

IV

LA VOIX DU PEUPLE

(Continued.)

[...]

WHAT IS GOVERNMENT?

WHAT IS GOD?

What is Government? What is its principle, its object, its right? — This is incontestably the first question that the political man poses to himself.

Now, this question, which appears so simple and the solution of which seems so easy, can, we find, only be answered by faith. Philosophy is as incapable of demonstrating Government as it is of proving God. Authority, like Divinity, is not a matter of knowing; it is, I repeat, a matter of faith.

That insight, so paradoxical at first glance and yet so true, merits some development. We are going to try, without any scientific apparatus, to make ourselves understood.

The principal attribute, the characteristic trait of our species, after THOUGHT, is *belief*, and above all things, the belief in God. Among the philosophers, some saw in that faith in a superior Being a prerogative of humanity, while others discovered there only its weakness. Whatever merit or demerit there is in the belief in the idea of God, it is certain that the beginning of all metaphysical speculation is an act of worship of the *Creator*: it is that which the human mind, among all the Peoples, certifies in an invariable manner.

But what is God? That is what the philosopher and the believer immediately, and with an irresistible movement, demand. And, as a corollary to that first interrogation, this one arises immediately: What, of all the religions, is the best? Indeed, if there exists a Being superior to Humanity, there must also exist a system of relations between that Being and Humanity. What then is that system? The search for the best religion is the second step that the human mind takes in Reason and Faith.

To this double question, no response is possible. The definition of Divinity escapes the intelligence. Humanity has been by turns fetishist, idolater, Christian and Buddhist, Jew and Mohammedan, deist and pantheist: it has worshiped in turn plants, animals, stars, the heavens, the soul of the world and, finally, itself: it has wandered from superstition to superstition, without managing to determine its God. The problem of the attributes and essence of God and of the worship that is proper to him, like a trap set for its ignorance, torments Humanity from its origin. Peoples are sacrificed for their idols. Society is exhausted by the elaboration of its beliefs, without the solution being advanced a step.

The deist and the pantheist, like the Christian and the idolater, is reduced to pure faith. One could even say, and it is the only progress we have made in this study, that it is repugnant to reason to know and understand God: it is only given to us to believe. And this is why in all eras, and under all religions, we encounter a small number of men, bolder in appearance than the others, who, not understanding God, have taken the part of denying him: we have given them the name of *free thinkers* or *atheists*.

But it is clear that atheism is still less logical than faith. The basic, conclusive fact of the spontaneous belief in the supreme Being remaining always, and the problem implied by that fact inevitably posing itself, atheism could not be accepted as a solution. Far from testifying to the strength of the mind, it would only prove its desperation. It is with atheism as it is with suicide: it has only been embraced by the smallest number. The People have always had a horror of it!

And so things have remained. Humanity seemed eternally placed between an insoluble question and an impossible negation, when, at the end of the last century, a philosopher, Kant, as remarkable for his profound piety as for the incomparable power of his reflection, realized how to attack the theological problem in an entirely new manner.

He no longer asked himself, as everyone had before him: What is God? And what is the true religion? From a question of *fact* he fashioned a question of *form*, and he said to himself: Why does it happen that I believe in God? How, by virtue of what is that idea produced in my mind? What is its point of departure and its development? What are its transformations and, if need be, its decline? How is it, finally, that, in the religious soul, these things come to be?

Such was the course of studies proposed, regarding God and Religion, by the philosopher of Königsberg. Renouncing further pursuit of the content, or the reality of the idea of God, he set himself to writing, if I dare put it in this way, the biography of that idea. Instead of taking, like an anchorite, the idea of God for the object of his meditations, he analyzed the faith in God, as a religious period of six thousand years presented it to him. In short, he considered in religion, not an external and supernatural revelation of the infinite Being, but a phenomenon of our understanding.

From this moment the spell was broken: the mystery of religion was revealed to philosophy. What we seek and what we see in God, as Malebranche said, is not at all that being, or to speak more fairly, that chimerical entity, that our imagination constantly enlarges and that, by the very fact that it must be after all the notion that our mind makes of it, cannot in reality be anything: it is our own ideal; it is Humanity.

What the theologian pursues, without knowing it, in the dogma that he teaches is not the mysteries of the infinite: it is the laws of our collective and individual spontaneity. The human soul does not perceive itself at first by reflective contemplation of itself, as the psychologist believe; it perceives itself outside itself, as if it were a different being placed in front of it: it is that mirror image that it calls God.

Thus, morals, justice, order and laws are no longer things revealed from on high, imposed on our free will by a so-called creator, himself unknown and unintelligible; they are things that are as proper and essential to us as our faculties and organs, as our flesh and blood. In short: Religion and

Society are synonymous terms; Man is sacred for himself as if he was God. Catholicism and Socialism, identical at base, differ only in form: in this way we explain faith, and the primitive face of the belief in God, and the indisputable progress of religions.

Now, what Kant did nearly sixty years ago for Religion; what he had previously done for Certainty; what others before him had attempted for happiness or the sovereign good, the *Voix du Peuple* proposes to undertake for Government.

After the belief in God, that which occupies the most prominent place in the general thought is the belief in Authority. Everywhere that there are men grouped in society, we encounter, with the rudiments of a religion, the rudiments of a power, the embryo of a government. That fact is as basic, as universal, as indisputable as that of the religions.

But what is power, and what is the best form of government? For it is clear that if we manage to understand the essence and attributes of power, we will know at the same time the best form to give to it, and which is, of all the constitutions, the most perfect. We will have, in this way, resolved one of the two great problems posed by the February Revolution: we will have resolved the political problem, principle, means and end, — we do not prejudge anything, — of social reform.

Well! Regarding Government, as regarding Religion, the controversy has endured since the origin of societies, and with as little success. It is for governments as for religions, for political theories as for systems of philosophy: that is to say, there is no solution. More than two thousand years before Montesquieu and Machiavelli, Aristotle gathered the various definitions of government, distinguishing them according to their forms: patriarchies, democracies, oligarchies, aristocracies, absolute monarchies, constitutional monarchies, theocracies, federative republics, etc. He declared, in short, that the problem was insoluble. Aristotle, with regard to government, as with regard to religion, was a skeptic. He had faith neither in God nor in the State.

And we who, in sixty years, have gone through seven or eight kinds of governments; who, hardly entered into the Republic, are already weary of our Constitution; we, for whom the exercise of power has only been, from the conquest of the Gauls by Julius Caesar until the ministry of the brothers Barrot, the practice of oppression and tyranny; we, finally, who witness in this moment the saturnalia of the governments of Europe, do we then have more faith than Aristotle? Isn't it time that we get out of this unhappy rut, and instead of exhausting ourselves any more in the search for the best government, the best organization to make of the political idea, we should pose the question, no longer of the reality, but of the legitimacy of that idea?

Why do we believe in Government?

From where, in human society, comes that idea of Authority, of Power; that fiction of a superior Person, called the State?

How is that fiction produced? How is it developed? What is its law of evolution, its economy?

Won't it be with Government as with God and the Absolute, which have so long and so fruitlessly occupied the philosophers? Would it not still be one of the first-born conceptions of our understanding, which we wrongly give the name of ideas, which, without reality, without

possibility of realization, expresses only something indefinite, which only has tyranny for its essence?

And since, relative to God and Religion, we have already found, by philosophical analysis, that, beneath the allegories of its religious myths, Humanity pursues nothing other than its own ideal, could we still seek what we want beneath the allegory of its political myths? For in the end, the political institutions, so different, so contradictory, exist neither for themselves, nor by themselves. Like the cults, they are not essential to society; they are hypothetical formulas or combinations, by means of which civilization maintains an appearance of order or, to put it better, seeks order. What then, once again, is the secret meaning of these institutions, the real reason why the political concept, the notion of government, comes to naught?

In short, instead of seeing in government, with the absolutists, the organ and expression of society; with the doctrinaires, an instrument of order or rather of policy; with the radicals, a means of revolution: let us try to see simply a phenomenon of the collective life, the external representation of our right, the education of some one of our faculties. Who knows if we could not discover then that all these governmental formulas, for which nations and citizens have slit each others' throats for sixty centuries, are only a phantasmagoria of our mind, that the first duty of a free reason is to return to the museums and libraries?

Such is the question posed and resolved in the *Confessions of a Revolutionary*, and on which the *Voix du Peuple* proposes, with the aid of facts furnished to it by the power and the parties who dispute it, to give daily commentary.

Just like Religion, Government is a manifestation of social spontaneity, a preparation of Humanity for a higher state.

What Humanity seeks in Religion, and calls God, is itself.

What the citizen seeks in Government and names *king*, *emperor* or *president*, is also himself; it is Liberty.

Without Humanity, no God; the theological concept makes no sense. — Without Liberty, no Government; the political concept is without value.

The best form of Government, like the most perfect of religions, taken in the literal sense, is a contradictory idea. The problem is not to know how we will be governed best, but how we will be the most free. Liberty adequate and identical to order, that is all that power and politics really contain. How is that absolute liberty, synonym of order, constituted? That is what the analysis of the different formulas of authority will teach us. For all the rest, we do not accept the government of man by man, any more than the exploitation of man by man...

Thus, the course that we propose to follow, in treating the political question and in preparing the materials for a constitutional revision, will be the same that we have followed up to this point in treating the social question. *La Voix du Peuple*, in completing the work of the two journals that preceded it, will be faithful to their wanderings.

What have we been saying, in these two papers, fallen one after the other under the blows of the reaction and the state of siege?

We have not been asking, as our predecessors and associates have thus far:

What is the best system of community? the best organization of property? Or better still: Which is better, property or community? The theory of Saint-Simon or that of Fourier? The system of Louis Blanc or that of Cabet?

Following the example of Kant, we have posed the question in this way:

How does man possess? How does he acquire property? How is it lost? What is the law of its evolution and transformation? Where is it going? What does it want? What, finally, does it represent? For it appears sufficiently, by the indissoluble mixture of good and evil that accompanies it, by the tyranny that is its essence (*jus utendi et abutendi*) and is the condition *sine quâ non* of its wholeness, that it is still, just like Religion and Government, only a hypothesis, or rather, a *hypotyposis* of Society, that is to say, an allegorical representation of a conception of our intelligence.

How, then, does man labor? How do we establish the comparison of products? How will circulation take place in society? On what conditions? According to what laws?

And the conclusion of all these monographs on property has been this:

Property indicates a function or allocation; community, reciprocity of action; usury, always decreasing, the identity of labor and capital.

In order to bring about the clarification and realization of all these terms, until now shrouded beneath the old proprietary symbols, what must we do? Let the workers guarantee work and outlets to one another; to that end, let them accept, as currency, their reciprocal obligations.

Well! Today we say:

Political liberty will result for us, like industrial liberty, from our mutual guarantee. It is by guaranteeing liberty to one another that we will pass from this government, whose purpose is to symbolize the republican motto: *Liberty, Equality, Fraternity*, leaving to our intelligence the care of finding its realization. Now, what is the formula of that political and liberal guarantee? Presently, universal suffrage; later, free contract...

Economic and social reform, through the organization of credit;

Political reform, through the organization of universal suffrage:

Such is the program of the *Voix du Peuple*.

The Revolution advances, cried an absolutist paper yesterday, with regard to the message of Louis Bonaparte. Those people see the Revolution only in catastrophes and *coups d'état*. We say in our turn: Yes, the Revolution advance, for it has found interpreters. Our strength may fall short of the task; our devotion, never!

[...]

(No 66. — November 25, 1849.)

RESISTANCE TO THE REVOLUTION

A silent league, fomented by unjust suspicions, proceeding by disparagement, calumnies and secret correspondence, seems to have been organized in this moment against the *Voix du Peuple*.

We are publicly reproached for having compromised the Revolution by the critique we have made of the governmental principle, as we were reproached, at another time, for dooming it by the critique that we made of the principle of capital.

In private conversations, our critics return to the system of defamation, to the underhanded maneuvers to which we have so often been exposed for these last eighteen months.

We would have passed, last year, for creatures of General Cavaignac.

Today we are partisans of Louis Bonaparte.

We are represented as unfaithful to our flag, because, battling in the presidential institution the principle even more than the man, we thought we should protest against the candidacy of Ledru-Rollin, who appeared to us to be a contradiction for the democratic and social party. We have not forgotten that it was enough, for us to regain favor, to change the object of our attacks and to combat, after December 10, not the presidency, but the President. How much of a place is still occupied by personal questions in the political religion of the people!

Now it is said we are defectors from our party, because in our soul and conscience, we have thought ourselves capable of indicating the mystical and governmental tendencies of some notable socialists, because, after having denied the exploitation of man by man, we also deny, and for the same reason, the government of man by man. Later, and this time could not be far off, when we are seen battling the dictatorial personalities that the spirit we resist cannot fail to impose on France, no doubt we will be granted a new pardon.

Meanwhile, we are moderates, Bonapartists, almost renegades. This is not yet printed, but it is said, peddled, circulated. The *Voix du Peuple* is denounced daily to the suspicious populace as the organ of the bourgeois reaction and the imperial ambitions of the Elysée. Thus we served, in September, October, November and December 1848, the doctrinaire reaction and the covetous spirit of the Rue de Varennes!...

However, this situation must be resolved. It is a question, at this moment, of nothing less than recognizing the formula of that true Republic, which Thoré was seeking. It is a question of knowing — we are deliberately reproducing this analogy — if, after having declaimed so much against *the exploitation of man by man*, we must take as an article of faith *the government of man by man*. We believe that there exists in politics, on the question of government, a formula adequate to the one that we presented, in social economy, on the question of capital.

We ask, consequently, before the hour of constitutional revision has come, if it does not suit the members of the democracy, to whom the conduct of affairs will one day fall, to seek this solution. In what way then do we trouble the conscience of the democrats? How are we dividing minds and

compromising the existence of the Republic? The moment is favorable for discussion: moreover, it is not given to us to take up any other.

We also believe that there is an emergency.

This is why, in the manifesto of the *Voix du Peuple*, after having pointed out what we consider to be the capital error of the democratic party, we took the initiative and laid the foundations for a solution to the political problem, agreement with the solution previously posed by us of the economic problem. It was our right; we believed that it was our duty.

But just as we encountered the resistance of the interests on the terrain of political economy, so, on the terrain of politics, we encounter the resistance of ambitions and self-esteem. Men who are not attached to capital, either by the attractions of the soul or by the lusts of the heart, are attached to power, either by the illusions of their philosophy or by the antecedents of their public life. This is the secret of the hostility suddenly manifested against the *Voix du Peuple* by the citizens Louis Blanc and Pierre Leroux, and, following them, by a certain number of republicans.

In order therefore to clarify the controversy, to reduce the question of persons to its simplest expression and, thereby, to spare the democratic party, on the serious question of power, a disastrous split, we accuse the citizens Louis Blanc and Pierre Leroux of resisting the Revolution, by defending, as they do today, the governmental principle, the last fortress of monopoly.

We consider the political line in which they strive to retain democracy as as counter-revolutionary as that in which the President of the Republic and the majority of the Assembly find themselves engaged.

We therefore propose to citizens Louis Blanc and Pierre Leroux to debate with them, in a series of articles published by the same organs, the principle of authority, government or State, of which they are, in our eyes, the last representatives.

To this end, we put at their service the columns of the *Voix du Peuple*, as we did for Mr. Frédéric Bastiat, asking, for our responses, reciprocity of insertion in the newspapers and magazines available to our antagonists.

Each article must appear on the same day, and without comments from the editors, in the newspaper of each party, so that the documents of the trial all pass before the eyes of the readers of each sheet, and the cases of both are fully and simultaneously presented.

