former editor-in-chief of the National, now editor-in-chief of the constitution, acquitted himself of this academic task not without talent.

The Constituent Assembly resembled that Chilian official who wanted to regulate property relations in land more firmly by a cadastral survey, just at the moment when subterranean rumblings had already announced the volcanic eruption that was to hurl away the land itself from under its feet. While in theory it accurately measured the forms in which the rule of the bourgeoisie found republican expression, in reality it held its own only by the suspension of all formulas, by force sans phrase, by the state of siege. Two days before it began its work on the constitution, it proclaimed its permanency. Formerly, constitutions had been made and adopted as soon as the social process of revolution had reached a point of rest, the newly formed class relationships had established themselves and the contending factions of the ruling class had had recourse to a compromise which allowed them to continue the struggle among themselves and at the same time to keep the exhausted masses of the people out of it. On the other hand, this constitution did not sanction any social revolution; it sanctioned the momentary victory of the old society over the revolution.

The first draft of the constitution, made before the June days, still contained the droit au travail, the right to work, the first clumsy formula wherein the revolutionary aspirations of the proletariat are summarised. It was transformed into the droit à l’assistance, the right to public relief, and what modern state does not feed its paupers in some form or other? The right to work is, in the bourgeois sense, an absurdity, a miserable, pious wish. But behind the right to work stands the power over capital; behind the power over capital the appropriation of the means of production, their subjection to the associated working class and, therefore, the abolition of wage labour as well as of capital and of their mutual relations. Behind the “right to work” stood

1 Without circumlocution.—Ed.
2 On this passage, extremely important theoretically, see Engels’ Introduction to The Civil War in France, p. 446 in the present volume.—Ed.

the June insurrection. The Constituent Assembly, which in fact set the revolutionary proletariat hors la loi, outside the law, had on principle to throw the formula out of the constitution, the law of laws, had to pronounce its anathema on the “right to work.” But it did not stop there. As Plato banned the poets from his republic, so it banished forever from its republic—the progressive tax. But the progressive tax is not only a bourgeois measure, which can be carried out within the existing relations of production to a greater or less degree; it was the only means of binding the middle strata of bourgeois society to the honnête république, of reducing the state debt, of holding in check the anti-republican majority of the bourgeoisie.

In the matter of the concordats à l’amiable, tricolour republicans had actually sacrificed the petty bourgeoisie to the big bourgeoisie. They elevated this isolated fact to a principle by the legal prohibition of the progressive tax. They put bourgeois reform on the same level as proletarian revolution. But what class then remained as the mainstay of their republic? The big bourgeoisie. And its mass was anti-republican. If it exploited the republicans of the National in order to re-establish the old relations of economic life, it thought, on the other hand, of exploiting the re-established social relations in order to restore the political reforms that corresponded to them. Even at the beginning of October, Cavaignac saw himself forced to make Dufaure and Vivien, previously ministers of Louis Philippe, ministers of the republic, however much the brainless puritans of his own party growled and blustered.

While the tricolour constitution rejected every compromise with the petty bourgeoisie and did not know how to attach any new social element to the new state form, it hastened, on the other hand, to give back to a body that constituted the most hardbitten and fanatical defender of the old state its traditional immunity. It raised the irremovability of judges, which had been questioned by the Provisional Government, to a constitutional law. The one king whom it had removed rose again, multiplied in these irremovable inquisitors of legality.

1 Honest.—Ed.
The French press has analysed from numerous aspects the contradictions of M. Marrast's constitution, for example, the coexistence of two sovereigns, the National Assembly and the President, etc., etc.

The most comprehensive contradiction of this constitution, however, consisted in the following: The classes whose social slavery the constitution is to perpetuate, proletariat, peasantry, petty bourgeoisie, it puts in possession of political power through universal suffrage. And from the class whose old social power it sanctions, the bourgeoisie, it withdraws the political guarantees of this power. It forces its political rule into democratic conditions, which at every moment help the hostile classes to victory and jeopardise the very foundations of bourgeois society. From the former classes it demands that they should not go forward from political to social emancipation; from the others that they should not go back from social to political restoration.

These contradictions perturbed the bourgeois republicans very little. To the extent that they ceased to be indispensable—they were indispensable only as the advance fighters of the old society against the revolutionary proletariat—a few weeks after their victory they felt from the position of a party to that of a coterie. And they treated the constitution as a big intrigue. Above all, what should be constituted in it was the rule of the coterie. The President should be a protracted Cavaignac; the Legislative Assembly a protracted Constituent Assembly. They hoped to reduce the political power of the masses of the people to a fictitious power, and to be able to make sufficient play with this sham power itself, continually to keep hanging over the majority of the bourgeoisie the dilemma of the June days: realm of the National or realm of anarchy.

The work on the constitution, which began on September 4, was ended on October 23. On September 2 the Constituent Assembly had decided not to dissolve until the organic laws supplementing the constitution were enacted. None the less, it decided to call into being the creation, most of all its own, the President, on December 4, long before the circle of its own activity was closed. So sure it was of hailing in the homunculus of the constitution, the son of his mother. As a precaution it was provided that if none of the candidates received two million votes, the election should pass over from the nation to the Constituent Assembly.

Fruitless provisions! The first day of the realisation of the constitution was the last day of the rule of the Constituent Assembly. At the bottom of the ballot box lay its sentence of death. It sought the "son of his mother" and found "the nephew of his uncle." Saul Cavaignac obtained one million votes, but David Napoleon obtained six million. Saul Cavaignac was defeated six times over.

December 10, 1848, was the day of the peasant insurrection. Only from this day does the February of the French peasants date. The symbol that expressed their entry into the revolutionary movement, clumsily cunning, knavishly naive, doltishly sublime, a calculated superstition, a pathetic burlesque, a cleverly stupid anachronism, a world historic piece of buffoonery and an indecipherable hieroglyphic for the understanding of the civilised—this symbol bore the unmistakable features of the class that represents barbarism within civilisation. The republic had announced itself to this class with the tax collector; it announced itself to the republic with the emperor. Napoleon was the only man who had exhaustively represented the interests and the imagination of the peasant class, newly created in 1789. By writing his name on the front page of the republic, it declared war abroad and the enforcing of its class interests at home. Napoleon, for the peasants, was not a person but a programme. With banners, with beat of drums and blast of trumpets, they marched to the polling booths shouting: plus d'impôts, à bas les riches, à bas la république, vive l'Empereur! No more taxes, down with the rich, down with the republic, long live the emperor! Behind the

1 According to Paracelsus, a diminutive man produced artificially and endowed with magic powers.—Ed.

2 I.e., Louis Bonaparte, later Emperor Louis Napoleon III, the nephew of Napoleon I.—Ed.
emperor was hidden the peasant war. The republic that they voted down was the republic of the rich.

December 10 was the coup d'état of the peasants, which overthrew the existing government. And from that day on, when they had taken a government from France and given one to her, their eyes were turned steadily on Paris. For a moment active heroes of the revolutionary drama, they could no longer be forced back into the passive and spineless role of the chorus.

The other classes helped to complete the election victory of the peasants. The election of Napoleon, for the proletariat, meant the deposition of Cavaignac, the overthrow of the Constituent Assembly, the dismissal of bourgeois republicanism, the rescinding of the June victory. For the petty bourgeoisie, Napoleon meant the rule of the debtors over the creditors. For the majority of the big bourgeoisie the election of Napoleon meant an open breach with the fraction of which it had had to make use, for a moment, against the revolution, but which became intolerable to it as soon as this fraction sought to consolidate the position of the moment into the constitutional position. Napoleon in place of Cavaignac, for the majority of the big bourgeoisie, meant the monarchy in place of the republic, the beginning of the royalist restoration, a shy hint at Orleans, the lily hidden beneath the violet. Finally, the army voted for Napoleon against the Mobile Guard, against the peace idyll, for war.

Thus it happened, as the Neue Rheinische Zeitung stated, that the most simple-minded man in France acquired the most multifarious significance. Just because he was nothing, he could signify everything save himself. Meanwhile, different as the meaning of the name Napoleon might be in the mouths of the different classes, with this name each wrote in its bulletin: Down with the party of the National, down with Cavaignac, down with the Constituent Assembly, down with the bourgeois republic. The Minister, Dufaure, publicly declared in the Constituent Assembly: December 10 is a second February 24.

Petty bourgeoisie and proletariat had voted en bloc for Napoleon, in order to vote against Cavaignac and, by pooling their votes, to wrest the final decision from the Constituent Assembly. The more advanced sections of the two classes, however, put forward their own candidates. Napoleon was the collective name of all parties in coalition against the bourgeois republic. Ledru-Rollin and Raspail were the proper names, the former of the democratic petty bourgeoisie, the latter of the revolutionary proletariat. The votes for Raspail, the proletarians and their socialist spokesmen loudly declared, were to be merely a demonstration, so many protests against either presidency, i.e., against the constitution itself, so many votes against Ledru-Rollin, the first act by which the proletariat, as an independent political party, cut loose from the democratic party. This party, on the other hand, the democratic petty bourgeoisie and its parliamentary representative, the Mountain, treated the candidate of Ledru-Rollin with all the seriousness with which they are in the habit of solemnly duping themselves. For the rest, this was their last attempt to set themselves up as an independent party, as against the proletariat. Not only the republican bourgeois party, but also the democratic bourgeoisie and its Mountain were beaten on December 10.

France now possessed a Napoleon side by side with a Mountain, proof that both were only the lifeless caricatures of the great realities whose names they bore. Louis Napoleon, with the emperor's hat and the eagle, parodied the old Napoleon no more miserably than the Mountain, with its phrases borrowed from 1793 and its demagogic poses, parodied the old Mountain. Thus the traditional superstition in 1793 was stripped off at the same time as the traditional superstition in Napoleon. The revolution had only come into its own when it had won its own original name and it could only do that when the modern revolutionary class, the industrial proletariat, came dominantly into its foreground. One can say that December 10 dethroned the Mountain and caused it to grow confused in its own mind, because it laughingly cut short the classical analogy to the old revolution with a rude peasant joke.

On December 20 Cavaignac laid down his office and the Con-
stinent Assembly proclaimed Louis Napoleon president of the republic. On December 19, the last day of its autocracy, it rejected the proposal for amnesty for the June insurgents. To revoke the decree of June 27, through which it had condemned 15,000 insurgents to deportation by evading legal judgment, did not that mean to revoke the June battle itself?

Odilon Barrot, the last Minister of Louis Philippe, became the first Minister of Louis Napoleon. Just as Louis Napoleon dated his rule, not from December 10, but from a decree of the Senate of 1806, so he found a prime minister who did not date his ministry from December 20, but from a royal decree of February 24. As the legitimate heir of Louis Philippe, Louis Napoleon softened the change of government by retaining the old ministry, which, moreover, had not had time to wear itself out, since it had not found time to come to life.

The chiefs of the royalist bourgeois factions advised him in this choice. The head of the old dynastic opposition, who had unconsciously made the transition to the republicans of the National, was still more fitted to make with full consciousness the transition from the bourgeois republic to the monarchy.

Odilon Barrot was the head of the one old opposition party which, always fruitlessly struggling for ministerial portfolios, had not yet worn itself out. In rapid succession the revolution threw all the old opposition parties to the top of the state, so that they had to deny and revoke their old phrases not only in deeds but in words, and might finally be flung all together, combined in a repulsive mixture, on the dung heap of history by the people. And this Barrot was spared no apostasy, this incarnation of bourgeois liberalism, who for eighteen years had hidden the rascally vacuity of his mind behind the serious demeanour of his body. If, at certain moments, the far too striking contrast between the thistles of the present and the laurels of the past startled the man himself, a glance in the mirror gave back his ministerial serenity and human self-admiration. What beamed at him from the mirror was Guizot, whom he had always envied, who had always mastered him. Guizot himself, but Guizot with the Olympian forehead of Odilon. What he overlooked were the ears of Midas.1

The Barrot of February 24 first became manifest in the Barrot of December 20. Associated with him, the Orleansist and Voltairian was the Legitimist and Jesuit, Falloux, as Minister for Education.

A few days later, the Ministry for Home Affairs was given to Leon Faucher, the Malthusian. Law, religion and political economy! The ministry of Barrot contained all this and, in addition, a combination of Orleansists and Legitimists. Only the Bonapartist was lacking. Bonaparte still hid his longing to signify Napoleon, for Souloque did not yet play Toussaint L’Ouverture.2

The party of the National was immediately relieved of all the higher posts where it had entrenched itself. The positions of Prefect of Police, Director of the Post, Procurator General, Mayor of Paris, were all filled by old creatures of the monarchy. Changiarnier, the Legitimist, received the unified supreme command of the National Guard of the Department of the Seine, the Mobile Guard and the troops of the first military division; Bugeaud, the Orleansist, was nominated as the commander-in-chief of the Alpine army. This change of officials continued uninterruptedly under the Barrot government. The first act of his

1 Midas was the legendary king of the Phrygians. According to the old fable, at a musical competition between Apollo and Pan, Midas gave the preference to Pan. Because of this the indignant Apollo rewarded him by giving him ass’s ears.—Ed.
2 Souloque was the name of the president of the Negro republic of Haiti, who, in imitation of Napoleon I in 1800, proclaimed himself Emperor, surrounding himself with a whole staff of Negro marshals and generals, establishing a court after the French model and in everything attempting to copy Napoleon. The masses of the people in France wittily commented on the resemblance by dubbing Louis Bonaparte "the French Souloque."—Ed.
3 Toussaint L’Ouverture (1748-1803) the famous Negro revolutionary, the son of a slave, who headed the insurrection of the slaves in San Domingo in 1796-1802. He was taken prisoner by the French forces and died in prison. The heroic struggle of Toussaint L’Ouverture is deeply enshrined in the memory of the oppressed Negroes in the U.S.A. and in the colonies, as one of the first great leaders of the Negro struggle against imperialist exploitation and oppression.—Ed.
ministry was the restoration of the old royalist administration. The official scene was transformed in a trice—scenery, costumes, speech, actors, supers, dummies, prompters, the position of the parties, the theme of the drama, the content of the conflict, the whole situation. Only the antediluvian Constituent Assembly remained in its place. But from the hour when the National Assembly had installed Bonaparte, Bonaparte Barrot and Barrot Changarnier, France stopped out of the period of republican constitution-making into the period of the constituted republic. And in the constituted republic what place was there for a Constituent Assembly? After the earth had been created, there was nothing else for its creator to do but to take flight to heaven. The Constituent Assembly was determined not to follow his example; the National Assembly was the last asylum for the party of the bourgeoisie republicans. If all levers of executive power had been wrested from it, there was not left to it constituent omnipotence? Its first thought was to hold under all circumstances the positions of sovereignty that it occupied, and thence to reconquer the lost ground. The Barrot ministry once displaced by a ministry of the National, and the royalist personnel would have to vacate the palaces of the administration forthwith and the tricolour personnel would move in again triumphantly. The National Assembly resolved on the overthrow of the ministry and the ministry itself offered an opportunity for the attack, than which the Constituent Assembly could not have found a better.

It must be remembered that for the peasants Louis Bonaparte signified: No more taxes! He sat for six days in the President’s chair, and on the seventh day, on December 27, his ministry proposed the retention of the salt tax, the abolition of which the Provisional Government had decreed. The salt tax shares with the wine tax the privilege of being the scapegoat of the old French financial system, particularly in the eyes of the country folk. The Barrot ministry could not have put into the mouth of the elected choice of the peasants any more mordant epigram on his electors than the words: Restoration of the salt tax! With the salt tax, Bonaparte lost his revolutionary salt—the Napoleon of the peasant insurrection dissolved like an apparition, and nothing remained but the great unknown of royalist bourgeoisie intrigue. And not without intention, the Barrot ministry made this act of tactlessly rude disillusionment the first governmental act of the President.

The Constituent Assembly, on its part, seized eagerly on the double opportunity of overthrowing the ministry, and, as against the elect of the peasantry, of setting itself up as the representative of peasant interests. It rejected the proposal of the finance minister, reduced the salt tax to a third of its former amount, thus incurring by sixty millions a state deficit of five hundred and sixty millions, and, after this vote of no confidence, calmly awaited the resignation of the ministry. So little did it comprehend the new world that surrounded it and its own changed position. Behind the ministry stood the President and behind the President stood six millions, who had placed in the ballot box as many votes of no confidence in the Constituent Assembly. The Constituent Assembly gave the nation back its no confidence vote. Absurd exchange! It forgot that its votes had lost compulsory quotation. The rejection of the salt tax only matured the decision of Bonaparte and his ministry to “end” the Constituent Assembly. That long duel began which lasted half the entire life of the Constituent Assembly. January 29, March 31 and May 3 are the journées, the great days of this crisis, just so many forerunners of June 13.

Frenchmen, for example, Louis Blanc, have construed January 29 as the date of the emergence of a constitutional contradiction, the contradiction between a sovereign, indissoluble National Assembly born of universal suffrage and a President, who, in words, was responsible to the Assembly, but who, in reality, was not only similarly sanctioned by universal suffrage and, in addition, united in his own person all the votes that were split up a hundred times and distributed among the individual members of the National Assembly, but was also in full possession of the whole executive power, above which the National Assembly hovered as a merely moral force. This interpretation of January 29 confuses the language of the struggle on the platform, through the
press and in the clubs, with its real content. Louis Bonaparte as against the National Assembly—that was not a one-sided constitutional power as against another; it was not the executive power as against the legislative, it was the constituted bourgeois republic itself as against the instruments of its constitution, as against the honour-seeking intrigues and ideological demands of the revolutionary bourgeois faction that had founded it and was now amazed to find that its constituted republic looked like a restored monarchy, and now violently desired to adhere to the constituting period with its conditions, its illusions, its language and its personnel and to prevent the mature bourgeois republic from emerging in its complete and peculiar form. As the Constituent National Assembly represented Cavaignac who had fallen back into it, so Bonaparte represented the Legislative National Assembly, that had not yet been estranged from him, i.e., the National Assembly of the constituted bourgeois republic.

The election of Bonaparte could only become explicable by putting in the place of the one name its many-sided significance, by repeating itself in the election of the new National Assembly. The mandate of the old was annulled by December 10. On January 29, therefore, it was not the President and the National Assembly of the same republic that were face to face, it was the National Assembly of the republic in the making and the President of the republic in being, two powers that embodied quite different periods in the life process of the republic; the one the small republican section of the bourgeoisie that alone could proclaim the republic, wrest it from the revolutionary proletariat by street fighting and a reign of terror, and draft its ideal features in the constitution, and the other the whole royalist mass of the bourgeoisie that alone could rule in this constituted bourgeois republic, strip the constitution of its ideological trimmings, and realise by its legislation and administration the indispensable conditions for the subjection of the proletariat.

