice. Elite men perform as well and better on the job site as they do in the study room.

Same thing in government.

It is not enough to say that we are opposed to the presidency, if we do not abolish the ministries, the eternal object of political ambition. It is up to the National Assembly to exercise, through the organization of its committees, the executive power, just as it exercises, through its joint deliberations and its votes, the legislative power. The ministers, undersecretaries of state, heads of division, etc., do double work with the representatives, whose idle, dissipated life, given over to intrigue and ambition, is an incessant cause of embarrassment for administration, bad laws for society, sterile expenditure for the State.

Let our young recruits put it into their minds; socialism is the opposite of governmentalism. This is as old for us as the precept: Between master and servant, there is no society.

We want, alongside universal suffrage; and as a consequence of this vote, the application of the imperative mandate. Politicians are loath to accept it! Which means that in their eyes the People, by electing representatives, do not give themselves agents, but alienate their sovereignty... Certainly, this is not socialism, it is not even democracy.

We want unlimited liberty of man and citizen, except respect for the liberty of others:

Liberty of association,

Liberty of assembly,

Liberty of worship,

Liberty of the press,

Liberty of thought and speech,

Liberty of work, commerce and industry,

Liberty of education,

In a word, absolute liberty.

Now, among these liberties there is always one that the old politics does not admit, which leads to the ruin of all! Will we be told, once, whether we want liberty with exception or without exception?

We want the family. Where are those who respect it more than us?... But we do not take the family as the type of society. The defenders of the monarchy taught us that it was in the image of the family that monarchies were constituted. The family is the patriarchal or dynastic element, the rudiment of royalty: the type of civil society is fraternal society.

We want property, but brought back to those who deserve it. limits, that is to say to the free disposal of the fruits of labor; property minus usury!... We don't need to say more. Those who know us hear us.

This is, in essence, our profession of faith. The Declaration of the deputies of the Mountain made it our duty to reproduce it, so that we could judge whether it was we who, by not accepting, on the recommendation of its friends, the candidacy of the honorable M. Ledru-Rollin, fail the democratic and social cause, or if it is the authors of the Declaration who lag behind socialism.

We do justice to the tendencies of the young Mountain, we applaud its efforts, we take note of its progress. The Mountain, today, goes to the prophet; politics resolves itself into socialism: a few steps further, and all the republican nuances are confused.

But the Mountain is only socialist in intention, although it says the opposite, and no doubt believes it. The People have read its Declaration, they will read our Manifesto. Let it compare and judge. Let it say if, faced with this piece, as light on ideas as it is compromising for us by its policy, we should hide ourselves and strike the flag.

The Mountain, hardly socialist at all, despite its desire, is also hardly revolutionary, despite its ardor. Its political actions, as much as its ideas, prove it.

Was it revolutionary in September, during the elections?

Was it revolutionary in June?

Was it revolutionary in April?

Was it revolutionary at the Luxembourg sessions?

And we were as revolutionary as it and more than it in February.

The Mountain complains that we are not political!

We will answer that the Mountain is under a strange illusion if it imagines that politics, without socialism, is anything. Socialism is politics defined in its goal and its means. Until it, politics was nothing but skill. In two words, socialism is the thing, politics the man. From which it follows that socialism can very well do without politics, while politics cannot do without socialism. We take as witness the profound mediocrity of the political acts that have occurred, we will not say only for nine months, but for eighteen years!...

And now we come to this miserable question of the Presidency.

It was certainly a serious matter to know, on the one hand, whether the People should abstain or vote; secondly, under what flag the election would take place, under what profession of faith. As for the candidate, the first to come would have been ours.

Democratic and social opinion had to be directly consulted: the Mountain acted alone.

It published its Declaration, as Louis XVIII did his granted charter, without consulting anyone.

It poses a candidate Paris and in the departments, without warning.

Then, when the electoral committee is formed, it comes to tell it: Things are too advanced, retreat is impossible! No division! The Mountain imposes on us the vote, the program, the candidate. It seems to tell us: You will come this far, but you will go no further. To use an expression that has passed into parliamentary style, it dodges socialism for its own benefit!

We will not dwell on the personal question. We regret that a politician (and we use this epithet here without irony) such as the honorable M. Ledru-Rollin, could have served as an instrument for clumsy friends. Our personal sympathies, our preferences were acquired by him. The aggressive mood, the insulting mistrust of those around us threw us into opposition...

Moreover, we believe that this division, far from diminishing the strength of the democratic and social party, will only increase it. In the current state of things, no candidate could win all the votes: too deep disagreements still exist between the socialist democracy of the day before and that of the next day.

The central electoral committee decided, unanimously, to nominate citizen Raspail as a candidate for president.

Raspail, elected by 66,000 votes from Paris and 35,000 from Lyon;

Raspail, the socialist democrat;

Raspail, the implacable denouncer of political mystifications;

Raspail, whose work in the art of healing has placed him among the benefactors of humanity.

By adhering to this candidacy, we do not intend, as was written somewhere by the honorable M. Ledru-Rollin, to possibly give the Republic a chief: far from it, we accept Raspail as a living protest against the principle of the Presidency! We present him to the suffrage of the People, not because he is or believes to be possible, but because he is impossible; because with him the presidency, the image of royalty, would be impossible.

Nor do we mean, by calling for votes on Raspail, to cast a challenge to the bourgeoisie, which fears this great citizen. What we seek above all is reconciliation, peace. We are socialists, we are not disorganizers.

We support Raspail's candidacy, in order to express more strongly in the eyes of the country this idea, that from now on, under the flag of the Republic, there are only two parties in France, the labor party and the party of capital.

It will not be up to us if the last vestige of this ancient division is not soon erased.

Argument to the Mountain.

November 20.

When, on February 24, the provisional government was formed, the honorable citizens who were called to be part of it, and several of whom had until then belonged to the constitutional monarchical opinion, did not bargain with the will of the People. They all felt, they proclaimed loudly that the event that had just taken place brought in its wake something more than a Republic, that it had as its logical and necessary consequence a Social Revolution. This idea was reflected in all their decrees.

When the government then occupied itself with sending commissioners to the departments to prepare minds for this great revolution, as it had to replace prefects, sub-prefects, attorneys general, all the removable personnel whose intentions could appear doubtful, those who came to offer their services to the Republic did not hesitate about the character of the Revolution either: they all repeated that in their eyes it was social.

When, two months later, the elections came, and the avalanche of professions of faith fell on the victorious people, the candidates did not fail to say, for the most part, that they were ready to recognize the rights of the worker. They thereby admitted that the Revolution was not only political, but social, that it was only political to the extent that it was social.

The bourgeoisie, at that time, admitted defeat. They felt that the old system was broken, that the poles of society were reversed and the center of gravitation shifted. So the bourgeoisie had taken its side; the People could then obtain from it everything they wanted: the February revolution was declared, hailed, recognized as social; we accepted the definition.

Even today, after all the defections, the betrayals; after the bloody defeat of the democratic and social party, and the restoration of mercantile and financial feudalism, everyone still agrees that the February Revolution must, on pain of nullity, be a social Revolution. Because, if it is not a Social Revolution, it does not have the slightest reason for existence; it is nothing. The whole question is whether we will move on, I mean, whether this Revolution will be accomplished.

How then, if opinion is and has never ceased to be unanimous on the meaning and scope of the February Revolution, how did those who, for four months, were responsible for leading it, only concern themselves with aborting it?

How, if they were revolutionaries and socialists, after having exiled the Social Revolution to Luxembourg on February 25, did they allow it to be flouted, imprisoned, shot, on April 16, May 15, June 26?...

How did the men of the Revolution never know anything but how to get in the way of the Revolution?

How is it that the Republicans, without reproach as long as it is only a question of the political form, are no longer, when it comes to socialism, anything but obscurants and reactionaries?

The country is at this moment like the hardened sinner spoken of in Scripture, who calls for peace! peace! and who can never find peace. We cry: Revolution! revolution! but, thanks to our politicians, there is no revolution!

Let us be allowed to say this, without wanting to put anyone on trial. If the Revolution is hampered, if it has not yet begun, if we are still only at the dawn, it is because we do not know, or, to speak frankly, because we misunderstand the revolutionary matter, because the goal and object of the social revolution are concealed, denied. We accept the name, a new name, which amuses curiosity with its indecision: we do not want the thing, we turn our eyes away for fear of seeing it.

However, we should be heard, or we should be silent. Let the young Mountain, so-called democrat and socialist, go to the clubs and banquets to recruit votes for its candidate; let it pour out in its toasts, its manifestos, its newspapers, its harangues, its oratorical eloquence: all this may testify to an excellent intention, but all this, in truth, is very innocent! The people of the Mountain must know this: they will be nothing, they will represent nothing, neither politics, nor socialism, nor revolution, as long as they have not confessed, before France and before Europe, the goal, the real goal of the February Revolution.

Now, it is this goal that we are going to make known for the hundredth time.

We will say it in such a way that the Mountain cannot be mistaken, and that no one is mistaken, in such a way as to make any ambiguity or evasion impossible. The idea will be so clear, so categorical, so palpable, that all we will have to do is decide yes or no, declare ourselves for or against the Revolution.

In 89, when Siéyès wanted to determine the movement, to set the Revolution in motion, he began by defining its object and showing its goal. For this, his work was simple. He only had to present to the People the picture of the privileges or so-called feudal rights, the feudal iniquities, the clerical turpitudes, the royal corruptions, the endless humiliations of the Third Estate. And this, he cried, is what must now be abolished or consecrated for eternity.

The answer was then like the question: it was clear and categorical, and was not long in coming.

We will do as Siéyès did. We will present in a few lines, clear and precise, the assessment of capitalist exploitation, the assessment of the misery of the proletariat. And we will say like Siéyès: Here, oh sublime Mountain, here is the Revolution! Do you want it or don't you want it?...

The French people produce each year, for the needs of their subsistence, their government and their luxury, a sum of values of approximately nine billion.

Nine billion is, at most, according to the most reliable approximations, the amount of national production.

It is with these nine billion that the People must provide for all the necessities of their consumption, all the expenses of their government, all the fancies of their citizens.

These nine billion, if they were equally distributed among the citizens, numbering approximately 36 million, would give each of them 250 francs per year, 69 centimes per day per head.—Thus each family, made up of four people, would have to live on, according to this mean, an income of 2 fr. 75 cents, 55 sous per day.

But the average income or salary of workers is far from being 55 cents per day per family of four.

Out of the nine billion annual product, labor, before paying itself, must repay to capital, for the price of its voluntary service:

1. Interest and mortgage costs, at a minimum of 8 percent, on a capital of at least 8 billion, 960 million
2. Interest and costs of fiduciary obligations, at 6 percent, on a capital of at least 4 billion, 249
3. Trade discounts (commissions, protest costs, etc., etc., included), at 8 percent, out of a circulation of 20 billion, maturing in three months, 400
4. Public debt, floating and consolidated, 400
5. Pawnshops 42
6. Customs, that is to say costs of protecting national capital against competition from foreign capital, bonuses, differentials, contraband, etc., 200
7. Sponsorship share interests, valued at 60
- 8° rents and rents, after deduction of interest on the mortgage debt, valued at 5 percent, on a capital of 8 billion, 2,600
- 9° State and municipal budget, after deduction of public debt, 1,400

Total 6,302 million

We say 6 billion 302 million, which labor must take from its product before buying the first piece of bread, to pay the royalties of capital, the costs of providing capital, and the charges of the State.

Of this sum of 6 billion 302 million, it is necessary to destroy 1.302 million for the essential service of the national community, and the amortization of the capital invested each year in production.

This leaves five billion, net, that the parasitism of capital costs the working people each year.

It follows from this,

That out of the nine billion annual product, five billion, approximately 55 percent, more than half, are regularly taken from labor as remuneration for the service, true or supposed, that it derives from capital;

That thus the average of 69 centimes per day and per head, which the equal distribution of the nine billion would have given, is reduced to 29 centimes, or 1 franc 16 centimes or 23 sous per day, with which each family composed of four people must survive.

That is to say that a worker who earns 49 francs 25 centimes per week, to support himself, his wife and two children, in reality only benefits from 8 francs 12 centimes; the surplus, i.e. 11 francs 13 centimes, being reimbursed by him to the master of the house, the baker, the butcher, the wine merchant, the tax collector, etc., etc., for the remuneration of capital.

And as the wages of workers, as well as the incomes of capitalists, are unequal, it results, in the final analysis, that for a notable part of the French people, the amount of wages or income is well below 29 centimes per day and per head: it drops today to 5 centimes 5 thousandths, — five liards per day, in round numbers, as results from the accounts of the administration, whose aid to

citizens in need is fixed at 12 centimes and half, the right to assistance, recognized by the Constitution, combined with the right to property, also recognized by the Constitution, allowing neither less nor more to be done.

Five liards a day is the minimum that society guarantees to the unemployed worker; this is the right that, if certain republicans are to be believed, the People would have won in February!...

Depending on whether times are calm, whether the political situation seems more or less fortunate, whether capital is pleased to lend or refuse, as M. Thiers wittily says, a more or less considerable number of workers find themselves deprived of their the average of 29 centimes, and condemned to the bare minimum of five liards!

However, this condition of the worker, in the current economic regime, is irremediable. Whether the population increases or decreases; whether work abounds or whether it becomes scarcer, it doesn't matter. The class which works will no less have to pay to that which possesses:

So much for the rent of the land,

So much for the rent of houses and work instruments, depreciation not included,

So much for the fiduciary and mortgage provision of capital,

So much for the discounting of goods and commercial instruments,

So much for the rentiers of the State,

So much for the protection of the country's capitalists, against competition from foreign capitalists, otherwise customs,

So much for the police, for the judges, the gendarmes, in a word for the State.

Whatever he does, and in whatever way he goes about it, the worker, as long as he is placed under the patronage of capital, is like the bee that the peasant shelters, like the sheep to whom he gives a barn. He must pay the capitalist, for the rent of capital, 55 percent of his honey, his wool and his milk; and if he makes a bad face, if he decides to upset his gentle lord, let him be content to live on five liards a day. Five liards! This is what the worker gains by living in domesticity, like sheep and flies, instead of living as a free man! The Mountain, which spreads everywhere, at home and abroad, that we are a Hebert, a Chaumette, a false brother, sold to Cavaignac, — what does it want him to do with us, Cavaignac? — the Mountain, which calls us proud, impolitic, dreamer, sleepyhead, hinderer, apostle of individualism, of selfishness; man with fixed ideas, bad citizen, sower of discord, author and instigator of the split between it and socialism, counter-revolutionary, what do I know? defender of property, that says it all!... has the Mountain ever, in its wisdom, reflected on all this? Does it know what labor is and what capital is?...

Suppose, on the other hand, that the function, perfectly useless, according to us, of capitalist, is abolished, as those of monk and noble were abolished in 89; — if every worker becomes his own capitalist, as in 89 every citizen became his own overlord, what would result from that?

First, the five billion taken today from the workers by the capitalists, would remain with those who produce them.

Second, citizens currently living off capital would be led to take part in labor, consequently to produce themselves the five billion that they devour, which would immediately increase production from nine billion to fourteen.

Finally, by the removal of all capitalist constraints, of all rights on production, circulation and consumption, rights collected both by the owners of capital and by the State, labor would be increased by half, and, consequently, annual wealth doubled.

So that the average income of the worker, which is today, through the deductions to be made for the benefit of capital,, when business is good and there is no shortage of work, only 1 franc. 16 cents per day per family of four, and only 22 cents when there is unemployment; — this income, now assured, continuous, equitably distributed, would be 5 francs, 52 centimes, or, per year, 2.014 francs. 80 centimes, instead of 423 fr. 40.