Moreover, and despite the kind of ostracism that some are trying to impose on the *Voix du Peuple* at the moment, we will not lose sight for a single moment of the fact that this portion of the Republican left that sits on the National Assembly under the name of Mountain, and which they try to make hostile to us, is the tent around which all democrats, sincere friends of the Republic and liberty, must rally; so we leave it out of the debate. We urge it, as a political body, to remain temporarily neutral. The initiative for questions like the one being discussed at the moment belongs only to the press; it could not, without serious inconveniences, be taken up prematurely by the representatives of the people.

We only deal with publicists, our equals, our imitators perhaps, but, so far at least, our collaborators in the work of the Revolution. It is to these men, isolated, like us, from any official sympathy, that we will address our criticisms. It is with them only that we intend to discuss,

before France and before Europe, the future organization of the Universal Republic, declaring, moreover, to submit in advance to the judgment of public opinion.

The citizens Louis Blanc and Pierre Leroux having first initiated the discussion, the latter in the République, the former in the *Nouveau Monde*, we will first respond to their attack.

RESISTANCE TO THE REVOLUTION

LOUIS BLANC AND PIERRE LEROUX

Revolutions recognize no initiators: they come when the signal of destiny calls them; they stop when the mysterious force that makes them hatch is exhausted. They allow us to push them: they don't allow us to drag them. This is what is demonstrated to us today, in a striking manner, by the example of all those who, eager for power and popular favor, have harnessed themselves to the chariot of revolutions, imagining that they would stop when they stopped pulling. But the indomitable machine rolls on, sweeping away pell-mell, both those who want to hinder its course, and its powerless drivers. Wise man, do you want to not be crushed under the wheels? Get behind the car, and then, when you see it rushing, get on the running board.

Pius IX, one day, wanted to determine whether the papacy and liberty could live together. He soon learned, to his cost, that liberty recognizes neither mistress nor rival, and that it breaks, when it pleases, the institutions it has given itself, Monarchy and Catholicism, State and property. The Pope then, first helmsman of the Revolution, steps back, and wants to hold back the revolutionary chariot, which passes over his body. — Roll, Revolution!

After the pope, there is dynastic opposition. The example of Pius IX seizes it and ignites it: Courage! Holy Father, it cries to him through the mouth of Mr. Thiers, taking an arm from the shaft. Courage! Shame on this cowardly government, which ignores the spirit of the century and the need for progress! — Courage dynastics! cry out the republicans in turn, attaching their gear to the former. — Courage, everyone! take up the socialists; let's not stop halfway: forward!... And the thundering chariot, chasing before it papacy, dynasty and bourgeoisie, precipitates them one on top of the other in the democratic and social Republic. — Roll, Revolution!

Halt! then said the President of Luxembourg, Louis Blanc: I am Minister, Secretary of State for Progress; we don't move forward without my permission. Down with the anarchists, the individualists, the egalitarians! Men of the people, respect to the State: the State is you!

Halt! cries for his part the revealer of the Triad, the restorer of metempsychosis, the apocryphal author of the *Universal Being*, Pierre Leroux: I am the apostle of the neo-Christians, the last of the seers. Down with the Voltairians, the liberals and the atheists! Respect to my religion and my God! Worker, stop, in the name of fraternity, charity, solidarity, humanity, unity!...

And the two heralds of Religion and the State, out of breath, put themselves across the cart, carried by its acquired speed and its mass, and pushed by a mysterious, irresistible force. — Roll, roll, Revolution!

We have read, with real pleasure, as this reading filled us with hope, the last pamphlet of Louis Blanc, and the pious disquisitions of Pierre Leroux.

The ex-statesman of the provisional government, the writer beloved of classical republicans, romantic democrats, communitarian and fraternitarian socialists, shines, in this diatribe, with all

the qualities of his style, and with all the miseries of his logic. Passion, a true passion, this time, elevates him above himself: he bursts out, he is indignant, he insults, he slanders; he has superb injuries and magnificent disdain. He calls the people to witness; he attests to the workers, his brothers, who awarded him the title of first worker of the Republic, and who now, in full convalescence from the government epidemic, speak of doing without statesmen, as well as capitalists and priests. He even appeals to the proprietors, to whom he promises fair, but not preliminary compensation, if they want to allow him to seize their properties, unless he uses them to organize work without cataclysm, peacefully.

One senses that the famous utopian is fighting for his hearth and his gods: for the State, the power, is the heritage, it is the blood and the life of Louis Blanc. Blow on the State, Louis Blanc is a dead man. It is for him, it is in order to realize his plan for organizing labor by the State, that the Resolution of February was made. So never did his verve appear more lively and more frank. No more refined tirades, idle epithets, affected sentimentalities, effective antitheses: it is almost revolutionary language. *Quousque tandem...*

Pierre Leroux joins Louis Blanc, Pierre Leroux who also has his interest in the debate: the holy man aspires to replace the Pope in his functions as vicar of God; some even go so far as to say that he remembers having been Jesus Christ. — No more government, he said, no more religion; all is lost! Where are you going, wretch? Come back to religion; without religion, there is no society. We are religion; UNITY! We are the Way, the Truth, the Life: TRINITY IN UNITY!... Sensation-feeling-knowledge! He who denies our *Doctrine*, and who ignores the *Triad*, is not a Republican!...

But let us leave the demagogue and the mystagogue together, and let us tackle this great problem of the State, even more obscure than that of labor ever was; but which, we firmly hope, will not take long to become as clear, as positive.

The Revolution of February raised two leading questions: one economic, the question of labor and property; the other political, the question of government or the State.

On the first of these questions the socialistic democracy is substantially in accord. They admit that it is not a question of the seizure and division of property, or even of its repurchase. Neither is it a question of dishonorably levying additional taxes on the wealthy and property-holding classes, which, while violating the principle of property recognized in the constitution, would serve only to overturn the general economy and aggravate the situation of the proletariat. The economic reform consists, on the one hand, in opening usurious credit to competition and thereby causing capital to lose its income, — in other words, in identifying, in every citizen to the same degree, the capacity of the laborer and that of the capitalist; on the other hand, in abolishing the whole system of existing taxes, which fall only on the laborer and the poor man, and replacing them all by a single tax on capital, as an insurance premium.

By these two great reforms social economy is reconstructed from top to bottom, commercial and industrial relations are inverted, and the profits, now assured to the capitalist, return to the laborer. Competition, now anarchical and subversive, becomes emulative and fruitful; outlets no longer being wanting, the workingman and employer, intimately connected, have nothing more to

fear from stagnation or suspension. A new order is established upon the old institutions abolished or regenerated.

On this point the revolutionary course is laid out; the meaning of the movement is known. Whatever modification may appear in practice, the reform will be effected according to these principles and on these bases; the Revolution has no other issue. The economic problem, then, may be considered solved.

It is far from being the same with the political problem, — that is, with the disposal to be made in the future, of government and the State. On this point the question is not even stated; it has not been recognized by the public conscience and the intelligence of the masses. The economic Revolution being accomplished, as we have just seen, can government, the State, continue to exist? Should it continue to exist? This no one, either in the democracy or out of it, dares to call into question; and yet it is the problem that must next be solved if we would escape new catastrophes.

We affirm, then, and as yet we are alone in affirming, that with the economic Revolution, no longer in dispute, the State must entirely disappear; that this disappearance of the State is the necessary consequence of the organization of credit and the reform of taxation; that, as an effect of this double innovation, government becomes first useless and then impossible; that in this respect it is in the same category with feudal property, lending at interest, absolute and constitutional monarchy, judicial institutions, etc., all of which have served in the education of liberty, but which fall and vanish when liberty has arrived at its fullness.

Others, on the contrary, in the front ranks of whom we distinguish Louis Blanc and Pierre Leroux, maintain that, after the economic revolution, it is necessary to continue the State, but in an organized form, furnishing as yet, however, no principle or plan for its organization. For them the political question, instead of being annihilated by identification with the economic question always subsisting, they favor an extension of the prerogatives of the State, of power, of authority, of government. They change names only; for example, instead of *Master-State* they say *Servant-State*, as if a change of words sufficed to transform things! Above this system of government, about which nothing is known, hovers a system of religion whose dogma is equally unknown, whose ritual is unknown, whose object, on earth and in heaven, is unknown.

This, then is the question that at present divides the socialistic democracy, now in accord, or nearly so, on other matters: Must the State continue to exist after the question of labor and capital shall be practically solved? In other words, shall we always have, as we have had hitherto, a political Constitution apart from the social Constitution?

We reply in the negative. We maintain that, capital and labor once identified, society exists by itself, and has no further need of government. We are, therefore, as we have more than once announced, anarchists. Anarchy is the condition of existence of adult society, as hierarchy is the condition of primitive society. There is a continual progress in human society from hierarchy to anarchy.

Louis Blanc and Pierre Leroux affirm the contrary. In addition to their capacity of *socialists* they retain that of *politicians*; they are men of government and authority, men of State.

To settle the difference, we have, then, to consider the State, no longer from the point of view of the old society, which naturally and necessarily produced it, and which approaches its end, but from the point of view of the new society, which is, or must be, the result of the two fundamental and correlative reforms of credit and taxation.

Now if we prove that, from this last point of view, the State, considered in its nature rests on a thoroughly false hypothesis; that, in the second place, considered in its object, the State finds no excuse for its existence save in a second hypothesis, equally false; that, finally, considered in the reasons for its continuance, the State again can appeal only to a hypothesis as false as the two others,—these three points cleared up, the question will be settled, the State will be regarded as a superfluous, and consequently harmful and impossible, thing; government will be a contradiction.

Let us proceed at once with the analysis:

I. On the nature of the State.

“What is the State?” asks Louis Blanc.

And he replies:—

“The State, under monarchical rule, is the power of one man, the tyranny of a single individual.

“The State, under oligarchical rule, is the power of a small number of men, the tyranny of a few.

“The State, under aristocratic rule, is the power of a class, the tyranny of many.

“The State, under anarchical rule is the power of the first comer who happens to be the most intelligent and the strongest; it is the tyranny of chaos.

“The State, under democratic rule, is the power of all the people, served by their elect, it is the reign of liberty.”

Of the twenty-five or thirty thousand readers of Louis Blanc, perhaps there are not ten to whom this definition of the State did not seem conclusive, and who do not repeat, after the master: The State is the power of one, of a few, of many, of all, or of the first comer, according as the word State is prefaced by one of these other adjectives, — *monarchical*, *oligarchical*, *aristocratic*, *democratic*, or *anarchical*. The delegates of the Luxembourg — who think themselves robbed, it seems, when any one allows himself to hold an opinion different from theirs on the meaning and tendencies of the Revolution of February — in a letter that has been made public, have done me the honor to inform me that they regard Louis Blanc’s answer as quite triumphant, and that I can say nothing in reply. It would seem that none of the citizen-delegates ever have studied Greek. Otherwise, they would have seen that their master and friend, Louis Blanc, instead of defining the State, has only translated into French the Greek words *monos*, one; *aligoi*, a few; *aristoï*, the great; *demos*, the people; and the privative *a*, which means *no*. It is by the use of these qualifying terms that Aristotle has distinguished the various forms of the State, which is designated by the word *archê*, authority, government, State. We ask pardon of our readers, but it is not our fault if the political science of the Luxembourg does not go beyond etymology.

And mark the artifice! Louis Blanc, in his translation, only had to use the word tyranny four times, *tyranny of one, tyranny of many*, etc., and to avoid it once, *power of the people, served by their elect*, to win applause. Every state save the democratic, according to Louis Blanc, is *tyranny*. Anarchy especially receives a peculiar treatment; *it is the power of the first comer who happens to be the most intelligent and the strongest*; it is the *tyranny of chaos*. What a monster must be this first comer, who, first comer that he is, nevertheless happens to be *the most intelligent and the strongest*, and who exercises his *tyranny in chaos*! After that who could prefer anarchy to this charming government of all the people, served so well, as we know, by their elected officials? How overwhelming it is, to be sure! At the first blow we find ourselves flat on the ground. O rhetorician! Thank God for having created for your express benefit, in the nineteenth century, such stupidity as that of your so-called delegates of the working classes; otherwise you would have perished under a storm of hisses the first time you touched a pen.

What is the State? This question must be answered. The list of the various forms of the State, which Louis Blanc, after Aristotle, has prepared, has taught us nothing. As for Pierre Leroux, it is not worth while to interrogate him; he would tell us that the question is inconsiderate; that the State has always existed; that it always will exist, — the final reason of conservatives and old women.

The State is the EXTERNAL constitution of the social power.

By this external constitution of its power and sovereignty, the people does not govern itself; now one individual, now several, by a title either elective or hereditary, are charged with governing it, with managing its affairs, with negotiating and compromising in its name; in a word, with performing all the acts of a father of a family, a guardian, a manager, or a proxy, furnished with a general, absolute, and irrevocable power of attorney.

This external constitution of the collective power, to which the Greeks gave the name *archê*, sovereignty, authority, government, rests then on this hypothesis: that a people, that the collective being that we call society, cannot govern itself, think, act, express itself, unaided, like beings endowed with individual personality; that, to do these things, it must be represented by one or more individuals, who, by any title whatever, are regarded as custodians of the will of the people, and its agents. According to this hypothesis, it is impossible for the collective power, which belongs essentially to the mass, to express itself and act directly, without the mediation of organs expressly established and, so to speak, posted *ad hoc*. It seems, we say, — and this is the explanation of the constitution of the State in all its varieties and forms, — that the collective being, society, existing only in the mind, cannot make itself felt save through monarchical incarnation, aristocratic usurpation, or democratic mandate; consequently, that all special and personal manifestation is forbidden it.

Now it is precisely this conception of the collective being, of its life, its action, its unity, its individuality, its personality, — for society is a person, understand! just as entire humanity is a person, — it is this conception of the collective human being that we deny today; and it is for that reason that we deny the State also, that we deny government, that we exclude from society, when

economically revolutionized, every constitution of the popular power, either without or within the mass, by hereditary royalty, feudal institution, or democratic delegation.

We affirm, on the contrary, that the people, that society, that the mass, can and ought to govern itself by itself; to think, act, rise, and halt, like a man; to manifest itself, in fine, in its physical, intellectual, and moral individuality, without the aid of all these spokesmen, who formerly were despots, who now are aristocrats, who from time to time have been pretended delegates, fawners on or servants of the crowd, and whom we call plainly and simply popular agitators, *demagogues*.

In short:

We deny government and the State, because we affirm what the founders of States have never believed in, the personality and autonomy of the masses.

We affirm further that every constitution of the State has no other object than to lead society to this condition of autonomy; that the different forms of the State, from absolute monarchy to representative *democracy*, are all only middle terms, illogical and unstable positions, serving one after another as transitions or steps to liberty, and forming the rungs of the political ladder upon which societies mount to self-consciousness and self-possession.

We affirm, finally, that this *anarchy*, which expresses, as we now see, the highest degree of liberty and order at which humanity can arrive, is the true formula of the Republic, the goal towards which the Revolution or February urges us; so that between the Republic and the government, between universal suffrage and the State, there is a contradiction.

These systematic affirmations we establish in two ways: first, by the historical and negative method, demonstrating that no establishment of authority, no organization of the collective force from without, is henceforth possible for us. This demonstration we commenced in the *Confessions of a Revolutionist*, in reciting the fall of all the governments which have succeeded one another in France for sixty years, discovering the cause of their abolition, and in the last place signaling the exhaustion and death of authority in the corrupted reign of Louis Philippe, in the inert dictatorship of the provisional government, and in the insignificant presidency of General Cavaignac and Louis Bonaparte.