The storm which broke on January 29 gathered its elements together during the whole month of January. The Constituent Assembly wanted to drive the Barrot ministry to resign by its no confidence vote. The Barrot ministry, on the other hand, proposed that the Constituent Assembly should give itself a definitive no confidence vote, decide on suicide and decree its own dissolution. Rateau, one of the most obscure deputies, at the order of the ministry, on January 6 brought this motion before the Constituent Assembly, the same Constituent Assembly that already in August had resolved not to dissolve until a whole series of organic laws supplementing the constitution had been enacted. Fould, the ministerialist, bluntly declared to it that its dissolution was necessary "for the restoration of the deranged credit." And did it not derange credit when it prolonged the provisional stage and, with Barrot, again called Bonaparte in question, and, with Bonaparte, the constituted republic? Barrot, the Olympian, became a raving Roland with the prospect of seeing the finally grabbed premiership, which the republicans had already withheld from him once for a decade, i.e., for ten months, again torn from him after scarcely two weeks' enjoyment of it—Barrot confronting this wretched Assembly out-tyrannised the tyrant. His mildest words were "no future is possible with it." And actually it did only represent the past. "It is incapable," he added ironically, "of surrounding the republic with the institutions which are necessary for its consolidation." Incapable indeed! With its exclusive antagonism to the proletariat, its bourgeois energy was simultaneously broken, and with its antagonism to the royalists its republican exuberance lived anew. Thus it was doubly incapable of consolidating the bourgeois republic, which it no longer comprehended, by means of the corresponding institutions.

Simultaneously with Rateau's motion the ministry evoked a storm of petitions throughout the land, and from all corners of France came flying daily at the head of the Constituent Assembly bundles of billets doux in which it was more or less categorically requested to dissoleve and make its will. The Constituent Assembly, on its side, called forth counter petitions, in which it caused itself to be requested to remain alive. The election struggle between Bonaparte and Cavaignac was renewed as a petition struggle for or against the dissolution of the National Assembly. The

---

1 The hero of the epic poem, Orlando furioso, by the Italian writer, Ariosto (1474-1533).—Ed.
petitions were to be subsequent commentaries on December 10. During the whole of January this agitation continued.

In the conflict between the Constituent Assembly and the President, the former could not go back to the general election as its origin, for the appeal was from it to universal suffrage. It could base itself on no regular power, for the issue was the struggle against the legal power. It could not overthrow the ministry by no confidence votes, as it again essayed to do on January 6 and 26, for the ministry did not ask for its confidence. Only one possibility was left to it, that of insurrection. The fighting forces of the insurrection were the republican part of the National Guard, the Mobile Guard and the centres of the revolutionary proletariat, the clubs. The Mobile Guard, those heroes of the June days, in December as well formed the organised fighting force of the republican bourgeois factions, just as before June the National Ateliers had formed the organised fighting force of the revolutionary proletariat. As the Executive Commission of the Constituent Assembly directed its brutal attack on the National Ateliers, when it had to put an end to the pretensions of the proletariat that had become unbearable, so the ministry of Bonaparte directed its attack on the Mobile Guard, when it had to put an end to the pretensions of the republican bourgeois factions that had become unbearable. It ordered the dissolution of the Mobile Guard. One half of it was dismissed and thrown on the street, the other was organised on monarchist instead of democratic lines, and its pay was reduced to the usual pay of troops of the line. The Mobile Guard found itself in the position of June insurgents and every day the press carried public confessions in which it admitted its blame for June and implored the proletariat for forgiveness.

And the clubs? From the moment when the Constituent Assembly called the President in question in the person of Barrot, and the constituted bourgeois republic in the person of the President, and the bourgeois republic in general in the person of the constituted republic, all the constituent elements of the February republic necessarily ranged themselves round it, all the parties that wished to overthrow the existing republic and by violent retrograde process to reshape it to the republic of their class interests and principles. What was done was again undone, the crystallisations of the revolutionary movement had again become fluid, the republic that the parties fought for was again the indefinite republic of the February days, the defining of which each party reserved for itself. For a moment the parties again took up their old February positions, without sharing the illusions of February. The tricolour republicans of the National again leant on the democratic republicans of the Réforme and pushed them as advance fighters into the foreground of the parliamentary struggle. The democratic republicans again leant on the socialist republicans—on January 27 a public manifesto announced their reconciliation and alliance—and prepared their insurrectional background in the clubs. The ministerial press treated the tricolour republicans correctly as the resurrected insurgents of June. In order to maintain itself at the head of the bourgeois republic, it called in question the bourgeois republic itself. On January 26 the Minister Faucher proposed a law on the right of association, the first paragraph of which read: "The clubs are forbidden." He moved that this bill should immediately be discussed as urgent. The Constituent Assembly rejected the motion of urgency, and on January 27 Ledru-Rollin put forward a proposition, with 230 signatures appended to it, impeaching the ministry for violation of the constitution. The impeachment of the ministry at a moment when such an act was a tactless disclosure of the impotence of the judge, to wit, the majority of the Chamber, or was an impotent protest of the accuser against this majority itself—that was the great revolutionary trump that the latter-day Mountain played from now on at each high spot of the crisis. Poor Mountain! crushed by the weight of its own name.

On May 15, Blanc, Barbès, Raspail, etc., had attempted to break up the Constituent Assembly by forcing an entrance into its hall of session at the head of the Paris proletariat. Barrot prepared a moral May 15 for the same Assembly when he wanted to dictate its self-dissolution and close the hall. The same Assembly had commissioned Barrot with the official enquiry against the May accused, and now at the moment when he appeared before it like a royalist Blanc when it sought for allies against him in
the clubs, among the revolutionary proletarians, in the Party of Blanqui—at this moment the relentless Barrot tormented it with the proposal to withdraw the May prisoners from the Court of Assizes and hand them over to the High Court, to the haut cour, devised by the party of the National. Remarkable how the fear excited for a ministerial portfolio could pound out of the head of a Barrot points worthy of a Beaumarchais.\(^1\) The National Assembly, after much vacillation accepted his proposal. As against the makers of the May attempt, it reverted to its normal character.

If the Constituent Assembly was driven to insurrection against the President and the ministers, the President and the ministers were driven to a coup d’état against the Constituent Assembly, for they had no legal means of dissolving it. But the Constituent Assembly was the mother of the constitution and the constitution was the mother of the President. With the coup d’état, the President tore up the constitution and extinguished his republican lawful title. He was then forced to pull out the imperial lawful title, but the imperial lawful title woke up the Orleanist lawful title and both paled before the Legitimist lawful title. The downfall of the legal republic could only then throw to the top its most extreme opposite pole, the Legitimist monarchy, at a moment when the Orleanist party was still only the vanquished of February and Bonaparte was still only the victor of December 10, when both could still only oppose to republican usurpation their likewise usurped monarchist titles. The legitimists were aware of the favourableness of the moment; they conspired openly. They could hope to find their Monk\(^2\) in General Changarnier. The accession of the White monarchy was as openly predicted in their clubs as was that of the Red republic in the proletarian clubs.

The ministry would have escaped all difficulties through a happily suppressed rising. “Legality is the death of us,” cried Odilon Barrot. A rising would have allowed it, under the pretext of the salut public,\(^3\) to dissolve the Constituent Assembly, to violate the constitution in the interests of the constitution itself. The brutal action of Odilon Barrot in the National Assembly, the motion for the dissolution of the clubs, the tumultuous removal of 30 tricolour prefects, and their replacement by royalists, the dissolution of the Mobile Guard, the ill treatment of their chiefs by Changarnier, the reinstatement of L’Hermine, the professor who was impossible even under Guizot, the toleration of the Legitimist boasting—all these were just so many provocations to mutiny. But the mutiny remained mute. It expected its signal from the Constituent Assembly and not from the ministry.

Finally came January 29, the day on which the decision was to be taken on the motion of Mathieu (de la Drôme) for unconditional rejection of Rateau’s motion. Legitimists, Orleanists, Bonapartists, the Mobile Guard, the Mountain, the clubs, all conspired on this day, each just as much against ostensible allies as against ostensible enemies. Bonaparte, mounted on horseback, mustered a part of the troops on the Place de la Concorde; Changarnier play-acted with a display of strategic manoeuvres; the Constituent Assembly found its building occupied by the military. This Assembly, the centre of all the conflicting hopes, fears, expectation, ferment, tensions and conspiracies, this lion-hearted Assembly, did not falter for a moment, when it came nearer to the world spirit than usual. It was like that fighter who not only feared the use of his own weapons, but also felt himself obliged to maintain the weapons of his opponent unimpaired. Sorrowing death, it signed its own death warrant, and rejected the unconditional rejection of the Rateau motion.\(^4\) Even in the state of

---

\(^1\) Beaumarchais (1732-99). Pamphleteer and dramatist of the epoch before the French Revolution, famous for his comedies The Barber of Seville and the Marriage of Figaro.—Ed.

\(^2\) George Monk (1608-69) was an army general during the period of the English bourgeois revolution associated with Cromwell. While engaged in carrying out the king’s orders he was made prisoner by the revolutionary forces, but after some years in prison he was liberated and put in command of the parliamentary forces. In 1660, Monk led the troops under him for the restoration of the old Stuart dynasty and the suppression of the revolution, for which he was liberally rewarded by Charles II.—Ed.

\(^3\) Public welfare.—Ed.

\(^4\) Frightened by the threat of dissolution and by the military demonstration organised on January 29 by Louis Bonaparte, the Assembly had not the courage categorically to reject the proposal of Rateau and
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manifestly only understand by the right of association the associations that harmonised with the rule of the bourgeoisie, i.e., with the bourgeois order. If, for reasons of theoretical propriety, it expressed itself in general terms, was not the government and the National Assembly there to interpret and apply it in a given case? And if in the primitive epoch of the republic, the clubs actually were forbidden by the state of siege, had they not also to be forbidden in the ordered, constituted republic by the law? The tricolour republicans had nothing to oppose to this prosaic interpretation of the constitution but the high-flown phraseology of the constitution. A section of them, Pagnerre, Ducerce, etc., voted for the ministry and thereby gave it a majority. The others, with the archangel, Cavaignac, and the father of the church, Marrast, at their head, after the article on the prohibition of the clubs had gone through, retired to a special committee room in conjunction with Ledru-Rollin and the Mountain—"and held a council." The National Assembly was paralysed; it no longer had a quorum. At the right time, M. Cremieux remembered in the committee room that the way from here led directly to the street and that it was no longer February 1848, but March 1849. The party of the National, suddenly enlightened, returned to the National Assembly's hall of session, behind it the Mountain, duped once more. The latter, constantly tormented by revolutionary longings, just as constantly clutched at constitutional possibilities, and always felt itself more in place behind the bourgeois republicans than in front of the revolutionary proletariat. Thus the comedy was played. And the Constituent Assembly itself had decreed that the violation of the letter of the constitution was the only appropriate realisation of its spirit.

There was only one point left to settle, the relation of the constituted republic to the European revolution, its foreign policy. On May 8, 1849, an unwonted excitement prevailed in the Constitutional Assembly, whose term of life was due to end in a few days. The attack of the French army on Rome, its repulse by the Romans, its political infamy and military disgrace, the assassination of the Roman republic by the French republic, the first Italian campaign of the second Napoleon was on the order of the day.
The Mountain had once more played its great trump. Ledru-Rollin had laid on the President's table the inevitable bill of impeachment against the ministry and this time also against Bonaparte for violation of the constitution.

The motive of May 8 repeated itself later as the motive of June 13. Let us get clear about the expedition to Rome.

In the middle of November 1848, Cavaignac had already sent a battle fleet to Civita Vecchia, in order to protect the Pope, to take him on board and to ship him over to France. The Pope was to bless the honest republic, and to ensure the election of Cavaignac as president. With the Pope, Cavaignac wanted to angle for the priests, with the priests for the peasants, and with the peasants for the presidency. The expedition of Cavaignac, an election advertisement in its immediate purpose, was at the same time a protest and a threat against the Roman revolution. It contained in embryo France's intervention in favour of the Pope.

This intervention against the Roman republic, on the Pope's behalf, in association with Austria and Naples, was decided on at the first meeting of Bonaparte's ministerial council on December 23. Falloux in the ministry, that meant the Pope in Rome and in the Rome—of the Pope. Bonaparte did not need the Pope any longer in order to become the President of the peasants; but he needed the conservation of the Pope, in order to conserve the peasants of the President. Their credulity had made him President. With faith they lost credulity, and with the Pope, faith. And the Orleanists and Legitimists in coalition who ruled in Bonaparte's name! Before the king was restored, the power had to be restored that consecrates kings. Apart from their royalism; without the old Rome, subject to his worldly rule, no Pope; without the Pope, no catholicism; without catholicism, no French religion; and without religion, what became of the old French society? The mortgage that the peasant has on heavenly blessings guarantees the mortgage that the bourgeois has on peasant lands. The Roman revolution was, therefore, an attack on property, on the bourgeois order, dreadful as the June revolution. Re-established bourgeois rule in France required the restoration of papist rule in Rome. Finally, to smite the Roman revolutionaries was to smite the allies of the French revolutionaries; the alliance of the counter-revolutionary classes in the constituted French republic was necessarily supplemented by the alliance of the French republic with the Holy Alliance, with Naples and Austria. The decision of the ministerial council of December 23 was no secret for the Constituent Assembly. On January 8 Ledru-Rollin had already interrogated the ministry concerning it; the ministry had denied it and the National Assembly had proceeded to the order of the day. Did it trust the word of the ministry? We know that it spent the whole month of January in giving the ministry no confidence votes. But if it was part of the ministry's role to lie, it was part of the National Assembly's role to feign belief in its lie and thereby save the republican déhors. 1

Meanwhile, Piedmont was beaten, King Albert had abdicated and the Austrian army knocked at the door of France. Ledru-Rollin vehemently interrogated. The ministry proved that it had only continued in North Italy the policy of Cavaignac, and Cavaignac only the policy of the Provisional Government, i.e., of Ledru-Rollin. This time it even reaped a vote of confidence from the National Assembly and was authorized to occupy temporarily a suitable point in Upper Italy, in order to give support to peaceful negotiations with Austria concerning the integrity of Sardinian territory and the question of Rome. It is well known that the fate of Italy is decided on the battlefields of North Italy. Hence Rome had fallen with Lombardy and Piedmont, or France had to declare war on Austria and thereby on the European counter-revolution. Did the National Assembly suddenly take the Barrot ministry for the old Committee of Public Safety? Or itself for the Convention? Why, then, the military occupation of a point in Upper Italy? The expedition against Rome was covered with this transparent veil.

On April 14, 14,000 men sailed under Oudinot for Civita Vecchia; on April 16, the National Assembly voted the ministry...

1 An Italian harbour and fort near Rome.—Ed.

2 Appearances.—Ed.
a credit of 1,200,000 francs for the maintenance of a fleet of intervention in the Mediterranean Sea for three months. Thus it gave the ministry every means of intervening against Rome, while it adopted the pose of letting it intervene against Austria. It did not see what the ministry did; it only heard what it said. Such faith was not found in Israel; the Constituent Assembly had fallen into the position of not daring to know what the constituted republic had to do.

Finally, on May 8, the last scene of the comedy was played; the Constituent Assembly urged the ministry to take swift measures to bring the Italian expedition back to the aim set for it. Bonaparte that same evening inserted a letter in the Moniteur, in which he lavished the greatest appreciation on Oudinot. On May 11, the National Assembly rejected the bill of impeachment against this same Bonaparte and his ministry. And the Mountain, which, instead of tearing this web of deceit to pieces, took the parliamentary comedy tragically, in order itself to play in it the role of Fouquier-Tinville,² did it not reveal its natural petty-bourgeois calf's hide under the borrowed lion's skin of the Convention!

The last half of the life of the Constituent Assembly is summarised thus: On January 29, it admits that the royalist bourgeois factions are the natural superiors of the republic constituted by it; on March 21, that the violation of the constitution is its realisation, and on May 11, that the passive alliance of the French republic, bombastically proclaimed, with the struggling peoples means its active alliance with the European counter-revolution.

This miserable Assembly left the stage, after it had given itself the pleasure, two days before the anniversary of its birthday, May 4, of rejecting the motion of amnesty for the June insurgents. Its power shattered, held in deadly hatred by the people, repulsed, maltreated, contemptuously thrown aside by the bourgeoisie, whose tool it was, forced in the second half of

² Fouquier Tinville (1746-95). One of the most eminent Jacobin leaders of the first French bourgeois revolution. When the Revolutionary Tribunal was organised on March 10, 1793, Fouquier-Tinville was appointed Public Prosecutor. In this capacity he conducted a merciless struggle against the enemies of the Revolution, applying the method of revolutionary terror.—Ed.
supplemented by the Orleanists, the *synthesis of the restoration and the July monarchy?* The bourgeois republicans of the *National* did not represent any large fraction of their class resting on economic foundations. As against the two bourgeois factions that only understood their *own particular* regime, they had only the importance and the historical title, of having asserted under the monarchy the general regime of the bourgeois class, the *nameless realm of the republic*, which they idealised and embellished with antique arabesques, but in which, above all, they hailed the rule of their coterie. If the party of the *National* grew confused in its own mind when it described the coalesced royalists at the head of the republic founded by it, these royalists deceived themselves no less concerning the fact of their united rule. They did not comprehend that if each of their factions, regarded by itself separately, was royalist, the product of their chemical combination had necessarily to be *republican*, that the white and the blue monarchy had to neutralise each other in the tricolour republic. Forced, by antagonism to the revolutionary proletariat and the transition classes thronging more and more round this as the centre, to summon their united strength and to conserve the organisation of this united strength, each faction of the Party of Order, as against the desires for restoration and overweening presumptions of the other, had to assert their joint rule, *i.e.*, the *republican form* of bourgeois rule. Thus we find these royalists in the beginning believing in an immediate restoration, later preserving the republican form with foaming rage and deadly invective against it on their lips, and finally confessing that they can endure each other only in the republic and postponing the restoration indefinitely. The enjoyment of the united rule itself strengthened each of the two factions, and made each of them still more unable and unwilling to subordinate itself to the other, *i.e.*, to restore the monarchy.

The Party of Order directly proclaimed in its election programme the rule of the bourgeoisie, *i.e.*, the maintenance of the life-conditions of its rule, *property, the family, religion, order!* Naturally it represented its class rule and the conditions of its class rule as the rule of civilisation and as the necessary con-

ditions of material production as well as of the social relations arising from it. The Party of Order had enormous money resources at its command; it organised its branches throughout France; it had all the ideologists of the old society in its pay; it had the influence of the existing governmental power at its disposal; it possessed an army of unpaid vassals in the whole mass of petty bourgeois and peasants, who, still far removed from the revolutionary movement, found in the high dignitaries of property the natural representatives of their petty property and its petty prejudices. This party, represented throughout the country by countless petty kings, could punish the rejection of their candidates as insurrection, dismiss the rebellious workers, the recalcitrant farm hands, servants, clerks, railway officials, penmen, all the functionaries civilly subordinate to it. Finally, here and there, it could maintain the delusion that the republican Constituent Assembly had obstructed the Bonaparte of December 10 in the manifestation of his wonder-working powers. We have not mentioned the Bonapartists in connection with the Party of Order. They were not a serious faction of the bourgeois class, but a collection of old, superstitious invalids and young, sceptical fortune-hunters. The Party of Order was victorious in the elections; it sent a large majority into the Legislative Assembly.