By doubling production and equal distribution, the well-being or average income of the worker would be almost quintupled!

This, for our part, is what the revolutionary matter is, the goal and object of the February Revolution. To understand this, you don't need to be from any school. Communism, Fourierism, have nothing to do here: there is neither utopia nor system within. It is the most palpable reality. Either that, or nothing. The revolution; in 89, destroyed clerical and noble feudalism; will the Revolution, in 48, abolish capitalist feudalism? That is the question.

Yes; yes, montagnards, get it into your brains; the February Revolution has nothing else to do than to abolish rent, or to put it better, the system of seigniorial rights of capital, and by this alone, to quintuple the fortune of the worker. Later, when it is completely freed, labor will create its constitution, as the Third Estate did its own, after having abolished feudalism. It is then that the People will choose between the systems of association that will be offered to them and which serve as material for progress. Until then, the work of the People is not to organize, it is to revolutionize, to demolish.

Yes, the People must know it, the government must know it, the whole world must know it: the February Revolution must, by centralizing credit, gradually abolish interest on capital, and give everyone credit and discount for nothing; — abolish the rent of houses and tools of labor, and, except for the amortization of the capital invested, give everyone housing and tools for nothing; — abolish renting, and give the plowman, through association, the land for nothing; — change the tax into a benefit, consequently reducing the budget for all the costs that tax collection costs today; repay the State debt, and consequently eliminate the useless and absurd institution of amortization; organize nation-to-nation exchange, and thus further abolish the costly protection of customs.

Again, either that or nothing. We challenge anyone to discover something else in the Revolution.

Well! we call the entire People to witness this. What have we done so far for the Revolution? Or rather what have we not done to disguise and pervert it? Was the Revolution only understood, we will not say by the government, which gave us the right to assistance, five liards a day to workers who are in need; — we will not say through the press: we cannot say it, we who are journalists: the press, for the most part, never ceases to slander the Revolution; every time labor talks about emancipating itself from capital, it cries: — Haro! You destroy the family, you attack property!—but through the Mountain?

We are not making personalities here. We know all the montagnards individually, perhaps better than they know themselves. We will be fairer to them than they are to us. We know what patriotism, devotion, intelligence or revolutionary instinct there is in each of them. But let them allow us to tell them: they have proven to us once again, through their coalition, what the academies, what all the learned, political or literary assemblies had long taught us, that a meeting of fifty men of head and heart may not have common sense.

The day before the Revolution, the Mountain rejected socialism. It was not, believe me, out of a spirit of opposition: it was out of politics. The day after the Revolution, the Mountain separated itself from socialism: it was again out of politics. Since then, the Mountain has ended up declaring itself socialist; but in professing socialism, it only took the formula; it did not have the courage to confess the truth, it threw herself into philanthropy and palliatives: it was always out of politics.

It is a question 1. of returning to labor the five billion that capital takes from it each year; — 2. of doubling the country's production; — 3. of bringing from 423 fr. to 2014 the average net income for each working family.

Instead, the Mountain offers the People some petty budget cuts, six to eight million, according to the finance committee! It talks about taxes on movable income, net income, collateral inheritances, servants, dogs and other miseries. That's a hundred million, of which, with the help of dispatchers, collectors, controllers, tax agents and tax harassment, we would perhaps find a way to reduce the worker's contribution, by increasing as much that of the capitalist-owner.

One hundred million out of five billion!

Something like one centime per day per head, that's what revolutionary satisfaction, that's what extra pay, the Mountain, so-called socialist, is talking about giving to the People.

Instead of the government's five liards, the Mountain will give six!

For us, we resolutely declare it. If the revolution of 1848 does not aim to abolish capitalist privilege, as the revolution of 89 abolished feudal privilege, the revolution of 1848 is an inexpiable crime, a vengeance from heaven, which must not only be repaired, returning to the old rut as quickly as possible, but cry with tears of blood.

If, on the contrary, the People, while obeying blind instigators, were not mistaken in February, if for nine months their thoughts have been loudly and clearly expressed on the meaning and goal of the Revolution, then we must also believe that the People, who conceived the goal, conceived at the same time the means.

Does this means exist? Is this method practicable? Can labor free itself from the usury of capital, as the Third Estate freed itself from the oppression of the nobility and clergy? In a word, can the proletariat avoid paying five billion to capital, and living on five liards a day?

We affirm this on our behalf; and this affirmation forms the second part of the argument that we address to the Mountain.

Yes, the working class has within itself the means of achieving its emancipation and establishing its well-being forever; but it is here that the Revolution of 1848 differs from the Revolution of 89.

In 89, the Third Estate only needed, to win liberty and get rid of oppression, these two things: refuse and take: refuse obedience to superior orders, take their properties, or, as the it was then said, the national property.

In 1848, the proletariat, if it wants to free itself from capitalist exploitation, must go about it in a completely different way: its revolutionary law is to abstain. It is necessary, we say, for the proletariat to scrupulously abstain from any attack, direct or indirect, political, fiscal or otherwise, on capital and property, because such an attack, under whatever name it is disguised, would only be a way of recognizing the preponderance of capital, a contradiction. It is by operating in itself and on itself, through association, mutual guarantee, spontaneous organization, that labor can triumph over capital.

In 89, the goal of the Revolution was the movement of power and property: this is why this Revolution was a battle. In 1848, the goal of the Revolution was the democratization of the power and the reorganization of property; this is why this Revolution is a fusion. Now, we only organize and merge with principles; force and fraud are powerless to reconcile and organize.

This is therefore the argument that we address to the Mountain.

The goal of the Revolution of 1848 is known: it is the complete abolition of proprietary privilege.

The means of achieving this abolition is also known: it is the workers' association, it is the substitution of industrial solidarity for capitalist sponsorship; it is the centralization, through mutual credit, of all working forces; it is, in a word, the excommunication of property.

Now, you, Montagnards, do not dare to admit the aim of the Revolution: the proof is that you declare yourselves supporters, all the same, of property; is that you talk about credit like true proprietors.

You do not recognize the instrument, the means of this Revolution; your projects for economic reform, all borrowed from the English school, attest to this.

So what do you think of the Revolution? Explain yourself, because time is running out.

Or rather, what should we not think of you, when, after reading your declarations, we see you making the greatest efforts against socialism, repressing its manifestations, slandering those who defend it?...

You whisper, with all your words and in every way, regarding external politics as well as internal politics, insurrection to the people. So be it: let the People rise up! We do not claim to be able to prevent it. But, please, will you tell us why the People must rise up? Is it to add one centime to the five given to it by the Constitution?

No more reticence: you are for or are you against the Revolution, that is to say, you are for or you are against the restitution to the working class of five billion in rents; for or against the doubling of the national product, for or against the average of 2,000 francs salary, instead of the 5 cents 5 thousandths of assistance.

If you are against, we have nothing to object: all opinions are equally respectable in our eyes. We will only ask you to remove the democratic and social formula from your program.

If you are for, you must say it, but clearly, squarely, like the trader who responds to the offers of another trader, by repeating the same things and in the same terms. In saying it, you must give your word, your signatures; you must give pledges, because the People have become suspicious, and we are the People.

When you have done this, all disagreement between us will have disappeared and all controversy will cease. And since you love the power, you will find us devoted to you. Count on us then: things will go well!...

(N° 6. November 23.)

Finally, we are a serious party, a respectable party; we are almost honest people. We have the certificate for *twenty-four thousand francs*. We can walk hand in hand with the *National*, with the *Réforme*, with the *Révolution démocratique et sociale*, deal with the *Constitutionnel* and the *Siècle* from power to power. What poor mortals we are! We are almost converted to capital!

(No. 8. November 25.)

TO THE EDITOR

Citizen,

Le Peuple weakens; this morning he enters the path of compromise by indicating the Lamennais presidency. The politicians triumph.

On the other hand, your name, which is the workers' guarantee, has disappeared from the header of the newspaper. What does that mean? Are you withdrawing? Are you fading away? An explanation is necessary, or at least you must reassure us.

Raspail or abstention. Outside of this alternative, there is only intrigue.

I wrote to you a month ago. My letter has not reached you, or you have not thought it appropriate to reply to me. Regardless, I am for your ideas and not for you. I don't want to see you or receive a letter from you; but I want you to know that, despite the attacks, the insults, the slander that besiege you, there are strangers who defend you with absolute disinterest. I dare say that I am one of them.

One more word. I was commissioner at the Press banquet at the Château-Rouge; I had written a toast on this theme: *To the right to work, the only guarantee of public order against the anarchic invasions of the right to idleness.* This toast, applauded unanimously by the toast commission, was unanimously eliminated by the same commission, under the pretext that this subject should be reserved for Félix Pyat. However, Félix Pyat did not even attend the banquet. O aristocracy of democracy!

Fraternal greetings,

E. M.,
73, rue Montmartre.

Friday morning, November 24.

Response. — We are not entering into the path of compromise: we are offering our last sacrifice to peace. If the proposed conciliation is accepted, we will place no obstacle to it, preferring the union of hearts to the inflexibility of principles. On the contrary, if this conciliation is postponed, we will only be left to cry over the suicide of democracy, and to work obscurely on the work of the emancipation of workers, without expecting anything from the parties and politicians.

Citizen Proudhon is not withdrawing, believe me. Citizen Proudhon will not desert his post. He will not back down from the cries of the factions. The serpents of slander, exhausting their poisons on him, made his soul inaccessible to fear. What does it matter to him to be alone, if justice and reason are with him? What can the bullets and daggers with which he is threatened every day do for him? Citizen Proudhon is ready for the great journey: he will leave when it pleases God and the assassins.

Remain calm and faithful, and Citizen Proudhon thanks you.

P.-J. PROUDHON.

(No. 11. November 28.)

Citizen P.-J. Proudhon, representative of the people, sent the following letter to the president of the Central Electoral Congress:

Paris, November 27, 1848.

Citizen,

I received your fraternal invitation, in relation to the meeting of the *Central Electoral Congress* of the socialist democrats of the Seine, to which you announced that I had been appointed delegate by the citizens of the 3rd arrondissement.

At the same time as your letter reached me, I received communication, through the secretary of the permanent commission of the *Central Electoral Council*, of the manifesto published by this council, with an invitation to attach my signature to that of the members of the commission, authors of the called manifesto.

I will make you judge for yourself, citizen, my perplexity. Here I am between two contradictory requests, without any way of deciding for one or the other.

I presume that the aim of the *Central Electoral Congress*, which you ask me to attend, is to bring about a merger between the two factions of democratic-socialists that were produced during the vote on the presidency, and, consequently, to cancel the operations of the *Central Electoral Council* which is currently requesting my membership.

My wishes for conciliation have always been as ardent as they are sincere; and it was in spite of myself, despite my reasoned opinion, that I was led to take sides in favor of a candidacy. You have therefore done justice to my feelings, citizen, by choosing me for this delicate mission. However, I must point out to you that, representing the opinion contrary to yours, it would be more regular if I were delegated by the very people whose actions I have supported until now, and who, precisely, seem determined to ignore it, since they publish their manifesto.

In this situation, it seems to me that the *Central Electoral Congress*, created in opposition to the *Central Electoral Council*, is much less the expression of conciliation than of competition, and that it goes directly against the goal it sets for itself! ...

I can therefore only advise you, citizen, to come to an agreement on this subject with the permanent commission of rue des Fossés-Saint-Germain-l'Auxerrois; after which you will find me very willing to enter into the amicable path that you seem to me to desire.

Moreover, I cannot and must not conceal from you that, in the current state of mind, with the still little-advanced formulas of the democratic and social idea, a momentary division between us seems to me to be *inevitable*, and for that very reason little to regret.

This division will even be useful, if we know how to understand it and take advantage of it; because, I confess to you, I do not believe that we are in a position to act otherwise.

For two days, the appointment of the current head of the executive branch to the presidency has seemed assured to me. As for the candidacy of MM. Raspail and Ledru-Rollin, I am convinced, certain, that by grouping — something, in my opinion, that is impossible to achieve —

on the same head the votes acquired for each of these two candidates, we would still form, out of all the voters, only a fairly small minority.

Thus, without interest in the success of one or the other of your candidates, all acting only with a view to expressing a protest, pursuing no other goal than that of knowing the strengths of the socialist democracy, sure, finally, that if we wanted to try to bring back, either to M. Raspail the votes given to M. Ledru-Rollin, or to M. Ledru-Rollin or any other the votes given to M. Raspail, we would obtain only the defection of a portion of the citizens who march with us, our most advantageous part, the most patriotic even, is to support both these two candidates, and to leave the voters free.

The socialist democracy is *one*; France knows it. It is divided only on men, on proper names, representing separate but not very divergent tendencies.

Let us therefore vote separately, since it is impossible at this moment to do better; to know our collective and respective strengths: let us have no doubt, the presidential question, I mean personal, emptied, conciliation will not be long in coming.

In summary, today I believe the distinction between the two fractions of socialist democracy is good and profitable for both, since it must have the result of increasing their overall mass; I believe it useful to the triumph of our ideas; useful, finally, for the future of the Republic.

Fraternal greetings.

P.-J. PROUDHON.

(N. 12. November 29.)

The President of the Republic has not been named; the candidates have not yet issued their manifestos; it is still not even entirely known that the principle of the presidency is already bearing its detestable fruits. And it is not only the bourgeoisie, represented and personified as it was previously by constitutional royalty, that is divided in the face of the ballot; it is the people themselves who hesitate, it is the workers who, through a false idea of conciliation, allow themselves to be led into this abdication of their sovereignty. Then, as if to seek expiation for this crime against the democracy, it is we who are accused of dividing minds and betraying the Republic.

On this occasion of the presidency, against which we continue to protest every day, we are addressed with the most unfair and at the same time the most contradictory reproaches... We are told that we are *sold* to Cavaignac, that we *systematically* preach disunity among the socialist-democrats, that we vote with the *moderates*, that we are Montagnards and too advanced, that we do not march *progressively*, that it would be as good to vote for Cavaignac or Napoleon as to vote on the *sterile ground of socialism*, etc., etc.

These reproaches are addressed to us every day from Paris and the departments, in anonymous writings whose authors we deeply respect, but which in truth we do not understand, after the explanations that we have given so many times regarding our principles and our conduct.

We are sold to Cavaignac! — What do you mean? Because we voted, on November 4, in the company of fourteen Montagnards, against the presidential constitution, and because we rejected, on the 25th, the official agenda that, regarding the events of June, declared that the general had well served the homeland. So what was necessary to do on these two decisive occasions to prove that we were not sold?

That's not it, we are told: you are doing Cavaignac's business by voting for a man who has no chances, for M. Raspail.

Here we have to note both an illusion and a violation of principles in our critics.

The illusion! If we had all voted together for M. Ledru-Rollin, we would no less be doing General Cavaignac's business, since we would only be increasing the figure of the absolute majority, and consequently making the appointment of Louis Bonaparte more difficult, without giving the slightest chance to M. Ledru-Rollin. Please think carefully about this little calculation. The department of Côte-d'Or is, after that of Haute-Garonne, one of those best disposed in favor of M. Ledru-Rollin. However, according to the positive information that we have obtained on the state of opinion in Burgundy, the number of votes won for M. Ledru-Rollin in this department may amount to 5 or 6,000. Let us take the average, per department, of 4,000, this will make a total, for the eighty-six departments, of 344,000; let's say, if we like, 400,000.