We prove our thesis, in the second place, by explaining how, through the economic reform, through industrial solidarity and the organization of universal suffrage, the people passes from spontaneity to reflection and consciousness; act, no longer from impulse and enthusiasm, but with design; maintain themselves without masters and servants, without delegates as without aristocrats, absolutely as an individual would. Thus, the conception of person, the idea of the *me*, becomes extended and generalized; as there is an individual person or *me*, so there is a collective person or *self*; in the one case as in the other will, actions, soul, spirit, life, unknown in their principle, inconceivable in their essence, result from the animating and vital fact of organization. The psychology of nations and of humanity, like the psychology of man, becomes a possible science. It was this demonstration that we referred to in our publications on circulation and credit as well as in the fourteenth chapter of the manifesto of *La Voix du Peuple* relative to the constitution.

So, when Louis Blanc and Pierre Leroux assume the position of defenders of the State, — that is, of the *external* constitution of the public power, — they only reproduce, in a varied form peculiar to themselves, which they have not yet made known, that old fiction of representative government, whose integral formula, whose completest expression, is still the constitutional monarchy. Did we, then, accomplish the Revolution of February in order to attain this retrogressive contradiction?

It seems to us — what do you say, readers? — that the question begins to exhibit itself in a somewhat clearer light; that the weak-minded, after what we have just said, will be able to form an idea of the State; that they will understand how republicans can inquire if it is indispensable, after an economic revolution that changes all social relations, to maintain, to please the vanity of pretended statesmen, and at a cost of two thousand millions per annum, this parasitic organ called government. And the honorable delegates of the Luxembourg, who, being seated in the arm-chairs of the peerage, therefore think themselves politicians, and claim so courageously an exclusive understanding of the Revolution, doubtless will fear no longer that we, in our capacity of the *most intelligent* and the *strongest*, after having abolished government, as useless and too costly, may establish the tyranny of chaos. We deny the State and the government; we affirm in the same breath the autonomy of the people and its majority. How can we be upholders of tyranny, aspirants for the ministry, competitors of Louis Blanc and Pierre Leroux?

In truth, we do not understand the logic of our adversaries. They accept a principle without troubling themselves about its consequences; they approve, for example, the equality of taxation which the tax on capital realizes; they adopt popular, mutual, and gratuitous credit, for all these terms are synonymous; they cheer at the dethronement of capital and the emancipation of labor; then, when it remains to draw the anti-governmental conclusions from these premises, they protest, they continue to talk of politics and government, without inquiring whether government is compatible with industrial liberty and equality; whether there is a possibility of a political science, when there is a necessity for an economic science! Property they attack without scruple, in spite of its venerable antiquity; but they bow before power like church-wardens before the holy sacrament. Government is to them the necessary and immutable *a priori*, the principle of principles, the eternal *archeus*.

Certainly, we do not offer our affirmations as proofs; we know, as well as any one, on what conditions a proposition is demonstrated. We only say that, before proceeding to a new constitution of the State, we must inquire whether, in view of the economic reforms that the Revolution imposes upon us, the State itself should not be abolished; whether this end of political institutions does not result from the meaning and bearing of economic reform. We ask whether, in fact, after the explosion of February, after the establishment of universal suffrage, the declaration of the omnipotence of the masses, and the henceforth inevitable subordination of power to the popular will, any government whatever is still possible, whether a government would not be placed perpetually in the alternative either of submissively following the blind and contradictory injunctions of the multitude, or of intentionally deceiving it, as the provisional government has done, as demagogues in all ages have done. We ask, at least, which of the various attributes of the

State should be retained and strengthened, which abolished. For, should we find, as may still be expected, that, of all the present attributes of the State, not one can survive the economic reform, it would be quite necessary to admit, on the strength of this negative demonstration that, in the new condition of society, the State is nothing, can be nothing; in short, that the only way to organize democratic government is to abolish government.

Instead of this positive, practical, realistic analysis of the revolutionary movement, what course do our pretended apostles take? They go to consult Lycurgus, Plato, Orpheus, and all the mythological oracles; they interrogate the ancient legends; they appeal to remotest antiquity for the solution of problems that are exclusively modern, and then give us for answer the whimsical illuminations of their brain.

Once more: is this the science of society and of the Revolution which must, at first sight, solve all problems; a science essentially practical and immediately applicable; a science eminently traditional doubtless, but above all thoroughly progressive, in which progress takes place through the systematic negation of tradition itself?...

II. On the aim or object of the State.

We have just seen that the idea of the State, considered in its nature, rests entirely on a hypothesis which is at least doubtful, — that of the impersonality and the physical, intellectual, and moral inertia of the masses. We shall now prove that this same idea of the State, considered in its object, rests on another hypothesis, still more improbable than the first, — that of the permanence of antagonism in humanity, a hypothesis that is itself a consequence of the primitive dogma of the fall or of original sin.

We continue to cite the *Nouveau Monde*:

“What would happen,” asks Louis Blanc, “if we should leave the most intelligent or the strongest to place obstacles in the way of the development of the faculties of one who is less strong or less intelligent? Liberty would be destroyed.

“How prevent this crime? By interposing between the oppressor and the oppressed the whole power of the people.

If James oppresses Peter, shall the thirty-four millions of men of whom French society is composed run all at once to protect Peter, to maintain liberty? To pretend such a thing would be buffoonery.

“How then shall society intervene?

“*Through those whom it has chosen to REPRESENT it for this purpose.*

“But these REPRESENTATIVES of society, these servants of the people, who are they? The State.

“Then the State is only society itself, acting as society, to prevent... what? — oppression; to maintain... what? — liberty.”

That is clear. The State is a REPRESENTATION of society, externally organized to protect the weak against the strong; in other words, to preserve peace between disputants and maintain order. Louis Blanc has not gone far, as we see, to find the object of the State. It can be traced from

Grotius, Justinian, Cicero, etc., in all the authors who ever have written on public right. It is the Orphic tradition related by Horace:

Sylvestres homines sacer interpretsque deorum.
Cœdibus et victu fœdo deterruit Orpheus,
Dictus ob hoc lenire tigres rabidosque leones,
Dictus et Amphion, Thebæ conditor arcis,
Saxa movere sono testudinis, et prece blanda
Dueere quo vellet...

“The divine Orpheus, the interpreter of the gods, called men from the depths of the forests and filled them with a horror of murder and of human flesh. Consequently it was said of him that he tamed lions and tigers, as later it was said of Amphion, founder of Thebes, that he moved the stones by the sound of his lyre, and led them whither he wished by the charm of his prayer.”

Socialism, we know, does not require with certain people great efforts of the imagination. They imitate, flatly enough, the old mythologies; they copy Catholicism, while declaiming against it; they ape power, which they lust after; then they shout with all their strength: Liberty, Equality, Fraternity; and the circle is complete. One passes for a revelator, a reformer, a democratic and social restorer, one is named as a candidate for the ministry of progress,—nay, even for the dictatorship of the Republic!

So, by the confession of Louis Blanc, power is born of barbarism; its organization bears witness to a state of ferocity and violence among primitive men, — an effect of the utter absence of commerce and industry. To this savagism the State had to put an end by opposing to the force of each individual a superior force capable, in the absence of any other argument, of restraining his will. The constitution of the State supposes, then, as we have just said, a profound social antagonism, *homo homini lupus*. Louis Blanc himself says this when, after having divided men into the strong and the weak, disputing with each other like wild beasts for their food, he interposes between them, as a mediator, the State.

Then the State would be useless; the State would lack an object as well as a motive; the State would have to take itself away,—if there should come a day when, from any cause whatever, society should contain neither strong nor weak,— that is, when the inequality of physical and intellectual powers could not be a cause of robbery and oppression, independently of the protection, more fictitious than real by the way, of the State.

Now, this is precisely the thesis that we maintain today.

The power that tempers morals, that gradually substitutes the rule of right for the rule of force, that establishes security, that creates step by step liberty and equality, is, in a much higher degree than religion and the State, labor; first, the labor of commerce and industry; next, science, which spiritualizes it; in the last analysis, art, its immortal flower. Religion by its promises and its threats, the State by its tribunals and its armies, gave to the sentiment of justice, which was too weak among primitive men, the only sanction intelligible to savage minds. For us, whom industry,

science, literature, art, have corrupted, as Jean Jacques said, this sanction lies elsewhere; we find it in the division of property, in the machinery of industry, in the growth of luxury, in the overruling desire for well-being, — a desire which imposes upon all a necessity of labor. After the barbarism of the early ages, after the price of caste and the feudal constitution of primitive society, a last element of slavery still remained, — capital. Capital having lost its way, the laborer — that is, the merchant, the mechanic, the farmer, the savant, the artist — no longer needs protection; his protection is his talent, his knowledge is his industry. After the dethronement of capital, the continuance of the State, far from protecting liberty, can only compromise liberty.

He has a sorry idea of the human race — of its essence, its perfectibility, its destiny — who conceives of it as an agglomeration of individuals necessarily exposed, by the inequality of physical and intellectual forces, to the constant danger of reciprocal spoliation or the tyranny of a few. Such an idea is a proof of the most retrogressive philosophy; it belongs to those days of barbarism when the absence of the true elements of social order left to the genius of the legislator no method of action save that of force; when the supremacy of a pacifying and avenging power appeared to all as the just consequence of a previous degradation and an original stain. To give our whole thought, we regard political and judicial institutions as the exoteric and concrete formula of the myth of the fall, the mystery of redemption, and the sacrament of penitence. It is curious to see pretended socialists, enemies or rivals of Church and State, copying all that they blaspheme,—the representative system in politics, the dogma of the fall in religion.

Since they talk so much of doctrine, we frankly declare that such is not ours.

In our view, the moral condition of society is modified and ameliorated at the same rate as its economic condition. The morality of a wild, ignorant, and idle people is one thing; that of an industrious and artistic people another: consequently, the social guarantees that prevail among the former are quite different from those that prevail among the latter. In a society transformed, almost unconsciously, by its economic development, there is no longer either *strong* or *weak*; there are only laborers whose faculties and means incessantly tend, through industrial solidarity and the guarantee of circulation, to become equalized. In vain, to assure the right and the duty of each, does the imagination go back to that idea of authority and government which attests the profound despair of souls long terrified by the police and the priesthood: the simplest examination of the attributes of the State suffices to demonstrate that, if inequality of fortunes, oppression, robbery, and misery are not our eternal inheritance, the first leprosy to be eradicated, after capitalistic exploitation, the first plague to be wiped out, is the State.

See, in fact, budget in hand, what the State is.

The State is the army. Reformer, do you need an army to defend you? If so, your idea of public security is Caesar's and Napoleon's. You are not a republican; you are a despot.

The State is the police; city police, rural police, police of the waters and forests. Reformer, do you need police? Then your idea of order is Fouché's, Gisquet's, Carussidière's, and M. Carlier's. You are not a democrat, you are a spy.

The State is the whole judicial system; justices of the peace, tribunals of first instance, courts of appeal, court of cassation, high court, tribunals of experts, commercial tribunals, council of

prefects, State council, councils of war. Reformer, do you need all this judiciary? Then your idea of justice is M. Baroche's, M. Dupin's, and Perrin Dandin's. You are not a socialist; you are a red-tapist.

The State is the treasury, the budget. Reformer, you do not desire the abolition of taxation? Then your idea of public wealth is M. Thiers's who thinks that the largest budgets are the best. You are not an organizer of labor; you are an exciseman.

The State is the custom-house. Reformer, do you need, for the protection of national labor, differential duties and toll-houses? Then your idea of commerce and circulation is M. Fould's and M. Rothschild's. You are not an apostle of fraternity; you are a Jew.

The State is the public debt, the mint, the sinking fund, the savings-banks, etc. Reformer, are these the foundation of your science? Then your idea of social economy is that of MM. Humann, Lacave-Laplagne, Garnier-Pagès, Passy, Duclerc, and the *Man with Forty Crowns*. You are a Turcaret.

The State—but we must stop. There is nothing, absolutely nothing, in the State, from the top of the hierarchy to its foot, which is not an abuse to be reformed, a parasite to be exterminated, an instrument of tyranny to be destroyed. And you talk to us of maintaining the State, of extending the functions of the State, of increasing the power of the State! Go to, you are not a revolutionist; for the true revolutionist is essentially a simplifier and a liberal. You are a mystifier, a juggler; you are a marplot.

III. On an ulterior destiny of the State.

There arises in favor of the State one last hypothesis. The fact that the State, say the pseudo-democrats, hitherto has performed only a rôle of parasitism and tyranny is no reason for denying it a nobler and more humane destiny. The State is destined to become the principal organ of production, consumption, and circulation; the initiator of liberty and equality.

For liberty and equality are the State.

Credit is the State.

Commerce, agriculture, and manufactures are the State.

Canals, railroads, mines, insurance companies, as well as tobacco-shops and post-offices, are the State.

Public education is the State.

The State, in fine, dropping its negative attributes to clothe itself with positive ones, must change from the oppressor, parasite, and conservative it ever has been into an organizer, producer, and servant. That would be feudalism regenerated, the hierarchy of industrial associations, organized and graded according to a potent formula the secret of which Pierre Leroux still hides from our sight.

Thus, the organizers of the State suppose—for in all this they only go from supposition to supposition—that the State can change its nature, turn itself around, so to speak; from Satan become an archangel; and, after having lived for centuries by blood and slaughter like a wild beast,

feed upon plants with the deer, and give suck to the lambs. Such is the teaching of Louis Blanc and Pierre Leroux; such, as we said long ago, is the whole secret of socialism.

“We love the tutelary, generous, devoted government, taking as its motto those profound words of the gospel, ‘*Whosoever of you will be the chiefest, shall be the servant of all;*’ and we hate the deprived, corrupting, oppressive government, making the people its prey. We admire it representing the generous and living portion of humanity; we abhor it when it represents the cadaverous portion. We revolt against the insolence, usurpation, and robbery involved in the idea of the MASTER-STATE; and we applaud that which is touching, fruitful, and noble in the idea of the SERVANT-STATE. Or better: there is a belief which we hold a thousand times dearer than life,—our belief in the approaching and final TRANSFORMATION of power. *That is the triumphant passage from the old world to the new.* All the government. of Europe rest today on the idea of the MASTER-STATE; but they are dancing desperately the dance of the dead.”—*Le Nouveau Monde*, November 16, 1849.

Pierre Leroux is a thorough believer in these ideas. What he wishes, what he teaches, and what he calls for is a regeneration of the State,—he has not told us yet whereby and by whom this regeneration should be effected,—just as he wishes and calls for a regeneration of Christianity without, as yet, having stated his dogma and given his *Credo*.

We believe, in opposition to Pierre Leroux and Louis Blanc, that the theory of the tutelary, generous, devoted, productive, initiative, organizing, liberal and progressive State is a utopia, a pure illusion of their intellectual vision. Pierre Leroux and Louis Blanc seem to us like a man who, standing above a mirror and seeing his image reversed, should pretend that this image must become a reality some day and replace (pardon us the expression) his *natural person*.

This is what separates us from these two men, whose talents and services, whatever they may say, we have never dreamed of denying, but whose stubborn hallucination we deplore. We do not believe in the SERVANT-STATE: to us it is a flat contradiction.

Servant and *master*, when applied to the State, are synonymous terms; just as more and less, when applied to equality, are identical terms. The proprietor, by interest on capital, demands *more* than equality; communism, by the formula, *to each according to his needs*, allows *less* than equality: always inequality; and that is why we are neither a communist nor a proprietor. Likewise, whoever says *master-State* says usurpation of the public power; whoever says *servant-State* says delegation of the public power: always an alienation of this power, always a power, always an external, arbitrary authority instead of the immanent, inalienable, untransferable authority of citizens; always *more* or *less* than liberty. It is for this reason that we are opposed to the State.

Further, to leave metaphysics and return to the field of experience, here is what we have to say to Louis Blanc and Pierre Leroux.