As against the coalesced counter-revolutionary bourgeois class, the sections of the petty bourgeoisie and peasant class already revolutionised had naturally to join up with the high dignitaries of revolutionary interests, the revolutionary proletariat. We have seen how the democratic spokesmen of the petty bourgeoisie in parliament, *i.e.*, the Mountain, were driven by parliamentary defeats to the socialist spokesmen of the proletariat, and how the actual petty bourgeoisie, outside of parliament, were driven by the *cordatifs à l’amiable*, by the brutal enforcement of bourgeoisie interests and by bankruptcy to the actual proletariat. On January 27, Mountain and socialists had celebrated their reconciliation, and at the great banquet of February 1849, they repeated their act of union. The social and the democratic, the party of the workers and that of the petty bourgeoisie, were united into the *Social-Democratic Party*, *i.e.*, the *Red party.*
The French republic, paralysed for a moment by the agony that followed the June days, had lived through a continuous series of feverish excitement since the raising of the state of siege, since October 14. First the struggle for the Presidency, then the struggle between the President and the Constituent Assembly; the struggle for the clubs; the trial in Bourges, which, in contrast to the petty figures of the President, the coalesced royalists, the honest republicans, the democratic Mountain and the socialist doctrinaires of the proletariat, caused the proletariat’s real revolutionaries to appear as antediluvian monsters, such as only a deluge could leave behind on the surface of society, or such as could only precede a social flood; the election agitation; the execution of the Bréa murderers; the continual proceedings against the press; the violent interference of the government with the banquets by police action; the insolent royalist provocations; the exhibition of the portraits of Louis Blanc and Caussidière on the pillory; the unbroken struggle between the constituted republic and the Constituent Assembly, which each moment drove the revolution back to its starting point, which each moment made the victors the vanquished and the vanquished the victors and, in a trice, changed the positions of the parties and the classes, their separations and connections; the rapid march of the European
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counter-revolution; the glorious Hungarian fight; the armed uprisings in Germany; the Roman expedition; the ignominious defeat of the French army before Rome—in this vortex of the movement, in this torrent of historical unrest, in this dramatic ebb and flow of revolutionary passions, hopes, disappointments, the different classes of French society had to count their epochs of development in weeks where they had previously counted them in half centuries. A considerable section of the peasants and of the provinces was revolutionised. Not only were they disappointed in Napoleon, but the Red party offered them, instead of the name, the content, instead of illusory freedom from taxation, repayment of the milliard paid to the Legitimists, the regulation of mortgages and the suppression of usurers.

The army itself was infected with the revolutionary fever. In voting for Bonaparte it had voted for victory, and he gave it defeat. In him it had voted for the Little Corporal, behind whom the great revolutionary general was concealed, and he once more gave it the great generals, behind whom the pipe-clay corporal sheltered himself. There was no doubt that the Red party, i.e., the united democratic party, was bound to celebrate, if not victory, still, great triumphs; that Paris, the army and a great part of the provinces would vote for it. Ledru-Rollin, the leader of the Mountain, was elected by five Departments; no chief of the Party bore off such a victory, no candidate belonging to the true proletarian party. This election reveals to us the secret of the democratic-socialist party.

If, on the one hand, the Mountain, the parliamentary champion of the democratic petty bourgeoisie, was forced to unite with the socialist doctrinaires of the proletariat—the proletariat, forced by the terrible material defeat of June to raise itself up again through intellectual victories and not yet enabled through the development of the remaining classes to seize the revolutionary dictatorship, had to throw itself into the arms of the doctrinaires of its emancipation, the founders of socialist sects—on the other

1 The trial of those who had taken part in the events of May 15, 1848, on the charge of conspiracy against the government. There appeared before the court, which was held in the town of Bourges, representatives of the proletariat and also part of the Mountain. Barbes, Albert, Flotte, Sobrier and Raspail were condemned to exile. The same sentence was passed in their absence on Louis Blanc, Caussidière and others. Blanki was sentenced to ten years’ solitary confinement. In view of his illness it was considered that this term would be equivalent to a life sentence. —Ed.

2 General Bréa, who was in command of part of the troops which suppressed the July rising of the Paris proletariat, was killed by the insurgents on June 25. In connection with this, two of the participants in the rising were executed. —Ed.

3 Louis Blanc and Caussidière were accused of complicity in the movement of May 15 and in the July rising of 1848 and handed over to the jurisdiction of the court. After the July days they both fled the country and the infuriated counter-revolution had to content itself with placarding their portraits on the pillory. —Ed.

4 I.e., Napoleon I. —Ed.
hand, the revolutionary peasants, the army and the provinces ranged themselves behind the Mountain, which thus became the commander in the revolutionary army camp and through the understanding with the Socialists had eliminated every antagonism in the revolutionary party. In the last half of the life of the Constituent Assembly it represented the latter’s revolutionary fervour and buried in oblivion its sins during the Provisional Government, during the Executive Commission, during the June days. In the same measure as the party of the National, in accordance with its half-and-half nature, had allowed itself to be put down by the royalist ministry, the party of the Mountain, which had been brushed aside during the omnipotence of the National, rose and asserted itself as the parliamentary representative of the revolution. In fact, the party of the National had nothing to oppose to the other royalist factions but honours-hunting personalities and idealistic humbug. The party of the Mountain, on the contrary, represented a mass wavering between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, whose material interests demanded democratic institutions. As against the Cavaignacs and the Marrastes, Ledru-Rollin and the Mountain therefore represented the truth of the revolution, and from the consciousness of this important situation they drew greater courage the more the expression of revolutionary energy limited itself to parliamentary attacks, bringing in bills of impeachment, threats, raised voices, thundering speeches, and extremes which were only pushed as far as phrases. The peasants were in about the same position as the petty bourgeoisie; they had more or less the same social demands to put forward. All the middle sections of society, so far as they were driven into the revolutionary movement, were therefore bound to find their revolutionary hero in Ledru-Rollin. Ledru-Rollin was the personage of the democratic petty bourgeoisie. As against the Party of Order, the half conservative, half revolutionary and wholly utopian reformers of this order had first to be pushed to the front.

The party of the National, the Friends of the Constitution quand même,1 the republicains purs et simples were completely defeated in the elections. A tiny minority of them was sent into the Legislative Chamber, their most notorious chiefs vanished from the stage, even Marrast, the editor-in-chief and the Orpheus3 of the honest republic.

On May 29 the Legislative Assembly met; on June 11, the collision of May 8 was renewed and, in the name of the Mountain, Ledru-Rollin brought in a bill of impeachment against the president and the ministry for violation of the constitution, and for the bombardment of Rome. On June 12, the Legislative Assembly rejected the bill of impeachment as the Constituent Assembly had rejected it on May 11, but the proletariat this time drove the Mountain onto the streets, not to a street fight, however, only to a street procession. It is enough to say that the Mountain was at the head of this movement to know that the movement was defeated, and that June 1849 was a caricature, as laughable as it was futile, of June 1848. The great retreat of June 13 was only eclipsed by the still greater battle-report of Changarnier, the great man that the Party of Order improvised. Every social epoch needs its great men, and when it does not find them, it invents them, as Helvétius says.

On December 20 only one half of the constituted bourgeois republic was still in existence, the President; on May 29 it was completed by the other half, the Legislative Assembly. In June 1848, the constituent bourgeois republic, by an unspeakable blow against the proletariat, in June 1849, the constituted bourgeois republic, by an unutterable comedy with the petty bourgeoisie, had inscribed itself in the birth-register of history. June 1849, was the nemesis of June 1848. In June 1849, it was not the workers that were vanquished: it was the petty bourgeoisie, standing between them and the revolution that were felled; June 1849, was not a bloody tragedy between wage labour and capital, but a prison-filling and lamentable play of debtors and creditors. The Party of Order had won, it was all powerful; it had now to show what it was.

1 According to ancient Greek mythology, Orpheus was a musician who could tame wild beasts and even move the trees with his music.—Ed.
May 8 expressly commands the ministers to make the Rome expedition conform with the utmost speed to its original mission; it therefore just as expressly prohibits war on Rome—and Oudinot bombards Rome. Thus Ledru-Rollin called the constitution itself as a witness for the prosecution against Bonaparte and his ministers. At the royalist majority of the National Assembly, he, the tribune of the constitution, hurled the threatening declaration: "The republicans will know how to command respect for the constitution by every means, be it even by the force of arms!" "By the force of arms!" repeated the hundredfold echo of the Mountain. The majority answered with a terrible tumult; the President of the National Assembly called Ledru-Rollin to order; Ledru-Rollin repeated the challenging declaration, and finally laid on the President's table a motion for the impeachment of Bonaparte and his ministers. By 361 votes to 203, the National Assembly resolved to pass on from the bombardment of Rome to the simple order of the day.

Did Ledru-Rollin believe that he could beat the National Assembly by means of the constitution, and the President by means of the National Assembly?

To be sure, the constitution forbade any attack on the liberty of foreign peoples, but what the French army attacked in Rome, was, according to the ministry, not "liberty" but the "despotism of anarchy." Had the Mountain still not comprehended, all experiences in the Constituent Assembly notwithstanding, that the interpretation of the constitution did not belong to those who had made it, but only to those who had accepted it? That the letter must be construed in its living meaning and that the bourgeois meaning was its only living meaning? That Bonaparte and the royalist majority of the National Assembly were the authentic interpreters of the constitution, as the priest is the authentic interpreter of the bible, and the judge the authentic interpreter of the law? Should the National Assembly, fresh from the midst of the general elections, feel itself bound by the testamentary provisions of the dead Constituent Assembly, whose living will an Odilon Barrot had broken? When Ledru-Rollin cited the Constituent
Assembly's resolution of May 8, had he forgotten that the same Constituent Assembly on May 11 had rejected his motion for the impeachment of Bonaparte and the ministers; that it had acquitted the President and the ministers; that it had thus sanctioned the attack on Rome as "constitutional"; that he only lodged an appeal against a judgment already delivered; that he finally appealed from the republican Constituent Assembly to the royalist Legislative Assembly? The constitution itself calls the insurrection to its aid, by summoning, in a special article, every citizen to protect it. Ledru-Rollin based himself on this article. But, at the same time, are not the public powers organised for the defence of the constitution, and does not the violation of the constitution first begin from the moment when one of the public constitutional powers rebels against the other? And the President of the republic, the ministers of the republic and the National Assembly of the republic were in the most harmonious agreement.

What the Mountain attempted on June 11 was "an insurrection within the limits of pure reason," i.e., a purely parliamentary insurrection. The majority of the Assembly, intimidated by the prospect of an armed rising of the popular masses, was, in the persons of Bonaparte and the ministers, to destroy its own power and the significance of its own election. Had not the Constituent Assembly similarly attempted to annul the election of Bonaparte, when it insisted so obstinately on the dismissal of the Barrot-Falloux ministry?

Neither were there lacking from the time of the Convention models for parliamentary insurrections, which had suddenly transformed completely the relation between the majority and the minority—and should the young Mountain not succeed where the old had succeeded?—nor did the relations at the moment seem unfavourable for such an undertaking. The popular unrest had in Paris reached a critically high point; the army, according to its voting at the election, did not seem inclined towards the government; the legislative majority itself was still too young to have consolidated itself and, in addition, it consisted of old gentlemen. If the Mountain were successful in a parliamentary insurrection, then the helm of state fell directly into its hands. The democratic petty bourgeoisie, for its part, wished, as always, for nothing more fervently than to see the battle fought out in the clouds over its head between the departed spirits of parliament. Finally both of them, the democratic petty bourgeoisie and its representatives, the Mountain, through a parliamentary insurrection achieved their great purpose, that of breaking the power of the bourgeoisie, without unleashing the proletariat, or letting it appear otherwise than in perspective; the proletariat would have been used without becoming dangerous.

After the vote of the National Assembly on June 11, a conference took place between some members of the Mountain and delegates of the workers' secret societies. The latter pressed for striking the first blow the same evening. The Mountain decisively rejected this plan. On no account did it want to let the leadership slip out of its hands; its allies were as suspect to it as its antagonists, and rightly so. The memory of June 1848 surged through the ranks of the Paris proletariat more vigorously than ever. Nevertheless it was chained to the alliance with the Mountain. The latter represented the largest part of the Departments; it exaggerated its influence in the army; it had at its disposal the democratic section of the National Guard; it had the moral power of the shop behind it. To begin the revolution at this moment against the will of the Mountain, meant for the proletariat, decimated moreover by cholera and driven out of Paris in considerable numbers by unemployment, to repeat the June days of 1848 uselessly, without the situation which had forced this desperate struggle. The proletarian delegates did the only rational thing. They bound the Mountain to compromise itself, i.e., to come out beyond the confines of the parliamentary struggle in the event of its bill of impeachment being rejected. During the whole of June 13, the proletariat maintained this same sceptically watchful attitude, and awaited a seriously engaged irrevocable mêlée between the democratic National Guard and the army, in order then to plunge into the fight and push the revolution forward beyond the petty-bourgeois aim set for it. In the event of victory the proletarian commune was already formed which would take its place beside the official government. The Parisian workers had learned in the bloody school of June 1848.
On June 12 the Minister Lacrosse himself brought forward in the Legislative Assembly the motion to proceed at once to the discussion of the bill of impeachment. During the night the government made every provision for defence and attack; the majority of the National Assembly was determined to drive out the rebellious minority into the streets; the minority itself could no longer retreat; the die was cast; the bill of impeachment was rejected by 377 votes to 8. The Mountain, which had abstained from voting, rushed muttering into the propaganda halls of the "pacific democracy," into the newspaper offices of the Démocratie pacifique.1

Its withdrawal from the House of Parliament broke its strength as withdrawal from the earth broke the strength of Antaeus,2 her giant son. Samsons in the precincts of the Legislative Assembly, they were only Philistines in the precincts of the "pacific democracy." A long, noisy, rambling debate began. The Mountain was determined to compel respect for the constitution by every means, "only not by force of arms." In this decision it was supported by a manifesto and by a deputation of the "Friends of the Constitution." "Friends of the Constitution," was what the wreckage of the coterie of the National, of the bourgeois-republican party called itself. While six of its remaining parliamentary representatives had voted against, the others in a body voting for, the rejection of the bill of impeachment, while Cavaignac placed his sabre at the disposal of the Party of Order, the larger, extra-parliamentary part of the coterie greedily seized the opportunity to emerge from its position of a political pariah, and to press into the ranks of the democratic party. Did they not appear as the natural shield bearers of this party, which hid itself behind their shield, behind their principles, behind the constitution?

Till break of day the "Mountain" was in labour. It gave birth to "a proclamation to the people," which, on the morning of June 13, occupied a more or less shamedace place in two socialists journals. It declared the President, the ministers, the majority of the Legislative Assembly "outside the constitution" (hors la constitution) and summoned the National Guard, the army and finally the people "to arise." "Long live the constitution!" was the slogan that it put forward, a slogan that signified nothing other than "Down with the revolution!"

In conformity with the constitutional proclamation of the Mountain, there was a so-called peaceful demonstration of the petty bourgeois on June 13, i.e., a street procession from the Château d'Eau through the boulevards, 30,000 strong, mainly National Guards, unarmed and with an admixture of members of the workers' secret sections, moving along with the cry: "Long live the constitution," which was uttered mechanically, ice-coldly and with a bad conscience by the members of the procession itself, and thrown back ironically by the echo of the people that surged along the sidewalks, instead of swelling up like thunder. From the many-voiced song the chest notes were missing. And when the procession swung by the meeting hall of the "Friends of the Constitution" and a hired herald of the constitution appeared on the house-top, violently cleaving the air with his claquer 3 hat and from tremendous lungs letting the catch-cry "Long live the constitution" fall like hail on the heads of the pilgrims, they seemed overcome themselves for a moment by the comedy of the situation. It is well known how the procession, having arrived at the entrance of the Rue de la Paix, was received in the boulevards by the dragons and riflemen of Changarnier in an altogether parliamentary way, how in a trice it scattered in all directions and how it threw behind it a few shouts of "to arms" only in order that the parliamentary call to arms of June 11 might be fulfilled.

The majorit of the Mountain assembled in the Rue du Hazard dispersed when this violent disruption of the peaceful procession, the muffled rumours of murder of unarmed citizens on the boulevards and the growing tumult in the street seemed to herald the approach of a rising. Ledru-Rollin at the head of a small band of deputies saved the honour of the Mountain. Under the pro-

---

1 The organ of the Fourierists, published by Considerant.—Ed.
2 According to ancient Greek mythology, a giant who derived his strength from contact with the earth; he was defeated by Hercules who lifted him in the air.—Ed.
3 One who is paid to clap in the theatre.—Ed.
tection of the Paris Artillery which had assembled in the Palais National, they betook themselves to the Conservatory des Arts et Métiers, where the fifth and sixth legions of the National Guard were to arrive. But the Montagnards waited in vain for the fifth and sixth legions; these discreet National Guards left their representatives in the lurch; the Paris Artillery itself prevented the people from throwing up barricades; a chaotic disorder made any decision impossible; the troops of the line advanced with fixed bayonets; some of the representatives were taken prisoner, while others escaped. Thus ended June 13.

If June 23, 1849, was the insurrection of the revolutionary proletariat, June 13, 1849, was the insurrection of the democratic petty bourgeoisie, each of these two insurrections being the classically pure expression of the class which had made it.

Only in Lyons did it come to an obstinate, bloody conflict. Here, where the industrial bourgeoisie and the industrial proletariat stand directly opposed to one another, where the workers' movement is not, as in Paris, included in and determined by the general movement, June 13, in its reactions, lost its original character. Where it broke out elsewhere in the provinces it did not kindle fire—a cold lightning flash.

June 13 closes the first period of the Constitutional Republic, which had attained its normal span with the meeting of the Legislative Assembly in May. The whole period of this prologue is filled with noisy struggle between the Party of Order and the Mountain, between the bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie, which strove in vain against the consolidation of the bourgeois republic, for which it had itself continuously conspired in the Provisional Government and in the Executive Commission, and for which, during the June days, it had fought fanatically against the proletariat. The 13th of June breaks its resistance and makes the legislative dictatorship of the united royalist a fait accompli. From this moment the National Assembly is only a committee of public safety of the Party of Order.

Paris had put the President, the ministers and the majority of the National Assembly in a "state of impeachment"; they put

Paris in a "state of siege". The Mountain had declared the majority of the Legislative Assembly "outside the constitution"; for violation of the constitution the majority handed over the Mountain to the haute cour ¹ and proscribed everything in it that still had vital force. It was decimated to a rump without head or heart. The minority had gone as far as to attempt a parliamentary insurrection; the majority elevated its parliamentary despotism to law. It decreed new standing orders, which annihilate the freedom of the tribune and authorise the President of the National Assembly to punish the representatives, for infringement of the standing orders, with censorship, with fines, with withdrawal of the indemnity moneys, with temporary expulsion, with incarceration. Over the rump of the Mountain it hung the whip instead of the sword. The remainder of the deputies of the Mountain owed it to their honour to make a mass exit. By such an act the dissolution of the Party of Order would have been hastened. It had to break up into its original component parts from the moment when not even the appearance of an opposition held it together any longer.

Simultaneously with their parliamentary power, the democratic petty bourgeoisie were robbed of their armed power through the dissolution of the Paris Artillery and the 8th, 9th and 12th legions of the National Guard. On the other hand, the legion of high finance, which had raided the printshops of Boulé and Roux on June 13, destroyed the presses, played havoc with the offices of the republican journals and arbitrarily arrested editors, composers, printers, despatch clerks and errand boys, received the most stirring encouragement from the tribune of the National Assembly. All over France the dissolution of the National Guards suspected of republicanism was repeated.