Socialism, for its part, which hardly has numerous supporters except in Paris, Lyon, Limoges; which will also collect a few scattered votes in the other provinces, socialism will not reach 300,000; in all, 700,000 votes, for which we are asked for a useless, and in fact impossible, conciliation. Violation of principles! How can you not understand that we are not voting *for* the

presidency, but AGAINST the presidency; that if, therefore, we thought we would obtain the majority, instead of voting, to support a negative candidacy, we would propose abstention? We would tell the people to refer the nomination of the president to the National Assembly, to make the presidency impossible, finally, by their abstention.

We preach disunity systematically! But, the question of the presidency set aside, where is the disunity? In what way do we create disunity, because we want to maintain in its integrity the socialist dogma, which is, in our opinion, the true revolutionary dogma, which the pure politicians seem to us to misunderstand? So what is the flag to which we should rally? Which theories should we give our hands to? Where is the democratic and social party if it is not with us?

We vote with the moderates, and we are too-advanced Montagnards! We will first ask our adversaries to explain this double reproach to us, if they want us to be able to respond to them. We are voting with the moderates, because, in a domestic dispute between moderates, between M. Dufaure and M. Sénart, we ABSTAINED! We are voting with the moderates, because another time, regarding a speech on the right to work, where our ideas were condemned, we again, out of concern for personal dignity, ABSTAINED!

And then they say that we are too advanced, because we would like to overcome certain useless transitions, and because, according to us, periods of revolution are periods of sudden change.

You might as well vote for Cavaignac as vote on the *sterile ground of socialism!* Well, this is what we have never stopped telling you ourselves about M. Ledru-Rollin: the votes cast for this candidate are a free boost given to Cavaignac.

You might as well vote for Cavaignac as vote on the *sterile ground of socialism!* For this, we are in some ways of the opinion of our critics. It is SOCIALISM that separates us from Cavaignac: nothing but that! Without socialism, perhaps we would vote for him, instead of voting for Raspail; because, without socialism, we would never have had the idea of a democratic and social republic; without socialism, we would not have had the days of June, May 15, April 16; the deliberations in the Luxembourg, where the character of the February Revolution was defined. Without socialism, in short, we would be nothing; we would not exist.

In truth, we ask pardon of our adversaries, whom we would like to know and see that it is not the union that they have to recommend to us at this moment; it is our conversion that they need to carry out. Let them find a way to make us no longer socialists; let them explain the Revolution to us outside of socialism, and we vote with the Mountain (we are willing to assume that there is a party known as the *Mountain*); we will vote for M. Ledru-Rollin.

CAVAIGNAC.

December 5.

A few days ago we wrote the following words:

“It is socialism that separates us from Cavaignac: nothing but that! Without socialism, perhaps we would vote for him, instead of voting for Raspail. Because, without socialism, we would never have had the idea of a democratic and social Republic; without socialism, we would not have had the days of June, May, April; we would not have had the deliberations in Luxembourg, where the February Revolution was defined. Without socialism, in a word, we would be nothing, we would not exist.

These words, misinterpreted, commented on with malice, seemed to upset some of our friends; they made our adversaries cry scandal.

We also said, in the same article, that the election of Cavaignac — a horrible thing! — did not seem doubtful to us; and, at the same time, we made an approximate calculation of the votes that the socialist democracy, barely born, is already in a position to give, both to Raspail and to Ledru-Rollin. This is what was considered an advertisement in favor of Cavaignac.

Well! We are going to make heard, for the instruction of our readers and the malignity of our enemies, a very different blasphemy: we declare today, in the most formal manner, without detour or reluctance, that with the exception of Raspail, — whose candidacy is, as we know, on our part, only a protest against the presidential principle, — of all the candidates, avowed or tacit, who can offer themselves to the choice of the country, the one that we wish the most to see arrive is General CAVAIGNAC.

Will it take us twenty years of controversy to explain to those who read us what this great protest which has arisen in France since 1830, which we call *socialism*, means? Will it be understood, once, that irrevocably committed to the social question, we had to adapt our politics to our socialism, and not our socialism to our politics? Listen now, and think carefully about what we are going to say to you, all of you who are interested in our ideas, friends or followers, proletarians and proprietors:

If we were not for reason, we would be for faith;

If we were not with Voltaire, we would be with the Pope;

If we did not defend freedom, we would submit to authority;

If we did not pursue equality in the face of fortune, we would be partisans of privilege;

If we did not want democracy, we would accept the presidency;

If we were not for labor, we would be for capital;

If we did not vote for Raspail, we would vote for Cavaignac.

Here are seven propositions that, for us, are all identical and adequate; the last is similar to the others: it only translates into proper names what we consider to be the abstract formulas of our political and social symbol. There is an absolute necessity in our minds to decide for one or the other of these various alternatives: the dilemma is inexorable.

Cavaignac represents at this moment, for us, capital, and, consequently, by analogy or similarity, faith, the pope, authority, privilege, political antagonism, in other words the presidency:

as Raspail symbolizes in our eyes work, and synonymously reason, freedom, equality, democracy, unity.

— But, some object, Cavaignac is not the only man who represents these things: there are many others besides him, whose names would be even more significant. Why then, among so many illustrious people, — Bonaparte, Lamartine, Thiers, Molé, Ledru-Rollin, Larochejacquelein, Montalembert, the latter two, patrons, one of the Duke of Chambord, the other of the congregation of the Jesuits, — go and choose as the object of your opposition the machine-gunner of June, Cavaignac? Among so many heroes, Childebrand!

Ah! It is because each century has its own style and its particular expression: it is because at the point where we have arrived in our development, or rather in our civilized decadence, there is only one idea that still holds, CAPITAL, and because Cavaignac is the only man who represents purely, and to the exclusion of all others, this idea.

Notice first that, since February, Cavaignac is the only politician who has represented something. The provisional government represented chaos. The executive commission represented even less; it represented nothingness. Finally Cavaignac appeared, who said, in the face of the insurrection: Me, I am capital!

Cavaignac, I tell you, represents capital, but purely and brutally, without mixture of theocracy, monarchy, philanthropy or other trifles; capital stripped of its old formulas, reduced to its economic expression; capital finally, no less, no more. If the principle of capital is basically the same as that of the monarchy, the papacy or their diminutives, the aristocracy and the Jesuits, Cavaignac does not worry about it: he is capital, that is all.

Between MM. Bonaparte, Thiers or Molé, Larochéjacquelein or Montalembert, Lamartine, Lédru-Rollin and Cavaignac, — Raspail always aside, — we therefore prefer the last. The reason, it seems to us, is now easy to conceive.

With Bonaparte, we would have before us capital, plus the empire, the glory, the adventures, the expedition to Spain or Russia, the silence of liberty, *Siluit terra in conspectu ejus!* — Retrospective candidate, complex question.

With MM. Thiers, Molé, O. Barrot himself, we would have capital, plus the constitutional system, two equal powers, two chambers, etc. — Seesawing candidates, complex question.

With M. de Montalembert, we would have the capital, plus the confession notes, the submission of the temporal to the spiritual, the pilgrimages to the Holy Land. — Candidate, of the cross complex question.

With M. de Larochejaquelein, we would have the capital, plus the legitimacy and all its rights: — Feudal candidate, complex question.

With M. de Lamartine, we would have all the contradictions at once, capital, monarchy, aristocracy, popery, etc. — Omniform candidate, complex, indecipherable question.

With M. Ledru-Rollin, we would have, — it is his friends who say it, — capital, plus anti-capitalist tendencies; property, with certain poorly defined or undefined modifications; the economy of the State, as M. Jean Reynaud says, in place of the economy of society. We value M. Ledru-Rollin's intelligence too highly to attribute this nonsense to him. It is not at the moment of

struggle that a political leader poses as a man of transition, of compromise to put it more accurately: it is after victory. The candidacy of M. Ledru-Rollin at this moment is more than nonsense; it is a mistake. Let him therefore allow us to say of him; for this time: Candidate in reserve, question postponed.

Cavaignac alone represents capital, without increase or decrease, unequivocally, without accessories. He is the son of a regicide, a simple bourgeois, not infatuated with constitutional theories, neither Catholic nor philanthropist. Cavaignac, in a word, is the soldier of capital. Thus logical candidate, like Raspail; simple question.

Cavaignac alone suits us as President of the Republic, we mean as an adversary. With him Catholicism, royalty, the feudal system, constitutionalism, do not embarrass us; reluctance does not compromise us. Let capital, alone in struggle today, be defeated, and of all the ruins that the revolutionary spirit has accumulated over three centuries, not one will rise again.

What Cavaignac is to us, he is to his own eyes; he knows it, he feels it. Still alone, among his competitors, he has the clear and sincere understanding of what the President of the Republic should be.

We want the republic of labor: Cavaignac personifies the republic of capital, and presents himself as such. In June, Cavaignac, appointed dictator, posed socialism in front of him, as its opposing party. This is how Louis-Philippe, elected king on August 9, 1830, had posed the Republic as his antagonist.

The Republic came after eighteen years, after the republican idea had been sufficiently developed by the contradiction. Socialism will begin to come when it has found its opponent: the day Cavaignac is elected president will be a progress for socialism. Because, if it is true that the extremes touch, it is even more true that the opposites follow each other. Now, Cavaignac is the anti-socialist as Louis-Philippe was the anti-republican. Do you understand that?

And this is why, without worrying about the personal value or the private virtues of individuals; without establishing any kind of comparison between Lamartine, Thiers, Ledru-Rollin, etc., and Cavaignac, we do not hesitate to say that we passionately wish to have, as president of a Republic that is not ours, but to whose laws we are ready, as a minority, to submit, the man who, by himself as much as by the force of circumstances, poses as the personified negation of socialism, who represents with the most frankness and energy the counter-revolutionary principle, capital.

With anyone other than Cavaignac, we would have to argue about monarchy, theology, ideology, constitutionalism or romanticism: with Cavaignac, the question is admirably simplified, we are only dealing with the net product. If the net product succumbs in Cavaignac, it irrevocably takes with it into its ruin all the principles that are only variants or corollaries of it: the old civilization and the old world are over, they are over for eternity.

So what does it matter to us that our opinion on the presidency serves Cavaignac's candidacy, if among so many insignificant or hostile candidacies, this is the only one that can serve our interests? Is it not obvious, to those who reason, that it is important above all to weaken the enemy, by reducing him of everything that previously served as support and auxiliary; like a

general who, after having cut off the enemy army and broken through the center, takes advantage of both wings? Isn't this how Cavaignac himself defeated the insurrection?...

We know very well, moreover, we socialists in good faith, who like no more to deceive than to delude ourselves, we know that we still only form a fairly small minority in the country. What the socialist organs are in the press to other newspapers, we are in the Republic to the rest of the citizens: one against ten. But we also know that we are the ferment of the Revolution, the leaven that, in the time fixed by destiny, will make the social dough rise. This is why we want to position ourselves in the integrity of our principle and in the fullness of our antagonism. This is why we want, as a symbol of the present situation, not Raspail and Ledru-Rollin, which would only express a fratricidal division; not Ledru-Rollin and Cavaignac, which would express the transaction before the opposition; but Raspail and Cavaignac, labor and capital. Would we therefore be the only men in the Republic who were forbidden to loudly profess their opinions, and to formulate them through a candidacy?

Yes, general, you are our enemy, and because you are our enemy, we will be careful not to degrade you. You have done us too much harm for us to wish, when we begin this supreme struggle with you, to grow you further, to elevate you.

You were skillful, whatever anyone said, because you were true.

You were skillful in June, when the executive commission told you: *We are going to have a battle: we must finish it!* — It really didn't matter to you that it was not finished!

You were skillful when you called MM. Vivien and Dufaure. Your situation was poorly defined until then: it was still doubtful whether the victor of June had waged war on socialism or on escapees from prison. MM. Dufaure and Vivien gave you your real name, your real meaning: from then on you called yourself capital.

You were skillful when, to the great regret of your friends, and to the great joy of your accusers, you wanted the election of the President of the Republic to be fixed for December 10. You had calculated that the time limit was more than sufficient to express yourself in your essence, and to combine the interest of your candidacy with the interest of capital. You knew that a government, whatever it may be, is always sure of having a majority on the verge of a revolution: however, the country, still hot from February, March, April, May, June, the country is afraid of revolutions.

You were skillful when, to everyone's surprise, you challenged your political adversaries from the platform. — You still knew that you could only find among them accomplices, that on the other hand there were your accusers.

You are skillful when you stubbornly refused, under the pretext of assignats, to any creation of credit paper. Anything that can diminish capitalist feudalism is contrary to your principle; and in the current state of things, organizing credit would be committing suicide.

You are skillful when, despite the clamors of the left, you confined yourself, with regard to Europe, to imperturbable neutrality. You know that what is agitating Europe at the moment is socialism, and your mission is not to carry out armed propaganda on behalf of socialism. Those

who are shot in Vienna are the brothers of those you shot in Paris: you have to be stupid not to see that.

You are skillful, and what is more, you are fortunate when you offer the holy father the hospitality of the Republic: because the Republic over which you are going to preside is nothing other than the Republic of capital, the very Republic Christian, you understand, whose center will no longer be in Rome, but, as the Emperor wanted, in Paris. It has been a long time since Catholicism in the West made a pact with usury: you are going to renew this pact with the mystical union of the names of Pius IX and Cavaignac.

So follow your line without flinching; perform an act of government every day. Act, while your competitors, reduced to promising what you execute with so much resolution, sleep at the voters' doors.

But know one thing.

By defending capital, you. you are condemned to rebuild all these old principles whose successive elimination has made you what you are: first of all, constitutional monarchy, that pitiful stupidity of political ideologues; — then legitimacy, in which its own supporters no longer believe; — afterward, feudalism, buried more than two centuries ago by Richelieu; — then, the temporal and spiritual supremacy of the pope, beaten down by Philip the Fair, and demonetized by Luther.

In the field of capital, there is no stopping for you. Either you will backslide to theocracy, or you will be absorbed into socialism. On pain of ending up miserably like a Louis-Philippe, the President of the Republic becomes, either for the Pope a Charlemagne or for socialism a Constantine. But, Charlemagne, that is impossible, and Constantine, you don't want it. Louis-Philippe!... will this then, O Cavaignac, be your destiny?...⁸

⁸ Cavaignac was not elected President of the Republic: in this regard, the author's predictions were wrong. But the election of Louis Bonaparte only gave more force to his reasoning: barely in power, Louis Bonaparte declared himself the successor of Cavaignac. Louis Bonaparte, forced to renounce his imperialist and dynastic fantasies, represents, like Cavaignac, only capital. This is what constitutes the triumph of the latter, and the justification of the writer. (*Editor's note.*)

TO CITIZEN LEDRU-ROLLIN

In truth, citizen Ledru-Rollin, you do not understand us.

What! You convince yourself, or rather you are persuaded, that we are on a war footing with you!

What! Lowering our socialist colors to the proportions of a miserable politics, we would consider blocking your avenues to the presidency, out of jealousy of your personal preponderance!

We would place the tables of democratic law higher than you, in order to found a proud schism!

Let us speak frankly, you believe us to be your enemies even more than Cavaignac.

This is how we answer you:

We say to you: Go where you are led; seize it, this power, as soon as it lets itself be taken; listen to your professional friends, the *Rollinists*, as they say, and before six months you will no longer be Ledru-Rollin, you will be Cavaignac himself.

Yes, let the obstacles move away; cross in a single bound the distance that separates you from this damned presidency that confuses and diminishes us all; go to the goal, *become king* like Cromwell; you are Cavaignac, once again, and nothing but Cavaignac.

Judge for yourself.

Will you make credit flourish again in your hands, you who before the riots were already considered to be the frightener, the great killer of all confidence?