You pretend and affirm that the State, that the government, can, and ought to be, wholly changed in its principle, in its essence, in its action, in its relations with citizens, as well as in its results that thus the State, a bankrupt and a counterfeiter, should be the sole source of credit; that for so many centuries an enemy of knowledge, and at the present moment still hostile to primary instruction and the liberty of the press, it is its business to officially provide for the instruction of

citizens; that, after having left commerce, industry, agriculture, and all the machinery of wealth to develop themselves without its aid, often even in spite of its resistance, it belongs to it to take the initiative in the whole field of labor as in the world of ideas, that, in fine, the eternal enemy of liberty, it yet ought, not to leave liberty to itself, but to create and direct liberty. It is this marvelous transformation of the State that constitutes, in your opinion, the present Revolution.

There lies upon you, then, the twofold obligation: first, of establishing the truth of your hypothesis by showing its traditional legitimacy, exhibiting its historical titles, and developing its philosophy; in the second place, of applying it in practice.

Now, it appears already that both theory and practice, in your hypothesis, formally contradict the idea itself, and the facts of the past, and the most authentic tendencies of humanity.

Your theory, we say, involves a contradiction in its terms, since it pretends to make liberty a creation of the State, while the State, on the contrary, is to be a creation of liberty. In fact, if the State imposes itself upon my will, the State is master; I am not free; the theory is undermined.

It contradicts the facts of the past, since it is certain, as you yourselves admit, that everything that has been produced within the sphere of human activity of a positive, good, and beautiful character, was the product of liberty exclusively, acting independently of the State, and almost always in opposition to the State; which leads directly to this proposition, which ruins your system, that liberty is sufficient unto itself and does not need the State.

Finally, your theory contradicts the manifest tendencies of civilization; since, instead of continually adding to individual liberty and dignity by making every human soul, according to Kant's precept, a pattern of entire humanity, one face of the collective soul, you subordinate the private person to the public person; you submit the individual to the group; you absorb the citizen in the State.

It is for you to remove all these contradictions by a principle superior to liberty and to the State. We, who simply deny the State; who, resolutely, following the line of liberty, remain faithful to the revolutionary practice,—it is not for us to demonstrate to you the falsity of your hypothesis; we await your proofs. The *master-State* is lost; you are with us in admitting it. As for the *servant-State*, we do not know what it may be; we distrust it as supreme hypocrisy. The *servant-State* seems to us quite the same thing as a servant-mistress; we do not wish it; with our present light, we prefer to espouse Liberty in legitimate marriage. Explain, then, if you can, why, after having demolished the State through love of this adored liberty, we must now, in consequence of the same love, return to the State. Until you have solved this problem, we shall continue to protest against all government, all authority, all power; we shall maintain, through all and against all, the prerogative of liberty. We shall say to you: Liberty is, for us, a thing gained; now, you know the rule of law: *Melior est conditio possidentis*. Produce your titles to the reorganization of government; otherwise, no government!

To sum up :

The State is the external constitution of the social power.

The constitution supposes, in principle, that society is a creature of the mind, destitute of spontaneity, providence, unity, needing for its action to be fictitiously represented by one or more

elected or hereditary commissioners: an hypothesis the falsity of which the economic development of society and the organization of universal suffrage agree in demonstrating.

The constitution of the State supposes further, as to its object, that antagonism or a state of war is the essential and irrevocable condition of humanity, a condition which necessitates, between the *weak* and the *strong*, the intervention of a coercive power to put an end to their struggles by universal oppression. We maintain that, in this respect, the mission of the State is ended; that, by the division of labor, industrial solidarity, the desire for well-being, and the equal distribution of capital and taxation, liberty and justice obtain surer guarantees than any that ever were afforded them by religion and the State.

As for utilitarian transformation of the State, we consider it as a utopia contradicted at once by governmental tradition, and the revolutionary tendency, and the spirit of the henceforth admitted economic reforms. In any case, we say that to liberty alone it would belong to reorganize power, which is equivalent at present to the complete exclusion of power.

As a result, either no social revolution, or no more government; such is our solution of the political problem.

Now a few words of explanation from the writer to the citizens Louis Blanc and Pierre Leroux.

To Louis Blanc:

You complain that for a long time you have been the target of a system of attack from me; you say that you have always been reluctant to respond to it, because you did not want to give the counter-revolution the spectacle of our dissent. Please allow me to know that you have little sympathy for this feigned moderation, which is only a roundabout way of pointing out to me the animosity of the Democrats. The questions need to be studied. (The Revolution does not accommodate these reciprocal indulgences.) If you supposed for a single moment that I would keep silent or conceal anything that, in your books, seems false and dangerous to me, you have not done me justice; you have fooled yourself.

I have never slandered your intentions; I have often highlighted the honor, very rare in the world, that you had of being the first to raise, in an official manner, the social question. It is a glory that cannot be taken away from you; for my part, I think less than anyone of taking it. I have, moreover, drawn attention to your theory, which I know, be sure, better than you; not certainly because I approve of it, but because it expresses one of the sides of humanitarian development, the communist and governmental side, which is the one that I fight.

Also, without concerning myself with your person, I have always considered you as the least disguised expression of absolutism, and, as such, as one of the most dangerous men for the Revolution. I believed, in criticizing your ideas, that I was fulfilling a duty: I regret that you were not able to understand it. I am, in your eyes, the *theorist of tyranny through chaos*, to borrow your style: so be it! I have just told you what I mean by *anarchy* and abolition of the State; I had already made this sufficiently heard in various pamphlets, and, very recently, in the manifesto of the *Voix*

du Peuple. You only need to open your eyes to see that these ideas are far removed from those of *tyranny* and *chaos*. It pleased you, for the sake of your popularity and the satisfaction of your self-esteem, to distort and conceal my sentiments. You owe it to me to restore the truth on this point and retract your words: I demand it.

You insinuate, always for the sake of your popularity and in order to attract the hatred of the democracy on me, that I carry on the work of the Thermidorians, authors of the death of Robespierre, and you attribute to me guillotine intentions with regard to you and of all those who, with you, carry on the work of the Jacobins. You are a writer: you must know better than anyone that, despite the vehemence of the speech, violence is what is most foreign to the soul of the man of letters. Here again, you owe me compensation; and so that it costs less to your pride, I will give you the example of frankness.

It is true, I appreciate the role and work of Robespierre differently than you; I think, with many others, that Robespierre was, before Bonaparte, the fatal man who, after having energetically served it, doomed the Republic. Mr. Royer-Collard said one day to Mr. Odilon Barrot: "I know you, you are Pétion." Well, I recognize you too, citizen Louis Blanc, you are Robespierre. You have the same love of speech, the same dictatorial inclinations, the same talent for agitation, the same retrospective thoughts, the same reactionary attitudes, and, if I must tell you everything, the same nullity of ideas, the same political incapacity. And, admire the astonishing analogy of the times: you still have, in Pierre Leroux, your Dom Gerle, and I assure you that you will not lack the Catherine Théos. Does it follow, because I draw your horoscope in this way, that I am myself a Girondin? Only you could claim that. Far from it, I specifically accuse Robespierre of having doomed the Republic by precipitating, through the disgust of his petty person and the intolerance of his fanaticism, the fall of the Mountain and the defeat of the Jacobins.

France, bourgeois in its habits and its institutions, is montagnard by temperament: it prefers, in revolution, *coups de main* to methodical transitions; it is after having demonstrated its strength that it agrees to return to ideas. This is why our aspirations for liberty have almost always been disappointed: 1799, 1814, 1830 and 1848 attest to this. In each of these periods, the country made an effort to free itself from a corrupting and tyrannical power; but, the ideas not being up to the circumstances, the country fell again into oppression.

According to this disposition of our dear and unfortunate homeland, and given the speed of events, my predictions, very impartial as you will judge, are that the democratic and social Republic will be established under the influence of the ideas of which you are the the most significant organ; and that one day, perhaps soon, you will occupy this eminent position that you aspire to in the State. The demagogic carnival, predicted by me, must come to pass. Events moving faster than ideas, your imaginative theory of the State being more easily grasped than the scientific theory of freedom, it seems to me almost inevitable that we will escape the experiment of the theories of the Luxembourg. But I predict it to you in advance: you will not govern as you imagine, neither you nor anyone else. The worker, whatever favor he shows for your ideas, will not give you the initiative this time; he intends to govern himself; you will be the instrument of a

disorganized multitude, and you will have compromised, for the second time, the February Revolution, by constantly agitating, instead of the idea, the revolutionary passion.

This is why I, a republican, against whom you sow distrust and hatred, am trying today to ward off the danger, by casting into the world some positive ideas, which could one day join the democracy and serve as ballast for your deplorable loquaciousness. Because, despite the unpopularity to which I expose myself by fighting your sad influence, I know full well that my ideas are not lost. Didn't one of your people say to me one day: *We will give free credit without you, in spite of you and against you?* And isn't that what you already do yourself, when you sew the theory of free credit into your theory of the State?

You still dare to say that after having condemned power in Robespierre, I exalt it in Louis-Philippe; that after spitting on the scaffold of the Jacobin, I kneel before the dunghill into which the monarch sank.

If I had the slightest sensitivity left for slander of this kind, I would not go far to find my answer. I would apply Pascal's *mentiris impudentissime* to you, and leave you there. But I want to treat with more respect the president of these poor delegates from Luxembourg, who collect your speeches so preciously and admire you so naively. So force me to tell them, since they take your word for it and don't read me, that what you do with me is a pure joke, for the sole purpose of exposing me to patriotic vindictiveness, in the case where triumphant neo-Jacobinism produces a batch of *réacs* and *aristos*. Isn't anyone reactionary who dares to laugh at your so-called *Organization of Labor*? Is he not an aristocrat who allows himself an opinion outside the common profession of faith?

To Pierre Leroux:

My dear theosophist,

Your three articles contain in substance that I am a proud person, an eclectic, a liberal, a sophist, a Voltairian, a Fourierist, a Malthusian, an egoist, an atheist, an Erostratus, a bourgeois, a proprietor, — which does not prevent you from calling me your friend and saying to me: *My dear Proudhon*; — that I have plundered, without saying anything of it, Kant, Hegel, Feuerbach, Fourier and yourself; but if I took some of your ideas, it was with bad intention, and only to overthrow your *doctrine*; that after having criticized Louis Blanc, Considerant, Cabet and others, about whom you care *in petto* as much as me, I had the extreme audacity to attack you, the conqueror of M. Cousin and eclecticism, that I called you a *theologaster*, while you are indeed and duly the theologist of socialism; In short, I am not a republican.

It took you fifteen columns in the *République* to count out this rosary. I ask you: what does all this prove! What argument for your readers is this string of insulting epithets, used by the paperboys of the social democracy? And what does it matter to you, great theomancer, great theomime, not to say theomaniac, about whom I had said nothing, that Louis Blanc and the others, who worked so well after February, were confessed by me from office, because they refuse to speak?

The question you had to resolve was, however, very simple, and I had asked it in precise terms.

What is God? I asked myself. And I answered following Kant, following all the philosophers, following yourself: *We don't know.*

What is government? — *We do not know.*

And I added, in the form of a comment: It is my opinion that by worrying more about these questions, we seem like astrologers looking for the future in the stars.

So you only had one thing to do: show me, empirically or by dialectical formula, what God is, what government is. This was a great opportunity to produce your theory! Instead, you rant and rave; you call me sacrilegious, a Malthusian, *not a republican!* Finally, you threaten to treat me as you did to eclecticism, this great open door of modern philosophy, which you had the glory of breaking down alone. So what do you have? Which gadfly is biting you? What hypochondria are you prey to? I suspect, if you are not crazy, some excitement from the police, some coup of Carlier, as M. de Larochefajacquelein elegantly puts it. Be careful: we are surrounded by snitches, who only want to make us say, when they don't make us do stupid things.

Do you want me to tell you what I think?

Basically, you have no other ideas about God, religion, property, government, association than those which I strive to clarify, while you confuse them with triads, *circulus*, metempsychosis and all kinds of metaphysical and erotic illuminations. This is why you declare yourself my adversary: it angers you to see me sowing your ideas, like sand, in the public square.

God, it is you who say it, cannot be proven, cannot be explained. — And did I say something else?

Religion, according to you again, is social democracy. — I accept, with reservations, this definition. I abandon the word with the thing; you, by abandoning the thing, deny the word. Nothing is easier than for us to understand each other.

Property, it is again you whom I quote, is the right that every man has to develop in the triple physical, moral and intellectual respect. — Defined in this way, who would be so foolish as to deny property? I agree with you: I had only believed that property was something else.

After having thus explained yourself about God, religion and property, you declare yourself a partisan of FREE CREDIT, of which you even claim the first idea. Only, you claim that the *Bank of the People* is nothing but an absurdity, exclusively of my invention. This at least proves that, while we agree on principle and theory, we only differ on application. But what would the public say if it learned that the cause of the blame that you heap on the People's Bank comes solely from the fact that I had banned, in spite of you, any kind of triad? You first wanted, in the People's Bank, THREE divisions: Production, Consumption and Circulation. Then you distinguished THREE types of credit: then you established THREE funds. Everything was in *threes*, multiples and submultiples of *three*. I told you that you knew nothing about bookkeeping, and the meetings ended there. How much I regret not having published them! Will you tell us once, metaphysician of the Trimourti, why a pot only has three legs, while there are four wheels on a wagon?

In perfect community of ideas on capital and the interest of capital, we are still so on government. You deny, as I do, the government of man by man. You were the first to say that, in the Republic, each citizen must be *his own priest and his own emperor*. You go so far as to

reproach me for having stolen the idea from you. Pardon! I didn't know it was yours; and if I had known it, I would not have believed that it would lose anything by passing through my mouth: I have more of a reputation than you for knowing what I say.

But who could have put into your mind that the double formula: *Abolition of the exploitation of man by man* and *Abolition of the government of man by man*, which we affirm, you and I, was a treacherous antinomy on my part, while on your part it is simply a deduction? That if I affirmed these two propositions at the same time, it was in order to ruin one by the other, and thus to perpetuate both the exploitation of man by man, and the government of man by man? How could you attribute to me this antinomic malice, when I constantly repeat, from one end to the other of my *Confessions*, that the two formulas are identical and adequate, that they derive from the same principle, and are used reciprocally as a corollary. And it is on this that you base yourself, shouting from the rooftops that I am not a Republican! Once again, is this madness, or slander?

Yes, yes, yes, — I have to blare it in your ears! — I deny all at the same time, collectively, identically and synthesized, both the exploitation of man by man, and the government of man by man, and, what you are very wrong to forget, dear Theopompus, the worship of man by man. By denying it, I am, I swear to you, making neither antinomy nor antithesis, I am in no way thinking of demolishing your *Doctrine*; I don't even know if you have a doctrine.

The conformity of our feelings in matters of religion, government, credit and property, thus established, and by your own words, and by this bitter claim of ideas, of which, it seems, you are the father, while I would only be the midwife; is it not a shame for you to come suddenly, with brilliance, with scandal, to the defense of religion, which rejects you; of the government, which repudiates you; of property, which abhors you? What is then this crusade of which you are now the Peter the Hermit in favor of religion, of government, of property? What are you attacking? What do you stand for? Who, what do you have? What does this torrent of pedantic ramblings mean, where all that is clearest is that the idea of the century, the immortal idea, under the invocation of which I very humbly placed my pamphlet, this idea is yours.

Could you not tell your readers, simply, and without calling me Malthusian, Erostratus, proprietor, etc.: Citizens, He who solved the problem of the proletariat, He who alone has the right to raise his hand to heaven, and to say: *My idea is immortal*, this man is not Proudhon; it is PIERRE LEROUX! It is ME!