A new press law, a new law of association, a new law on the state of siege, the prisons of Paris overflowing, the political fugitives driven out, all the journals that go beyond the limits of the National suspended, Lyons and the five Departments surround-

¹ High court.—Ed.
ing it surrendered to the brutal chicanery of military despotism, the parquets 1 ubiquitous and the army of officials so often purged, purged once more—these were the inevitable, the constantly recurring commonplaces of victorious reaction, only worth mentioning after the massacres and the deportations of June, because this time they were directed not only against Paris, but also against the Departments, not only against the proletariat, but, above all, against the middle classes.

The repressive laws, by which the declaration of a state of siege was left to the discretion of the government, the press still more firmly muzzled and the right of association annihilated, absorbed the whole of the legislative activity of the National Assembly, during the months of June, July and August.

Nevertheless, this epoch is characterised not by the exploitation of victory in fact, but in principle; not by the resolutions of the National Assembly, but by the grounds advanced for these resolutions; not by the thing, but by the phrase; not by the phrase but by the accent and the gesture which enliven the phrase. The unreserved, unashamed expression of royalist sentiments, the contemptuously aristocratic insults to the republic, the coquettishly frivolous babbling of the restoration aims, in a word, the boastful violation of republican decorum, give its peculiar tone and colour to this period. Long live the constitution! was the battle-cry of the vanquished of June 13. The victors were therefore absolved from the hypocrisy of constitutional, i.e., republican, speech. The counter-revolution conquered in Hungary, Italy and Germany, and it believed that the restoration was already at the gates of France. Among the masters of ceremonies of the factions of order, there ensued a real competition to document their royalism in the Moniteur, and to confess, repent and beg pardon before God and man for liberal sins per chance committed by them under the republic. No day passed without the February Revolution being declared a public misfortune from the tribune of the National Assembly, without some Legitimist provincial cabbage-Junker solemnly stating that he had never recognised the republic, without

1 Office of the public prosecutor.—Ed.

one of the cowardly deserters of and traitors to the July monarchy relating the belated deeds of heroism in the performance of which only the philanthropy of Louis Philippe or other misunderstandings had hindered him. What was admirable in the February days was not the magnanimity of the victorious people, but the self-sacrifice and moderation of the royalists, who had allowed it to be victorious. One representative of the people proposed to divert part of the money destined for the relief of those wounded in February to the Municipal Guards, who alone in those days had deserved well of the fatherland. Another wanted to have an equestrian statue decreed to the Duke of Orleans in the Place de Carrousel. Thiers called the constitution a dirty piece of paper. There appeared in succession on the tribune Orleanists, to repent of their conspiracy against the legitimate monarchy; Legitimists, who reproached themselves with having hastened the overthrow of monarchy in general by resisting the illegitimate monarchy; Thiers, who repented of having intrigued against Molé; Molé, who repented of having intrigued against Guizot; Barrot, who repented of having intrigued against all three. The cry “Long live the Social-Democratic republic!” was declared unconstitutional: the cry “Long live the republic!” was prosecuted as social-democratic. On the anniversary of the Battle of Waterloo, a deputy declared: “I fear an invasion of the Prussians less than the entry of the revolutionary refugees into France.” To the complaints about the terrorism which was organised in Lyons and in the neighbouring Departments, Baraguay d’Hilliers answered: “I prefer the White terror to the Red terror.” (J’aime mieux la terreur blanche que la terreur rouge.) And the Assembly applauded frantically every time that an epigram against the republic, against the revolution, against the constitution, for the monarchy or for the Holy Alliance fell from the lips of its orators. Every infringement of the minutest republican formalities, for example, addressing the representatives as citoyens, filled the knights of order with enthusiasm.

The by-election in Paris on July 8, held under the influence of the state of siege and of the abstention of a great part of the proletariat from the ballot box, the taking of Rome by the
French army, the entry of the red eminences into Rome and, in their train, the inquisition and monkish terrorism, added fresh victories to the victory of June and increased the intoxication of the Party of Order.

Finally, in the middle of August, half with the intention of attending the Department Councils just assembled, half through exhaustion from the tendentious orgy of many months, the royalists decreed the prorogation of the National Assembly for two months. With transparent irony, they left behind a commission of twenty-five representatives, the cream of the Legitimists and the Orleanists, a Molé and a Changarnier, as proxies for the National Assembly and as guardians of the republic. The irony was more profound than they suspected. They, condemned by history to help to overthrow the monarchy they loved, were destined by her to conserve the republic they hated.

The second period in the life of the constitutional republic, its period of royalist boorishness, closes with the prorogation of the Legislative Assembly.

The state of siege in Paris was again raised, the activities of the press had again begun. During the suspension of the Social-Democratic papers, during the period of repressive legislation and royalist blusters, the Siècle, the old literary representative of the monarchist-constitutional, petty bourgeois, republicanised itself; the Presse, the old literary expression of the bourgeois reformers, democratised itself; while the National, the old classic organ of the republican bourgeois, socialised itself.

The secret societies grew in extent and intensity to the degree that the public clubs became impossible. The industrial associations of workers, tolerated as purely trade companies, while of no account economically, became politically so many means of cementing the proletariat. June 13 had struck off the official heads of the different semi-revolutionary parties; the masses that remained won their own head. The knights of order had intimidated the Red republic by prophecies of terror; the base excesses, the hyperborean atrocities of the victorious counter-revolution in Hungary,

---
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in Baden and in Rome washed the “Red republic” white. And the discontented intermediate classes of French society began to prefer the promises of the Red republic with its problematic terrors to the terrors of the red monarchy with its actual hopelessness. No Socialist in France did more actual revolutionary propaganda than Haynau. A chaque capacité selon ses œuvres! 2

In the meantime Louis Bonaparte exploited the recess of the National Assembly by making princely tours of the provinces, the most hot-blooded Legitimists made pilgrimages to Ems, to the grandchild of the saintly Louis, and the mass of the popular representatives on the side of order intrigued in the Department Councils, which had just met. It was necessary to make them pronounce what the majority of the National Assembly did not yet dare to pronounce, an urgent motion for immediate revision of the constitution. According to the constitution, the constitution could only be revised in 1852 by a National Assembly called together expressly for this purpose. If, however, the majority of the Department Councils expressed themselves in this sense, was not the National Assembly bound to sacrifice the virginity of the constitution to the voice of France? The National Assembly entertained the same hopes in regard to these provincial assemblies as the nuns in Voltaire’s Henriade entertained in regard to the pandurs. 3 But, some exceptions apart, the Potiphar of the National Assembly had to deal with just so many Josephs of the provinces. The vast majority did not want to understand the importunate insinuation. The revision of the constitution was frustrated by the very instruments by which it was to have been called into being, by the votes of the Department Councils. The voice of France, and indeed of bourgeois France, had spoken and had spoken against revision.

---

1 Haynau, An Austrian general, notorious for his ferocious punishment of the revolutionaries in the suppression of the revolution in Italy (1849) and in Hungary (1849). The “fame” of his cruelty and bloodthirstiness in the struggle against the revolution spread so far that, on the occasion of a visit to England, he was seized and flogged by the workers of a London brewery.—Ed.

2 To each talent according to its work.—Ed.

3 Hungarian foot soldiers in the Austrian service, so called from Pan- dur, a village in Hungary where they were first raised.—Ed.
At the beginning of October the Legislative Assembly met once more—*tandum mutatus ab illo*.

Its lineaments were completely changed. The unexpected rejection of revision on the part of the Department Councils had put it back within the limits of the constitution and indicated the limits of its term of life. The Orleanists had become mistrustful because of the pilgrimages of the Legitimists to Ems; the Legitimists had grown suspicious on account of the negotiations of the Orleanists with London; the journals of the two factions had fanned the fire and weighed the reciprocal claims of their pretenders. Orleanists and Legitimists grumbled in unison concerning the machinations of the Bonapartists, which showed themselves in the princely tours, in the more or less obvious emancipatory attempts of the President, in the presumptuous language of the Bonapartist newspapers; Louis Bonaparte grumbled concerning the National Assembly, which found only the Legitimist-Orleanist conspiracy legitimate, concerning the ministry, which betrayed him continually to this National Assembly. Finally, the ministry itself divided on the Roman policy and on the *income tax* proposed by the Minister Passy, and decried as socialistic by the conservatives.

One of the first bills of the Barrot ministry in the re-assembled Legislative Assembly was a demand for a credit of 300,000 francs for the payment of a widow’s pension to the *Duchess of Orleans*. The National Assembly granted it and added to the list of debts of the French nation a sum of seven million francs. Thus while Louis Philippe continued to play with success the role of the *pauvre honteux*, the ashamed beggar, the ministry neither dared to move an increase of salary for Bonaparte nor did the Assembly appear inclined to grant it. And Louis Bonaparte, as ever, vacillated in the dilemma: *Aut Casar aut Clithy?* The minister’s second demand for a credit, one of nine mil-

---

1 How greatly changed from the former.—Ed.

2 Ems was the place of residence of Count Chambord (Henry V), Bourbon pretender to the French throne. His rival of the Orleans dynasty (Louis Philippe), who had fled to England after the February revolution, lived in Claremont near London. Thus Ems and Claremont were the centres of royalist intrigue.

3 Either Casar or Clithy!—Ed.

---

1 lion francs for the costs of the *Rome* expedition, increased the tension between Bonaparte, on the one hand, and the ministers and the National Assembly, on the other. Louis Bonaparte had inserted a letter to his orderly officer Edgar Ney in the *Moniteur*, in which he bound the papist government to constitutional guarantees. The Pope, for his part, had published an address, *motu proprio*, in which he rejected any limitation of his restored rule, Bonaparte’s letter, with considered indiscretion, raised the curtain of his cabinet, in order to expose himself to the eyes of the gallery as a benevolent genius who was, however, misunderstood and shackled in his own house. It was not the first time that he had coquetted with the “timid flights of a free soul.” Thiers, the reporter of the commission, completely ignored Bonaparte’s flight and contented himself with translating the papist allocution into French. It was not the ministry, but Victor Hugo that sought to save the President through an order of the day in which the National Assembly was to express its agreement with Napoleon’s letter. *Allons donc! Allons donc!* With this disrespectful, frivolous interjection the majority buried Hugo’s motion. The policy of the President? The letter of the President? The President himself? *Allons donc! Allons donc!* Who the devil takes Monsieur Bonaparte au sérieux? Do you believe, Monsieur Victor Hugo, that we believe you, that you believe in the President? *Allons donc! Allons donc!*

Finally, the breach between Bonaparte and the National Assembly was hastened by the discussion on the recall of the Orleanists and the Bourbon. In default of the ministry, the cousin of the President, the son of the ex-king of Westphalia, had put forward this motion, which had no other purpose than to push the Legitimist and the Orleanist pretenders down to the same level, or rather a lower level than the Bonapartist pretender, who at least stood in fact at the head of the state.

Napoleon Bonaparte was disrespectful enough to make the recall of the expelled royal families and the amnesty of the
June insurgents parts of one and the same motion. The indignation of the majority compelled him immediately to apologise for this sacrilegious joining of the holy and the impious, of the royal races and the proletarian brood, of the fixed stars of society and of its swamp lights, and to assign to each of the two motions the position proper to it. The majority energetically rejected the recall of the royal family, and Berryer, the Demosthenes 1 of the Legitimists, left no doubt about the meaning of the vote. The civic degradation of the pretenders, that is what is intended! It is desired to rob them of their halo, of the last majesty that is left to them, the majesty of exile! What, cried Berryer, would be thought of him among the pretenders who, forgetting his august origin, came here to live as a simple private individual? It could not have been more clearly intimated to Louis Bonaparte that he had not gained the day by his presence, that if the royalists in coalition needed him here in France as a neutral person in the President’s chair, the serious pretenders to the throne had to be kept out of profane sight by the fog of exile.

On November 1, Louis Bonaparte answered the Legislative Assembly with a message which in pretty sharp words announced the dismissal of the Barrot ministry and the formation of a new ministry. The Barrot-Falloux ministry was the ministry of the royalist coalition, the d’Hautpoul ministry was the ministry of Bonaparte, the organ of the President as against the Legislative Assembly, the ministry of the clerks.

Bonaparte was no longer the merely neutral man of December 10, 1848. Possession of the executive power had grouped a number of interests around him, the struggle with anarchy forced the Party of Order even to increase his influence, and if he was no longer popular, the Party of Order was unpopular. Could he not hope to compel the Orleanists and the Legitimists, through their rivalry as well as through the necessity of some sort of monarchist restoration, to recognise the neutral President?

From November 1, 1849, dates the third period in the life of the constitutional republic, a period which closes with March 10, 1850. Not only does the regular play, so much admired by Guizot, of the constitutional institutions now begin, but the quarrel between executive and legislative power. As against the hankering for restoration on the part of the united Orleanists and Legitimists, Bonaparte represents the title of his actual power, the republic; as against the hankering for restoration on the part of Bonaparte, the Party of Order represents the title of its common rule, the republic; as against the Orleanists, the Legitimists and as against the Legitimists, the Orleanists represent the status quo, the republic. All these factions of the Party of Order, each of which has its own king and its own restoration in petto, 2 mutually assert, as against their rivals’ desires for usurpation and elevation, the common rule of the bourgeoisie, the form in which the particular claims remain neutralised and reserved—the republic.

Just as Kant makes the republic, as the only rational form of state, a postulate of practical reason whose realisation is never attained, but whose attainment must always be striven for and mentally adhered to as the goal, so these royalists make the monarchy.

Thus the constitutional republic had gone forth from the hands of the bourgeois republicans as a hollow ideological formula, to a form full of content and life in the hands of the royalists in coalition. And Thiers spoke more truly than he suspected, when he said: “We, the royalists, are the true pillars of the constitutional republic.”

The overthrow of the ministry of the coalition, and the appearance of the ministry of the clerks has a second significance. Its finance minister was Fould. Fould as finance minister signifies the official surrender of French national wealth to the Bourse, the management of the state’s property by the Bourse and in the interest of the Bourse. With the nomination of Fould, the financial aristocracy announced its restoration in the Moniteur. This restoration necessarily supplemented the other restorations, which form just so many links in the chain of the constitutional republic.

Louis Philippe had never dared to make a real loup-cervier.

1 Demosthenes (383-22 B.C.). A brilliant orator and politician of Athens, famous for his “Philippics” directed against Philip of Macedon.—Ed.

2 In reserve.—Ed.
(Bourse wolf) finance minister. Just as his monarchy was the ideal name for the rule of the high bourgeoisie, in his ministries the privileged interests had to bear ideologically neutral names. The bourgeoisie republic everywhere pushed into the forefront what the different monarchies, Legitimist as well as Orleans, kept concealed in the background. It made earthly what they had made heavenly. In place of the names of the saints, it put the bourgeois proper names of the ruling class interests.

Our whole exposition has shown how the republic, from the first day of its existence, did not overthrow the finance aristocracy, but consolidated it. But the concessions that were made to it were a fate to which submission was made without the desire to bring it about. With Foulard, the initiative in the government returned to the finance aristocracy.

The question will be asked how the bourgeoisie in coalition could bear and suffer the rule of finance, which under Louis Philippe depended on the exclusion or subordination of the remaining bourgeois factions.

The answer is simple.

First of all, the finance aristocracy itself forms a weighty, authoritative part of the royalist coalition, whose common governmental power is the republic. Are not the spokesmen and leading lights among the Orleansists the old confederates and accomplices of the finance aristocracy? Is it not itself the golden phalanx of Orleans? As far as the Legitimists are concerned, in practice they had already participated in all the orgies of the Bourse, mine and railway speculations under Louis Philippe. In general, the combination of large landed property with high finance is a normal fact. Proof: England; proof: even Austria.

In a country like France, where the volume of national production stands at a disproportionately lower level than the amount of the national debt, where the state revenue forms the most important subject of speculation and the Bourse the chief market for the investment of capital that wants to turn itself to account in an unproductive way—in such a country a countless number of people of all bourgeois or semi-bourgeois classes must participate in the state debt, in the Bourse gamblings, in finance. Do not all these subaltern participants find their natural mainsprings and commanders in the faction which represents this interest in its vastest outlines, which represents it as a whole?

By what is the reversion of the state property to high finance conditioned? By the constantly growing indebtedness of the state. And the indebtedness of the state? By the constant excess of its expenditure over its income, a disproportion which is simultaneously the cause and effect of the system of state loans.

In order to escape from this indebtedness, the state must either restrict its expenditure, i.e., simplify and curtail the government organism, govern as little as possible, employ as small a personnel as possible, enter as little into relations with bourgeois society as possible. This path was impossible for the Party of Order, whose means of repression, whose official interference for reasons of state and whose universal presence through organs of state were bound to increase in the same measure as its rule and the conditions for existence of its class were threatened from more numerous sides. The gendarmerie could not be reduced in the same measure as attacks on persons and property increase.

Or the state must seek to elude the debts and produce an immediate but transitory balance in its budget, by putting extraordinary taxes on the shoulders of the wealthiest classes. In order to withdraw the national wealth from exploitation by the Bourse, was the Party of Order to sacrifice its own wealth on the altar of the fatherland? Pas si bête! 1

Therefore, without a complete revolution in the French state, no revolution in the French state's budget. Along with this state budget necessarily goes state indebtedness, and with state indebtedness necessarily goes the rule of the trade in state debts, of the state creditors, the bankers, the money dealers and the wolves of the Bourse. Only a fraction of the Party of Order was directly concerned in the overthrow of the finance aristocracy—the manufacturers. We are not speaking of the middle, of the smaller industrials; we are speaking of the rulers of the factory interest.

1 Not so stupid.—Ed.
who had formed the broad basis of the dynastic opposition under Louis Philippe. Their interest is indubitably reduction of the costs of production, therefore reduction of the taxes, which enter into production, therefore reduction of the state debts, the interest on which enters into the taxes, therefore the overthrow of the finance aristocracy.

In England—and the largest French manufacturers are petty bourgeois as against their English rivals—we really find the manufacturers, a Cobden, a Bright, at the head of the crusade against the bank and the stock exchange aristocracy. Why not in France? In England industry rules; in France, agriculture. In England industry requires free trade; in France, protection, national monopoly besides other monopolies. French industry does not dominate French production; the French industrialists, therefore, do not dominate the French bourgeoisie. In order to put through their interest against the remaining fractions of the bourgeoisie, they cannot, like the English, take the lead of the movement and simultaneously push their class interest to the fore; they must follow in the train of the revolution, and serve interests which are opposed to the collective interests of their class. In February they had misunderstood their position; February sharpened their wits. And who is more directly threatened by the workers than the employer, the industrial capitalist? The manufacturer, therefore, of necessity became in France the most fanatical member of the Party of Order. The reduction of this profit by finance, what is that compared with the abolition of profit by the proletariat?

In France, the petty bourgeoisie does what normally the industrial bourgeoisie would have to do; the worker does what normally would be the task of the petty bourgeoisie; and the task of the worker, who solves that? No one. It is not solved in France; it is proclaimed in France. It is not solved anywhere within the national walls; the class war within French society turns into a world war, in which the nations confront one another. The solution begins only at the moment when, through the world war, the proletariat is pushed to the head of the people that dominates the world market, to the head of England. The revolution, which finds here, not its end, but its organisational beginning, is no short-lived revolution. The present generation is like the Jews, whom Moses led through the wilderness. It has not only a new world to conquer, it must go under, in order to make room for the men who are fit for a new world.