Will you ensure that capital does not hold it against you, that the monster does not return to its burrow when you call it, does not display itself when you no longer need it? This overwhelming yoke of capital, did you ever say that you would shake it?

What will you say to the bourgeoisie who, having given you, by a signal favor, the release of your circulars, will come to tell you "*that it is time to put an end to it!*"

What should we do with all these people who come to claim the right to assistance? Is it time to feed this hungry crowd of women, children, workers, like last winter, with manna and holy water from Lamartine?

Will you go, as on March 17, as on April 16, *depopularizing* the best part of yourself, stifling the voice of the petitions of a hundred thousand mouths to the beating of the drums of capital and privilege?

When the riot reappears, the periodic and terrible riot of hunger, what will you have to oppose to it, if not the cannons, the shells, the troopers of Cavaignac?

Thus, Cavaignac in the streets; — in the interior, Thiers, Guizot or Molé, whatever you can manage.

Do not hope to escape the rings of this gigantic camaraderie, which will envelop you entirely, once you are in business.

You will have on your hands all the old hands of the democracy, the whole battalion of old conspirators and pseudo-socialist scoundrels. Are all those who are advocating and pushing you

right now doing so without ulterior motives? — Positions! they shout to you from a league in advance, Commissions! Missions! Always the scramble started again for new charges.

And you will be there, arms crossed, saddened contemplator of the furies of your entourage, purveyor of all intrigues, simple and passive repository of the graces and superfluities of the budget.

The budget! So lighten it by one atom, we challenge you.

It is not you, gentle and good soul, who, under the pretext of Orleanism, will put poor fathers of families on the streets in order to accommodate your creatures; you who will take the bread from the mouth of Peter and put it into that of Paul. What budget will you need if you want to compensate for all the ingratitude of February! But what will the bourgeoisie say?

Cavaignac or Guizot; This is where you inevitably end up, this is what we want to take you away from, and we are your enemies!

Should you succeed in establishing equality of appearance or pageantry, you would have done nothing yet, leaving everyone in their sphere, the people in their rags, the high bourgeoisie in their simarres, the financier in his monopoly, the statesman in his proud grandeur.

The people no longer believe in the old sans-culottism.

What does historical, Greek, Roman or even Jacobin equality matter to them? What he wants is equality in terms of labor, education and well-being. This equality alone is real; all the rest is fiction and nothingness.

Who knows if we, your enemies, do not prevent the sacrifice of a good revolutionary temperament, which it would be regrettable to see end miserably between the double shock of the people and the bourgeoisie? This Dantonian fiber of yours, why not reserve it for better times?

You, Rollinists, who support him with so much enthusiasm towards this presidency, have you correctly imagined what figure he, Ledru-Rollin, will make under this quasi-monarchical canopy?

You are not afraid of seeing him engage in a disastrous role, of compromising himself between the two terms of this old antithesis of *the Tarpeian rock and the Capitol*. You dream of him in the Luxembourg or the Tuileries, and you don't remember that he visited Vincennes.

Once again, we, are we your enemies, citizen Ledru? Are you standing in our way, by any chance? This presidency, this candidacy, this political brawl, how does it affect us?

You still believe in the power, and we no longer believe in it.

We only believe in revolutions, and you believe in reforms, in the advent of certain proper names, in the preponderance of a particular political line, addresses, manifestos; programs, harangues, parliamentary stunts, platform feats, etc.

For us, all feasible reforms have been made. They also overwhelm the men who trust in them.

Tribune of the people, lawyer, chief, defender, haranguer of the people — these are old titles, offices abolished from the day the people are returned to themselves; as soon as they claim to live and behave without the help of these officious and irresponsible characters who will only ever be their tyrants in disguise.

You will undoubtedly find us excessive, exaggerated, above all impolitic; yes, impolitic, and we pride ourselves on it. But we call ourselves the People, and it is they themselves who tell you

through our voice that they are neither hateful nor vindictive, and that they know how to stifle even the seeds of the most legitimate grudges.

Is a rapprochement between the people and you still possible?

Yes; but escape the political territory as quickly as possible, loudly confess socialism, not the socialism of words and circumstances, following this club, following this newspaper, but the socialism that made us write here: — No president! nothing but citizens!

Is that declaration yours, citizen Ledru? From then on, you are no longer the stumbling block for the Social Republic. From then on, you yourself can say if it is indeed in our ranks that your enemies are.

(No. 20. December 7.)

To the Editor of the Democratic and Social Revolution.

Paris, December 6, 1848.

Monsieur Editor,

By publishing in your issue yesterday the article entitled: *M. Proudhon and M. Cavaignac*, you must have considered that I would not let such an attack go unanswered. What you are doing against me is no longer polemic: it is a violent incitement to contempt and hatred of my person. Whoever, having read your work, judges me on this strange biography, will not fail to believe that I am the greatest enemy of the Republic, and that the country would do well to purge itself of such an abominable man. So, what I would not have asked from you out of kindness, believe me, for the satisfaction of my self-esteem, I expect from your justice for my safety. You will oblige me, M. Editor, to insert this letter in your next issue.

At base, you only have one thing to reproach me for: being opposed to the candidacy of M. Ledru-Rollin, and, on the other hand, for having said that, as a candidate of capital, I preferred to M. Ledru-Rollin and to any other General Cavaignac. That is my whole crime. Take that charge away from me, and I become once again one of the most devoted patriots, one of the most intelligent revolutionaries. As for what you add about my opinions and my political conduct, these are only embellishments and seasonings of your own invention, with the sole aim of making me seem more and more odious and suspect. Please allow me, M. Editor, to first correct what is inaccurate in your allegations; the amendment of the details will make my justification clearer, on the essential point that divides us.

You begin by presenting me as a shameful plagiarist. According to you, I would have stolen from M. Mazel the idea of free credit and the Bank of Exchange.

You are not at all aware, M. Editor. I only became aware of M. Mazel and his work after the publication of the statutes of the Banque d'Exchange, and the very scientific demonstration that I had made of the principle of credit, a few months earlier. It was M. Mazel who, of his own accord, revealed himself to me, and who told me of his idea. And as for this idea in itself, far from claiming priority of invention for it, I repudiate it entirely, both in substance and in form. M. Mazel's idea is not mine; you recognize it implicitly yourself, when you say: *Soon we will know that by borrowing the mechanism invented by M. Mazel, M. Proudhon has only distorted it and made it impossible.*

No, sir, I borrowed nothing, distorted nothing. I am not in the habit of taking other people's ideas; I have some left over. I owe nothing to M. Mazel; and whatever esteem I profess for his enlightenment, I persist in believing that his idea, as he presented it in various publications, is incomplete and insufficient, as much from the point of view of the Revolution as from that of economic science.

Let us move on to another complaint.

You say: "Before the February Revolution, the government was careful not to do M. Proudhon the honors of persecution: the September laws were silent about his boldness, while every day the democratic sheets suffered fines and prison."

You are misinformed, M. Editor. In 1843, I was brought before the Assize Court of Besançon for a brochure entitled: *Warning to the Proprietors*, in a case in which the prosecution raised *NINE* different counts of accusation. On this occasion, M. Duchâtel, asked by me to refer this matter to a jury of economists, replied by telegraph to apply the maximum penalty, 12,000 francs fine and twelve years in prison! The jury showed less determination: I was dismissed from the complaint. I am not telling you about my other tribulations. It is enough for me to add that, since that time, I have been listed at the police headquarters as one of the most dangerous enemies of the monarchy. (See the *Revue rétrospectif* on this subject). I did not, I admit, ask for this honor.

You then say, and this is not the least of the attacks on me, that I have many times ridiculed universal suffrage.

In truth, M. Editor, I cannot imagine that a democrat would dare to speak of universal suffrage, after what the doctors of democracy have done with it! Do you therefore find that the National Assembly, the product of universal suffrage, well represents the *aspirations* of the democracy, as you say? And when the said vote is on the eve of giving M. Louis Bonaparte three million votes and M. Ledru-Rollin five hundred thousand, do you have reason to be so happy with it? Don't you feel the itch to correct, by some revolutionary means, the injustice of universal suffrage?... Come, M. Editor, universal suffrage will only be a truth after we socialists have taught you how to make it speak. Until then, the safest thing for you to do will be to keep your mouth shut; and this is what you will not fail to do if you come to power.

After having fought the progressive tax, I would have proposed, if I am to believe you, to apply it.

Your memory fails you, M. Editor. I proposed a temporary withholding of a third of the net income, or a sixth for the benefit of farmers, tenants and debtors, and a sixth for the State. I have never approved or proposed the progressive tax, which I reduced to the absurd in my *System of Economic Contradictions*, Volume I, chap. VII.

Another contradiction. After having said: *Property is theft!* I would have constituted myself, according to you, the defender of property!

If you mean by this that I fought any material attack on property as disruptive to the social order and contrary to economic reform, you were right, and, far from hiding it, I boast of it. If, on the contrary, you wanted to say that I rejected all economic development in the opposite direction to the principle of property, I will have the honor to answer you that this is not even a slander, it is quite simply stupidity.

"You don't have time," you say, "to reveal the distressing picture of my variations."

It is fortunate for you, M. Editor, that you ran out of time. Such a revelation, I warn you, would do little honor to your knowledge. I challenge you to prove that even once, in ten years, have I varied in any way in my opinions!

But here is something that is more serious: "Mr. Proudhon made himself the ally of M. d'Alton-Shée, the ex-count, to create discord within the democratic party."

I have not made an alliance with M. d'Alton-Shée, nor M. d'Alton-Shée with me. This must also be crossed out of your indictment. M. d'Alton-Shée is a man who, despite an aristocratic position, passed, like many others, from the constitutional monarchy to the Republic, and from the Republic to socialism, with no other impulse than that of truth and the intelligence of the century. If it would please you, M. Editor, to take a further step, you would undoubtedly meet us on the same ground. As for the crime of throwing discord into democracy, it is clear that you accuse of discord those who think differently than you, according to Boileau's rule:

He who does not love Cottin does not esteem his king,
And has, according to Cottin, neither God, nor faith, nor law.

You then say:

"After having extended his sympathies from M. Bonaparte to M. Cavaignac, etc."

On my alleged Bonapartism, I would have thought you, M. Editor, a little better informed.

I was introduced to M. Louis Bonaparte by M. Joly père, representative of Haute-Garonne, currently one of the hottest members of the Mountain. M. Joly told me that M. Ledru-Rollin was informed of the approach and would be informed of the result. We spoke to Citizen Bonaparte, M. Joly and I, as energetic republicans. M. Bonaparte replied to us, following his custom, showing us much consideration, and thanking us for our politeness.

I haven't seen the pretender since, and it didn't take long for me to realize that M. Joly despaired of him as much as I did. Strong in my conscience, covered by the presence of one of my colleagues, knowing that what was happening would be reported to the honorable M. Ledru-Rollin, then my leader, I did not think that suspicion should have reach. How then are MM. Joly and Ledru-Rollin today fierce republicans, while I have remained a Bonapartist?

The story of my sympathies for General Cavaignac is of the same type, and you are permitted, M. Editor, less than anyone else to ignore it.

Do you remember a certain meeting of patriots attended, among others, by M. Delescluze, current editor of the *Révolution démocratique et sociale*, in which the question of knowing what should be done, in case would a struggle break out in Paris between Louis Bonaparte and Cavaignac? Opinions were divided, or rather there were no opinions, so many disadvantages were found, either in joining Cavaignac against Bonaparte, or in taking his side, unless he was subsequently eliminated; or finally in remaining neutral. Finally, the first party prevailed: it was, in my opinion, the wisest. Cavaignac, it is said, represents for the moment the Republic; let us save the form first, the substance will come later. It was therefore agreed that we would go find General Cavaignac, and that we would agree with him on the conditions of the assistance to be given to him. I was designated for this step, which did not take place.

I contacted General Cavaignac another time, in a very personal interest, I admit: it was about the suspension of the *Représentant du Peuple*. To all the observations I was able to make, the

general replied that I was at odds with the country, and that with newspapers of the type of mine, order in the Republic was impossible. It appears, moreover, that with regard to principles, General Cavaignac found me incorrigible; the suspension of the newspaper was only lifted after six weeks, then pronounced again, following three consecutive seizures. Today, despite its moderation, despite its cajoling, the *Peuple*, heir of the *Représentant du Peuple*, has *FOUR TRIALS* pending; while the *Révolution démocratique et sociale*, which never ceases to insult Cavaignac and incite hatred of the government, lives in complete security. The fact is that you only represent one man, M. Editor, and I represent a principle.

And it is my opinion that this fierce hatred that you affect for Cavaignac is not as irreconcilable as it seems; because, finally, who brought General Cavaignac from Algeria? Aren't these the friends of his brother Godfrey, MM. Flocon, Ledru-Rollin, etc.? What! Would he have been made Minister of War without knowing him, and quite simply in consideration of the dead? This is indeed democratic camaraderie!... And then, what Cavaignac defends and represents, capital, rent, *net* product, you also defend: the starting point of your policy is the same as that of politics of Cavaignac. What sets you apart from him is not the ideas, it is the turbulence.

All these little slanders, these little insinuations aside, what remains of your diatribe? This only, which I do not retract, and which hardly embarrasses me, that I prefer, to represent capital and privilege, General Cavaignac, even to M. Ledru-Rollin. I said the reason in my last article, and I am surprised, really, that it scandalizes you.

Some time ago, I asked you and your friends, clearly, categorically, this question: Are you, yes or no, for the abolition of the *five billion* in rents that labor pays each year to capital? The whole Revolution is there. It is not a question of knowing how and how long from now this abolition will take place, — a very simple abolition in my opinion, which must regenerate society, — for the moment it is only a question of the principle. Grant me the principle, and I will grant you the time and the transitions.

If you decide, I added, in the affirmative, then you are socialists as I am myself, and I march with you. Otherwise, you are neither socialists nor democrats, and all your improvement projects are only changes to the system of poverty. In this case, I protest against the abuse you make of the title of socialist, and for the honor of the democracy, for the morality of the party you claim to defend, I will fight your candidacy.

So what's the point of equivocating? What is the point of so many insults and so much violence? You say that M. Ledru-Rollin was more capable than anyone of ridding the Republic of the presidential power, but that I prevented him from doing so by making his election impossible; that men of heart had formulated the program of immediately achievable reforms, and that I oppose these reforms; that they had sworn not to stop in the revolutionary march, and that I slander them..., etc., etc.

All these declamations, M. Editor, are pure nonsense. If M. Ledru-Rollin were elected President of the Republic, his duty would be to exercise the functions that he holds from the Constitution and the people, and I do not accept when it is said in his name that he would resign. It would be more than impolitic, it would be mad. As for the alleged obstacle that I am placing to

this election, I have said many times that you seem to me to be in a deplorable error, if you believed that M. Ledru-Rollin could gather more than five hundred thousand votes, including both socialist and democrats. What does it matter then that a hundred thousand votes stand out from this number, in the interest of a protest which, according to me, contains the secret of the future and the destiny of France? The extinction of the net product, I tell you, the abolition of *five billion* in rents! Beyond that, there is no Revolution, there is only shirking. All these immediately achievable reforms that you are talking about; this whole revolutionary march that you honor the signatories of the *Declaration*, is for me only a new and fruitless torture that you want to inflict on the social body, an agitation without idea and without result.

This has been my intimate conviction for many years; such it was formed, after long and laborious research. It is unfortunate for you, I admit, to encounter such an obstinate conviction on your path; but, allow me to tell you, M. Editor, you do not yet know what an idea is; because if you knew what an idea was, you would know what a conviction was.