Listen to me, dear Theoglossus. I pardon you, for today, for all the madness and absurdities that you have poured out in your three diatribes; I would make you suffer too much by taking them up. But, I warn you, I don't like this Jesuitical way of killing a man by kissing him. I prefer a thousand times the avowed, cordial hatred of Louis Blanc to your false good nature. You can qualify my ideas, it is your right; but I forbid you from qualifying my intentions: otherwise, I will qualify you yourself; I will mark you so deeply and so burningly that it will be remembered in future generations. It will be, for you, a means of arriving at posterity, more certain than the Triad, the *Circulus* and the Doctrine.

TO PIERRE LEROUX

My dear Pierre Leroux,

Do you want us to suspend our polemic for a moment and speak like good friends? Put aside your sensitivity and your suspicions: it is a new treaty that I propose to you, in which you will have nothing to put of your own.

I am determined to endure everything from you, the most mortifying criticisms, the most severe corrections, apart from you saying of me that I am not a republican, democrat and socialist; that I am *mean* and an *atheist*.

Such imputations, addressed not to ideas, but to the person, you have no right to express them, for the reason that no man in the world has the right to seek the intentions of his neighbor. The search for intentions, great God! Do you know then, Pierre Leroux, who knows so many things, what that is? It is the Inquisition; it is organized denunciation, systematic slander, condemnation without judgment, without motives, without proof, without *corpus delicti*. It is the abolition of all fraternity between men, the negation of the Gospel, the apotheosis of Torquemada, of Fouquier-Tinville, of Marat, and the glorification of the revolutionary tribunal.

Do you then, Pierre Leroux, want to start again where Marat left off? Would you be an incarnation of Fouquier-Tinville? Would your soul have once animated the atrocious figure of Torquemada? What! You who cry out so loudly against slander, which I have never used against you, as far as I know; you who compare slander to the assassin's dagger, you mean to erect it into a system, under the pretext of *investigating intentions*! Do you already possess canonical infallibility, to arrogate to yourself the right to accuse the intentions of a living man? Do you forget that the slightest error of judgment, while you speak of intentions, becomes slander?

Say, as much as you please: Such a proposition, such an idea, does not seem republican to me. Good! Say that I am mistaken in the way I understand the democracy and socialism; prove it in your own way. I find no fault with it. I even commit, as a response, to prove that, apart from your antediluvian fantasies, your opinions on government, property, association and credit are none other than mine. The public will judge.

But do not go and conclude, from what seem to you to be my ideas, what you could then take for my intentions: you do not have the right to do so. You could not do it without a slanderous intention, without making yourself the first guilty of the crime that you seek in others.

I am a republican: for twelve years my proofs have been made. It was necessary to be Pierre Leroux, it was necessary to have made the Triad, the *Circulus* and the Metempsychosis, the criterion of republicanism to discover, after twelve years of battles waged by me for the holy cause of the Republic, that I am not a republican.

I am a democrat: my explanations, constantly repeated, of what I mean by *an-archy* testify to this. Would then the only democrats, in France, be those who swear with you by the Triad, who

believe in the *Circulus* and the Metempsychosis? I greatly fear that on this account there exists, there has never existed a republican but you alone, in all the past, present and future republics.

I am a socialist, finally: I have said a hundred times that socialism, insofar as it limits itself to the criticism of current political economy, and as it proposes its hypotheses to criticism, is a protest; that insofar as it formulates practical and positive ideas, it is the same thing as social science. I protest against current society and I seek science; on this double count, I am a socialist. You have no right to take this quality away from me, because I recognize neither the Triad, nor the Metempsychosis, nor the *Circulus*. On this account, Fourier, Owen, Saint-Simon, Cabet, Louis Blanc, would not be more socialists than I: you alone would be Socialism, as you alone are the Democracy and the Republic.

I reject the qualification of atheist, not out of hypocrisy, you must know, nor out of any religious terror; but because this word, taken in the vulgar sense, implies an odious insinuation. The atheist is the abject materialist, without respect for justice and humanity, who makes a law of his egoism, a god of his belly, a cult of the satisfaction of his passions. It is not thus, as you are aware, that Spinoza was an atheist; it is not for such reasons that Kant, Fichte, Hegel later deserved the name. The so-called atheism of these great men was nothing other than idealism raised to its highest power, the culminating point of metaphysical and religious speculation.

I will not mention this other epithet of *enfant terrible* that you award me, after having translated it, for fear that the public might mistake it for *mean*. You who speak so much of intentions, you naively reveal your own. What! I am an *enfant terrible*, that is to say, in the language of Pierre Leroux, an *mean* person, because I believe neither in the Triad, nor in the Circulus, nor in Pantheism, nor in Metamorphosis, nor in Metempsychosis! I am a renegade of the Republic and of Socialism, of all that the People venerate, because I had the scandalous audacity to laugh at your so-called dogmas! You said to yourself: "orthodoxy is my doxy"; and thereupon, you go shouting everywhere that I am an atheist, a villain, the scourge of the democratic and social Republic.

You abuse the consideration with which the people honor you, the opinion that they have of your sincerity, of your probity, to make me suspect in their eyes. You avenge, by this immolation of my person, some jokes more cheerful than offensive, all this for the greater glory of the *Circulus* and the Doctrine. Do you know what that means, Pierre Leroux! It is that you prefer your doctrine to the Truth, to Charity, to the Republic.

No, I believe neither in the Triad, nor in the *Circulus*, nor in Metempsychosis, any more than in the resurrection of the dead and in the constitutional monarchy; I am neither theist, nor pantheist, nor atheist. I have no faith, love, hope except in Liberty and the Homeland. This is why I systematically oppose everything that seems to me hostile to Liberty, foreign to this sacred land of Gaul. I want my nation returned to its primitive nature, free once and for all from all exotic beliefs, from all alien institutions. For a long time the Greek, the Roman, the Barbarian, the Jew, the English have rubbed off on our race: one gave it its religion, the other its law; this one its feudalism, that one its government.

And as if this long invasion of foreign ideas were not enough, you come to offer us, renewed by Hindustani fables, the Triad, the *Circulus*, the Metempsychosis and the castes. You do not want this poor people, the first on earth, to resume, with their initiative, their lost *auto-maty*. You forbid them to live their own life, to speak to the world of the abundance of their heart and their genius; for its legitimate inspiration you substitute metempsychosis and the triad.

Ah! You who reproach me for not being a republican, you are not of your own country. You have not heard, like me, since childhood, the oaks of our druidic forests weep for the ancient homeland; you do not feel your bones, kneaded from this pure limestone of the Jura, shiver at the memory of our Celtic heroes, Vercingetorix dragged in triumph by Caesar, Orgetorix, Ariovistus, and this old Galgacus defeated by Agricole; you have not seen, on the banks of our Alpine torrents, liberty appear to you in the features of the Gallic Velleda.

You are not a child of Brennus: you do not understand anything of this restoration of our nationality, which, beyond economic reform and the transformation of a debased society, appears as the highest goal of the February Revolution. You are on the side of the foreigner; that is why Liberty, which was everything to our ancestors, which produced everything for them, is odious to you; that is why you do not understand anything of the work to which I devote myself, and why you slander my *intentions*; that is why you bring us the Triad, the *Circulus* and the Doctrine.

Speak then, Pierre Leroux, since you have the science; but do not touch Liberty, and above all do not slander: that is all I have to say to you. You will not find me lacking in good manners.

TO PIERRE LEROUX

My dear Pierre Leroux,

I must forgive you for your incessant accusations, because you do not know me, and you do not argue.

First, you have not read me, which gives you ample opportunity to attack me; then, if I must tell you, and everything you have written in the last month proves it, you are completely lacking in method. By dint of rehashing your empty formulas, of delighting in your sterile imaginations, of holding your thoughts in a supersensible world, you have become incapable of grasping the thoughts of others: this is what makes your criticisms, unbeknownst to you, I have no doubt, a perpetual incrimination.

On a few scraps of phrases torn from my books and taken in the wrong sense, you have made me an adversary of your own choosing, anti-democratic, anti-socialist, counter-revolutionary, Malthusian, atheist. It is to this fantastic being that you address your arguments, without worrying in the least whether the man you thus point out to the proletarians is affected by it. Sometimes you impute things to me that I have not said, or you lend me conclusions diametrically opposed to my own; other times, you take the trouble to instruct me on what no one in our century can honorably be unaware; all in order to benignly throw me out of democratic and social communion.

In the meantime, the readers of good faith who follow you, and the malicious ones, — there is no shortage of the latter kind, — go around peddling your accusations, commenting on them, amplifying them and exploiting them. Although in the end, and thanks to you, I find myself today to be the Satan of socialism, as I was, a year ago, that of property. The greatest business of socialism at the moment, says one of your good friends, Madame Pauline Roland, to anyone who will listen, is to demolish Proudhon. How much clearer will we see in socialism, is it not true, when this renegade Proudhon is demolished; and when the gossips of Pierre Leroux, whose hypochondria itches, will sit among men in the Assembly of the Representatives of the People!

Do you want then, my dear Pierre Leroux, the controversy to end? It is necessary, it is indispensable, to limit the debate, to treat, in each matter, first one question, then another, and not to pontificate on everything and other things, as you do in each of your articles. Without this, our discussions will infallibly become a subject of ridicule for the Malthusians, and a scandal for the proletarians. As for me, I confess to you, it is impossible for me to sustain a polemic, to waste my time and my paper in constantly reestablishing the facts, restoring the texts, clarifying your misunderstandings, dispelling your whims, and translating your inspired style into the common language.

Thus, you reproach me for having distinguished one from the other the problem of labor and the problem of the State, two problems identical at bottom, and susceptible of the same solution.

If you had as much desire to recognize the conformity of your ideas with mine as you have to bring out their dissimilarity, you would not have had difficulty in convincing yourself that, on the problem of labor and the State, as on so many other things, our two geniuses have nothing to envy each other. When I say, for example, that the capitalist principle and the monarchical or governmental principle are one and the same principle; that the abolition of the exploitation of man by man, and the abolition of the government of man by man, are one and the same formula; when, combating at the same time communism and absolutism, two correlative faces of the principle of authority, I observe that, if the family was the element of feudal society, the workshop is the element of the new society: it is quite obvious that I consider, as you do, as one and the same problem, the political problem and the economic problem. What you reproach me for ignoring on this subject is, on your part, pure ignorance of my own thought: and, what is worse, it is wasted time.

But from the fact that the question of labor and the question of the State are resolved by one another and are fundamentally the same question, does it follow that they should not be distinguished, and that they cannot each receive a solution of their own? From the fact that these two questions are, in principle, identical, does it follow that, from this identity, one should conclude that the State has its own organization, rather than that it is absorbed by labor! Neither one nor the other of these consequences is true. It is with social questions as with problems of geometry; they can be resolved by several ways, according to the aspect from which one considers them. It is even useful, it is indispensable to give these different solutions, which, multiplying the aspects of the theory, enlarge the domain of science.

And as for the State, since, despite this diversity of aspects, the definitive conclusion is that the problem of its organization is confused with that of the organization of labor, one can, one must further infer that a time will come when, labor being organized by itself, according to the law that is proper to it, and no longer needing a legislator or a sovereign, the workshop will make the government disappear. This is what I affirm, and which we will examine, my dear philosopher, when, with a little more attention to the ideas of others and a little less tenderness for yours, you will be pleased to discuss seriously one or the other of these two things, of which you always speak in order to say nothing: Association and the State.

The problem of government and the problem of labor being identical, you observe, and with reason, that this identity is stated in the following terms: *Problem of the organization of society*.

Now, read the first chapter of the *Economic Contradictions*: you will find in formal terms that it is inaccurate to say that labor is organized or that it is not; that it has been organized for all eternity; that society is a constant work of organization; that this organization is at once the principle, the life, the goal of society. Do me the pleasure, my dear Pierre Leroux, of believing me to be a little less ignorant, and above all less sophist than I appear to your terrified imagination: our dispute will be shortened by three-quarters.

Nothing is easier than to justify the orthodoxy of this proposition that fell from my pen, and that you raise in such a disdainful and irrational way: — "The February Revolution posed two capital questions; one economic, that is the question of labor and property; the other political, that

is the question of government or State.” I had only to recall what emerges from all my words, that politics and political economy are one and the same science, the first more personal, arbitrary or subjective; the second more real and positive. However, this interpretation of the February Revolution still seems dry and narrow to you; it lacks that something, beyond the government and the economy of societies, without which every idea seems satanic to you, and every proposition worthy of fire. This something is the feeling of the divine, theological and religious expression. With that, quotation from a homily by M. de Lamartine, and commentary in your own way on God, religion, the head of Christ, the Convention and Robespierre.

When you wish, my dear Pierre Leroux, I will give you a sermon on God, his Spirit and his Word, to make all the bluestockings of socialism and their doorkeepers cry: I know how to play, as well as you and M. de Lamartine, this instrument. But allow me not to mix theology with political economy, or, as the proverb says, *the good Lord with the plums*. This abuse of religiosity is one of the mystifications of our time, from which it is up to socialism to purge literature and the press. To speak religion to men when it is a question of founding social science, mathematical and objective, is to pollute intelligence; it is to make oneself guilty towards the People of the same crime that the insignificant Mazarin was accused of having committed on the person of the young Louis XIV.

What is your God?

What is your religion, your rite, your dogma?

What does this perpetual proclamation of Christ and the Church mean?

You are ignorant of the first word of all these things; you see nothing in your own thoughts, and all this transmundane poetry serves only to cover the misery of your so-called faith and the nothingness of your means. You speak so much of God, which you are ignorant of, you, the anti-Christian, only to excuse yourself from speaking of things here below, *non ut aliquid dicatur, sed ne taceatur*.

Yes, I tell you, the February Revolution (and I stick to my formula precisely because of its concrete simplicity, its very materiality), the February Revolution posed two questions: one political, the other economic. The first is that of government and freedom; the second, that of work and capital. I challenge you to express in fewer words greater things. Leave the supreme being in heaven, religion in the conscience, in the domestic hearth, between the mother of the family and her children.

I add, and nothing on my part authorizes you to doubt, as you do, my feelings in this regard, that, these two great questions resolved, the republican motto: *Liberty, Equality, Fraternity*, is realized. If this is what you call the *reign of God on earth*, I will even tell you that I have no opposition to it. I am very happy to know at last that the reign of God is the reign of liberty, equality and fraternity. Could you not then speak like everyone else?

You make me say, and I really do not know where you could have discovered this, that *the property of the instruments of labor must remain eternally individualized, and without organization*. These words are printed in italics, as if you had taken them from somewhere in my books. Then, on the guarantee of this alleged quotation, you begin to maintain against me that

society, or the State that represents it, has the right to *redeem* all property, that its duty is to effect this *redemption*, and that it will do so.

But from the fact that I reject, in the name of socialism, the redemption of property as absurd, illegitimate, and disastrous, it does not follow in the least that I wish to perpetuate the individualization, the non-organization of the instruments of labor. I have never said or written such a thing: I have affirmed the contrary a hundred times. I do not distinguish, like you, between true and false property; I deny, from the higher point of view of right and human destiny, any kind of proprietary domain. I deny it, precisely because I believe in a social order in which the instruments of labor, from appropriated things, will become attributed things; in which the whole earth will be depersonalized; where, all functions having become solidary, unity, social personality can be produced at the same time as individual personality. Certainly, if I did not know the candor of your soul, I would believe, my dear Pierre Leroux, that it is on purpose that you distort my intentions and my words in this way.

But, how to arrive at this solidarity of possession and labor! How to realize this social personality, which must result from the dispossession, or depersonalization of things?

That is obviously the question, the great revolutionary question.