Let us return to Fould.

On November 14, 1849, Fould mounted the tribune of the National Assembly and expounded his system of finance: Apologia for the old system of taxes! Retention of the wine tax! Repeal of Passy’s income tax!

Passy, too, was no revolutionary; he was an old minister of Louis Philippe’s. He belonged to the puritans of the Dufaure brand and to the most intimate confidants of Teste,1 the scapegoat of the July monarchy. Passy, too, had praised the old tax system and recommended the retention of the wine tax; but he had, at the same time, torn the veil from the state deficit. He had declared the necessity for a new tax, the income tax, if it were desired to avoid the bankruptcy of the state. Fould, who recommended state bankruptcy to Ledru-Rollin, recommended the state deficit to the Legislative Assembly. He promised economies, the secret of which later revealed itself in that, for example, the expenditure diminished by sixty millions, while the floating debt increased by two hundred millions—conjuring tricks in the grouping of figures, in the drawing up of accounts rendered, which all finally resulted in new loans.

Alongside the other jealous bourgeois factions, the finance aristocracy under Fould naturally did not act in so shamelessly corrupt a manner as under Louis Philippe. But the system remained the same, constant increase in the debts and masking of the deficit. And, in time, the old Bourse swindling came out more openly. Proof: the law concerning the Avignon railway; the

---

1 On July 8, 1947, before the Chamber of Peers in Paris, the trial of Parmentier and General Cubières began for bribery of officials with a view to obtaining a salt works concession and of the then Minister for Public Works, Teste, for accepting such money bribes. The latter, during the trial, attempted to commit suicide. All were sentenced to pay heavy fines, Teste, in addition, to serve three years’ imprisonment. [Note by F. Engels.]
mysterious fluctuations in government stocks, for a brief space the topic of the hour throughout Paris; finally, the ill-starred speculations of Fould and Bonaparte on the elections of March 10.

With the official restoration of the finance aristocracy, the French people had soon again to stand before a February 24.

The Constituent Assembly, in an attack of misanthropy against its heir, had abolished the wine tax for the year of the Lord, 1850. With the abolition of old taxes, new debts could not be paid. Creton, a cretin of the Party of Order, before the proroguing of the Legislative Assembly, already moved the retention of the wine tax. Fould took up this motion in the name of the Bonapartist ministry and, on December 20, 1849, the anniversary of the proclamation of Bonaparte, the National Assembly decreed the restoration of the wine tax.

The sponsor of this restoration was not a financier; it was the Jesuit chief, Montalembert. His argument was strikingly simple: Taxation is the maternal breast on which the government is suckled. The government is the instrument of repression; it is the organ of authority; it is the army; it is the police; it is the officials, the judges, the ministers; it is the priests. The attack on taxation is the attack of the anarchists on the sentinels of order, who safeguard the material and spiritual production of bourgeois society from the inroads of the proletarian vandals. Taxation is the fifth god, side by side with property, the family, order and religion. And the wine tax is incontestably taxation and, moreover, not vulgar, but traditional, monarchical disposed, respectable taxation. Vive l'impôt des boissons! Three cheers and one cheer more!  

The French peasant, when he paints the devil on the wall, paints him in the guise of the tax collector. From the moment when Montalembert elevated taxation to a god, the peasant became godless, atheist, and threw himself into the arms of the devil, socialism. The religion of order had lost him; the Jesuits had lost him; Bonaparte had lost him. December 20, 1849, had irrevocably compromised December 20, 1848. The "nephew of

1 Long live the tax on drinks.—Ed.
2 In English in the original text.—Ed.

his uncle" was not the first of his family whom the wine tax defeated, this tax which, in the expression of Montalembert, heralds the revolutionary storm. The real, the great Napoleon declared at St. Helena that the reintroduction of the wine tax had contributed more to his downfall than all else, since it had alienated from him the peasants of Southern France. Already the favourite object of the people's hate under Louis XIV (see the writings of Boisguillebert and Vauban), abolished by the first revolution, it was reintroduced by Napoleon in a modified form in 1808. When the restoration entered France, there trotted before it not only the Cossacks, but also the promises to abolish the wine tax. The gentilhommerie naturally did not need to keep its word to the gens taillable à merci et miséricorde. The year 1830 promised the abolition of the wine tax. It was not its way to do what it said or say what it did. 1848 promised the abolition of the wine tax as it promised everything. Finally, the Constituent Assembly, which promised nothing, made, as mentioned, a testamentary provision whereby the wine tax was to disappear on January 1, 1850. And just ten days before January 1, 1850, the Legislative Assembly introduced it once more, so that the French people perpetually pursued it and when it had thrown it out the door, saw it come in again through the window.

The popular hatred of the wine tax is explained by the fact that it unites in itself all the hatefulness of the French system of taxation. The mode of its collection is hateful, the mode of its distribution aristocratic, for the rates of taxation are the same for the commonest as for the costliest wines; it increases therefore, in geometrical progression as the wealth of the consumers decreases, an inverted progressive tax. It is accordingly a direct provocation to the poisoning of the working classes as a premium on adulterated and spurious wines. It lessens consumption, since it sets up octrois 2 before the gates of all towns of over 4,000 inhabitants and transforms each town into a foreign country with protective duties against French wine. The big wine merchants, but still more the small ones, the marchands de vins, the keepers

1 People deprived of rights.—Ed.
2 Local customs offices, at the gates of towns.—Ed.
of wine-shops, whose living directly depends on the consumption of wine, are so many declared enemies of the wine tax. And finally by lessening the consumption the wine tax cuts away the market from production. While it renders the urban workers incapable of paying for wines, it renders the wine growers incapable of selling it. And France has a wine growing population of about twelve millions. One can, therefore, understand the hate of the people in general, one can, in particular, understand the fanaticism of the peasants against the wine tax. And, in addition, they saw in its restoration no isolated, more or less accidental event. The peasants have a kind of historical tradition of their own, which is handed down from father to son, and in this historical school it is muttered that every government, as long as it wants to dupe the peasants, promises the abolition of the wine tax, and as soon as it has duped the peasants, retains or reintroduces the wine tax. In the wine tax the peasant tests the bouquet of the government, its tendency. The restoration of the wine tax on December 20 meant: Louis Bonaparte is like the others; but he was not like the others; he was a peasant discovery, and in the petitions carrying millions of signatures against the wine tax they took back the votes that they had given a year before to the "nephew of his uncle."

The country folk—over two-thirds of the total French population—consist for the most part of so-called free landed proprietors. The first generation, gratuitously freed by the revolution of 1789 from its feudal burdens, had paid no price for the soil. But the following generations paid, under the form of the price of land, what their semi-serf forefathers had paid in the form of rent, tithe, corvée, etc. The more, on the one hand, the population grew and the more, on the other hand, the division of the soil increased—so much the higher became the price of the holdings, for the extent of the demand for them increased with their smallness. But in proportion as the price which the peasant paid for his holding rose, whether he bought it directly or whether he received it as capital from his co-heirs,

in this same proportion the indebtedness of the peasant, i.e., the mortgage, necessarily rose. The title to the debt encumbering the land is termed a mortgage, a pawn ticket in respect of the land. Just as privileges accumulated on the mediaval estate, mortgages accumulate on the modern tiny holding. On the other hand: under the system of fragmentation of holdings the earth is purely an instrument of production for its proprietors. Now in the same measure as land is divided its fruitfulness diminishes. The application of machinery to the land, the division of labour, the ample means of improving the soil, such as cutting drainage and irrigation channels and the like, become more and more impossible, while the unproductive costs of cultivation increase in the same proportion as the division of the instrument of production itself. All this, apart from whether the possessor of the lot possesses capital or not. But the more the division increases, so much the more does the holding with its most utterly wretched inventory form the entire capital of the small peasant, so much the more does investment of capital in the land diminish, so much the more does the cotter lack land, money and education for making use of the progress in agriculture, and so much the more does the cultivation of the soil retrogress. Finally, the net proceeds diminish in the same proportion as the gross consumption increases, when the whole family of the peasant is kept back from other occupations through its holding and yet is not enabled to live by it.

In the measure, therefore, that the population and, with it, the division of the land increases, in this same measure the instrument of production, the soil, becomes dearer and its fruitfulness decreases, in this same measure agriculture declines and the peasant becomes loaded with debt. And what was the effect becomes, for its part, the cause. Each generation leaves behind another more deeply in debt; each new generation begins under more unfavourable and more aggravating conditions; mortgaging begets mortgaging, and when it becomes impossible for the peasant to offer his lot as security for new debts, i.e., to encumber it with new mortgages, he falls a victim to usury, and so much the more huge do the usurious sums of interest become.

1 Compulsory unpaid labour of serfs rendered to feudal lords.—Ed.
Thus it came about that the French peasant, in the form of interest on the mortgages encumbering the soil and in the form of interest on the advances made by the usurer without mortgages, cedes to the capitalist not only ground rent, not only the industrial profit, in a word, not only the whole net profit, but even a part of the wages, and that therefore he has sunk to the level of the Irish tenant farmer—all under the pretence of being a private proprietor.

This process was accelerated in France by the ever growing burden of taxes, by legal expenses called forth in part directly by the formalities themselves, with which French legislation encumbers landed property, in part by the innumerable conflicts over holdings everywhere bounding and crossing each other, and in part by the passion for litigation of the peasants, whose enjoyment of property is limited to the fanatical assertion of their fancied property, of their property rights.

According to a statistical statement of 1840 the gross product of French land amounted to 5,237,178,000 francs. Of this, the costs of cultivation come to 3,552,000,000 francs, including the consumption by the persons working. There remains a net product of 1,685,178,000 francs, from which 550,000,000 have to be deducted for interest on mortgages, 100,000,000 for law officials, 350,000,000 for taxes and 107,000,000 for registration money, stamp money, mortgage fees, etc. There is left one-third of the net product or 533,000,000; when distributed over the population, not 25 francs per head net product. Naturally neither usury outside of mortgage nor the expenses for lawyers, etc., are included in this calculation.

The condition of the French peasants, when the republic had added new burdens to their old ones, can be understood. It can be seen that their exploitation differs only in form from the exploitation of the industrial proletariat. The exploiter is the same: capital. The individual capitalists exploit the individual peasants through mortgages and usury; the capitalist class exploits the peasant class through the state taxes. The peasant's title to property is the talisman by which capital captivated him hitherto, the pretext under which it set him against the indus-

trial proletariat. Only the fall of capital can raise the peasant; only an anti-capitalist, a proletarian government can break his economic misery, his social degradation. The constitutional republic, that is the dictatorship of his united exploiters; the Social-Democratic, the Red republic, that is the dictatorship of his allies. And the scale rises or falls, according to the votes that the peasant casts into the ballot box. He himself must decide his fate—so spoke the Socialist in pamphlets, almanacs, calendars and leaflets of all kinds. This language became more understandable to him through the counter-writings of the Party of Order, which, for its part, turned to him and by gross exaggeration, by its brutal conception and representation of the intentions and ideas of the Socialists, struck the true peasant note and exceedingly stimulated his lust after forbidden fruit. But most understandable was the language of the actual experiences that the peasant class had from the use of the suffrage, and of the disillusionments overwhelming him, blow upon blow, in revolution hasty. Revolutions are the locomotives of history.

The gradual revolutionising of the peasants was manifested by various symptoms. It was already shown in the elections to the Legislative Assembly; it was shown in the state of siege in the five Departments bordering Lyons; it was shown a few months after June 13 in the election of a Montagnard in place of the former president of the Chambre introuvable by the Department of the Gironde; it was shown on December 20, 1849, in the election of a Red in place of a deceased Legitimist deputy in the Department of Gard, that landed land of the Legitimists, the scene of the most frightful infamies committed against the republicans of 1794 and 1795 and the centre of the terreur blanche in 1815, where Liberals and Protestants were publically murdered. This revolutionising of the most stationary class is most clearly evident since the reintroduction of the wine tax. The governmental measures and the laws of January and February, 1850, are directed

---

1 This is the name given by history to the fanatically ultra-royalist and reactionary Chamber of Deputies elected immediately after the second overthrow of Napoleon in 1815. [Note by F. Engels.]
2 White terror.—Ed.
almost exclusively against the Departments and the peasants. The most striking proof of their progress.

The circular of Hautpoul, by which the gendarme was appointed inquisitor of the prefect, of the sub-prefect and, above all, of the mayor, and by which espionage was organised even in the hidden corners of the remotest village communes; the law against the school teachers, by which they, the men of talent, the spokesmen, the educators and interpreters of the peasant class were subjected to the arbitrary power of the prefect, they, the proletarians of the learned class, were chased like hunted beasts from one commune to another; the proposed law against the mayors, by which the Damocles sword of dismissal hung over their heads, and they, the presidents of the peasant communes, were every moment confronted by the President of the republic and the Party of Order; the ordinance which transformed the 17 military divisions of France into 4 pashalics and forced the barracks and the bivouac on the French as the national salons; the education law by which the Party of Order proclaimed the ignorance and the forcible stupification of France as the condition of its own life under the regime of universal suffrage—what were all these laws and measures? Desperate attempts to reconquer the Departments and the peasants of the Departments for the Party of Order.

Regarded as repression, wretched methods that wrung the neck of their own purpose. The big measures, like the retention of the wine tax, of the 45 centsimes tax, the scornful rejection of the peasant petitions for the repayment of the milliard, etc., all these legislative thunderbolts struck the peasant class only once, whole-

The law was promulgated on December 13, 1849. On the basis of this law, teachers could be arbitrarily dismissed by the prefects and subjected to disciplinary punishment. — *Ed.*

The decree on the organisation of military command by territorial areas was issued on February 15. The districts were divided into four areas which Marx compares with the pashalics ruled by Turkish pashas under governors general whose authority was marked by unrestricted supremacy of the military command. — *Ed.*

The education law adopted by the National Assembly on March 16, 1850, put education into the hands of the clergy and Jesuits. — *Ed.*

sale, from the centre; the laws and measures instanced made the attack and the resistance the common topic of the day in every hut; they inoculated every village with revolution; they localised and peasantised the revolution.

On the other hand, did not these proposals of Bonaparte and their acceptance by the National Assembly prove the unity of the two powers of the constitutional republic, so far as it is a question of repression of anarchy, i.e., of all the classes that rise against the bourgeois dictatorship? Had not Soulouque, directly after his sharp message, assured the Legislative Assembly of his devotion to order through the immediately following message of Carlier, that dirty, mean caricature of Fouché, as Louis Bonaparte himself was the shallow caricature of Napoleon?

The *education law* shows us the alliance of the young Catholics with the old Voltaireans. Could the rule of the united bourgeois be anything else but the coalesced despotism of the restoration, friendly to the Jesuits, and the would-be free-thinking July monarchy? Had not the weapons that the one bourgeois faction had distributed among the people against the other faction in their mutual struggle for supremacy again to be torn from it, the people, since the latter was confronted by their united dictatorship? Nothing has aroused the Paris shopkeeper more than this coquetish exhibition of Jesuitism, not even the rejection of the *concordats à l'amiable*.

Meanwhile the collisions between the different factions of the Party of Order continued, as well as between Bonaparte and the National Assembly. The National Assembly was far from pleased that Bonaparte, immediately after his coup d'état, after appointing his own Bonapartist ministry, summoned before him the disabled soldiers of the monarchy, now appointed prefects, and made their unconstitutional agitation for his re-election as President the condition of their appointment; when Carlier celebrated his inauguration with the closing of a Legitimist club, or when Bo-

*Joseph Fouché (1763-1820).* Active political figure in the first French bourgeois revolution and afterwards in the First Empire. Fouché was one of the most expert and ambitious intriguers and careerists known to history. — *Ed.*
Napoleon founded a journal of his own, *Le Napoléon*, which betrayed the secret longings of the President to the public, while his ministers had to deny them from the tribune of the Legislative Assembly. The latter was far from pleased by the defiant retention of the ministry, notwithstanding its various votes of no confidence; far from pleased by the attempt to win the favour of non-commissioned officers by extra pay of four sous a day and the favour of the proletariat by a plagiarisation of Eugène Sue's *Mystères*,¹ by an honour loan bank,² far from pleased, finally by the effrontery with which the ministers were made to move the deportation of the remaining June insurgents to Algiers, in order to heap unpopularity on the Legislative en gros,³ while the President reserved popularity for himself en détail, by individual grants of pardon. Thiers let fall threatening words about coups d'état and coups de tête, and the Legislative Assembly revenged itself on Bonaparte by rejecting every proposed law which he put forward for his own benefit, and by inquiring with noisy mistrust, in every instance where he made a proposal in the common interest, whether through increase of the executive power he did not aspire to augment the personal power of Bonaparte. In a word, it revenged itself by a conspiracy of contempt.

The Legitimist party, on its side, saw with vexation the more capable Orleanists once more occupying almost all posts and

¹ Eugène Sue’s *Mystères* have been translated into English under the titles, *The Mysteries of Paris* and *The Mysteries of the People*, or *The History of a Proletarian Family Across the Ages*. The latter work was translated into English by Daniel DeLeon.—Ed.

² Marx and Engels in *The Holy Family* give the following characterisation of the loan bank for the poor which was proposed by Eugène Sue in his *Mysteries of Paris*.

³ The idea of the critical Poor Bank, if otherwise taken as reasonable, reduces itself to the following. From the pay of the worker during the period when he is employed there is to be withdrawn as much as he needs to live on in the period of unemployment. Whether I advance him a definite sum in the unemployed period and he gives me this sum back when employed, or whether he gives up a definite sum when employed and I return it to him in the period of unemployment, is one and the same. He always gives me in his employed period what he receives from me in his unemployed period.”—Ed.

³ As a whole.—Ed.

Centralisation increasing, while it sought its well-being principally in decentralisation, And so it was. The counter-revolution centralised violently, i.e., it prepared the mechanism of the revolution. It even centralised the gold and silver of France in the Paris bank through the compulsory quotation of bank notes, and so created the complete war chest for the revolution.

Lastly, the Orleanists saw with vexation the rising principle of legitimacy contrasted with their bastard principle and themselves every moment snubbed and maltreated as the bourgeois-mésalliance of a noble spouse.

Little by little we have seen peasants, petty bourgeois, the middle classes in general, stepping alongside the proletariat, driven into open antagonism to the official republic and treated by it as antagonists. Revolt against bourgeois dictatorship, need of a change in society, adherence to democratic-republican institutions as organs of their movement, grouping round the proletariat as the decisive revolutionary power—these were the common characteristics of the so-called party of Social-Democracy, the party of the Red republic. This party of anarchy, as its opponents christened it, is no less a coalition of different interests than the Party of Order. From the smallest reform of the old social disorder to the overthrow of the old social order, from bourgeois liberalism to revolutionary terrorism, as wide apart as this lie the extremes that form the starting and final point of the party of “anarchy.”

Abolition of the protective duties—socialism! For it strikes at the monopoly of the industrial faction of the Party of Order. Regulation of the state budget—socialism! For it strikes at the monopoly of the financial faction of the Party of Order. Free admission of foreign meat and corn—socialism! For it strikes at the monopoly of the third faction of the Party of Order, large landed property. The demands of the free-trade party, i.e., of the most advanced English bourgeois party, appear in France as so many socialist demands. Voltaireanism¹—socialism! For it

¹ Religious free-thinking, named after the philosopher Voltaire (1694-1778), who waged a struggle against the church.—Ed.
strikes at the fourth faction of the Party of Order, the Catholic. Freedom of the press, right of association, universal public education—socialism, socialism! They strike at the entire monopoly of the Party of Order.