I am, M. Editor, your very humble servant,

P.-J. PROUDHON.

P. S. As I close my letter, I receive the following postmarked note, the original of which I have at your disposal.

“To Monsieur Proudhon, the royalist.

"Please tell me who is paying you to disunite the Democrats? Is it by Cavaignac, Louis-Philippe or Henry V! How, wretch that you are, at a time when you should be making all your efforts to ensure the triumph of the Republic, are you seeking to bring it down, because the people have not nominated you for the presidency! You are therefore an ambitious man!... It is a worker, who until this day had confidence in you, who speaks to you and who hates you, letting you know that the same fate that this Italian Rossi experienced awaits you, and whoever assassinates you will have deserved well from the country, and especially from the democracy, since you are a traitor!....."

I have twenty such letters in my writing desk. The first ones all came to me from the bourgeois; for some time now, since there has been talk of the presidency, they have been coming to me from workers. You and your friends have done so well, with your accusations and your intrigues, that at this moment I am, for many poor devils, presidential fanatics, a scoundrel. Certainly, I am not accusing you of moral complicity; but when such opinions come to me regularly following your diatribes, I have every right to complain about a controversy that, having nothing to say about things, begins to tear people apart. If this is politics, I declare that I understand nothing about it, and I withdraw from the arena.

We implore our friends to meditate on the following sentences from General Cavaignac's proclamation, relating to the election of the President of the Republic:

“Citizens, if you appear calm, thoughtful, resolute, you will have given your work a solid and respectable basis. *Your enemies, those of society*, would perhaps like to exploit your agitations, your struggles: they will stop before the imposing work of your meditation.

“You have been told, as we have been told ourselves, that *fools speak of judging the choice of the people*, in order to then bargain for their obedience. Rest assured: the government knows its duties, and never has it been *more energetically determined to fulfill them*.

“Good citizens are those who, after having freely and conscientiously cast their vote, know that they will then only have to *bow with respect to the choice of the nation*, WHATEVER NAME it has pronounced.

“As for those who harbor other projects, who prepare for disastrous undertakings, as for those, if there exist any, TODAY AS A GOVERNMENT, TOMORROW AS SIMPLE CITIZENS, we could only see in them *public enemies* whom the law would not and could not cover.”

Thus, those about whom the government of the Republic is concerned, those who are the object of its uncertainties, whom it designates to the distrust and hatred of the citizens, and for whom there exists neither law nor mercy, they are not the partisans of legitimacy, they are neither the Bonapartists nor the Orleanists: it is the social democracy, it is us! We are those *public enemies* whom *the law cannot and does not want to cover*, before whom bourgeois dissensions are silenced, political rivalries fade away. Cavaignac is nothing more than Napoleon's gendarme!

As we said yesterday, the capitalist conspiracy, the offensive and defensive alliance of privilege against the proletariat is formed; there is an *entente cordial* between all these men whom we supposed to be enemies: Bugeaud, Changarnier, Cavaignac, Lamoricière, Molé, Thiers; between the *Presse* and the *National*. Whether they admit it or deny it, whether they know it or not, it doesn't matter. The strength of interests unites them, the same thought directs them: this thought is the extermination of socialism.

Whatever name comes out of the ballot, this name is accepted in advance as the rallying cry of the entire capitalist party. To this name the government *bows*; those to whom we attributed the ambition of Caesars and Pompeys become modest and disinterested like Cincinnatus. Don't think that they have a fetish for universal suffrage any more than we do: on this point, they are all sons of Voltaire, as skeptical as we ourselves would be, if we thought that universal suffrage had received its final form. What they like, what they value at the moment in universal suffrage is the authority they draw from it for their projects of reaction. To subdue the people, in fact, we need nothing less than the will of the people.

Moreover, everything seems, by a marvelous arrangement, to have been planned against the possibility of a conflict. While in Paris the government arms its cohorts and concentrates its troops; while M. Dufaure summons the staff of the national guard; while the friends of Louis-Bonaparte exalt the zeal of their supporters, Marshal Bugeaud federalizes the departments and is

preparing, it is said, to march on Paris at the head of 200,000 men. When a riot breaks out, Cavaignac retreats to the Saint-Denis plain; then, with the winner of Isly, he retakes the capital, and purges the Republic of the new Albigenians.

Then, we will share the spoils: Napoleon will have the presidency of the Republic; Cavaignac the presidency of the National Assembly; Lamoricière the government of Algeria, etc. On the day the proletarian flinches, they will remake a less democratic, less inconvenient Constitution; they will start the parliamentary comedy again; they will quarrel from January 1 to December 31 over portfolios, unless we come together and stand up on all sides. It will be the golden age of politics, the ideal of the capitalist and antisocial republic...

Friends, let the declarations of the power enlighten us. We are barely one against ten, without money and without weapons against enemies equipped with all the ammunition. Let us not repeat the tragedies of 1831, 1832, 1834, which, if they gave rise to the Republic, also prolonged the existence of the royalty for eighteen years. Let us not engage in this unholy war: enough bloodshed, enough orphans, enough misery. The social idea is planted to bear its immortal fruits. It has no use for our blood; it only needs our sweat.

The five to six hundred thousand votes that the social democracy, currently represented by citizens Raspail and Ledru-Rollin, will obtain, we hope, form a total of at least two million souls devoted to our cause. Socialism, having barely entered political life, would already form a powerful state, superior to the Swiss Confederation. Let us know how to organize, on the commercial and industrial ground, this working mass. Let us not postpone the hope of our principles until a new presidential election. Let us not remain inactive in the presence of representative waste; let us not waste time on these distractions of an empty politics, which, for six weeks, tormenting and dividing us, will only result, you will see, in giving one more sanction to the monarchical institution of the quadrennial presidency. We worked so well for the power! Let us do something for liberty.

The *Révolution démocratique et sociale*, which has sworn, as everyone knows, to exterminate us from the Republic, bequeaths to us this morning, with its inquisitorial authority, the curses of the democracy. According to our colleague, it is we who, through our perfidious actions, prepared these December elections, where we see here and there the votes being distributed among the candidates in this relation that is not very flattering for certain ambitions: Louis-Bonaparte, 1,000; Cavaignac, 100; Ledru-Rollin, Raspail included, 10! It is we who caused the panic among the workers in Paris and Lyon, we who spread dizziness across the eighty-six departments, we who ignited this Napoleonic craving! Certainly, if honest people died from the rage of fools, we would not have fifteen days of life! Bad garlic, as the Sage speaks, has cast its sinister regard on us: we are quite surprised to have yet lost neither our appetite nor our sleep!

But why this epileptic hatred? Why this relentlessness which was never equaled in the splendor of journalism?

Must we say it?

It is because the *Révolution démocratique et sociale*, which only conceives of revolution through M. Ledru-Rollin, of democracy only with M. Ledru-Rollin, of socialism only under M. Ledru-Rollin, imagines that everything is lost, that everything has vanished, socialism, democracy and revolution, with the candidacy of M. Ledru-Rollin!

Because we, who could not be taken as fools, had the misfortune to forecast this result, and, having foreseen it, we are supposed to have caused it!

Because we believed that the true policy to follow for our party, on the question of the presidency, both from the point of view of tactics and in terms of principles, was to abstain, and that by forcing ourselves to take part in the vote, we highlighted our minority!

Because with the memories of the provisional government and the executive commission, for any recommendation to the voters, M. Ledru-Rollin had, in our opinion, to reserve himself and stay away, and his friends from the *Révolution démocratique et sociale*, better advised no doubt, have compromised and used him up in a sterile struggle!

Because M. Ledru-Rollin did not initially have the slightest desire to become a socialist; because it was in spite of us that he passed himself off as such, and because this caused him to lose more votes than he gained!

Because, silencing our feelings about the man of June, and considering only the progress of the Revolution, we would have preferred Cavaignac to Napoleon; and because our prudent opponent, by dint of declaiming against Cavaignac, contributed more than any other to the success of Napoleon, which saddens him today.

It is for all these grievances that the *Révolution démocratique et sociale* accuses us; for this reason that it arouses the despair of the people against us, and dedicates our heads to the infernal gods! The *Révolution démocratique et sociale* has just lost its last illusion; reality enlightens it and kills it: in revenge, it anathematizes us! In truth, very honored colleague, you have the transport in your brain: go take a shower.

For us, leaving aside the small disappointments of the contenders, we do not hesitate to say that if the result of the election did not meet our expectations, we are far from despairing. We even find, in the comparison of the figures, and especially in their analysis, positive encouragement for greater efforts. So, far from discouraging the people with stupid lamentations, we will tell them, figures in hand, to consider what they were before February, what they have since become.

How many were there, a year ago, the republicans of the day before, that is to say the men of the *National* and the *Réforme*? — Less than a hundred thousand perhaps, for all of France. How many are there of the Republicans of the next day? More than four million! See for yourself: we take the results of the Seine department ballot as a basis.

In Paris and the suburbs, Louis Bonaparte obtained, in round numbers, 191,000 votes; Cavaignac, Ledru-Rollin, Raspail, etc., 135,000. — But it is recognized that, out of Louis Bonaparte's 191,000 votes, more than 30,000 come from the socialists, who failed Raspail in hatred of Cavaignac, and that, moreover, a large number of citizens, in Paris as in the departments, voted for Napoleon, who are nonetheless republican.

The majority thus finds itself shifted in favor of the Republic. Paris, in a word, which believed itself to be constitutional in February, recognized itself as republican in December. The same thing happens in the departments. In Haut and Bas-Rhin, in Franche-Comté, in Languedoc, the peasants voted for Napoleon with cries of: *Long live the Republic!* In Bresse and the Ardennes, we heard them say: *Long live Napoleon! Down with the rich!* Everywhere the socialist instinct, joined to the deepest republicanism, is mixed with this name of Napoleon, who, for the people, was, and still is today, only the Revolution incarnate, or, as Madame de Staël said, Robespierre on horseback!

Courage then, friends; do not give way to thoughts of despair in your hearts; don't let yourself be discouraged by the cries of joy of the reactionaries. Louis Bonaparte is condemned, by popular vote, to complete the Revolution of 1848, just as the emperor had been condemned, by Providence, to complete the Revolution of 1792.

It is not only the socialists of Paris, Lyon, Limoges, who, by their spontaneous and in some way fateful vote, assigned the role of President of the Republic; it is also the peasants of Burgundy, Lorraine, Languedoc, the workers of Mulhouse and Rouen who want it.

Bonaparte will be republican, democratic republican and socialist, or else he will fall like Louis-Philippe, like Lamartine, like Cavaignac, under ridicule or contempt. We wanted Cavaignac as a representative of capital; we will accept Bonaparte as the representative of the workers. Socialist or traitor: there is no middle ground for him.

Let's wait for him to work!

Louis-Napoleon Bonaparte.

December 17.

We fought Louis-Napoleon's candidacy by the means that were within our power, polemics and voting.

All questions of persons aside, we knew, and no one could ignore it, that the election of Louis-Napoleon, posed by the reaction, supported by the reaction, could only benefit the reaction. *A priori*, therefore, we had to decide against this candidacy.

In agreement then with the central electoral committee of Paris, which believed it necessary, instead of abstaining, to intervene in the vote, we wanted, by choosing a candidate, to raise the figure of the absolute majority, and thereby make the accession of Bonaparte more difficult.

Everyone in the democratic and social party seemed to agree so well with this tactic that, when it came to choosing a candidate, symbol of their protest, it was unanimously recognized that the man on whom would be called for the votes of the Democrats could only be an honorary candidate: M. Ledru-Rollin, in a letter addressed to the committee, formally recognized this.

Cavaignac was therefore the last resort of the democracy, which, better inspired than it was later, wanted above all, by saving the integrity of the form, to make the work easier for the reform of the substance...

We frankly entered into this path, of which we had not taken the initiative; and, by sacrificing our personal opinion, we set an example of discipline. The purpose of our vote thus marked, the candidate did not matter to us; it was even the same for us whether there were two or just one: the whole question was to know our forces and to keep Napoleon aside.

Since then, we have been able to judge, from the liveliness of the opposition made to us regarding Raspail's candidacy, that several of our political co-religionists, while approving the democratic and social faith, and taking an oath of hatred to the presidency, hid the thought, guilty in our eyes because it was as contrary to socialism as to democracy, of making their candidate succeed. The candidacy of M. Ledru-Rollin, which was to be, like that of Raspail, only a simple protest, suddenly became a serious candidacy, as serious, consequently as threatening, as hostile for us as those of Napoleon and of Cavaignac. It was an apostasy against which our duty was to protest, a Machiavellian combination that we fought with all our efforts, but which we do not boast of having defeated: the blatant minority of the democratic and social party making failure, for the moment, inevitable.

Moreover, to put everyone at ease and not disguise anything of our thoughts, we will say without pretense that independently of our inviolable fidelity to the anti-presidential principle, if the candidacy of M. Ledru-Rollin had had the slightest chance of success, and it had been up to us to abort it, we would have done it. We have no more confidence in the ideas that M. Ledru-Rollin represents today than in those represented by the *National* and Cavaignac. M. Ledru-Rollin, — we mean the democratic fraction of which he is the leader, — has not spent a long enough quarantine in the socialist lazaret for us to believe him already transformed, purified of this political rust that has produced all the failures of the Revolution since February.

So, if today Louis-Napoléon Bonaparte is elected President of the Republic, the responsibility cannot fall to us. It belongs entirely to those who, following the slogan, wanted to exploit for their own benefit the horror that Cavaignac inspired, and who, unable to make people believe in their success, rushed most of the democrats towards Napoleon.

Let us now try to attenuate the scope of the vote; whether we explain it, whether we torture it, whether we excuse it, it will nonetheless remain true that the fruit belongs entirely to the reaction: because, in any war, only those who held the flag in combat benefit from victory. Socialist democracy committed the same mistake as the legitimist party, which also voted, tactically, for Napoleon, believing it was serving the interests of Henry V, and which did nothing other than crown the Bonapartist pretender in place of its own.

Regardless, Louis-Napoléon Bonaparte is president. He is the president of the reaction, not of the legitimist reaction, which annihilated itself by giving him its votes; not of the Jesuitical reaction, reduced, since 89, to hiding from all governments and singing *Domine salvum fac* for all princes; not even the financial and bourgeois reaction, which since June had been personified in Cavaignac; but of the monarchical-constitutional reaction, which, on this pivot of the presidency, is preparing to rebuild the *bascule* system broken in February.

This is what, by the law of the vote, Napoleon is for us.

In vain you will protest, democrats; in vain you will try to compensate for your defeat by the calculations of a miserable tactic. Louis-Napoléon would tell you, the *senatus-consulte* of 1804 and the additional act of 1815 in hand: I am the true constitutional monarch who was to reign over France. Louis XVIII, Charles X and Louis-Philippe were only intruders, usurpers against whom the People protested in July 1830 and February 1848, as they have just protested, by choosing me as president, against the Republic of Luxembourg and the 45 centimes. The restoration and the last reign were only a surprise of history, a theft committed against the family of the great Napoleon. Is it surprising that this admirable constitutional system, the work of Siéyès and the Emperor, exploited by lies, produced only lies, and that it was swept away by two revolutions? Frenchman, you have not lived since 1814: Start again with me!...

Such could be the speech of Louis-Napoléon, supported by his godfather the *Constitutionnel* and his godmother the *Presse*, and escorted by five and a half million votes! So let's start again, since this is what the People wanted. The voice of the People, it is said, is the voice of God: this idea has constantly come back to us since we saw universal suffrage working. It must be admitted, however, that the People spoke this time like a drunken man. But, says the proverb, he is a god to drunkards. Let us start again. How long will the experiment last? This is what needs to be calculated.