You invoke, with Louis Blanc, *association* and *redemption*; but association, such as it must arise from the new reforms, is as unknown as religion, and all the attempts at association attempted before our eyes by the workers, more or less modeled on the forms of societies defined by our civil and commercial codes, can only be considered as transitional attempts. In a word, we know nothing up to now about association. But the redemption of properties, besides the fact that it should be agreed to by all the proprietors, by all the citizens, which is impossible, is a concept of mathematical absurdity. With what will the State reimburse the properties? With the properties. Universal redemption is universal expropriation without public utility and WITHOUT COMPENSATION. And it is you, Pierre Leroux, whose prudence does not fear to compromise itself by sponsoring such stupidities!

There is a simpler, more effective, and infinitely less expensive and less risky way to convert this property, to achieve Liberty, Equality and Fraternity: this way, I have indicated many times, is to put an end to the productivity of capital through the democratic organization of credit and the simplification of taxation.

Capital having lost its power of usury, economic solidarity is gradually created, and with it the equality of fortunes;

Then comes the spontaneous and popular formation of groups, workshops or associations of workers;

Finally, the supreme group is determined and formulated, which includes the entire nation, and which you call the State, because you give it an extra-social representation, but which, for me, is no longer the State.

This, dear philosopher, is how I conceive the progress of the Revolution. This is how we must rise from Liberty to Equality, and from the latter to Fraternity. This is why I insist so strongly on

the importance of economic reform, a reform that I provisionally formulate with these words: *Free credit*.

And this is also what we would examine methodically, what we would discuss step by step, if you could once emerge from your amorous ecstasies, and deal with this ignoble practice of credit and discounting. But you judge it more useful, more urgent, to say and have it repeated everywhere that I am an enemy of Socialism, an enemy of the Democracy, an enemy of the Revolution, a hidden disciple of Malthus, who wants to eternalize *bourgeoisism* and *propertarianism*.

Here, Pierre Leroux, I must tell you what I think of your role and mine in this gigantic drama of the nineteenth century! I am the barn-beater of the February Revolution; the proletarians who listen to us will be the millers and the bakers, and you, with your triad, and the others, with their *charivari*c nonsense, you are all nothing but pastry chefs.

CONCERNING LOUIS BLANC

ON THE PRESENT UTILITY AND FUTURE POSSIBILITY OF THE STATE

(First article.)

I said to myself: What shall we make of Louis Blanc? A controversialist or an insulter? — His choice. Either one suits the *Voix du Peuple*. It is up to him to prove, by the way he responds to our challenges, that he has even more wit than eloquence. Otherwise, a booed author, he must disappear from the revolutionary scene. Whatever he does and whatever he says, stupidity or stroke of genius, we will draw our own conclusions. Science will gain, the Revolution will profit and the people will take notice. *Quidquid direrit, argumentabor.*

On this, I wrote a book, the Manifesto of the *Voix du Peuple*, in which, confessing Louis Blanc, I told him in substance:

You claim to be a revolutionary! But all your economic science is only a clumsy application to society of domestic economy, an absurd generalization of the mercantile and proprietary routine; but your system of government is only a breath of the air of the policy of Ferdinand Flocon, who competed for it with M. Armand Marrast, who held it in direct line from M. Thiers, who was a crony of M. Guizot, who had studied under M. Royer-Collard, who himself, under the name of doctrine, established among us this variety of Absolutism. You are, in short, a pseudo-socialist and a pseudo-democrat. That is why in March you reacted to Blanqui; why, in April, believing him dead, you aspired to dictatorship; why, by your ultra-governmentalism, you have made the social revolution odious to the peasant and the bourgeois, and contributed, more than anyone else, to the defeats of the democracy. It is time for the people to get out of the rut that you have paved for them, which can only lead them to total dissolution. What do you have to answer?

At the same time, to give Louis Blanc every facility for justification, and to make the discussion between him and us more instructive, I proposed that he insert his explanations in the *Voix du Peuple*, while, for his part, he will publish my observations in the *Monde Nouveau*. Could I then respond better to him?

Certainly, if the ex-president of Luxembourg had had the slightest spark of faith in what he so complacently calls his *System*, he would have had a fine opportunity to perform; he only had to revive this well-known theme: that the family is the element of society; that consequently domestic economy is the type of social economy; that thus a nation must be like a big household, where the government, by turns monarchical, aristocratic or democratic, takes the place of father, and the workers that of the children; where finally liberty, equality, property, labor, all rights and all duties, flow from the authority of the law, manifested by the representatives of the people, and having as sanction the force of the State. The country listened: the opposition which burst forth unexpectedly within the democracy assured Louis Blanc a passionate audience. What a moment to

make his eloquence shine! Had he succumbed in the struggle, the theoretician of the organization of labor by the State would have fallen with honor, and, victor or vanquished, the recognition of the patriots was his. The error would have been excused in favor of the intention.

When, fifty or sixty years ago, Catholic and monarchical absolutism was on the eve of descending into the grave, it made a supreme effort. It was then that it produced its most illustrious apologists, de Maistre, de Bonald, Chateaubriand and Lamennais, whose marvelous destiny was to show the world, in a single life of a thinker, the philosophical progress of eighteen centuries. Now, in the person of Louis Blanc, an idea more general, more profound, more ancient than vile absolutism, the very idea of government, adequate to the idea of God, was called into question. What a thesis for an orator of some genius! What a cause to defend for a publicist, for a historian, for a statesman! It was tradition to justify, universal belief to avenge, popular prejudice, so dear to demagogues, to warm up, a glorious palm to conquer. I expected a magnanimous struggle, from which I hoped to reap only the honor, certainly very modest, of having been the first, with profound knowledge and a certain dose of reason, to pose the problem, the inevitable problem of the State,

Well, what did Louis Blanc answer!

In his first Catilinarian, through many personalities, digressions, protestations of respect for the sovereignty of the people, he throws in my face what is called in rhetoric an antithesis of words. To the MASTER STATE, he opposes the SERVANT STATE; and there is his demonstration.

The State, says Louis Blanc, has been until now the master and tyrant of the citizens; henceforth it must be their servant. The relationship is changed: therein lies the whole revolution. — As if, at all times, the apologists of the monarchy had not also claimed that royalty was the *servant* of the people, *that the kings were made for the people, not the people for the kings*, and other parables to which the experience of the people has done justice. We know today the work of this servitude of the State, this devotion of the government to liberty. Did not Bonaparte, a compatriot of Louis Blanc, call himself the servant of the Revolution! What services he rendered to it!...

Thus, the *Servant state*, that is Louis Blanc's response to my first question. As for the question of how the State can really and effectively become a *servant*; how, being a *servant*, it can still be the State, Louis Blanc does not explain it: he keeps a prudent silence. He is content to protest that, if he, the first worker of the Republic, ever becomes a statesman and minister of progress again, he will be the very humble servant of the people; that he will govern with the people: which will not prevent him, on occasion, from resisting the whims and the movements of the people!... In truth, this man has nothing in his *panetière*.¹ He is only a nibbler of political crusts. I am angry with myself for having taken so long to believe it, and especially to say it. Judge for yourself.

Asked on what basis he based the need, under an egalitarian regime, in which credit, work and opportunities are guaranteed to all, for an external representation of society: — he replied, shaking his ears: *I don't understand*.

¹ An ornate bread box. — TRANSLATOR.

Asked repeatedly: How do you reconcile the theory of free credit, which you claim, concurrently with Pierre Leroux, to be the father of, since the idea became popular, with your initiative of power, with your communist tendencies, with your love of dictatorship, with your system of the *factotum* State, with your beef-stew economy?

He said: that I was a *professional gladiator, a tearer of popular fame, a panegyrist of tyrants, a juggler, a spreader of lime, a sower of doubts, a blower of discord, a extinguisher of lights, a slanderer of the people, of the race of Thrasy machus, the race of Lysander, the race of Tallien* (it is for all good that he believes himself to be Robespierre), a *sophist, a philippist*, and what is worse, a *Hellenist, Galimafron, a giant, proud, vain, coarse, brutal, an idolator of myself, a Satan, a schoolboy, an Erostratus, a madman*; — that I was a free pupil at the college of Besançon; that I belong to *Pitt and Coburg*; that I *forbid audacity* to the republicans; that after having defended him, Louis Blanc, in an article in *Le Peuple*, I am today making the reaction laugh at his expense, etc., etc., etc.

What do you say about this appendix to the litany composed in my honor by Pierre Leroux: *Malthusian, eclectic, liberal, individualist, bourgeois, atheist and proprietor!* Chorus of seraphim! When the first says: *Kill!* the other answers: *Knock down!* These people do not even know that insult, to be in good taste and to be tolerated by honest people, must be the correct expression of the fact and the idea, and never reveal the secret and ugly passion of the one who resorts to it.

All this interspersed with warm handshakes to the twelve or fifteen so-called delegates who once made up the Luxembourg clique, and a few commonplaces about the government and the State, hatched since 9 Thermidor in the knitters' hand-warmers.

Certainly, we have had many mystifications after February; but, I must admit, I would never have expected this one. What! It is to give birth to the *Servant-state* that the Revolution, this woman of the Apocalypse, clothed with the sun like a mantle and crowned by the stars, has been in labor for forty centuries! It is for the servant-State that Christianity has brought about the fusion of cults and founded the centralization of the human race! For the *Servant-state* that we have assaulted royalty, on August 10, on July 29, on February 24! For the *Servant-state*, and the *Ministry of Progress*, no doubt. That the proletariat suffered death and passion in June 48, and that the young Montagne protested in June 49!

What! here is a man who, taking metaphors for ideas, comes to tell us that the State is the head of society; that in the State resides the soul of the people, as, according to Descartes, the soul of man has its seat in the pineal gland; that the *collective Being* needs, in order to make itself manifest, this cranioscopic REALIZATION; that it thinks, acts, exists only insofar as it is thus representatively REALIZED: as if every being were not essentially a collection, a group; as if there existed something else, in nature, than collections or groups; as if all the difference between realities or collections did not consist solely in the fact that the former form organisms, the latter simple aggregates; as if finally life and thought did not necessarily appear everywhere where there is organization in the collection, whatever, moreover, the formula of this organization.

And this man, the Américo Vespucci of Socialism, has written, despite his crass ignorance, a book that everyone has read, on the *Organization of Labor!* Without knowing a word about the

organization, he made himself counted, through palaver, among the organizers! On February 22, the people, attracted by the label, chose him first to be part of the provisional government. A member of this government, he dared to solicit, through six thousand petitioners and under the name of minister of progress, the dictatorship. He is still, for a crowd of people for whom the rattling of words strikes more than the evidence of the reasons, the purest, most advanced expression of the Revolution! It is in the presence of Haynau's hangings, Radetzki's beatings, the amnesties of the Pope, the fiscal, police, and academic reaction of Louis Bonaparte; it is when the secret revealed of the most unbridled squanderings, when the most devouring stagnation, the most dreadful misery, testify every day to the radical impotence, not only of the men of power, but of the very principle of power; it is at that moment that Louis Blanc, that stunted shadow of Robespierre dares to plead the cause of the Power, of the strong Power, and always stronger! What are we destined for, — good God! — if, after M. Molé, M. Guizot, M. Thiers; after the provisional government and the executive commission; after M. Sénart, M. Dufaure, M. Barrot, M. Faucher, M. de Falloux, M. d'Hautpoul, we must still hear Louis Blanc singing us the same tune, the tune of the *strong power*, the music of the organizing, initiating, hard-working State!... Oh! We would have to despair of our race, if we had to judge its genius on such samples. But let us not be discouraged, let us not cease to strike at these empty skulls: it is the best way to give the people the awareness of their own laws, and to teach them to judge their masters. Do we then want the democratic and social edifice to be once founded? Let us begin by purging the soil; let us set fire to the undergrowth: we still have more than one wild boar to drive away.

So, Louis Blanc does not accept the closed-field struggle that we courteously proposed to him in the *Monde Nouveau* and the *Voix du Peuple*. A prudent shepherd, he is careful not to expose his flock to the contagion of severe criticism, which, by teaching them to reason, could tighten their hearts. Instead of the sainfoin of controversy, he prefers to make them graze on the straw of his monthly flattery. Here we are, thanks to him, freed from learned demonstrations, from these long historical, philosophical, economic dissertations, which tire the poor workers, and break the heads of the people. From now on, we will reason down to earth, as true practitioners and following the Socratic method, fortunately substituted for the German dialectic. What is the point of getting worked up, in fact, to discuss the *servant-State* and the *realization of the collective Being*, and the society that gives itself a head and a brain through the election of its representatives!

Let us talk about the State, simply, plainly, without metaphysics or scholarship, as if it were a question of the society of tailors or cooks.

Unhappy State! After having tumbled, for twenty years, from Charles X to Louis-Philippe, from Louis-Philippe to the provisional government, from the provisional government to the executive commission, from the executive commission to Cavaignac. and from Cavaignac to Louis Bonaparte, it was still in its destiny to have as an apologist the most vain, the most empty, the most impudent, the most nauseating rhetorician that the most cowardly of literatures has produced in the most talkative of centuries! — Let us also speak of association: it seems that it is the strong point of Louis Blanc; and we will have, on this interesting subject, curious revelations to make to the people. No one knows, no one has yet said what association can, what it must be, in the future.

Then, we will explain to the workers the Triad, the *Circulus* and the Metempsychosis. We will make them acquainted with these great discoveries of modern illuminism. And since our *conduct* is constantly being discussed, we agree to give our accounts. But beware! We will call upon our adversaries to give theirs as well.

In the meantime, let the workers continue to associate: we do not put the slightest obstacle to it. Association is a right of man and of the citizen, which the Constitution guarantees, which universal practice proclaims, and against which we have never seen a body that disagrees. Let the workers form themselves into groups and squads; let them centralize their forces; let them organize their circulation and their exchanges, and not be discouraged by a few setbacks. Faith in charlatans has led them down a false path; their experience, more than our advice, will pull them out of it. Association can no longer be what they imagine: we will demonstrate it to them, and they will not be long in agreeing. But it is good, it is essential that they experiment for themselves with the ideas of their dreamers: something will always remain of them. Enlightened by daily practice, they will grasp the principles better, as they are led to their meditations; then it will be easy for them to recognize who are the jugglers, those who spare them no truth, no redress, or those who, not having an idea with which they can pay homage to them, know only how to caress, in the interest of a desperate ambition, their passions and their prejudices. It will not take long.

A little more patience, proletarians; and if you are not enlightened, this time; if, being enlightened, you do not know how to be free, blame only yourselves; blame only your intelligence and your heart for your misfortune.

(No 88. — December 28.)

(Second article.)

The destiny of the one who writes these lines has something strange about it. If he were to yield to the pride of an almost unprecedented situation, he would have to believe that at this moment everyone, except himself, is insane; or that it is he himself who, by an inexplicable prodigy, is mad, with the most learned, the most reflective, the most reasoned, the most conscientious, the most philosophical madness, the most conforming, in a word, in its principle, its object, its deductions, to pure science and common sense.

But, God forbid that we give access in our minds to this presumptuous alternative: it is better to investigate whether the contradiction, which exists at this moment between public faith and the opinions that we defend, is not the effect of some misunderstanding. Every idea that occurs for the first time in the world, although drawn from the universal conscience, and deduced from the previous tradition, is nevertheless regarded, at the moment of its appearance, as proper and personal to the one who formulates it and who, for this reason, assumes exclusive responsibility for it. The idea, at this moment, seems outside of general belief; it receives the name of *paradox*. But soon the recognition of the paradox is made; little by little common sense seizes it, the idea enters

into public reason, and receives from it a title of credence and circulation. There is not one of us who has not witnessed, at one time in his life, a similar movement of the public spirit. Is it not then a conversion of this nature that we are witnessing today!