So swiftly had the march of the revolution ripened conditions, that the friends of reform of all shades, the most moderate claims of the middle classes, were compelled to group themselves round the banner of the most extreme party of revolution, round the red flag.

Yes, manifold as was the socialism of the different large sections of the party of anarchy, according to the economic conditions and the total revolutionary requirements of their class or fraction of a class arising out of these, in one point it is in harmony: in proclaiming itself as the means of emancipating the proletariat and the emancipation of the latter as its object. Deliberate deception on the part of some; self-deception on the part of the others, who give out the world transformed according to their own needs as the best world for all, as the realisation of all revolutionary claims and the abolition of all revolutionary collisions.

Under the somewhat similar sounding, general socialist phrases of the "party of anarchy," is concealed the capitalism of the National, of the Presse and of the Siècle, which more or less consistently wants to overthrow the rule of the finance aristocracy and to free industry and trade from their hitherto existing fetters. This is the socialism of industry, of trade and of agriculture, whose rulers in the Party of Order deny these interests, in so far as they no longer coincide with their private monopolies. From this bourgeois socialism, to which, as to every variety of socialism, a section of the workers and petty bourgeoisie naturally rallies, specific petty-bourgeois socialism, socialism par excellence, is distinct. Capitalhands this class chiefly as its creditors, so it demands credit institutions; capital crushes it by competition, so it demands associations supported by the state; capital overwhelsms it by concentration, so it demands progressive taxes, limitations on inheritance, taking over of large works by the state, and other measures that forcibly stem the growth of capital. Since it dreams of the peaceful achievement of its socialism—allowing, perhaps, for a second February Revolution lasting a brief day—naturally the coming historical process appears to it as the application of systems, which the thinkers of society, whether in companies or as individual inventors, devise or have devised. Thus they become the eclectic or adepts of the existing socialist systems, of doctrinaire socialism, which was the theoretical expression of the proletariat only so long as it had not yet developed further into a free historical self-movement.

While this utopia, doctrinaire socialism, which subordinates the total movement to one of its moments, which puts in place of common, social production the brainwork of individual pedants and, above all, in fantasy does away with the revolutionary struggle of the classes and its requirements by small conjuring tricks or great sentimentality; while this doctrinaire socialism, which at bottom only idealises the present society, takes a picture of it without shadows and wants to achieve its ideal against the reality of society; while this socialism passes from the proletariat to the petty bourgeoisie; while the struggle of the different socialist chiefs among themselves sets forth each of the so-called systems as a pretentious adherence to one of the transit points of the social revolution as against another—the proletariat rallies more and more round revolutionary socialism, round communism, for which the bourgeoisie has itself found the name of Blanqui. This socialism is the declaration of the permanence of the revolution, the class dictatorship of the proletariat as the inevitable transit point to the abolition of class differences generally, to the abolition of all the production relations on which they rest, to the abolition of all the social relations that correspond to these relations of production, to the revolutionising of all the ideas that result from these social connections.

The scope of this exposition does not permit of developing the subject further.

We have seen that just as in the Party of Order the finance aristocracy inevitably takes the lead, in the party of "anarchy"
the proletariat does so. While the different classes united in a revolutionary league grouped themselves round the proletariat, while the Departments became ever more unsafe and the Legislative Assembly itself ever more morose towards the pretensions of the French Soulouque, the long deferred and delayed election of substitutes for the Montagnards proscribed after June 13 drew near.

The government, scorned by its foes, maltreated and daily humiliated by its alleged friends, saw only one means of emerging from a repugnant and untenable position—a rising. A rising in Paris would have permitted the proclamation of a state of siege in Paris and the Departments and thus the control of the elections. On the other hand, the friends of order, in face of a government that had gained victory over anarchy were bound to make concessions, if they did not want to appear as anarchists themselves.

The government set to work. At the beginning of February 1830, provocation of the people by cutting down the trees of liberty. In vain. If the trees of liberty lost their place, it itself lost its head and fell back frightened by its own provocation. The National Assembly, however, received this clumsy attempt at emancipation on the part of Bonaparte with ice-cold mistrust. The removal of the wreaths of immortelles from the July column was no more successful. It gave a part of the army an opportunity for revolutionary demonstrations and the National Assembly the occasion for a more or less veiled vote of no confidence in the ministry. In vain the government press threatened the abolition of universal suffrage, the invasion of the Cossacks. In vain was d'Hautpoul's direct challenge issued from the midst of the Legislative Assembly to the Left, to betake itself to the streets, and his declaration that the government was ready to receive it. Hautpoul received nothing but a call to order from the President, and the Party of Order, with quiet, malicious joy, allowed a deputy of the Left to mock Bonaparte's usurpatory longings. In vain, finally was the prophecy of a revolution on February 24. The government caused February 24 to be ignored by the people.

The proletariat did not allow itself to be provoked into a rising, because it was on the point of making a revolution.

Unhindered by the provocations of the government, which only heightened the general irritation against the existing situation, the election committee, wholly under the influence of the workers, put forward three candidates for Paris: Dejalle, Vidal and Carnot. Dejalle was a June deportee, amnestied through one of Bonaparte's popularity-seeking ideas; he was a friend of Blanqui's and had taken part in the attempt of May 15. Vidal, known as a communist writer through his book Concerning the Distribution of Wealth, was formerly secretary to Louis Blanc in the Commission of the Luxembourg. Carnot, son of the man of the Convention who had organised victory, the least compromised member of the National party, Minister for Education in the Provisional Government and the Executive Commission, through his democratic education bill was a living protest against the education law of the Jesuits. These three candidates represented the three allied classes: at the head, the June insurgent, the representative of the revolutionary proletariat; next to him, the doctrinaire Socialist, the representative of the socialist petty bourgeoisie; finally, the third, the representative of the republican bourgeois party, the democratic formulas of which had gained a socialist significance as against the Party of Order and had long lost their own significance. This was a general coalition against the bourgeoisie and the government, as in February. But this time the proletariat was at the head of the revolutionary league.
In spite of all efforts the Socialist candidates won. The army itself voted for the June insurgent against its own War Minister, Laliberté. The Party of Order was thunderstruck. The elections in the Departments did not solace them; they gave a majority to the Montagnards.

The election of March 10, 1850. It was the revocation of June 1848: the butchers and deportees of the June insurgents returned to the National Assembly, but humbled, in the train of the deported, and with their principles on their lips. It was the revocation of June 13, 1849: the Mountain proscribed by the National Assembly returned to the National Assembly, but as advance trumpeters of the revolution, no longer as its commanders. It was the revocation of December 10: Napoleon had been rejected with his minister Lagarde. The parliamentary history of France knows only one analogy: the rejection of d’Haussey, minister of Charles X, in 1830. Finally, the election of March 10, 1850, was the cancellation of the election of May 13, which had given the Party of Order a majority. The election of March 10 protested against the majority of May 13. March 10 was a revolution. Behind the ballot papers lay the paving stones.

"The vote of March 10 is war," shouted Ségué d’Agenas, one of the most advanced members of the Party of Order.

With March 10, 1850, the constitutional republic entered a new phase, the phase of its dissolution. The different factions of the majority are again united among themselves and with Bonaparte; they are again the saviours of order; he is again their neutral man. If they remember that they are royalists it happens only from despair of the possibility of the bourgeois republic; if he remembers that he is President, it happens only because he despair of remaining President.

At the command of the Party of Order, Bonaparte answers the election of Deflote, the June insurgent, by appointing Baroche

---

1 On March 10, 1850, the by-elections to the Legislative Assembly took place, new deputies being elected in place of those imprisoned or exiled after the action of the Mountain on June 13, 1849. Marx gives an estimate of these elections in "The Eighteenth Brumaire," chap. IV, in the present volume.—Ed.

2 The massacre of St. Bartholomew’s night, August 23-24, 1572, one of the most bloody episodes in the history of religious struggles in France in the sixteenth century, when the Protestant Huguenots were treacherously massacred by order of the king.—Ed.
the revolution with its weapons and on its terrain; we have accepted its institutions; the constitution is a fortress, which safeguards only the besiegers, not the besieged! By smuggling ourselves into holy Ilion in the belly of the Trojan horse, we have, unlike our forefathers, the Greeks, not conquered the hostile town, but made ourselves into prisoners."

The foundation of the constitution, however, is universal suffrage. The abolition of universal suffrage is the last word of the Party of Order, of bourgeois dictatorship.

On May 24, 1848, on December 20, 1848, on May 13, 1849, and on July 8, 1849, universal suffrage admitted that they were right. On March 10, 1850, universal suffrage admitted that it had itself been wrong. Bourgeois rule as the outcome and result of universal suffrage, as the express act of the sovereign will of the people, is the meaning of the bourgeois constitution. But from the moment that the content of this suffrage, of this sovereign will, is no longer bourgeois rule, has the constitution any further meaning? Is it not the duty of the bourgeoisie so to regulate the suffrage that it wills the reasonable, its rule? By ever and again putting an end to the existing state power and creating it anew out of itself, does not universal suffrage put an end to all stability, does it not every moment question all the powers that be, does it not annihilate authority, does it not threaten to elevate anarchy itself to authority? After March 10, 1850, who should still doubt it?

By repudiating universal suffrage, with which it had hitherto draped itself and from which it sucked its omnipotence, the bourgeoisie openly confesses, "Our dictatorship has hitherto existed by the will of the people; it must now be consolidated against the will of the people." And, consistently, it seeks its supporters no longer within France, but without, in foreign countries, in an invasion.

With the invasion, it, a second Coblenz, which has established

its seat in France itself, rouses all the national passions against it. With the attack on universal suffrage it gives a general pretext for the new revolution, and the revolution required such a pretext. Every particular pretext would divide the factions of the revolutionary league, and give prominence to their differences. The general pretext stuns the semi-revolutionary classes; it permits them to deceive themselves concerning the definite character of the coming revolution, concerning the consequences of their own act. Every revolution requires a banquet question. Universal suffrage is the banquet question of the new revolution.

The bourgeois factions in coalition, however, are already condemned, since they take flight from the only possible form of their united power, from the strongest and most complete form of their class rule, the constitutional republic, back to the subordinate, incomplete, weaker form of monarchy. They resemble that old man who, in order to regain his youthful strength, fetched out his boyhood apparel and sought to torment his withered limbs in it. Their republic had the sole merit of being the hot-house of the revolution.

March 10 bears the inscription: Après moi le déluge! After me the deluge!

IV

The Abolition of Universal Suffrage, 1850

(The continuation of the three foregoing chapters is found in the Revue in the fifth and sixth double number of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung, the last to appear. There, after the great commercial crisis that broke out in England in 1847 had first been described and the coming to a head of the political complications on the European Continent in the Revolutions of February and March 1848 had been explained by its reactions there, it is then shown how the prosperity of trade and industry, that again set in during the course of 1848 and increased still further in 1849, paralysed the revolutionary upsurge and made possible the simul-
taneous victories of the reaction. With special reference to France, it is then said:) 1

The same symptoms showed themselves in France after 1849 and particularly since the beginning of 1850. The Parisian industries are abundantly employed and the cotton factories of Rouen and Mühlhausen are also doing pretty well, although here, as in England, the high prices of the raw material have exercised a retarding influence. The development of prosperity in France was, in addition, especially advanced by the comprehensive tariff reform in Spain and by the reduction of the duties on various luxury articles in Mexico; the export of French commodities to both markets has considerably increased. The growth of capital in France led to a series of speculations, for which the exploitation of the California gold mines on a large scale served as a pretext. A swarm of companies sprang up, the low denomination of whose shares and whose socialist-coloured prospectuses appeal directly to the purses of the petty bourgeois and the workers, but which all and sundry result in that sheer swindling which is characteristic of the French and Chinese alone. One of these companies is even patronised directly by the government.

The import duties in France during the first nine months of 1848 amounted to 63,000,000 francs, of 1849 to 95,000,000 francs and of 1850 to 93,000,000 francs. Moreover in the month of September 1850 they again rose by more than a million compared with the same month of 1849. Exports had also risen in 1849 and still more in 1850.

The most striking proof of restored prosperity is the bank's reintroduction of cash payments by the law of September 6, 1850. On March 15, 1848, the bank was authorised to suspend its cash payments. Its note circulation, including the provincial banks, amounted at that time to 373,000,000 francs (£14,920,000 sterling). On November 2, 1849, this circulation amounted to 422,000,000 francs or £19,280,000 sterling, an increase of £4,360,000 sterling, and on September 2, 1850, to 496,000,000 francs or £19,840,000 sterling, an increase of some

£5,000,000 sterling. This was not accompanied by any depreciation of the notes; on the contrary the increased circulation of the notes was accompanied by the steadily increasing accumulation of gold and silver in the cellars of the bank so that in the summer of 1850 its metallic reserve amounted to about £14,000,000 sterling, an unprecedented sum in France. That the bank was thus placed in a position to increase its circulation and therewith its active capital by 123,000,000 francs or £5,000,000 sterling is a striking proof of the correctness of our assertion in the earlier number that the finance aristocracy has not only not been overthrown by the revolution, but has even been strengthened. This result becomes still more evident from the following survey of the French bank legislation of the last few years.

On June 10, 1847, the bank was authorised to issue notes of 200 francs; hitherto the smallest note had been one of 500 francs. A decree of March 15, 1848, declared the notes of the Bank of France legal tender and relieved the bank of the obligation of redeeming them in cash. Its note issue was limited to 350,000,000 francs. It was simultaneously authorised to issue notes of 100 francs. A decree of April 27 prescribed the merging of the departmental banks in the Bank of France; another decree of May 2, 1848, increased the latter's note issue to 422,000,000 francs. A decree of December 22, 1849, raised the maximum of the note issue to 525,000,000 francs. Finally, the law of September 6, 1850, reintroduced the exchangeability of notes for gold. These facts, the continual increase in the circulation, the concentration of the whole of French credit in the hands of the bank and the accumulation of all French gold and silver in the bank vaults, led M. Proudhon 1 to the conclusion that the bank must now shed its old snakeskin and metamorphose itself into a

1 Proudhon (1809-65) was not a Socialist. A typical representative of the petty property owners, he put forward in opposition to the system of capitalist property the system of petty commodity producers, who exchange the products of their "labour" property according to the quantity of labour expended on them. This exchange was to be carried out by the People's Bank, projected by him, which would give out to the owners of goods special bonds serving as exchange tokens. The petty-bourgeois views of Proudhon were subjected to an annihilating criticism by Marx in his Poverty of Philosophy.—Ed.
Proudhonian people's bank. He did not even need to know the history of the English bank restriction from 1797-1819; he only needed to direct his glance across the Channel to see that this fact, for him unprecedented in the history of bourgeois society, was nothing more than a very normal bourgeois event that now only occurred in France for the first time. One sees that the alleged revolutionary theoreticians who, after the Provisional Government, talked big in Paris, were just as ignorant of the nature and the results of the measures taken, as the gentlemen of the Provisional Government themselves. In spite of the industrial and commercial prosperity that France momentarily enjoys, the mass of the people, the twenty-five million peasants, labour under a state of great depression. The good harvests of the last few years have forced the prices of corn much lower than in England, and the position of the peasants in such circumstances, in debt, sucked dry by usury and crushed by taxes, can only be anything but brilliant. The history of the last three years has, however, provided sufficient proof that this class of the population is capable of absolutely no revolutionary initiative.

Just as the period of crisis occurs later on the Continent than in England, so does that of prosperity. The original process always takes place in England; she is the demiurge of the bourgeois cosmos. On the Continent, the different phases of the cycle through which bourgeois society is ever speeding anew, occur in secondary and tertiary form. First, the Continent exported incomparably more to England than to any other country. This export to England, however, in turn depends on the position of England, particularly with regard to the overseas market. Then England exports to the overseas lands incomparably more than the entire Continent, so that the quantity of Continental exports to these lands is always dependent on England's overseas exports in each case. If, therefore, the crises first produce revolutions on the Continent, the foundation for these is, nevertheless, always laid in England. Violent outbreaks must naturally occur earlier in the extremities of the bourgeois body than in its heart, since here the possibility of adjustment is greater than there. On the other hand, the degree to which the Continental revolutions react on England, is at the same time the thermometer on which is indicated how far these revolutions really call in question the bourgeois conditions of life, or how far they only hit their political formations.

With this general prosperity, in which the productive forces of bourgeois society develop as luxuriantly as is at all possible within bourgeois relationships, there can be no talk of a real revolution. Such a revolution is only possible in the periods when both these factors, the modern productive forces and the bourgeois production forms, come in collision with one another. The various quarrels in which the representatives of the individual factions of the Continental Party of Order now indulge and mutually compromise themselves, far from providing the occasion for new revolutions, are, on the contrary, only possible because the basis of the relationships is momentarily so secure and (what the reaction does not know) so bourgeois. From it all attempts of the reaction to hold up bourgeois development will rebound just as certainly as all moral indignation and all enthusiastic proclamations of the democrats. A new revolution is only possible in consequence of a new crisis. It is, however, also just as certain as this.

Let us now turn to France.

The victory that the people, in conjunction with the petty bourgeois, had won in the elections of March 10, was annulled by it itself when it provoked the new election of April 28. Vidal was elected not only in Paris, but also in the Lower Rhine. The Paris Committee, in which the Mountain and the petty bourgeois were strongly represented, induced him to accept for the Lower Rhine. The victory of March 10 ceased to be a decisive one; the date of the decision was once more postponed; the tension of the people was relaxed; it became accustomed to legal triumphs instead of revolutionary ones. The revolutionary meaning of March 10, the rehabilitation of the June insurrection, was finally, completely annihilated by the candidature of Eugene Sue, the sentimental petty bourgeois social-phantast, which the proletariat could at best accept as a joke to please the grisettes. As against this well-meaning candidature, the Party of Order, emboldened by
the vacillating policy of its opponent, put up a candidate who was to represent the June victory. This comic candidate was the Spartan paterfamilias,1 Leclerc, from whose person the heroic armour was torn piece by piece by the press, and who also experienced a brilliant defeat in the election. The new election victory on April 28 made the Mountain and the petty bourgeoisie overconfident. They already exulted in the thought of being able to arrive at the goal of their wishes in a purely legal way and without again placing the proletariat into the foreground through a new revolution; they reckoned positively on bringing Ledru-Rollin into the presidential chair, and a majority of the Montagnards into the Assembly through universal suffrage in the new elections of 1852. The Party of Order, rendered perfectly certain by the prospective elections, by the candidature of Sue and by the mood of the Mountain and the petty bourgeoisie, that the latter were resolved to remain quiet under all circumstances, answered the two election victories with the election law which abolished universal suffrage.

The government took good care not to make this legislative proposal on its own responsibility. It made an apparent concession to the majority by entrusting the working out of the bill to the high dignitaries of this majority, the seventeen burgesses. Therefore, it was not the government that proposed the repeal of universal suffrage to the Assembly; the majority of the Assembly proposed it to itself.