If there is no doubt that the election of Napoleon-Louis is a return to the monarchical-constitutional system, with three balanced powers, with an equivocal and bourgeois appearance; it is also certain that there is something in this election that singularly dampens its effect, let us even say that condemns its principle. Napoleon the Younger, like Napoleon the Great, carries with him the idea, the dart that will kill him. Our duty, as socialist democrats, loyal adversaries, who do not want the death of the power, but for it to be converted, is to publicly release this idea. Our

campaign plan was made in advance against Cavaignac: we are going to say what it will be against Napoleon, if, in the labyrinth into which he has just embarked, Napoleon takes the wrong route!

In the election of Louis Bonaparte we make two parts, or, to use the style of business people, we establish two accounts: one that includes all the progress of the triumphant reaction under the emblem of Bonaparte, which is summed up in this decisive expression, CONSTITUTIONAL MONARCHY; — the other, which contains all the obligations contracted towards the country and the voters by the pretender. The first of these accounts forms, so to speak, the *assets*, the second forms the *liabilities* of the presidency.

We know sufficiently, from the experience of the last thirty-three years, what the assets consists of: — let us see a little what the liabilities are.

In his manifesto to voters, Louis-Napoléon Bonaparte said, among other things, that his sole ambition was, after having made the Republic happy and prosperous, to return, at the end of the four years of his presidency, the power, as he receives it today, to his successor.

With these words, Louis-Napoleon made a formal declaration of adhesion, not only to the Republic, but to the Constitution. He is committed to respecting and ensuring respect for the Constitution. He abjured all monarchical pretensions, all counter-revolutionary ulterior motives. And those who voted for him, like him, made an act of adhesion to the Republic and the Constitution.

It is a first obligation, a first debt, that commits the future of Louis Bonaparte, which stops him at the line where the political meaning of his election inevitably takes him. — Louis Bonaparte, by the principle of his candidacy, much more than by his inclination, tends to reestablish the constitutional monarchy, and, like Louis-Philippe, to found another dynasty. By the articles of his manifesto, on the contrary, and by the principle of voting, he obliged himself to return the Presidential Constitution after four years in the state in which he received it. I would like to know how he and his can advisors satisfy at the same time the wish of principle and the duty of commitment?...

That is not all.

Louis Bonaparte, who, since his entry into the National Assembly, has constantly maintained a prudent silence; who knew with such skill how to remain silent, even though everything provoked him to speak; Louis Bonaparte did not always have the same reserve. In his life he had the misfortune of writing; he wrote some singularly random things, and these things, far from hiding them, he reproduced them on the occasion of his candidacy; he used them as electoral leverage; they are part of his manifesto, because they accompanied him. We want to talk here especially about the brochure entitled: *Extinction of pauperism*.

A Bonaparte must know what he is saying. The extinction of pauperism is the emancipation of the proletariat; it is the right to work; it is society turned upside down. Bonaparte, in a word, did neither less nor more than Raspail and Ledru-Rollin: to obtain votes, he became a socialist. This is how the peasants and workers who gave their votes to Louis-Napoleon understood it.

Long live the Republic! some shouted: *Amnesty!* said the others. *Down with Cavaignac! Down with the rich!* it was the refrain of the majority. The most determined added: *We'll give him six months!* doubling the term assigned to the provisional government by the February insurgents.

What is all this other than the commentary on the *Manifesto* and the *Extinction of Pauperism?*

Long live the Republic! So, down with the empire! Down with the constitutional monarchy, bastard of the Empire and the Republic!

Amnesty! That is to say: Give us Barbès, Raspail, Blanqui, Caussidière, Louis Blanc. Return to us those transported from Brest, Cherbourg and Rochefort, Let us forget our quarrels of March, April, May, June, December! *Amnesty!* Ah! President of the Republic, if you have ever pressed the hand of the proletarian, if your heart has beaten on his chest, it will be of all your debts the sweetest to pay, the least perilous! The amnesty will last you as long as your four million votes.

Down with Cavaignac! that is to say, down with capital! Down with the rich! translate: Down with the poor! down with the exploitation of man by man! down with poverty! — The representatives of the People, devoted to the preservation of the monopoly, had gone to petition in favor of Cavaignac. — No! No! No Cavaignac, the peasants replied: *Long live Napoleon! Down with the rich!*

The Republic, the Constitution, amnesty, the extinction of the proletariat, the organization of work; This is what we call the *liabilities* of the presidency.

Now it is a question, for the new elected official, of honoring his signature. With what will he pay, the citizen president? How do you think he meets all these demands, fulfills these promises, fulfills these obligations, avoids protest at maturity? Do you believe that it is with this remission of some taxes, which should immediately be replaced by others, that Louis Bonaparte will give his creditors a change?

The tax on salt, the gabelle, produces 56 million in the treasury. I suppose this tax is completely abolished and consumption doubled: it will be as if Louis Bonaparte donated 116 million per year to the People, who elected him.

The tax on beverages produces 103 million. I suppose this tax abolished, and consumption doubled, that is to say the use or benefit of the wine increased by double for the consumer who deprives himself of it, and consequently the sale doubled for the wine-grower who only knows that to make it: it will be as if Louis Bonaparte made a new donation to the People of 206 million.

I bring to 100 million the duties and customs duties on meat, cereals and other food substances. Assuming these rights are abolished, and consumption doubled. The benefit for the People: 200 million.

Sugar duties produce 70 million. — Suppose this perception is abolished and consumption doubled: it will be a new increase in well-being for the People of 140 million.

Together, 662 million from which the budgets of municipalities and the State should be immediately relieved, in the interest of public well-being and health!

Six hundred and sixty-two million divided by 36 million citizens, and 365 days of which the year is composed, give the quotient, — as an arithmetic expression of the physical, moral and

intellectual improvement of the People, obtained by the abolition of 662 millions of taxes, — *five centimes ten thousandths* per day and per head!...

But this result is exaggerated, because the 662 million deducted for the benefit of the working class will have to be transferred to the rich class: that is to say, to fill the budget deficit it will be necessary to increase or create other taxes. Now, it is here that the question becomes complicated and the embarrassment increases.

The property tax cannot be increased: it is not only the 45 centimes of the Republic that should be subtracted, it would rather be 90 centimes.

The occupational duty is in the same situation.

The contributions on personal and movable property can be made progressive by means of a tax on revenue: the income that would be obtained from this is estimated at 60 million.

The recording and stamp fees are already excessive: only we could, by the process of Goudchaux, make more on the right established on collateral inheritances: i.e. 20 million per year.

Tobacco shops, posts, navigation and transit rights are already too high: no increase is possible.

Therefore, 80 million must be deducted from the 662 million that should be reduced from the consumption of the People, which reduces to five centimes, instead of five centimes six tenths, the amount of well-being that could be given to the People by the abolition of the four categories of taxes that we have previously listed; tax on salt, tax on beverages, tax on meat and cereals, tax on sugars.

Thus, to give the People five cents of income per day per head, we would put the State in debt of 582 million each year! But as the State cannot do without a budget any more than society can do without government, it would infallibly happen, before the expiration of the first year, that all taxes would be reestablished, and consequently poverty returned to the *status quo*; — or the State would go bankrupt, that is to say the nation would no longer have a government, something impossible in a republic with a presidency.

Instead of 662 million, only reduce by half, a third or a quarter; make whatever combination and compensation you want: you will never escape from this circle of the poverty of the People and the bankruptcy of the State.

We are currently talking about a loan of 500 million, at 6 percent, under the guarantee of Emperor Nicholas! — I admit that this loan will be fulfilled tomorrow. When you have filled the deficit already known for the year 1848, and the deficit forecast for the year 1849, there will only remain of the 500 million borrowed an annual income of 30 million to add to the budget of the Republic and to distribute between the workers. This is the clearest, most distinct result that can come to us from the appointment of Napoleon.

I therefore ask Louis-Napoléon Bonaparte, President of the French Republic:

Do you have what it takes to meet your electoral obligations?

And without asking about political questions, which are easy to resolve when you have solved the problem of poverty, can you, tell me, reduce your budget by three quarters, double national production, and quadruple the average worker's income?

Can you relieve the proletariat, not temporarily of 500 million, which you will then have to ask for again, on pain of delivering the country to anarchy; but in perpetuity of the five billion in rents that labor pays to capital?

Can you credit the workers' associations, put an end to industrial antagonism, guarantee education, labor, health, wealth, freedom to all?

If you can, hurry to make it known to us and to justify the people's choice: because we are, towards those who govern us, impatient and merciless. Otherwise, I declare to you in the name of this same People, that you are only a borrower in bad faith, a miserable forger, who, the very day he signs his contract, is already dreaming of ways to become bankrupt.

The Oath.

December 21.

Yesterday, at half past four, in the meeting room of the National Assembly, Louis-Napoléon Bonaparte, President of the French Republic by universal suffrage, took the oath to the Constitution.

This oath, he said in his speech, obliges his honor and his policy.

We have no doubt of the perfect good faith and sincere resolution of M. Bonaparte. But, really, what does this prove? Is this the literal observation of the oath? Is this even the president's current intention? Don't we know that there are a thousand ways, without violating an oath, to do exactly the opposite of what it presupposes? And besides, isn't necessity stronger than all oaths?

This morning, our readers must have learned with great satisfaction that five and a half million citizens had made, through the mouth of M. Bonaparte, an act of adhesion to the Republic. They must have believed that the Constitution and the Republic, thanks to M. Bonaparte, were strengthened forever. Well! If these same readers deign to follow our reasoning, they will soon convince themselves that if M. Bonaparte was master in swearing, he is not at all master in maintaining.

We will proceed like the surveyors, we will carry out, so to speak, an operation of parliamentary trigonometry, the result of which will be to prove that M. Bonaparte, without his knowledge, is working from this moment on to demolish the Constitution.

1. It is a fact, and it has been noted many times, that M. Bonaparte constantly abstained from voting during the discussion of the Constitution. He did not vote for anything in this Constitution, neither chapter, nor article, nor paragraph, nor the whole. If M. Bonaparte professes any opinion whatsoever on the Constitution, no one knows it: he has always kept it secret. Does he think, on this important matter, which was the subject of his oath, like M. Thiers or M. de Larochejacquelein, like Ledru-Rollin or Pierre Leroux? It would be strange if the President of the Republic, the first organ of the Constitution, the creature of the Constitution, did not have a firm opinion on the Constitution!....

Mr. Bonaparte, by taking an oath to the Constitution, therefore swore as President of the Republic, because he could not do otherwise: he did not commit his conscience as a man. In him, the citizen has made his reservations against the magistrate. While the President of the Republic will set the example of obedience to the pact, it could be that the Emperor's nephew thinks, regarding the pact, just like the last of the crusaders or the first of the socialists. What can result from this contradiction of opinion between the public man and the private man? This is what the sequel will teach us. This is our first milestone: here is the second.

2. After taking the oath, M. Bonaparte's first act was to appoint M. O. Barrot president of the ministry.

Now, it turns out that M. Barrot has no more voted for the Constitution than M. Bonaparte. He was present at the vote on the whole, but he abstained. That is not all: M. Barrot supported and voted for M. Duvergier de Hauranne's amendment, relating to the duality of national

representation: a principle completely contrary to the democratic thinking that dominates the entire Constitution.

No doubt M. Barrot, who is an honest man, will know how, through a compromise with his reason, to respect and ensure respect for the pact; but it is no less true that by acting in this way, he will be acting against his convictions; he will be making a sacrifice to the oath taken by the president. We would prefer a minister who would have nothing to sacrifice, and whose conviction would be in agreement with the power.

The other ministers, chosen by M. Barrot, are in almost the same situation as him. All voted, it is true, for the entire Constitution, but all also voted for the monarchical principle of the two chambers, laid down by M. Duvergier de Hauranne. So that, in summary, M. Bonaparte's first-born ministry is made up entirely of supporters of the constitutional system overthrown in February. The president of the council, M. Odilon-Barrot, is the same one that Louis-Philippe, yielding to the pressure of the discontented bourgeoisie and to the wishes of the dynastic opposition, offered to the country the day before his expulsion. Except for a few new names, such as that of Bonaparte, which replaces that of d'Orléans, the government personnel are of the same nature, the same value, as they were on the eve of the day on which the Republic was proclaimed. Suppress, in thought, the shooting of the Capucines and what followed until December 20, and you will find that in the interval of these ten months, the story did not advance, despite the change in dates!

3. What we have just said about the personal faith of the President of the Republic and his ministers against the Constitution could only give rise to a probability. What we are going to report will convert this probability into certainty.

The mouth speaks from the abundance of the heart. M. Bonaparte, who, until the day of the oath, had not said a word, the oath taken, showed what was in his soul by delivering his Presidential Speech.

This speech confirms what we had only suspected, namely, that the President of the Republic is the designated founder of a Bonapartist dynasty. From the first words, monarchical thinking is revealed:

"I will see enemies of the homeland," said M. Bonaparte, "in all those who would attempt to change, *by illegal means*, what France has established."

Hear this. M. Bonaparte speaks of *illegal means*; everyone agrees on this point. But he says nothing about *_legal means_*. This is because in fact the Constitution can be changed by legal means, completely. Article 111 says this explicitly. As for LEGITIMATE means, that is something else. Our jurists do not go that far: legality is enough for them.

But in what sense does M. Bonaparte, who voted for nothing of the Constitution; M. Odilon Barrot, who spoke for both chambers, and who abstained during the vote on the Constitution; MM. de Falloux, Léon Faucher, Drouyn de Lhuys, Bixio, Rulhières, all of whom, like M. Barrot, voted for the Duvergier de Hauranne amendment, destructive of the Constitution; in what sense, we say, do these gentlemen think that what the National Assembly has established should be changed, through legal means?

This is the whole significance of the oath: this is the key to M. Bonaparte's speech. Let us continue our research.

4. When leaving the Assembly, M. Bonaparte informed M. Marrast that he was instructing M. Barrot to compose a ministry.

Certainly no one should have seen in this communication an indication of monarchical restoration; and since the Constitution does not prohibit it, we consider it very legal and entirely parliamentary.

Here then is M. Barrot, by delegation of the President of the Republic, in charge of organizing the government, and disrupting the destiny of France; M. Barrot, like M. Guizot on October 29, 1840, is in control of the situation. It is he who, covering the president with his person, presents himself as guarantor of the cabinet's policy. M. Barrot, finally, responds for M. Bonaparte, in whose favor he reestablishes, in fact, the old fiction of monarchical irresponsibility, while waiting for him to write it, as legally as possible, in the Constitution.

In this, M. Barrot demonstrates high political reason, but also little love for the Constitution.

Without this condition of irresponsibility, the position of the President of the Republic is not tenable. It is responsibility that has ruined Cavaignac: it is this which, in six months, will kill Bonaparte, if M. Barrot does not succeed in being accepted by the country as a lightning rod. Inviolability is therefore the *sine qua non* condition of the presidency.

But inviolability is royalty. This first point obtained, the rest of the Constitution will follow: you will have in turn, with the inviolability of the president, the heredity of the presidency; then, the equality of powers, currently in a relationship of subordination between them; then finally the two chambers.

As soon as you engage in this field of the presidency, of a head of the executive power elected by the People and independent of the legislative power, you must, in order to be logical, in order to be possible: 1° declare the president inviolable; 2° make his function hereditary; 3° make it equal to the legislative power; and 4° as this equality in itself can only create an unfortunate antagonism, establishing a third power, moderating and conciliating, a high chamber is necessary.