What have we said since February! What has the *Voix du Peuple*, founded to continue the work of its two elders, the *Peuple* and the *Représentant du Peuple*, said for three months?

It is that the Revolution, in the nineteenth century, has a double object:

1. In the economic order, it pursues the complete subordination of capital to labor, the identification of the worker and the capitalist, by the democratization of credit, the annihilation of interest, the reduction to equal and true exchange of all transactions which have as their object the instruments of labor and the products. From this point of view, we have observed, and we have said, the first, that henceforth there were only two parties in France: the party of labor, and the party of capital.

2. In the political order, the Revolution has as its aim to absorb the State into society, that is to say to proceed to the cessation of all authority, and to the suppression of all governmental apparatus, by the abolition of taxation, administrative simplification, the separate centralization of each of the functional categories, in other words, the organization of universal suffrage. From this point of view again, we say that there are only two parties in France: the party of liberty, and the party of government.

Such is, in two articles, our profession of social and political faith:

Yes, it is necessary in the future that in every producer the quality of worker and that of capitalist or owner be made equal and distinct. Just as in the past the serf was attached to the soil, so today, by the inversion of relations, capital must be attached to the worker. There is the most positive wish, the most authentic tendency of the Revolution. Socialism and democracy agree with us on this point.

Yes, it is necessary that in every citizen liberty and authority be equal: without this equality would not exist and would be compromised; the sovereignty of the people, transferred to a small number of representatives, would be a fiction. Here again is the wish, here also is the irrefutable and irresistible tendency of the Revolution, although public opinion does not yet realize exactly how this identity of liberty and power must be established. In this regard, let the bourgeoisie consult its tradition; let it remember its long efforts against despotism, its profound hatred of government; let those who, on February 22, were the first to cry: *Long live the Reform!* and who laid, before Ledru-Rollin himself, the first stone of universal suffrage, let them answer for us; let them say if we are right!

Now, this double wish, this double tendency noted and proven, what else do we affirm? What is the superior and definitive conclusion that we give to the Revolution?

It is that labor and liberty, like capital and government, are similar to each other and homologous: so that instead of four parties which we found just now in the country, placing ourselves alternately from the economic point of view and from the political point of view, there are really only two: the party of labor or liberty, and the party of capital or government. This is because these two propositions: *abolition of the exploitation of man by man*, and *abolition of the*

government of man by man, are one and the same proposition; it is finally that the revolutionary IDEA, despite the dualism of its formula, is one and indivisible, like the Republic itself: universal suffrage implying the negation of the preponderance of capital and equality of fortunes, as equality of fortunes and the suppression of interest imply the negation of government.

It is only necessary to state the identity of these ideas, for any logical mind to recognize it and adhere to it: it is this which forms the point of passage between the capitalist and governmental period which is ending, and the period of liberty and equality which is beginning; it is there, if one can so say, that is the historical apogee, the humanitarian equator.

All our opposition, our polemic, our revolutionary science flows from this fact: it is thus that, later, all philosophical progress, all religious manifestation, if indeed society has to manifest itself again under this aspect, will flow from it. We are provoking with all our might, on the one hand, the abolition of interest and the gratuity of credit, on the other, the suppression of the present system of taxation, and, consequently, the annihilation of the government. The *Voix du Peuple* has no other reason for its existence.

Now, this is what is happening to us.

By one of those contradictions so frequent in periods of great intellectual development, it so happens that at this moment the working class, that which opposes capital, and for whose benefit the Revolution is mainly accomplished, is inclined, without its knowledge, by the communism of its ideas, and thanks above all to the ineptitude of its leaders, towards the preservation of authority: it is still the old monarchical instinct which, under the form of Dictatorship, Convention, etc., deludes the people; — while the middle class, or bourgeoisie, always antipathetic to power, and which has baptized itself with the title of liberal party, inclines, by its economic routine and by the servility of its interests, to the perpetuity of capitalist and proprietary exploitation.

So that we, who, in the name of the Revolution and of the principle invoked by each of the parties which represent it, pursue equally and simultaneously the abolition of capital and the State, while we should rally all opinions, we find ourselves in contradiction with each of them, reproached and fought by all those whose cause we serve. Politics! do you want to come to power surely, beware of being right against everyone.

Thus the Revolution, which the middle class and the proletariat, the community of their ideas and their needs, seemed bound to precipitate at will, is stopped in its march the blind, illogical split of their opinions and their interests. From February 25, when everything seemed to agree to give it a formidable impulse, the Revolution encountered before it the entire nation, divided into two antagonistic parties: those who, with MM. Dunoyer, Frédéric Bastiat, etc., following in the footsteps of J.-B. Say, ready to deliver the State, defended capital; and those who, with the provisional government, Louis Blanc, Pierre Leroux, the whole democratic and utopian tradition, claimed to make the State the creator of liberty and order.

For, we can say it without fear of quoting falsely and without slander, it is very seriously that Pierre Leroux, who rejects, he assures us, the government of man by man, wants however, in the name of the Triad, and of the consent of *each*, to establish *over* all the sovereignty of SOME. The draft of a triadic Constitution, published by Pierre Leroux, and which we will have the

opportunity to examine some day, lays bare the governmental tendencies of its author. It is also very seriously that Louis Blanc, despite his famous anagram of the *master-State* into a *servant-State*, wants a power, formed, like all powers, by delegation of citizens; a State, organ and representative of society; a government, finally, which is to the people what the head is to the body, that is to say, leader and sovereign.

Such is the contradiction that, with all the energy of our conscience, with all the power of our reason, we work to put an end to. While the political idea, which animates the middle class, and the economic idea, pursued by the people, should, complementing each other, resolve themselves into one and the same idea, which would thus express the past and the future of the Revolution, and would reconcile the two classes, these two ideas are at war with each other, and, by their discordance, stop the movement and compromise public security.

And such is also the cause of the recriminations which our polemic raises, each time that, contrary to one of the partial ideas which dispute influence, we have to develop one of the great principles of February. On the right, we encounter the old liberalism, hostile to power, but defender of interest and of quiritary property; on the left, the governmentalist democrats, opponents like us of the exploitation of man by man, but full of faith in the dictatorship and omnipotence of the State; in the center, absolutism, which unites in its motto the two faces of the counter-revolution; behind us, moderation, whose false mass is always ready to compromise with all opinions.

Each party imputing its own contradictions to us, we are accused all at once, by the democratic socialists, of treason; by the liberal economists, of inconsistency; by the moderates, of exaggeration. The former reproach us for preaching individualism after having fought against property. You see, they tell us, only one term of the republican formula, *Liberty, Equality, Fraternity*; your AN-ARCHY is the *chacun chez soi, chacun pour soi* of M. Dupin; what you attack under the name of government is the very thought of the century, it is association. — The economists ask us, in their turn, how it is that, rejecting the initiative of the State, we nevertheless appeal to popular initiative; they maintain that to put society in the place of government, by the organization of the free concurrence of wills and interests, is to always turn in the same circle, and to oppose liberty.

The moderates recognize the accuracy of our logic; they approve of our principles; but they refuse to follow us in our deductions. To follow a principle in all its consequences is, according to them, to sacrifice truth to logic, to go beyond the goal that one wants to attain, it is to lose oneself by exaggeration. As for the absolutists, they are, of all our adversaries, those who understand us best. They do not accuse us of anything, do not slander us; they consider us as making for their own benefit the reduction to absurdity of all the ideas that divide opinion, democracy, constitutional republic, representative monarchy, economism, socialism and philosophism; and, always dupes of their illusions, they seriously expect us to convert and repent.

However, the situation must be clarified, and this already too long ambiguity must come to an end.

Who here is in contradiction with himself, us, or the governmental socialists, whose disastrous tendencies we have been pointing out for twenty months, whose defeats we have predicted all? Us, or the liberal economists, whose errors we have been refuting for ten years? From us, or from the stubborn doctrinaires, to whom we never cease to repeat that their so-called moderation is only impotence and arbitrariness? Which must attract to itself its antagonist, from us, who follow in all its breadth the great road of progress, or from the partisans of absolutism, immobile as terms, at the other end of the horizon?...

All doubts would be removed, and many discussions would be spared the public, if, just as we agree to recognize, on the one hand, the liberal tendency of the bourgeoisie, and, on the other, the egalitarian tendency of the proletariat, we could still agree on their identity.

Is it true that socialism, the expression of the proletariat, has from all eternity waged war on capital, even on property? — Yes.

Is it true that liberalism, the expression of the middle class, has been fighting since time immemorial the action of government, the initiative of power, the prerogative of the State? — Yes, again.

These two points established, what do we say?

That what is called in politics *Authority* is the analogue and equivalent of what is called, in political economy, *Property*; that these two ideas are adequate to each other, and identical;

That to attack one is to attack the other;

That the latter is unintelligible without the former, and vice versa;

That if you eliminate the former, you must also eliminate the latter, and *vice versa*;

That where capital is deprived of all interest, government becomes useless and impossible; and on the other hand, that capital, without a government that supports it, that covers it with its prerogative and guarantees the exercise of its privilege, necessarily remains unproductive, and all usury impracticable;

Finally, that Socialism and Liberalism are the two halves of the integral opposition that Liberty makes, from the origin of the world, to the principle of AUTHORITY, expressed by property and by the State.

Are we wrong, now, and are we inconsistent, unfaithful to our cause, traitors to our principles, when we defend this great and magnificent conclusion! Is it our fault if the proletariat and the middle class, divided at this moment by the egoism of their respective tendencies, are basically in agreement, both on principles, and on the goal, and on the means? And because so-called revolutionaries, exploiting hatred, maintain, in the interest of their detestable ambition, this artificial antagonism, must we silence our thought, the very thought of February! Should we cowardly flee before the risk of slander and unpopularity?

But, we are told, you constantly take the *tendencies* of civilization for its *laws*, and it is in this that your error consists; that is where the contradictions, the inconsistencies, the exaggerations of which the entire people accuse you come from. Thus, says a socialist, it is quite true, and we have welcomed this truth with joy, that the circulation of capital and products must be free, and the use of the instruments of work guaranteed to all without any other remuneration than depreciation.

This is indeed a law of society; you yourself have given the mathematical demonstration of it. But it is not true, in the same way, that society can and must do without government. Who then, without the government, who then, without the State, would give credit to the worker, organize circulation, guarantee education and work to all!

— But, resumes an economist of the liberal school, it is precisely the opposite that is true. The abolition of governments is the ideal of societies; the production of order by the indefinite extension of freedom is their law. As for the decrease in interest, we must see in the phenomenon of social economy only a simple tendency, not a principle of regeneration. The rent of capital decreases as capital multiplies: that is true. But it is absurd to claim that this interest ever reaches zero: who then would want to give credit without that! who would save who would work? So, socialist, leave your political and egalitarian chimeras, and follow the standard of freedom: it is that of 89 and 1830!

THE SOCIALIST. You do not want the Social Revolution! You support usury! You defend the exploitation of man by man! So be it. There is in the people enough intelligence, initiative, and patriotism for them to be able to complete the Revolution alone. They will know how to do without a suspect alliance; they will never set themselves in tow of the bourgeoisie.

THE ECONOMIST. It is to the bourgeoisie that liberty owes all its conquests; it is to them that the working class itself is indebted for the well-being and rights it enjoys. It is this valiant and disciplined bourgeoisie that has done alone, until this day, the work of Revolutions: they will neither allow themselves to be overtaken nor dragged along. They will never set themselves in tow of the proletariat.

Well! Citizens, if you cannot agree, at least try to agree with common sense. How can you not see that every *tendency* accuses a LAW? That the tendency is the law itself, not in potential, but in action? Aristotle taught that the first cause of movement is the intelligible heaven: he meant the pure Idea, the Reason, the Law. Thus, what we call *attraction* in bodies, *love* or *passion* in man, *tendency* or *progress* in society, *life* in organized beings, *destiny* in the universe: all this is only the manifestation of the Idea, the Law, the intelligible heaven, which commands the creature, solicits it, determines it and makes itself magnetically obeyed.

But let us leave psychology, ontology and metaphysics aside. Let us come to the facts and the proofs. As long as the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, suspect to each other, keep each other in check, the Revolution, instead of developing peacefully, will only proceed by leaps and bounds; society will be threatened, at every step, by a general dislocation. Let us show them, then, that their principle, both of them, is the same, their tendency the same, their pride the same again; that all that each could do in his own interest would be the accomplishment of the desires of the other, as also the victory of one over the other would be the suicide of both. Singular thing, that, to escape universal ostracism, we fail, at this moment, to bring about universal reconciliation!

What! You claim that socialism, which was to regenerate commerce, agriculture, industry, property, the family, religion, philosophy, art, the State; which was to revolutionize humanity and the globe, is entirely in the abolition of interest, in the Bank of the People! — Yes, as the oak is in the acorn.

What! You don't want a Constitution! You want to abolish the government! What then will maintain order in society? What do you put in place of the State? in place of the police, in place of the great political powers! — Nothing. Society is perpetual motion. It does not need to be wound up or to be set in time. It carries within itself its spring, always taut, and its pendulum.

But finally, who will enforce the laws? Wouldn't you want laws either? — No. An organized society has no more need of laws than of legislators. Laws are in society like spiders in the hive: they only serve to catch bees.

How can you talk about organization, you who do not want laws? What organization is yours, where there is neither legislative power, nor executive power, nor armed force, nor courts, nor police officers! That organization is anarchy. — Exactly: society will be organized when there is no one left to make laws for it, to guard it and to judge it. And it is because society has never been organized, but only in the process of being organized, that it has needed until now legislators, statesmen, heroes and police commissioners. When the tree is young, it is given a tutor: one does not tie a sixty-foot oak to a stake.

You mean, no doubt, that, all men being brothers, all antagonistic interests having disappeared in the community of work and property, association will take the place of government and laws? — Association thus understood is in the opposite sense of liberty and progress. It is still government; it is the suppression of all guarantees, the destruction of solidarity, the cessation of life; it is social disorganization.

Thus, no more interest, no more government, no more Constitution, no more association, no more laws! ANARCHY in capital, in work and in the State; anarchy everywhere and always, that is what you call organization, solidarity, guarantee, progress! You suppress institutions; and you call that instituting society! To *destroy*, for you, is synonymous with *building*! This is how you claim to realize the republican motto: Liberty, Equality, Fraternity! What a paradox! What irony!

— What do you want! Ancient and modern languages provide me with no other term to render my thought, to express, in its simplicity and grandeur, the IDEA of the even revolution. Yes: *Anarchy*! That is to say, for minor nations, chaos and nothingness; for adults, life and light. Complete, absolute anarchy: once again, I cannot formulate otherwise the identity of the two tendencies that we have noted in the working class and the bourgeois class. This is, moreover, what I hope to make you see with your eyes, touch with your finger, envisage in thought, as if you had before you the Pantheon or the column of the Bastille. I will hardly need your attention.

The task that I have set myself would be beyond my strength, if I had to treat it doctrinally, by science, history, philosophy, law. No human force could sustain such a labor.

But the mind is fertile in resources. When facts encumber him, when experience embarrasses him, when the variety of observation perplexes him, he generalizes, establishes classifications, and thus founds science: analysis and summary of nature. When science obsesses him in turn, and the thread escapes him, then he simplifies his knowledge by reducing it all to a primitive fact, and beginning science anew on a higher experience.