On May 8, the project was brought into the Chamber. The entire social-democratic press rose as one man in order to preach to the people dignified bearing, calme majestueux, passivity and trust in its representatives. Every article of these journals was a confession that a revolution must, above all, annihilate the so-called revolutionary press and that, therefore, it was now a question of their self-preservation. The alleged revolutionary press betrayed its whole secret. It signed its own death warrant.

On May 21, the Mountain put the preliminary question to debate and moved the rejection of the whole project because it violated the constitution. The Party of Order answered that the constitution would be violated if it were necessary; there was, however, no need for this at present, because the constitution was capable of every interpretation, and because the majority was alone competent to decide on the correct interpretation. To the unbridled, savage attacks of Thiers and Montalembert the Mountain opposed a decorous and civilised humanism. It took its stand on the ground of law; the Party of Order referred it to the ground on which the law grows, to bourgeois property. The Mountain whimpered: Did they really want, then, to conjure up revolutions by main force? The Party of Order replied: One would await them.

On May 22, the preliminary question was settled by 462 votes to 227. The same men who had proved with such solemn profuseness that the National Assembly and every individual deputy would abdicate if he dismissed the people, his mandator, now stuck to their seats and suddenly sought to let the country act, through petitions at that, instead of themselves, and still sat there unmoved when, on May 31, the law passed brilliantly. They sought to revenge themselves through a protest in which they recorded their innocence of the rape of the constitution, a protest which they did not even set down openly, but smuggled into the President’s pocket from behind.

An army of 150,000 men in Paris, the long deferment of the decision, the peaceful attitude of the press, the pusillanimity of the Mountain and the newly elected representatives, the majestic calm of the petty bourgeoisie, but, above all, the commercial and industrial prosperity, prevented any attempt at revolution on the part of the proletariat.

Universal suffrage had fulfilled its mission. The majority of the people had passed through the school of development, which is all that universal suffrage can serve for in a revolutionary period. It had to be set aside by a revolution or by the reaction.

The Mountain developed a still greater display of energy on an occasion that soon afterwards arose. From the tribune the War Minister d’Haastpoul termed the February Revolution a disastrous catastrophe. The orators of the Mountain, who, as always, distinguished themselves by morally indignant uproar, were not allowed to speak by the President, Dupin. Girardin proposed to

1 Head of the family.—Ed.
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the Mountain that it should walk out at once *en masse*. Result: the Mountain remained seated, but Girardin was cast out from its midst as unworthy.

The election law still needed one thing to complete it, a new *press law*. This was not long in coming. A proposal of the government, made many times more drastic by amendments of the Party of Order, increased the caution money, put an extra stamp on feuilleton novels (answer to the election of Eugène Sue), taxed all publications appearing in weekly or monthly parts up to a certain number of sheets and finally provided that every article of a journal must bear the signature of the author. The provisions concerning the caution money killed the so-called revolutionary press; the people regarded its extinction as satisfaction for the abolition of universal suffrage. However, neither the tendency nor the effect of the new law extended only to this section of the press. As long as the newspaper press was anonymous, it appeared as the organ of a numberless and nameless public opinion; it was the third power in the state. Through the signature of every article, a newspaper became a mere collection of literary contributions from more or less known individuals. Every article sank to the level of an advertisement. Hitherto the newspapers had circulated as the paper money of public opinion; now they were resolved into more or less bad *solo* bills, whose worth and circulation depended on the credit not only of the drawer but also of the endorser. The press of the Party of Order had not only incited for the repeal of universal suffrage but also for the most extreme measures against the bad press. However, in its sincerest anonymity even the good press was irksome to the Party of Order and still more to its individual and provincial representatives. As for itself it still demanded only the paid writer, with name, address and description. In vain the good press bemoaned the ingratitude with which its services were rewarded. The law went through; the provision concerning the giving of names hit it hardest of all. The names of republican journalists were pretty well known; but the respectable firms of the *Journal des Débats*, the *Assemblée Nationale*, the *Constitutionnelle*, etc., etc., cut a sorry figure in their high protestations of state wisdom, when the mysterious company all at once disintegrated into purchasable penny-a-liners of long practice, who had defended all possible causes for cash, like Granier de Cassagnac, or into old milksoops who called themselves statesmen, like Capefigue, or into coquetish fops, like M. Lemoine of the *Débats*.

In the debate on the press law the Mountain had already sunk to such a level of moral degeneracy that it had to confine itself to applauding the brilliant tirades of an old notability of Louis Philippe’s time, M. Victor Hugo.

With the election law and the press law the revolutionary and democratic parties stepped off the official stage. Before their departure home, shortly after the end of the session, both factions of the Mountain, the socialist democrats and the democratic socialists, issued two manifestoes, *testimonia pauperatus*, in which they proved that if neither power nor success were on their side, nevertheless they had ever been on the side of eternal justice and all the other eternal truths.

Let us now consider the Party of Order. The *N. Rh. Z.* had said (Number III, p. 16):

"As against the hankerings for restoration on the part of the united Orleansists and Legitimists, Bonaparte represents the title of his actual power, the republic. As against the hankerings for restoration on the part of Bonaparte, the Party of Order represents the title of its common rule: the republic. As against the Orleansists, the Legitimists, as against the Legitimists, the Orleansists, represent the *status quo*; the republic. All these factions of the Party of Order, each of which has its own king and its own restoration in *petio*, mutually assert, as against their rival’s desires for usurpation and elevation, the common rule of the bourgeoisie, the form in which the particular claims remain neutralised and reserved: the republic. And Thiers spoke more truly than he suspected, when he said: ‘We, the royalists, are the true pillars of the constituent republic.’"

This comedy of the *républicains malgré eux*, of antipathy to the *status quo* and constant consolidation of it; the incessant

1 Certifications of poverty.—*Ed.*

2 Republicans in spite of themselves.—*Ed.*
friction between Bonaparte and the National Assembly; the ever renewed threat of the Party of Order to split into its single component parts, and the ever repeated reunion of its factions; the attempt of each faction to transform each victory over the common foe into a defeat for its temporary allies; the mutual petty jealousy, chicanery, harassment, the tireless drawing of swords that ever and again ends with a baiser-Lamourette 1—this whole unifying comedy of errors never developed more classically than during the last six months.

The Party of Order regarded the election law at the same time as a victory over Bonaparte. Had not the government abdicated when it handed over the editing of and responsibility for its own proposal to the Commission of Seventeen? And did not the chief strength of Bonaparte as against the Assembly lie in the fact that he was the chosen of six millions?—Bonaparte, for his part, treated the election law as a concession to the Assembly, with which he had purchased harmony between the legislative and executive powers. As reward, the vulgar adventurer demanded an increase of three millions in his civil list. Dared the National Assembly enter a conflict with the executive at a moment when it had excommunicated the great majority of Frenchmen? It was roused to anger; it appeared to want to go to extremes; its Commission rejected the motion; the Bonapartist press threatened, and referred to the dispossessed people, deprived of its franchise; numerous noisy attempts at an arrangement took place, and the Assembly finally gave way in fact, but at the same time revenged itself in principle. Instead of increasing the civil list in principle by three millions per annum, it granted him an accommodation of 2,160,000 francs. Not satisfied with this, it made the concession only after it had been supported by Changarnier.

1 Lamourette (1742-94). French prelate and statesman, a deputy in the Legislative Assembly during the first French bourgeois revolution. He was famous for the so-called baiser-Lamourette, a fraternal kiss by which he proposed to end all party dissension. Under the influence of his proposal, put forward with exceptional fervour, on July 7, 1792, the representatives of the hostile parties embraced one another but, as might have been expected, on the following day this hypocritical “fraternal kiss” was forgotten.—Ed.

the general of the Party of Order and the protector thrust upon Bonaparte. Really, therefore, it granted the two millions not to Bonaparte, but to Changarnier.

This present, thrown to him de mauvaise grâce 2 was accepted by Bonaparte quite in the spirit of the donor. The Bonapartist press blustered anew against the National Assembly. When, now in the debate on the press law, the amendment was made on the signing of names, which, in turn, was directed especially against the less important papers—the representatives of the private interests of Bonaparte, the principal Bonapartist paper, the Pouvoir, published an open and vehement attack on the National Assembly. The ministers had to disavow the paper before the National Assembly; the chief editor of the Pouvoir was summoned before the bar of the National Assembly and sentenced to pay the highest fine, 5,000 francs. Next day the Pouvoir published a much more insolent article against the Assembly, and, as the revenge of the government, the public prosecutor promptly prosecuted a number of Legitimist journals for violating the constitution.

Finally there came the question of proroguing the Chamber. Bonaparte desired this in order to be able to operate unhindered by the Assembly. The Party of Order desired it partly for the purpose of carrying on their factional intrigues, partly for the pursuit of the private interests of individual deputies. Both needed it in order to consolidate and push further the victories of the reaction in the provinces. The Assembly therefore adjourned from August 11 until November 11. Since, however, Bonaparte in no way concealed that his only concern was to get rid of the irksome surveillance of the National Assembly, the Assembly imprinted on the vote of confidence itself the stamp of want of confidence in the President. All Bonapartists were kept off the permanent commission of twenty-eight members, who persevered during the recess as guardians of the virtue of the republic. In their stead, some republicans of the Siècle and the National were actually elected to it, in order to prove to the President the attachment of the majority to the constitutional republic.

2 With bad grace.—Ed.
Shortly before and, especially, immediately after the prorogu-
ing of the Chamber, the two big factions of the Party of Order, the Orleanists and the Legitimists, appeared to want to be re-
conciled, and indeed by a fusion of the two royal houses under
whose flags they were fighting. The papers were full of reconcili-
ation proposals that had been discussed at the sick bed of Louis
Philippe at St. Leonards, when the death of Louis Philippe sudden-
ly simplified the situation. Louis Philippe was the usurper;
Henry V, the dispossessed; the Count of Paris, on the other hand,
owing to the childlessness of Henry V, his lawful heir to the throne.
Every objection to the fusion of the two dynastic interests was
now removed. But now, precisely, the two factions of the bour-
geoisie first discovered that it was not zeal for a definite royal
house that divided them, but that it was rather their divided
class interests that kept the two dynasties apart. The Legitimists
who had made a pilgrimage to the residence of Henry V at Wies-
baden just as their competitors had to St. Leonards, received
there the news of Louis Philippe's death. Forthwith they formed
a ministry in portibus infidelium, which consisted mostly of
members of that commission of guardians of the virtue of the
republic and which on the occasion of a squabble taking place in
the bosom of the party, came out with the most outspoken proc-
unam of right by the grace of God. The Orleanists rejoiced
over the compromising scandal that this manifesto called forth
in the press, and did not conceal for a moment their open enmity
to the Legitimists.

During the adjournment of the National Assembly, the meet-
ing of the councils of the Departments took place. The majority
of them declared themselves for a more or less qualified revision
of the constitution, i.e., they declared themselves for a monarch-
list restoration, not more closely specified, for a "solution," and
confessed at the same time that they were too incompetent and too
cowardly to find this solution. The Bonapartist faction construed
this desire for revision in the sense of a prolongation of Bonap-
parte's presidency.

The constitutional solution, the retirement of Bonaparte in
May 1852, the simultaneous election of a new president by all
the electors of the land, the revision of the constitution by a
Chamber of Revision in the first months of the new presidency,
is utterly inadmissible for the ruling class. The day of the new
presidential election would be the day of the rendezvous for all
the hostile parties, the Legitimists, the Orleanists, the bourgeois
republicans, the revolutionaries. It had to come to a violent deci-
sion between the different factions. Even if the Party of Order
should succeed in uniting round the candidature of a neutral
person outside the dynastic families, he would still be opposed
by Bonaparte. In its struggle with the people, the Party of Order
is compelled constantly to increase the power of the executive.
Every increase of the executive's power increases the power of
its bearer, Bonaparte. In the same measure, therefore, as the
Party of Order strengthens its joint might, it strengthens the
fighting resources of Bonaparte's dynastic pretensions, it strength-
en his chance of frustrating the constitutional solution by force
on the day of the decision. He will then have, as against the
Party of Order, no more scruples about the one pillar of the
constitution than that party had, as against the people, about
the other pillar in the matter of the election law. As against the
Assembly, he would seemingly appeal even to universal suffrage.¹
In a word, the constitutional solution questions the entire polit-
ical status quo, and behind the jeopardising of the status quo,
the bourgeois sees chaos, anarchy, civil war. He sees his purchases
and sales, his bills of exchange, his marriages, his legal contracts,
his mortgages, his ground rents, house rents, profits, all his
contracts and sources of gain called in question on the first Sunday
in May 1852 and he cannot expose himself to this risk. Behind
the jeopardising of the political status quo lurks the danger of the
collapse of the entire bourgeois society. The only possible solu-
tion in the bourgeois sense is the postponement of the solution.
It can only save the constitutional republic by a violation of the
constitution, by the prolongation of the power of the President.
This is also the last word of the press of order, after the pro-
tracted and thoughtful debates on the "solutions," to which it

¹ Marx's supposition was strikingly confirmed. See The Eighteenth
Brumaire in the present volume.—Ed.
devoted itself after the session of the general councils. The high
and mighty Party of Order thus finds itself, to its shame, com
pelled to take seriously the ridiculous, commonplace and, to it,
odious person of the pseudo-Bonaparte.
This dirty figure likewise deceived himself concerning the
causes that clothed him more and more with the character of
the indispensable man. While his party had sufficient insight to
ascribe the growing importance of Bonaparte to the circum-
stances, he believed that he owed it solely to the magic power of
his name and his continual caricaturing of Napoleon. He became
more enterprising every day. To the pilgrimages to St. Leonards
and Wiesbaden he opposed his round tours of France. The Bona-
partists had so little faith in the magical effect of his personality
that they sent with him everywhere as claquers people from
the Society of December 10, that organisation of the Paris
lumpenproletariat, packed en masse into railway trains and
post-chaises. They put speeches into the mouth of their marionette
which, according to the reception in the different towns, pro-
claimed republican resignation or perennial tenacity as the keynote
of the president's policy. In spite of all the manoeuvres these
journeys were anything but triumphant processions.
When Bonaparte believed he had thus enthused the people,
he set out to win the army. He caused great reviews to be held
on the plain of Satori near Versailles, at which he sought to
buy the soldiers with garlic sausages, champagne and cigars. If
the genuine Napoleon, amid the hardships of his campaigns of
conquest, knew how to encourage his weary soldiers with out-
bursts of patriarchal familiarity, the pseudo-Napoleon believed
it was in gratitude that the troops shouted: Vive Napoleon, vive
le saucisson! that is, hurrah for the sausage, hurrah for the
buffoon! 3

These reviews led to the outbreak of the long suppressed
3 The reference is to Louis Bonaparte's own organisation, built
by him from the dregs of society, with whose aid he carried through his
outrages. This organisation was called the Society of December 10, in
memory of the day of election of Louis Bonaparte as President of the French
Republic (December 10, 1848). — Ed.
3 A play on words. Sausage in German - Wurst; buffoon - Hanswurst. Es lebe die Wurst, es lebe der Hanswurst! — Ed.

dissension between Bonaparte and his War Minister d'Hautpoul,
on the one hand, and Changarnier, on the other. In Changarnier,
the Party of Order had found its real neutral man, in whose
case there could be no question of his own dynastic claims. It
had designated him as Bonaparte's successor. In addition, Chan-
garnier had become the general of the Party of Order through
his conduct on January 29 and June 13, 1849, the modern
Alexander, whose brutal intervention had, in the eyes of the
frightened bourgeoisie, cut the Gordian knot of the revolution. At
bottom just as ridiculous as Bonaparte, he had thus become a
power in the very cheapest manner and was set up by the National
Assembly against the President to watch over him. He himself
coquetted, for example, in the matter of the grant, with the
protection that he gave Bonaparte, and rose up even more over-
poweringly against him and the ministers. When, on the occasion
of the election law, an insurrection was expected, he forbade his
officers to take any orders whatever from the War Minister or
the President. The press was further instrumental in magnifying
the figure of Changarnier. With the complete absence of great
personalities, the Party of Order naturally found itself compelled
to endow with the strength lacking in its class as a whole a single
individual and so puff up this individual to a prodigy. Thus arose
the myth of Changarnier, the "bulwark of society." The arrogant
charlatanry, the secretive officiousness with which Changarnier
condescended to carry the world on his shoulders forms the most
ridiculous contrast to the events during and after the Satori review,
which irrefutably proved that it needed only a stroke of the pen by
Bonaparte, the infinitely little, to bring this fantastic offspring
of bourgeois fear, the colossus Changarnier, back to the dimen-
sions of mediocrity, and transform him, society's heroic savior,
into a pensioned general.

Bonaparte had for some time revenged himself on Chan-
garnier by provoking the War Minister to disputes in matters
of discipline with the irksome protector. The last review at
Satori finally brought the old animosity to a climax. The con-
stitutional indignation of Changarnier knew no bounds when he
saw the cavalry regiments file past with the unconstitutional
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cry: vive l'Empereur! Bonaparte, in order to forestall any unpleasant debate on this cry in the coming session of the Chamber, removed the War Minister d'Hautpoul, by appointing him Governor of Algiers. In his place he put a reliable old general of the time of the emperor, one who was fully a match for Changarnier in brutality. But so that the dismissal of d'Hautpoul might not appear as a concession to Changarnier he simultaneously transferred General Neumayer, the right hand of the great saviour of society, from Paris to Nantes. It had been Neumayer, who at the last review had induced the whole of the infantry to file past the successor of Napoleon in icy silence. Changarnier, himself hit in the person of Neumayer, protested and threatened.

To no purpose. After two days' negotiations, the decree for transferring Neumayer appeared in the Moniteur, and there was nothing left for the hero of order but to submit to discipline or resign.

The struggle of Bonaparte with Changarnier is the continuation of his struggle with the Party of Order. The re-opening of the National Assembly on November 11 therefore takes places under threatening auspices. It will be a storm in a tea-cup. In essence the old game must go on. Meanwhile the majority of the Party of Order will, despite the clamour of the sticklers on principle of its different factions, be compelled to prolong the power of the president. Similarly, Bonaparte, already humbled by lack of money, will, despite all preliminary protestations, accept this prolongation of power as simply delegated to him from the hands of the National Assembly. Thus the solution is postponed; the status quo continued; one faction of the Party of Order compromised, weakened, made impossible by the other; the repression of the common enemy, the mass of the nation, extended and exhausted, until the economic relations themselves have again reached the point of development where a new explosion blows into the air all the squabbling parties with their constitutional republic.

For the peace of mind of the bourgeois, moreover, it must be said that the scandal between Bonaparte and the Party of Order has the result of ruining a multitude of small capitalists on the Bourse and putting their possessions in the pockets of the big Bourse wolves.

THE EIGHTEENTH BRUMAIRE OF LOUIS BONAPARTE

AUTHOR'S PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

My friend Joseph Weydemeyer,¹ whose death was so untimely, intended to publish a political weekly in New York from January 1, 1852. He invited me to provide this weekly with the history of the coup d'état. Down to the middle of February, I accordingly wrote him weekly articles under the title: The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte. Meanwhile Weydemeyer's original plan had fallen through. Instead, in the spring of 1852 he published a monthly, Die Revolution, the second number of which consists of my Eighteenth Brumaire. A few hundred copies of this found their way into Germany at that time, without, however, getting into the actual book trade. A German publisher of extremely radical pretensions, to whom I offered the sale of my book, was most virtuously horrified at a "presumption" so "contrary to the times."