Thus, presidential inviolability, in fact posed by M. Odilon-Barrot, is the first step taken by the new government towards the reestablishment of the constitutional monarchy through legal means.

To complete this demonstration, it remains for us to pose a fifth term, which we draw, like the previous one, from M. Bonaparte's speech. This is cabinet policy.

5. This policy was given by the situation, and it must be admitted that M. Bonaparte grasped it admirably.

The February revolution is not only political, but social.

In politics, the revolution consists of abolishing the ancient distinction of powers and governing the State by means of a National Convention, legislating by its general deliberations, and governing by its committees. The Grévy amendment was the natural transition to this system.

In social economy, the Revolution consists of abolishing the distinction between proprietors and proletarians, entrepreneurs and employees, capitalists and workers, by means of integral association and the submission of capital to labor.

The Revolution having been defeated on the political ground, had to also be defeated on the economic ground: the governmental idea and the socialist idea being basically the same idea, under a double formula.

The National Assembly understood this first of all; Cavaignac conformed his thoughts to it: Bonaparte, in taking possession of the presidency, followed the same tradition, the same mistakes.

Reestablish society on its foundations, which socialism has shaken;

Raise up the country, which the February Revolution demolished;

Heal your wounds; — it is no longer a question of repaying the 45 cents!

Bring back the lost men, through anti-Malthusian theories, no doubt!

No utopia, above all! That is to say no reform, no paper money, no right to work. That is it internally!

Outside, peace! Peace everywhere and always, as in the time of M. Guizot; with this, if we do not do great things, we will at least give up doing good ones! This is the conclusion of this astonishing profession of faith.

Thus, internally, M. Bonaparte limits his ambition to putting things back to the state they were in before February, and to stopping, if possible, the socialist torrent; externally, his policy can be summed up in one word, peace! And in truth, what agitates Europe, what rouses the Germans against their despots, the Italians against their conquerors, the Romans against the Pope, is it not utopia, the right to work, socialist madness?

Who would we declare war on? The conservatives of Berlin, Frankfurt, Vienna or Rome? Contradiction! The cause that has just triumphed there is the same as that which won in June in Paris. By virtue of caste solidarity, our duty is to stay at home.

Bourgeois, form a Holy Alliance, And join hands!

We won't even talk about Poland anymore. Poland! It is the home of socialism among the Slavic peoples!...

So, M. Bonaparte is not coming to continue the Revolution, he is coming to repress the Revolution. This is why he praises the policy of General Cavaignac, why he shakes his hand as a sign of intelligence, why he salutes him as his master and his model. Cavaignac smoothed the way for Bonaparte: after God and the voters, it is to Cavaignac that Bonaparte owes the most. — This is why Bonaparte calls men of all colors and all origins to his side: he wants, he says, to form a ministry of conciliation, translate COALITION, against modern barbarism, against socialism. — This is finally why we are talking about giving M. Bugeaud the command of this army of the Alps, which, instead of looking at Piedmont, has its eye constantly open on Paris and Lyon, the two centers of the proletarian insurrection.

Courage then, Bonaparte! March, through legal channels, towards the monarchical restoration, against which you took an oath; organize the crusade of the exploiters against the exploited, who gave you five and a half million votes; elected representative of the Revolution, stifle the Revolution as much as it is in you. You will not stop destiny; you will not seize on the fly these ideas that you want to proscribe, you will not prevent them from being translated into facts more powerful than even politics and your battalions.

Courage ! there is a glory that you are sure to obtain; like the last of the emperors, that contemporarie derisively named Romulus Augustulus, you will be Bonaparte the little, Napoleon the dwarf.

(No. 36. December 23.)

Paris, December 22.

We said it yesterday, and we repeat it today: Bonaparte's oath is a declaration of war on the socialist democracy.

What! Citizen president, you talk about conciliation, and you start by excluding the party that alone was able to give a name, an object, a meaning to the February Revolution!

You speak of relieving the misery of the people, of healing the wounds of the country, of reestablishing society on its basis and you dismiss those who were the first to assign the true cause to the misery; you maintain the ban placed on labor; you call on the economists of the school of Malthus; you take advice from the old defenders of constitutionalism who passed away in February, after a consumption of eighteen years!

And this immense retreat, prepared for ten months, now admitted, recommended, legalized, it is through Bonaparte that it is accomplished.

Forty-nine years ago, a Bonaparte emerged from the 18th of Brumaire, and the reign of corruption ended. A Bonaparte emerges from December 10, and the reign of corruption will begin again!

The first of these men, son of a revolution, carried his mother's standard high and far, and acquired immortal glory. The second, also the son of a revolution, will only be a parricide!

Democracy and socialism have no greater enemy today than Bonaparte!

Who indeed could doubt it?

The tendencies of Louis Napoleon, manifested by the adventures of his youth and by his calculated abstentions in the National Assembly;

The known opinions of his ministers;

The allocation of constitutional practices in the formation of the cabinet and the appointment of a president of the council;

The equivocal promise to treat as an enemy of the homeland anyone who wishes to change, by illegal means, the established order;

The indirect blame cast on the democratic and social party;

The coalition of parties hostile to socialism, expressed by the composition of the ministry;

The political system adopted by Bonaparte, a renewal of the system of Cavaignac, who took it from the Executive Commission, who had received it from the Provisional Government, which itself, this Provisional Government, establisher of the Republic, reformer and regenerator, had drawn it from the pure sources of the constitutional bankocracy:

Does not all this prove more and more that we alone, socialist democrats, in the eyes of all these rulers, who succeed one another like a procession of the dead, are the excommunicates of civilization, the enemies of society, against which the government of the bourgeoisie, putting an end to its dynastic quarrels, must turn all its efforts?

Bonaparte's speech is only a paraphrase of Cavaignac's last proclamation. The thinking is the same, the politics the same, the slander always the same. War on the socialists! War on the enemies of family and property! Since April 16, we have not heard anything else.

Well! bourgeois president, Cavaignac or Bonaparte, whatever name you call yourself, we accept the challenge. Slander, intrigue, form coalitions and alliances, organize counter-revolution; the more you attack us, the more harm you will do to yourself. You are the serpent of the revolution, but your teeth will break on the steel of our consciences.

Bring order to the streets: we will help you;

Bring back, if you can, confidence to the hearts of your capitalists: we swear not to ask them for credit or alms;

Organize assistance for the unemployed workers: we will contribute with all our means to the fulfillment of this fraternal duty;

Do not be afraid, in order to restore business, to commit the Treasury for a hundred million: the people will pay your debts and, when you file for bankruptcy, will relieve you of bankruptcy.

We only ask you, along with the freedom to discuss, the freedom to associate, that is to say the loyal observation of two articles of this charter that you have just sworn.

Freedom of discussion! Freedom of association! Just that, and before four years, president without a presidency, you will come and tell us what you have become!...

(No. 41. December 29.)

To discover the laws of nature and to help, through science, industrious humanity, the famous Lavoisier did not fear submitting to the most painful and repugnant ordeals. Love for the poor overcame in him the disgust of a foul analysis. Like Davy, his rival, like all inventors, Lavoisier was great, not only through genius, he was great through his devotion to the people.

The hyenas of 1793 paid Lavoisier's services with the scaffold.

To enlighten the people and warn them against the worst species of their parasites, those who, not having an idea to offer, only know how to caress the passions or irritate them, we will not fear to descend, at times, into the cesspools of journalism and stir up the muck. We know what men who sometimes slander and sometimes dishonor the revolution have in store for us.

Regarding an article entitled *Noël*, published in our issue of December 25, and signed Luc Desage, a well-known name in the socialist press, a supposedly democratic and social newspaper published the following reflections:

“Mr. Proudhon's paper has just entered a new phase; he becomes a mystic and wants to resurrect the reveries of the mother of God, Catherine Théos. And, in fact, on the occasion of the Christmas celebration, he launched the program of the new religion, of which its director would be the high priest. The sun will be the god of this new school, and already undoubtedly a college of vestal virgins has been recruited by M. Proudhon to maintain the sacred fire in the temple of Apollo, disguised as the patron of neo-Christianity invented by the exclusives.

“Mr. Proudhon could not end otherwise. After having glorified atheism, after having cursed God, it was due to his nature to fall into the opposite excess. As for us, who are fighting the most dangerous enemy of democracy in M. Proudhon, we could not help but protest against this transfiguration of Proudhonism. The Democrats have been warned; they now know that the man who has so many times insulted the revolutionary tradition, who wants to confiscate universal suffrage for the benefit of a college of scholars whose direction he undoubtedly reserves for himself, calls on the resources of mysticism. After having dethroned Malthus, M. Proudhon could only become a Jesuit. The laurels of Deacon Paris have turned his brain. Soon you will see the return of the convulsionaries.”

Thus, because we have granted the hospitality of our columns to a socialist whom the law of bail has reduced to silence; because then we did not believe it necessary to refuse the benefit of an advertisement for the festival of EQUALITY, a celebration for which we did not take the initiative, a celebration that we did not attend, we are reported to the disapproval of democrats and socialists as *mystic, dreamer, disciple of Catherine Théos (Robespierre's mother), high priest of a new religion, of which the sun is the god; recruiter of vestal virgins; patron of neo-Christianity, invented by the exclusives; the greatest enemy of democracy, confiscator of universal suffrage, atheist, Jesuit and convulsionary.*

This is the encouragement our efforts are rewarded by certain papers that call themselves patriots. And notice the coincidence!

The same day, and the next day, and the day before, the reactionary press, *en masse*, addressed us with the same outrages. *Le Siècle*, coming after *Le Constitutionnel* and *Les Débats*, printed in a fit of holy indignation:

“What is a socialist, as you see it?”

“1. He is an atheist. Here are in fact the considerations on which your symbol is based.” (There follows the well-known passage from the *System of Contradictions*, in which we have developed the antinomy of the theological idea, a passage that is a demonstration of our atheism,

just as the objections reported by Saint Thomas in the *Summa* are a demonstration that Saint Thomas was an atheist.)

“Do the legislator of the Gospel and the ridiculous Salmoneus who has just launched these blasphemies have some similarities? The author of the naive and sublime prayer: Our Father who art in heaven, etc.” — Sentimental tirade on the Pater noster!

“2. The socialist, like M. Proudhon, believes that the family is ‘a word.’”

“3. Finally, this same socialist is convinced that property is theft.

“Did he despise the family, this crucified Savior, who, etc.” — Tirade of eloquence on the sacrament of marriage.

“Did he believe that property was theft, he who preached submission to the powers, regular payment of taxes, etc.?” — Tirade on contempt for wealth.

“What then is this socialist Christmas, if not the mockery of one of the most beautiful celebrations of the holiest religion in the world? And who wins here, the insane or the odious? See here this new breed of Christians, seated in a gambling den and celebrating there, drinks in hand, *to the confusion of Malthus, the ugly man in the white tie, the English economist*, the nativity of Jesus Christ! A newspaper that we quoted yesterday exclaimed: “May the tears of our mothers, our wives and our sisters wash away at the foot of the altars the impure trace of these kisses of Judas!” Tirade chanted to the words of the *Journal des Débats*.

What can we respond to these accusations, as cowardly as they are hypocritical, if it is not the *mentiris impudentissime* of Pascal? — You have lied, lied twice, lied three times!

You, *Constitutionnel*, when you recall our definition: *Property is theft*, you are a liar, and an imbecile liar, since everyone knows today that denying property is synonymous for us with developing and perfecting property, in the proper sense determined by MM. Thiers and Lamartine. The only difference between them and us is that these gentlemen want to stop the development of the property at their convenience, and we want to push this development to the end. *Property is theft!* — this means, we have repeated it to you over and over, that the rent of land, the rent of houses, the rent of instruments of work, the rent of money, can and must be free, and will be free when it will please the government.

You, the *Débats*, are a liar, and a hypocritical liar, when you accuse us of profanation and scandal. Was it we who invented the mysteries of Grandvaux and all the jokes of the last reign?... we who put on performances, on Christmas Day, in the forty theaters of the capital? They are edifying, your theaters, where each scene is nothing more than a living picture; each room a glass of absinthe before the orgy! Our friends, the workers, celebrated Christmas night in the Winter Garden with social and patriotic songs! And your youth, the religious and property-owning youth, celebrated it, in their furnished hotels, with obscene songs, with grisettes and champagne.

Ah! Loathsome tartuffes, take advantage of the time that you have left! Suffocate, burn every last revolutionary thought; be especially careful not to let another February return; you would perhaps not find, to take you back to the water, a Ledru-Rollin or Lamartine!

You, the *Siècle*, are lying to your wits when you impute to us this phrase, entirely your invention, that family is only a word! Ten volumes, published over the past ten years, against your economy and your Malthusian maxims, a hundred articles from *Le Peuple* and the *Représentant du Peuple*, all filled with apologies for marriage, the family, even inheritance, are there to tell you that you and yours are vile slanderers.

Tell me what haunts you, and I'll tell you who you are.

In line behind the *Constitutionnel*, the *Débats* and the *Siècle*, there is a newspaper that has taken on the task, by shouting louder than the socialists and the revolutionaries, of constantly

insulting socialism and the Revolution. *Le Constitutionnel* and its acolytes, *Le Siècle* and *Les Débats*, have discovered in us only an enemy of property, of the family and of God; the so-called *Révolution démocratique et sociale* denounces us as the enemy of reason and of humankind. In the affected, calculated hatred of this sheet of ignominy, we are placed well before the Sénarts, the Dufaures, the Malevilles, and all those who, for six months, have been passing the sad legacy of the provisional government from hand to hand. These have only taken the places of the dictators of February: we who, with Louis Blanc, with a cabinet revolution, have almost made a revolution of the globe, we have doomed the Revolution! We are the plague of democracy! Henry V, Joinville, Cavaignac, the emperor himself, are nothing compared to us.

Once and for all, would the estimable newspaper that we cite tell us what it is and what it represents?

We initially believed, and we make honorable amends to those concerned, that the so-called *Révolution démocratique et sociale* was the organ of the young Mountain; and you could judge, from the weakness of our defense, how repugnant it was to us to wage war against men whom, despite inevitable disagreements, we have not learned to despise and hate. Since then it has come back to us, and we have learned it with happiness, that the so-called *Révolution démocratique et sociale* represented only itself; and, from that moment, we thought that the only polemic that suited us with an adversary without confession was silence.

But, since the so-called *Révolution démocratique et sociale*, which never ceases to insult the socialists, which accuses socialism of having lost the Revolution, because it has already lost two or three cliques; since this entrepreneur of the filth of the reactionary press is so eager for us to concern ourselves with it, let it tell us, once again, who he is, and what he represents.

Is it the newspaper of the Mountain? The last act of the Montagnards bore 60 signatures. We do not ask so much of our insulter. Let him show us a certificate signed by only twelve representatives of the extreme left, and we will take it to be the organ of the entire fraction of the Assembly grouped around M. Ledru-Rollin.

The elections for the presidency saw 371,000 votes for the former interior minister. We are not asking the so-called democratic and social Revolution to justify, through its subscription register, that it represents these 371,000 citizens. The difference would be too humiliating. Let her show us only the adhesion of 371 — one in a thousand! — 371 socialist democrats having received first degree revolutionary education; 371 citizens who approve of its policies, who are amused by its diatribes, who applaud its infamies: and we will consider it the organ of the entire party.