This is the procedure I will use, in a question that would have required, to be developed scientifically, the accumulation, in a single head, of almost the entirety of human knowledge. I will not demonstrate: such a demonstration would be impossible for me. I will SHOW: that is to say, instead of explaining the thing, I will try to make it visible; in such a way that the objections that may be made to me, and to which I will have to respond, do not accuse a lack of intelligibility in my story, but only a lack of transparency. The reader must not be able to tell me, like Louis Blanc, *I do not understand*; but only, *I have not seen*. Then it will be up to me to shed more light on the object in perspective, or to apply, if necessary, eye drops to the spectator's eyes.

But, first, what is the fact that we have to bring to light! It is a matter of defining it well.

It is, in the first place, that by the combined tendency, and of the proletariat which calls for a reform in property, and of the bourgeoisie which demands another in the State, the government annihilates itself and disappears;

It is, then, that as and when this abolition of the government proceeds, and by the very fact of this abolition, liberty, equality, solidarity, security, order, all the rights consecrated by the Constitution, all the promises of the Republic, all the wishes of society, are realized.

This is indeed what we have to recognize, is it not true what was announced, two years ago, by this epigraph placed at the head of a book of demolition: *Destruam et ædificabo!* Which means that to a negative series necessarily corresponds, in the mind and in society, an affirmative series; so that, if the negation is complete and irreproachable, the affirmation exists; There is nothing left but to disengage it. If the honorable critics who spoke of the *System of Contradictions* had understood this elementary truth, they would have spared themselves the trouble of accusing us of presumption and pride; they would have taken care not to reproach us that we excelled at demolishing, but that we knew how to build nothing. To demolish is to build! Will the critic then never be anything but the beast of burden of literature?...

Here is what is understood: we have to see how, by the double movement of revolution which carries away at once the bourgeoisie and the people, the government perishes in society; then how, by the extinction of the government, order, that is to say liberty, equality and fraternity, is established.

Now, by what means, by what torch are we going to see all these things? — For it is obvious that, being neither a painter, nor a physicist, nor a machinist, nor a government official, but a simple press worker, I cannot show the public the coming of the Revolution on a canvas, in a magic lantern, or a model phalanstery. My field of exhibition is the *Voix du Peuple*; my instrument is writing. But writing represents things only to the understanding and in a successive manner: how then can we grasp the whole? What guarantee will we have of the fidelity of our understanding? What will be our compass, our criterion?

This criterion, I will say it. It could not be simpler, everyone can verify its accuracy. It is this axiom of geometry: *The sum of the parts is equal to the whole*. Do you believe, reader, in geometry! In that case, you can abandon yourself to our guidance: we will show you the most interesting novelties, and you will run no risk of getting lost.

Well! It is with the help of this axiom: *The sum of the parts is equal to the whole*, that I hope to show you this true, unheard-of phenomenon, that government, through the progress of reforms, necessarily perishes in society, and that as it perishes order is born in its place, as perfect as it is possible, in the current state of our knowledge, to conceive it.

And, indeed, if I show, on the one hand, that by the organization of free credit, by the abolition or conversion of taxation and the extension of universal suffrage, triple and inevitable consequence of the February Revolution, the governmental system is struck, in all its parts, by such a simplification, that each of the functions by which public authority is manifested becomes useless, and that the action of power find itself totally annihilated: it is clear that, the whole not being able to subsist after the elimination of the parts, the government becomes a pure entity: created by a fiction of general thought; it returns to fiction.

And if, on the other hand, I show that everywhere where the action of power has ceased, there spontaneously manifests an action of liberty at once individual and corporate, communal and national; corporate, because individual; national, because communal; action which is the very agreement of interests, for this simple reason that they depend only on liberty, not on property; which is the expression of all wills, because where nothing is abandoned to chance, to favor, to birth, to privilege, wills can have no other object than freedom; action which simultaneously satisfies general and particular needs, henceforth identical; if, I say, I show this progressive creation of harmony by liberty, succeeding everywhere to the decrease of order by power: it will be evident again that, the whole being homogeneous to each of its parts and equal to their sum, the highest degree of order in society is expressed by the highest degree of individual freedom, in a word by ANARCHY.

Thus no philosophy, no metaphysics, no jurisprudence; no dissertation, no controversy: we would never have finished. Nothing but an empirical exposition: instead of reasoning, a series of facts. And, the facts noted and admitted, it is enough that the people, author of the government, making government for the last time, convert them into decrees, so that, in the opinion of everyone, the Revolution will be over in twenty-four hours.

(No. 99. — January 8, 1850.)

(Fourth article.)

Since I have been interested in public affairs, I have often heard patriots ask themselves this scabrous question: What will we do the day after the Revolution? But I must also say that I have never seen a single one answer it. They would take, it was said, advice from the circumstances;

and, the question thrown into the air, they no longer thought about it. This is how the fruit of all our revolutions has constantly been lost for the people.

Did Robespierre know, before May 31, what he would do after having overthrown the Gironde! His manuscripts, quoted by M. de Lamartine; his last speeches, the six weeks of idleness and sulking in which the proud tribune indulged, and which led to the 9th Thermidor, bear witness to his uncertainties. On May 31, 1793, the defeat of the Girondins had raised the question of the democratic and social Republic: fourteen months of dictatorship and terror were granted to Robespierre to resolve it. In the meantime, Carnot organized the victory; Cambon reformed the finances; our generals, placed under the knife of the guillotine, saved the Republic. Robespierre alone, the man of the police and of utopia, organized nothing, did nothing. The law of Prairial was his masterpiece. The reaction, which suddenly arose on the 9th of Thermidor, was, like the one we saw unfold after February, the logical result of the incompetence of men and the necessity of things.

Look at Bonaparte, on the contrary. He knows, that one, what he is coming to do in Paris, by leaving Egypt: it is the rout of demagoguery and the consolidation of the happy medium. In agreement with opinion and destiny, Bonaparte hunts the representatives of the people at the point of his bayonets; three and a half million votes then consecrate the coup de main, the brutal usurpation of Saint-Cloud. In a revolution, he who knows what he wants and what he is doing is sure to command others: such is the logic of facts and the politics of the masses.

The liberals of fifteen years also knew what they would do after having overthrown the legitimate throne: it was the application of the constitutional system, pure of any Catholic and feudal mixture. Also, while the republicans of July sought their resolution and made the people wait, the liberal bourgeoisie collected, if I dare say so, the benefit of the glorious days. For eleven days, France was between the Monarchy and the Republic. The democratic idea not being posed, Louis-Philippe was declared king of the French, and democracy was reduced to conspiring, for another eighteen years, at the tail of the dynastic opposition. Educate yourselves, republicans, in the school of royalty and monopoly!

At least, these eighteen years having passed, the republicans will be in a position; they will know what they must do the day after the revolution! Eighteen years to deliberate, to organize work and the State!.... But politics absorbed intelligence. The democrats found themselves after February as after July: nothing studied, nothing learned, therefore nothing done. The Revolution surprised them, as much and perhaps more than the dynasties. Circulars, commissioners, emissaries, utopias, harangues; finally a diffuse, confused patching up of all the monarchical and quasi-monarchical constitutions that the people, in their great days, had thrown down, like a bull shaking off the yoke: that is all that the eighteen-year-old conspirators knew how to do with the victory of February.

The *Moniteur* contains the acts of the provisional government: now, with the exception of the decree that establishes universal suffrage, there is not one that shows the slightest understanding of the situation, any more than of the Revolution. The Constitution of November 4 summarizes all the work of the Constituent Assembly. Now, apart from the principle of constitutional and social

perfectibility, expressed in articles 1 and 111 of the Constitution, there is nothing, in all the acts of this assembly, that deserves the smallest honorable mention in history. This time, like the others, the result was what it had to be: the republicans of the day before appeared in power for a moment only to serve as a stepping stone for the republicans of the day after, dragging behind them the doctrinaires and the Jesuits.

Let us not be unjust, however, towards our elders in democracy. By resolutely pronouncing the downfall of royalty, and by founding universal suffrage, they made the social revolution inevitable; they cut short all the sleights of hand and advanced, perhaps by a century, the hour of universal emancipation. When the present pain has become less acute, and the feeling of the faults committed less bitter, there will be thanksgiving for the initiators of February...

Now then, democracy, always ousted, still protests, and prepares itself, by propaganda and elections, to seize the helm again. The ballot of 1852, assuming that the people wait until 1852, will be, do not doubt it, the signal for a new revolution.

What will we do the day after this Revolution!

This is the question that the people must ask themselves, that they must study tirelessly, and resolve in the short term.

It is not enough to vote; it is nothing to demonstrate; it is little to carry off the Hôtel-de-Ville and the Tuileries with the bayonet: victory must be used.

Let the people therefore question themselves and answer themselves. For if, on the day of the Revolution, I does not have the solution ready, after a pause in the demagogic orgy, they will return, for centuries, to monarchy and capitalism, to the government of man by man, to the exploitation of man by man. The Republic cannot regress, nor live in the *status quo*: it must advance or die.

Well! Democrats! Are you ready? I suppose that this revolution, calculated on a fixed day, arrives tomorrow. What confusion in your ranks! Here is Pierre Leroux who offers you his triad, who organizes power for you by three, six, nine; who proposes to you, as a remedy for misery, the *circulus*; as a compass for reason, metempsychosis.

Louis Blanc, seizing, this time, the dictatorship, proceeds to the transshipment of men and things: it is the universal redemption, read the universal confiscation. Considerant, more modest, on a credit of six million, founds the first phalanstery. The Mountain, forced by its words and actions, abolishes indirect taxes for 600 million, and replaces them with a progressive tax on net income, while net income is no more than a fiction of political economy, while the rich no longer exist except in the presumptions of the tax collector. The government, opening up to itself a credit on all fortunes, makes the press groan at the assignats, sends commissioners everywhere to revolutionize the cities and the countryside, declares war on Europe, puts the world on the alert. Private industry, free trade, small and large property are pushed towards association. The workers' corporations, divided by interests as by principles, deprived of direction, become entangled in each other, sometimes making war on each other by competition, sometimes annihilating each other by non-competition. The peasant, having become a landowner, once he is well-off, refuses the paper money presented to him by the industrialist, and will not sell his goods except for good money in

cash. Jealousy and discord are between the urban and rural populations, as well as between the workers' societies and the corporations. Schism enters the Church, sects abound, illuminism takes hold of the masses, parasitism is at its height, betrayal everywhere. The world is full of organizers, regulators, directors, governors, revelators, orators; but there are no more workers. To tell the truth, society is dissolving, and the nation is expiring.

Proletarians and bourgeois, I repeat and confirm it to you. The Revolution is coming upon you with great weight: you carry it in your ideas, in your hearts, in your blood. With you or without you, it must be accomplished: once it has knocked at the door, if you do not know how to answer it, it will devour you. Proletarians and bourgeois, the truce expires in two years: what will you do the day after the Revolution?...

How could they say it, when both, in reaction against their own tendencies, think only of obstructing progress, and are only occupied in clinging to all the branches that the locomotive that carries them away shaves as it rolls? They have learned nothing, they do not want to learn anything; they close their eyes and stop their ears; they know only how to fight against destiny: they seem doomed to eternal misery.

God forbid that I should take it upon myself to make an answer that must be that of all the people! Who would dare to draw the horoscope of humanity, and cut out the work for revolutions! — But what I can say with certainty is, first, that every revolution proceeds by negation and abolition; secondly, that today there remains only these two things to deny and abolish: the exploitation of capital and the oppression of the State; so that from this double negation results the affirmation which must reorganize society and regenerate the world. Revolution and Revelation are synonymous. Every negation in the order of liberty is the prodrome of a new creation. Deny capital and the State, then, if you want to be reborn to life, if you do not want to be crushed by the Revolution.

They are afraid!.... For almost two years now that we have been trying to make the democratic and social idea shine in the midst of this dark demagoguery, we have only collected rare and timid sympathies. Everything is for reaction, some for the government, some for the monopoly. So, how many times since February have I asked myself if, despite the demonstrated possibility of making all men equal and free, equality and freedom were really in human destiny by fighting with all my strength servitude, hypocrisy and theft, I was not painted the dupe of some philanthropic hallucination; if finally, in pursuing this ideal that reason reveals, I was not in contradiction with nature. And, I must admit, in the face of the resistance of the masses, the bad faith of the parties, the cunning of the leaders, doubt seized me.

It must be, I often said to myself, that there is a secret reason for all this. Popular instinct has its motives, deeper than all the speculations of philosophy: this instinct is infallible. Now, it is obvious that the people, in revolutionary times, have never sought and wanted anything but displacements: displacements of men, displacements of fortunes. They understand nothing of equations. The people give glory, wealth and power to those they love; they chase away kings, they break thrones; they convert republics into empires, empires into kingdoms, and kingdoms into republics: they change masters, exploiters, favorites and parasites. What they keep for themselves,

constantly, faithfully, heroically, is misery. Could it not be that Humanity, considered in its ideal, is also itself, like the sovereignly good, just, powerful and wise Being that it adores, only an intellectual notion, a being of reason without reality or possible realization?

And what does it matter, after all, that the cosmic IDEA, which terraqueous humanity represents, poses itself in an endless antagonism, manifests itself by war or by love? What use is it to glorify our nature, whether it extends to the entire species, or whether it is limited to an elite! For thirty or forty thousand years, we have been devouring one another: the slavery of the ancients, feudal servitude, capitalist exploitation, are only successive refinements of this eating of man by man which closes the circle of production and consumption in the universe. The *servant-State* of Louis Blanc is only one more way brought to this cuisine. This is the *circulus* reduced by Pierre Leroux to such a singular expression: life in humanity, metempsychosis in flesh and blood. What does it matter, I say, in the infinity of existences, times and spaces, that a few million billions of human creatures, more or less, are sacrificed on the altar of government and property! Caesar and Napoleon will be less great for it; Descartes, Leibniz, Bonnet, less sublime, and the Venus de Milo less beautiful? It is enough for the manifestation of the human race that a few arrive: the rest only serve as manure. Nature, which never acts in vain; which does not count the minutes, because it is eternal; which does not fear death, because it is life; to whom the fabrication of men costs little, because it has the mold and the way, as well as the raw material, for nothing; nature has refuted in advance, by its daily and traditional practice, all the utopias of equality and fraternity.

No, it is not true that Liberty shines for everyone; Justice is only a ray escaped from the intelligible world; union and peace among men. an illusion of honest people. Man is above all a warlike animal: it is by war that he manifests himself in the sublimity of his nature; It is war alone that makes heroes and demigods. The patriciate and the proletariat are the two poles of civilization; collective life results from our reciprocal exploitation; when I have ceased to eat my brother in the name of property, I eat him in the name of the community: this is what the mystics call communion. Pierre Leroux, Louis Blanc and Malthus would thus agree. At least it must be recognized that until now universal consent has spoken for them, all of nature bears witness to them.

Such were my reflections, when, on the revolutionary question, categorically posed since February, I saw, on the one hand, philosophical reason say: Yes; on the other, popular practice say: No. I add that to these considerations of a pitiless teleology, I have never found an answer. This finality seems to me, speculatively, just as probable as any other. I am a partisan of liberty and equality, because the possibility of them has been demonstrated to me, and because they suit my temperament better. I do not intend to affirm for this in an absolute manner that these are things providentially and naturally good, useful, moral, in conformity with the harmony of the worlds and with our future destiny. If historical development pushes us there, universal sentiment is repugnant to it; there are, as Bonnet says, invincible reasonings for, and an immemorial tradition against. But the Revolution, which is also destiny, told us, placing us on the edge of the ditch: Either you will jump, or you will regress. Now, we have learned, by the ruins of twenty extinct

societies, what fate awaits retrograde peoples. We do not know where the disdain for our routines can lead us. Onward then: To life or death, let us march. It is a question of abolishing capital and the State: that is all we will have to do, if indeed we want to do something the day after the Revolution.

Working translations by Shawn P. Wilbur; last revised August 29, 2026.