Let the the so-called *Révolution démocratique et sociale*, in a word, make its program, its personnel, its leaders and its supporters known; let it say what it is, what it wants, what it thinks. We know what to expect from the *Constitutionnel* as well as from the *Siècle* and the *Débats*. We do not know what the so-called *Révolution démocratique et sociale* is. We know of no supporters, no will, no ideas. Judging only from our experience, we should only see in it an agent provocateur, in the service of the party represented by the *Constitutionnel*, the *Siècle* and the *Débats*, revolving around Ledru-Rollin and his friends, as in the past the Carlier and the Delahodde, and designating to the bourgeoisie the heads it must strike. Once again, let the the so-called *Révolution démocratique et sociale*, in the absence of ideas, present us with guarantees; then, only then, will we see how to respond to it.

(No. 43. December 31.)

The *Révolution démocratique et sociale* contains the following letter:

My dear Delescluze,

According to your request, we went to Citizen Proudhon, in order to obtain satisfaction for the insulting and defamatory article signed by him in today's issue of *Le Peuple*.

We found Citizen Proudhon at the printing house of his newspaper and we explained to him the reason for our visit.

Citizen Proudhon, pressed to indicate to us his witnesses, positively refused to give you satisfaction.

We insisted twice, as it was our duty, and twice Citizen Proudhon declared that he did not want to fight.

We then had to withdraw, reserving to inform you of the result of our approach.

Fraternal greetings,

AMABLE LEMAITRE, senior, AUGUSTE DALICAN.

Paris, December 29, 1848.

This letter is preceded by a long article serving to establish, from the point of view of the democratic and social Revolution, that citizen Proudhon is a COWARD: a conclusion that we expected in advance. Moreover, the *Révolution démocratique et sociale*, responding to our questions, lets us know that it is up to it alone, and that only it represents principles.

Accordingly, we in turn declare to the *Révolution démocratique et sociale*, that from this day on, it is free to call us daily, in its columns, cowardly, miserable, beggars, spies, recruiters of girls, and such other insults picked up in the sludge of the market, if not worse.

Such attacks are no longer answerable by our newspaper.

P.-J. PROUDHON.

From Alfred Darimon, *A Travers une Révolution* (1884)

NOTICE

ON THE JOURNALS OF PROUDHON

I. — le *Représentant du Peuple*.

The true founder of the *Représentant du Peuple* was M. Jules Viard, a humorous writer who died very young. M. Jules Viard published under this title, in 1847, a financial and two sample issues, one dated October 4, 1847, and the second dated November 13, 1847.

It was also M. Jules Viard who began, after the revolution of February, the publication of the *Représentant du Peuple*.

The first issue appeared on February 27, 1848; but after the third issue, bearing the date of February 29, le journal was subjected to an interruption which lasted until the month of April.

Starting on the 1st of April, the *Représentant du Peuple* resumed publication under this title, which became permanent:

le *Représentant du Peuple*.
Journal des Travailleurs.

On each side of the title, the following mottos were featured:

What is the producer? Nothing. What should he be? All.

What is the capitalist? All. What should he be? Nothing.

A decree of General Cavaignac, rendered because of the state of siege, suspended the *Représentant du Peuple* on July 10, 1848.

The suspension was raised on August 9; but the journal was suspended anew by a decree dated August 21, 1848.

It endured in its new form three months and twenty-one days.

The issue of the *Représentant du Peuple* published on April 1 carried the number 1.

The last issue, published August 21, was number 108.

But there were some errors in the numbering of the journal that it is important to remember:

1° The journal did not appear on the 26th or 27th of June. The issues of June 28, 29, and 30, and July 1 are numbered 88, 89, 88, 89. The issue for June 25 being numbered 85, we must obvious substitute for those numbers the following: 86, 87, 88, 89.

2° The issue for July 9 is numbered 97. However the number for August 9, the date of the reappearance of the journal, after its suspension, bears the number 96. That is an obvious error.

All the numbering up to August 21, the date of the final suppression of the journal, should be modified. The last issue should bear the number 110.

P.-J. Proudhon did not begin to collaborate with the *Représentant du Peuple* until April 19.

The following articles were published in this journal: *How Revolutions are Lost*, *What the Revolution Owes to Literature*, *The Revolutionary Program* and the famous pamphlet: *The Malthusians*.

It is also in the *Représentant du Peuple* that Proudhon outlined the principles underlying the Bank of the People. That series of articles was later gathered in a volume under the title: *Résumé De La Question Sociale*. — Banque D'échange, with a preface by M. Alfred Darimon.

The political direction of the journal was in the hands of M. Charles Fauvety.

The managing editor was a former typographer, M. L. Vasbenter.

Among the usual writers of the journal were: Jules Viard, Amédée de Césena, Philippe Faure, A. Etex, Gabriel Mortillet, G. Duchêne.

Towards the middle of the month of June, the journal appointed Alfred Darimon and J.-A. Langlois as associates.

II. — le *Peuple*.

The *Peuple* was the continuation of an enterprise formed in the month of May, 1847, that the revolution of February had prevented from being carried out.

Mr. Victor Pilhes had planned to revive Dupoty's *Journal du Peuple*. The new organ would carry the title: *le Peuple, journal hebdomadaire de la Démocratie française*.

M. Victor Pilhes was assured of the collaboration of P.-J. Proudhon, Dupoty, Félix Pyat, T. Thoré, A. Luchet and Lucien de la Hodde.

The prospectus of the journal appeared by itself in October 1847.

The *Peuple* of 1848 took the following title:

le Peuple
Journal de la République démocratique et sociale.

The following epigraphs were placed in banner headlines on each side of the title:

What is the producer? Nothing. What should he be? All.

What is the capitalist? All. What should he be? Nothing.

(Le Représentant du Peuple de 1848)

No more taxes; no more usury, no more poverty.

Labor for all, property for all.

division of functions. — indivisibility of power.

The sample issue appeared September 2 with this indication: *Editor in chief*, P.-J. Proudhon.

The first issue, bearing the number 2, was published November 1, 1848, with this indication: *Director*: P.-J. Proudhon. *Administrator*: Charles Fauvety.

The *Peuple* was weekly until November 23, 1848. From that date, it became a daily.

From issue number 8 to number 23, the journal bore this indication: *Director*: P.-J. Proudhon. *Managing Editor*: G. Duchène. It disappeared with number 24 (December 11, 1848).

The *Peuple*, as a daily, published a weekly edition containing a four-page supplement.

The last number of the *Peuple*, appearing June 13, 1849, bore the number 205.

It had been suspended by a decree on June 13 and suppressed following a military occupation and the ransacking of its offices.

Proudhon had engaged in a most active collaboration with the *Peuple*. Among the articles that he published in that journal, we must cite: the *Toast to the Revolution*, the *Pamphlet on the Presidency*, the *Argument à la Montagne*, the *Responsibility of the President*, the *Demonstration of Socialism*, the *Legal Resistance*, the *Protocole à la Montagne*, etc., etc.

The duration of the *Peuple* had been five months and thirteen days (from November 1, 1848 to June 13, 1849).

The list of the usual contributors to the *Peuple*, in November 1848, is found at the bottom of the electoral manifesto of the journal. According to that list, the original editorial staff was made up of P.-J. Proudhon, Alfred Darimon, J.-A. Langlois, Ph. Faure, L. Vasbenter, Charles Fauvety and G. Duchène.

In the month of March 1849, the staff was subjected to some modifications. The list places at the bottom of the article: *Violation de la constitution, résistance légale* (March 22, 1849), carries the following name: P.-J. Proudhon, Alfred Darimon, J.-A. Langlois, Ph. Faure, G. Duchène, L. Vasbenter, Louis Ménard, A. Crétin, C.-F. Chevé, T. Delord, A. Fremy, A. Madier de Montjau, Sr., lawyer for the *Peuple*.

In the weekly supplement, in addition to the usual contributors to the journal, we find the names of J.-B. Bocquet, J. Benoît, Charles Sellier, Pierre Dupont, Ernest Lebloys, Luc Desages, Delbrouck, Benjamin Gastineau. Goupy, Gautier, Pierre Lefranc, Pierre Lachambaudie, Alexis Lagarde, Savinien Lapointe, Th. Morisset, Gabriel Morlillet, Pauline Roland, Ramon de la Sagra, A. Salières, Tournoux.

III. — la *Voix du peuple*.

The *Voix du Peuple* had neither subtitle nor epigraph.

The journal was daily; but like the *Peuple*, it had a weekly edition composed of a double issue.

The sample issue appeared September 25, 1849.

The first issue was published on October 1, 1849.

The last issue, bearing the number 223, appeared on May 14, 1850.

The *Voix du Peuple* lasted for five months and fourteen days (from October 1, 1849 to May 14, 1850).

The first issue contained a letter from Proudhon in which one read:

“My position as a condemned prisoner, the conventions of every sort which it requires me to respect, in these difficult times, my forced distance from you, the impossibility which results for me to direct, from dusk until dawn, a process of composition whose consequences could become, at any given moment, excessively serious, I am obliged to remind your readers and whomever it may concern, that, whatever influence I exert, by my communications and advice, on the composition of the *Voix du Peuple*, I cannot and must not accept any other responsibility than that of the articles signed by me, all other participation in your work being forbidden me on political grounds.”

The collaboration of Proudhon with the *Voix du Peuple* had above all an economic and philosophical character. It was in the *Voix du Peuple* that were published that remarkable series of articles on *Socialism and Taxation*, on *The Present Utility and Future Possibility of the State*, on *Communism*, etc. It is in the columns of that journal that the brilliant tournament between Proudhon and Bastiat on the legitimacy of interest took place.

The usual contributors to the *Voix du Peuple* were Alfred Darimon, Charles Edmond, G. Duchêne, A. Herzen, Ch.-F. Chevé, Philippe Faure, François Favre, A. Crétin, L. Vassbenter.

The managing editor was M. P. Laugrand.

The supplement counted among its collaborators, apart from the usual contributions: Victor Avril, d'Alton-Shée, P. Bizet, J.-Ph. Berjeau, Colfavru, G. Duchêne, J. Dessirier, A. Etex, Benjamin Gastineau, Edouard Hervé, Charles de Janzé, Alexis Lagarde, Louis-Arsène Meunier, Edouard Pompéry, Pauline Roland, A. Rousselle, Charles Robin, Paul Robert, J. Tournoux, M.-L. Boutteville.

The *Voix du Peuple* ceased to appear following the withdrawal of the license of its printer.

le *Peuple de 1850*.

The *Peuple de 1850* appeared three times per week. The sample issue was published on June 15, 1850. The last issue, bearing number 33, appeared October 13, 1850.

The journal lasted two months and thirteen days.

The involvement of Proudhon in the *Peuple de 1850* appears to have been almost nothing.

The principal contributors to the journal were Alfred Darimon, Marc Dufraisse, Massol, Ch.-F. Chevé, Boutteville, Ph. Faure, Gallot, Villegardelle.

The managing editor was M. L. Vassbenter, former managing editor of the *Représentant du Peuple*.

The *Peuple de 1850* was forced to disappear because of an infraction of the law on securities.

The articles published by Proudhon in the four journals with which he cooperated have been gathered by M.-L. Boutteville, under the title: *Mélanges. — Articles De Journaux. — 1848-1852.* Paris, librairie internationale, 3 volumes in-18, 1868, 1869, 1871.

The public should treat this collection cautiously: we observe in it some unfortunate suppressions and omissions.

Thus the admirable pamphlet, *The Presidency*, which appeared in the *Peuple* in November 1848, has been subjected to an entirely inexplicable mutilation; more than a hundred lines have been suppressed, which removed a great deal of its literary flavor and its political significance.

The article, *First Campaign of Louis Bonaparte*, published in the *Peuple* on January 30, 1849, has been replaced by some lines of periods.

The article *Sainte-Pélagie to l'Élysée, Greetings!*, which appeared in the *Voix du Peuple* on November 8, 1849, was equally mutilated.

In March, 1850 there was a polemic between Proudhon and E. de Girardin under the heading *The Question of Tomorrow*, of which we do not find the least trace in the collection of M. M.-L. Boutteville. While the articles of Proudhon were not signed, they were easy to find, with the aid of the correspondence maintained with his collaborators.

Mr. M.-L. Boutteville has doubtless had to submit to certain exigencies, and that is his excuse. But what are we to say of the qualifications he has made on the subject of the legitimacy of interest and the rent of capital in a note placed at the head of the discussion between Proudhon and Bastiat? On the part of a former contributor to the *Voix du Peuple* and the *Peuple de 1850*, these qualifications must appear curious at the very least.

APPENDIX.

The Three Eras

[unsigned editorial]

Anarchy, it is said, has ruled the streets since February 24. She reigns without violence against persons and against things, thanks to the gentleness and morality of the People, but in the end she is the sole mistress.

What does anarchy mean in the streets, if not the absence of informers and armed police? But if, without armed police, without informers, without gendarmes, order reigns in the streets; if no one is robbed there, if no one is murdered there, if no one is insulted there, will the population not have proven that it can do without this *power* called gendarmes, police and municipal guards? Will it not have proven that it knows how to guard, protect and *govern* itself?

When the government of Louis-Philippe governed the country, there were 60,000 men in Paris; troops posted at every crossroads, sentries at every street corner, city sergeants everywhere, and houses were robbed, there were sometimes murders and peasants were insulted in the streets; the stronger defeated the weaker; women dared not venture out in the evening unaccompanied. The sentries allowed murders to be carried out ten paces from their sentry-box on the pretext that they were not to abandon their sentry-box for a single moment; the armed police arrived just in time to take you to the station when you were knocked down, and if you were robbed, you were accused of having robbed yourself and for your personal pleasure: IT WAS THE TIME OF GOVERNMENT.

When the People reigned alone, after the victory of February, never in the streets had there been such security for all. The vanquished of the day before mingled with the victors of the day, the weak were defended against the strong, the women circulated in the middle of the crowd with a security which they never found in the times of government, despite our pretended French gallantry, the thieves, themselves, had disappeared, for all eyes were watching, and some examples of the justice of the people frightened off the criminals.

We breathed liberty through every pore. The air was purer, the women more beautiful, the men less ugly!

IT WAS THE TIME OF ANARCHY.

One fine day, the People learns that Poland is dying for want of help; as it does not understand that France, with 2 million men under arms, may not be in a condition to wage war, it rises en masse, calling on the government to decree intervention. But this unanimity of the people comes to be shattered before the attempt of some foolish democrats who are trying to bring about the dissolution of the National Assembly at the very moment when this National Assembly was about to become in their hands a passive instrument of power. Be that as it may, that day, in an easily foreseen reversal, influence returned to the hands of the bourgeoisie. Then the National Guard was the real Government, and in the National Guard the party of reaction is that which has made its impulsive power most strongly felt. Since that day terror has been wrought against the

Communists, against the Socialists, against the clubs, against the newspapers. Words of hatred and revenge have been uttered in the streets; violent, illegal measures have been taken; sincere Republicans have been mistreated; blood has flowed in a few particular confrontations, and now the *moderates* demand that scaffolds be raised for the *troublemakers*. In the meantime, immense patrols roam the streets, Louis-Philippe's guard corps are no longer sufficient to contain the soldier-citizens of the Republic; the national guard, which performs the duties of a praetorian guard in the assembly, is obliged to perform, in the streets, the service of the municipal guard and the armed police. The city is less free than before, but on the other hand it is always on the alert and everyone watches with their weapons at their side. The whole of Paris looks like a battlefield. May the three or four armies that are present not soon come to blows!

It is the Iron Age! IT IS THE TIME OF ORDER!

Translator's note: This is presumably a response to the demonstrations of 15 May 1848, which preceded the June Days.

"Les trois époques," *Le Représentant du Peuple* no. 51 (22 mai 1848): 1.