From the above facts it will be seen that the present work took shape under the immediate pressure of events and its historical material does not extend beyond the month of February (1852). Its re-publication now is due in part to the demand of the book trade, in part to the urgent requests of my friends in Germany.

Of the writings dealing with the same subject and appearing approximately at the same time as mine, only two deserve notice: Victor Hugo's Napoleon le Petit ² and Proudhon's Coup d'État.

Victor Hugo confines himself to biting and witty invective against the responsible author of the coup d'état. The event itself

¹ Military commandant of the St Louis district during the American Civil War. [Note by Karl Marx.]
² Napoleon the Little.—Ed.
appears in his work like a bolt from the blue. He sees in it only
the violent act of a single individual. He does not notice that he
makes this individual great instead of little by ascribing to him
a personal power of initiative such as would be without parallel
in world history. Proudhon, for his part, seeks to represent the
coup d'état as the result of the antecedent historical development.
Unnoticeably, however, the historical exposition of the coup d'état
is transformed into an historical apologia for its hero. Thus he
falls into the error of our so-called objective historians. I, on the
contrary, demonstrate how the class struggle in France created
circumstances and relationships that made it possible for a gro-
tesque mediocrity to play a hero's part.

A revision of the present work would have robbed it of its
peculiar colouring. Accordingly I have confined myself to mere
correction of printer's errors and to striking out allusions now no
longer intelligible.

The concluding sentence of my work: "But if the imperial
mantle finally falls on the shoulders of Louis Bonaparte, the iron
statue of Napoleon will crash from the top of the Vendôme
Column," has already been fulfilled.

Colonel Charras opened the attack on the Napoleon cult in his
work on the campaign of 1815. Subsequently, and particularly in
the last few years, French literature has made an end of the Na-
poleon legend with the weapons of historical research, of criticism,
of satire and of wit. Outside France this violent breach with the
traditional popular belief, this tremendous mental revolution,
has been little noticed and still less understood.

3 The Vendôme Column was erected in 1806-10, as a memorial to the
victories of the armies of Napoleon I in 1805. It was cast from 1,200
cannon taken by Napoleon I in his battles with the Austrian and Russian
armies. A statue of Napoleon I was erected at the top of the column. In
the concluding sentence of The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte,
Marx predicts that Louis Bonaparte's coming to power would put an end
to the cult of Napoleon I—the Napoleonic legend. It was not only in the
sense of which Marx writes in his preface of 1849 that this prophecy came
true. Fifteen months after Marx had written these lines, Louis Bonaparte
was deposed; and half a year after that the Vendôme Column was
destroyed, by decision of the Paris Commune (May 16, 1871), as a symbol
of chauvinism and enmity of nations. After the defeat of the commune,
the column was restored.—Ed.
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Lastly, I hope that my work will contribute towards eliminat-
ing the stock phrase now current, particularly in Germany, of so-
called Cesarism. In this superficial historical analogy the main
point is forgotten, namely that in ancient Rome the class struggle
took place only within a privileged minority, between the free rich
and the free poor, while the great, productive mass of the popu-
lation, the slaves, formed the purely passive pedestal for these com-
batants. People forget Saint-Just's significant remark: The Roman
proletariat lived at the expense of society, while modern society
lives at the expense of the proletariat. With so complete a differ-
ence between the material, economic conditions of the ancient and
the modern class struggles, the political figures they produce can
likewise have no more in common with one another than the Arch-
bishop of Canterbury has with the High Priest Samuel.

London, June 23, 1849.

FREDERICK ENGELS’ PREFACE TO THE THIRD GERMAN EDITION
(1883)

The fact that a new edition of The Eighteenth Brumaire has
become necessary, thirty-three years after its first appearance,
proves that even today this little work has lost none of its value.

It is in truth a work of genius. Immediately after the event
that struck the political world like a thunderbolt from a blue sky,
that was condemned by some with loud cries of moral indignation
and accepted by others as salvation from the revolution and as
punishment for its errors, but was only wondered at by all and
understood by none—immediately after this event Marx came out
with a concise, epigrammatic exposition that laid bare the whole
course of French history since the February days in its inner inter-
connection, reduced the miracle of December 2 to a natural,
necessary result of this interconnection and in so doing did
not even need to treat the hero of the coup d'état otherwise than
with the contempt he so well deserved. And with such a master
hand was the picture drawn that every fresh disclosure since made
has only provided fresh proofs of how faithfully it reflected real-
ity. This eminent understanding of the living history of the day, this clear-sighted appreciation of events at the moment of happening, is indeed without parallel.

But for this, Marx's thorough knowledge of French history was also requisite. France is the land where, more than anywhere else, the historical class struggles were each time fought out to a decision, where, consequently, the changing political forms within which they occur and in which their results are summarised have likewise been stamped with the sharpest outlines. The centre of feudalism in the Middle Ages, the model country of centralised monarchy resting on estates, since the Renaissance, France demolished feudalism in the Great Revolution and established the unalloyed rule of the bourgeoisie in a classical purity unequalled by any other European land. And the struggle of the upward striving proletariat against the ruling bourgeoisie also appeared here in an acute form unknown elsewhere. This was the reason why Marx not only studied the past history of France with special interest, but also followed her current history in every detail, stored up the material for future use and consequently was never taken by surprise by the events.

In addition, however, there was still another circumstance. It was precisely Marx who had first discovered the great law of motion of history, the law according to which all historical struggles, whether they proceed in the political, religious, philosophical or some other ideological domain, are in fact only the more or less clear expression of struggles of social classes, and that the existence and thereby the collisions, too of these classes are in turn conditioned by the degree of development of their economic position, by the mode of their production and by the form of exchange resulting from it. This law, which has the same significance for

---

1 The Renaissance is the name given to the period from the fourteenth to the sixteenth centuries preceding the bourgeois revolutions in England, France and Germany, when on the basis of the downfall of feudalism and the first successes of capitalism, the urban bourgeoisie began to flourish and bourgeois culture to develop, especially in Italy and along the shores of the Mediterranean. The opposition to medieval, ecclesiastic-feudal culture was marked above all by tremendous interest in ancient Greek and Roman culture.—*Ed.

2 On the Eighteenth Brumaire (according to the calendar introduced in the period of the first French bourgeois revolution), or November 9, 1799, Napoleon I carried out the coup d'état whereby as First Consul he concentrated supreme power in his hands; in 1804 he declared himself emperor. By "the second edition of the Eighteenth Brumaire," Marx means the coup d'état accomplished by Louis Bonaparte, the nephew of Napoleon I, on December 2, 1851.—*Ed.
1814 draped itself alternately as the Roman Republic and the Roman Empire, and the Revolution of 1848 knew nothing better to do than to parody, in turn, 1789 and the revolutionary tradition of 1793 to 1795. In like manner the beginner who has learnt a new language always translates it back into his mother tongue, but he has assimilated the spirit of the new language and can produce freely in it only when he moves in it without remembering the old and forgets in it his ancestral tongue.

Consideration of this world-historical conjuring up of the dead reveals at once a salient difference. Camille Desmoulins, Danton, Robespierre, Saint-Just, Napoleon, the heroes, as well as the parties and the masses of the old French Revolution, performed the task of their time in Roman costume and with Roman phrases, the task of releasing and setting up modern bourgeois society. The first ones knocked the feudal basis to pieces and moved off the feudal heads which had grown from it. The other created inside France the conditions under which free competition could first be developed, the parcelled landed property exploited, the unfettered productive power of the nation employed, and outside the French borders he everywhere swept the feudal formations away, so far as was necessary to furnish bourgeois society in France with a suitable up-to-date environment on the European Continent. The new social formation once established, the antediluvian Colossi disappeared and with them the resurrected Romans—the Brutes, Gracchi, Publicolis, the tribunes, the senators and Cesar himself. Bourgeois society in its sober reality had begotten its true interpreters and mouthpieces in the Says, Cousins, Royer-Collards, Benjamin Constant and Guizots; its real military leaders sat behind the office desks, and the hog-headed Louis XVIII was its political chief. Wholly absorbed in the production of wealth and in the peaceful struggle of competition, it no longer comprehended that ghosts from the days of Rome had watched over its cradle. But unheroic as bourgeois society is, yet it had need of heroism, of sacrifice, of terror, of civil war and of national battles to bring it into being. And in the classically austere traditions of the Roman Republic its glad-

iators found the ideals and the art forms, the self-deceptions that they needed in order to conceal from themselves the bourgeois limitations of the content of their struggles and to keep their passion at the height of the great historical tragedy. Similarly, at another stage of development, a century earlier, Cromwell and the English people had borrowed speech, passions and illusions from the Old Testament for their bourgeois revolution. When the real aim had been achieved, when the bourgeois transformation of English society had been accomplished, Locke supplanted Habakkuk.

The awakening of the dead in those revolutions therefore served the purpose of glorifying the new struggles, not of parodying the old; of magnifying the given tasks in imagination, not of taking flight from their solution in reality; of finding once more the spirit of revolution, not of making its ghost walk again.

From 1848 to 1851 only the ghost of the old revolution walked, from Marrast, the republicain en gants jaunes, who disguised himself as the old Bailly, to the adventurer who hides his trivally repellent features under the iron death mask of Napoleon. An entire people, which had imagined that by a revolution it had increased its power of action, suddenly finds itself set back into a dead epoch and, in order that no doubt as to the relapse may be possible, the old data again arise, the old chronology, the old names, the old edicts, which have long become a subject of antiquarian erudition, and the old henchmen, who had long seemed dead and decayed. The nation appears to itself like that mad Englishman in Bedlam, who fancies that he lives in the times of the ancient Pharaoths and daily bemoans the hard labour that he must perform in the Ethiopian mines as a gold digger, immersed in this subterranean prison, a dimly burning lamp fastened to his head, the overseer of the slaves behind him with a long whip, and at the exits a confused mass of barbarian mercenaries, who understand

1 In the English bourgeois revolution, “the bourgeoisie was allied with the new nobility against the monarchy, the feudal nobility, and the ruling church.” (Marx.)—Ed.

2 Republican in yellow gloves.—Ed.
neither the forced labourers in the mines nor one another, since they have no common speech. "And all this is expected of me," groans the mad Englishman, "of me, a free-born Briton, in order to make gold for the old Pharaohs." "In order to pay the debts of the Bonaparte family," sighs the French nation. The Englishman, so long as he was in his right mind, could not get rid of the fixed idea of making gold. The French, so long as they were engaged in revolution, could not get rid of the memory of Napoleon, as the election of December 10, 1848 \(^1\) proved. From the perils of revolution their longings went back to the flesh-pots of Egypt, and December 2, 1851, was the answer. They have not only a caricature of the old Napoleon, they have the old Napoleon himself, caricatured as he would inevitably appear in the middle of the nineteenth century.

The social revolution of the nineteenth century cannot draw its poetry from the past, but only from the future. It cannot begin with itself, before it has stripped off all superstition in regard to the past. Earlier revolutions required world-historical recollections in order to drug themselves concerning their own content. In order to arrive at its content, the revolution of the nineteenth century must let the dead bury their dead. There the phrase went beyond the content; here the content goes beyond the phrase.

The February Revolution was a sudden attack, a taking of the old society by surprise, and the people proclaimed this unhoped for stroke as a world-historic deed, opening the new epoch. On December 2 the February Revolution is conjured away by a card-shaper's trick, and what seems overthrown is no longer the monarchy; it is the liberal concessions that were wrung from it by century-long struggles. Instead of society having conquered a new content for itself, the state only appears to have returned to its oldest form, to the shamelessly simple domination of the sabre and the cowl. This is the answer to the coup de main of February 1848, given by the coup de tête of December 1851. Easy come, easy go. Meanwhile the interval has not passed by unused: During the years 1848 to 1851 French society has made up, and that

\(^1\) The day Louis Bonaparte was elected president of the republic.—\textit{Ed.}

by an abbreviated, because revolutionary, method, for the studies and experiences which, in a regular, so to speak, text-book development would have had to precede the February Revolution, if the latter was to be more than a disturbance of the surface. Society now seems to have fallen back behind its point of departure; it has in truth first to create for itself the revolutionary point of departure, the situation, the relationships, the conditions, under which modern revolution alone becomes serious.

Bourgeois revolutions, like those of the eighteenth century, storm more swiftly from success to success; their dramatic effects outdo each other; men and things seem set in sparkling brilliants; ecstasy is the everyday spirit; but they are short lived; soon they have attained their zenith, and a long depression lays hold of society before it learns soberly to assimilate the results of its storm and stress period. Proletarian revolutions, on the other hand, like those of the nineteenth century, criticise themselves constantly, interrupt themselves continually in their own course, come back to the apparently accomplished in order to begin it afresh, derive with unmerciful thoroughness the inadequacies, weaknesses and paltrinesses of their first attempts, seem to throw down their adversary only in order that he may draw new strength from the earth and rise again more gigantic before them, recoil ever and anon from the indefinite prodigiousness of their own aims, until the situation has been created which makes all turning back impossible, and the conditions themselves cry out:

\begin{quote}
Hic Rhodus, hic salta! \(^1\)
Hier ist die Rose, hier tanze! \(^2\)
\end{quote}

For the rest, every fairly competent observer, even if he had not followed the course of French development step by step, must have had a presentiment that a terrible fiasco was in store for the revolution. It was enough to hear the self-complacent howl of victory with which Messieurs the Democrats congratulated each

\(^1\) Here is Rhodes, leap here!—\textit{Ed.}
\(^2\) Here is the rose, dance here!—\textit{Ed.}
other on the gracious consequences of May 2, 1852.\footnote{The day on which new presidential elections were to be held. Louis Bonaparte would have had to retire on this day, as the constitution did not permit anyone to be elected to the presidency for a second time, except after an interval of four years.—\textit{Ed.}} In their minds May 2, 1852, had become a fixed idea, a dogma, like the day on which Christ should reappear and the millennium begin, in the minds of the Chiliasm.\footnote{The adherents of an ancient Christian sect, who believed in the second coming of Christ and in the establishment of the millennium, a thousand years of paradise on earth.—\textit{Ed.}} As ever, weakness had taken refuge in a belief in miracles, had fancied the enemy overcome when he was only conjured away in imagination, and lost all understanding of the present in a passive glorification of the future that was in store for it and of the deeds it had \textit{in petto},\footnote{In reserve.—\textit{Ed.}} but merely did not want to carry out as yet. Those heroes, who seek to disprove their demonstrated incapacity by mutually offering each other their sympathy and getting together in a crowd, had tied up their bundles, collected their laurel wreaths in advance and were just then engaged in discounting on the exchange market the republics \textit{in partibus}, for which they had already thoughtfully organised the government personnel with all the calm of their unassuming disposition. December 2 struck them like a thunderbolt from a clear sky, and the peoples that in epochs of pusillanimous depression gladly let their inward apprehension be drowned by the loudest bawlers will per chance have convinced themselves that the times are past when the cackle of geese could save the Capitol.\footnote{An old Roman story tells that once, when Rome was besieged, the sacred geese in the Roman fortress, the Capitol, wakened the garrison with their cackling; thanks to this, the garrison was able to beat off the attack of the enemies who had stolen up in the night.—\textit{Ed.}}

The Constitution, the National Assembly, the dynastic parties,\footnote{For these parties see p. 335 \textit{et seq.}—\textit{Ed.}} the blue and the red republicans,\footnote{The blue (bourgeois) and the red (socialist) republican parties.—\textit{Ed.}} the heroes of Africa,\footnote{This refers to the generals distinguished for their savage deeds in Africa during the conquest of Algeria (Cavaignac, Changarnier and others).—\textit{Ed.}} the thunder from the platform, the sheet lightning of the daily press,

\footnote{\textit{The} eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte \textit{the} entire literature, the political names and the intellectual reputations, the civil law and the penal code, the \textit{liberté, égalité, fraternité} and the second of May, 1852—all have vanished like a phantasmasgoria before the spell of a man whom even his enemies do not make out to be a magician. Universal suffrage seems to have survived only for a moment, in order that with its own hand it may make its last will and testament before the eyes of all the world and declare in the name of the people itself: Everything that exists has this much worth that it will perish. It is not enough to say, as the French do, that their nation has been taken by surprise. A nation and a woman are not forgiven the unguarded hour in which the first adventurer that came along could violate them. The riddle is not solved by such terms of speech, but merely formulated in another way. It remains to be explained how a nation of thirty-six millions can be surprised and delivered unresisting into captivity by three high class swindlers. Let us recapitulate in their general outlines the phases that the French Revolution has gone through from February 24, 1848, to December 1851. Three main periods are unmistakable: the \textit{February period}; the period of the constituting of the republic or of the Constituent National Assembly, May 4, 1848, to May 29, 1849; the period of the constitutional republic or of the Legislative National Assembly, May 29, 1849, to December 2, 1851. The \textit{first period}, from February 24, or the overthrow of Louis Philippe, to May 4, 1848, the meeting of the Constituent Assembly, the \textit{February period proper}, may be described as the \textit{prologue} of the Revolution. Its character was officially expressed in the fact that the government improvised by it declared itself to be \textit{provisonal} and, like the government, everything that was instigated, attempted or enunciated during this period, proclaimed itself to be \textit{provisonal}. Nothing and nobody ventured to lay claim to the right of existence and of real action. All the elements that had prepared or determined the Revolution, the dynastic opposition, the republican bourgeoisie, the democratic-republican petty bourgeoisie and the social-democratic workers, provisionally found their place in the \textit{February government}.}
It could not be otherwise. The February days originally intended an electoral reform, by which the circle of the politically privileged among the possessing class itself was to be widened and the exclusive domination of the aristocracy of finance overthrown. When it came to the actual conflict, however, when the people mounted the barricades, the National Guard maintained a passive attitude, the army offered no serious resistance and the monarchy ran away, the republic appeared to be a matter of course. Every party construed it in its own sense. Having been won by the proletariat by force of arms, the proletariat impressed its stamp on it and proclaimed it to be a social republic. There was thus indicated the general content of the modern revolution, which stood in most singular contradiction to everything that, with the material at hand, with the degree of education attained by the masses, under the given circumstances and relationships, could be immediately realised in practice. On the other hand, the claims of all the remaining elements that had participated in the February Revolution were recognised by the lion’s share that they obtained in the government. In no period do we therefore find a more confused mixture of high-flown phrases and actual uncertainty and clumsiness, of more enthusiastic striving for innovation and more deeply rooted domination of the old routine, of more apparent harmony of the whole society and more profound estrangement of its elements. While the Paris proletariat still revelled in the vision of the wide prospects that had opened before it and indulged in seriously-meant discussions on social problems, the old powers of society had grouped themselves, assembled, reflected and found an unexpected support in the mass of the nation, the peasants and petty bourgeoisie, who all at once stormed on to the political stage, after the barriers of the July monarchy had fallen.

The second period, from May 4, 1848, to the end of May 1849, is the period of the constitution, of the foundation of the bourgeois republic. Directly after the February days the dynastic opposition had not only been surprised by the republicans, the republicans by the socialists, but all France had been surprised by Paris. The National Assembly, which had met on May 4, 1848, having emerged from the national elections, represented the nation. It was a living protest against the presumptuous aspirations of the February days and was to reduce the results of the Revolution to the bourgeois scale. In vain the Paris proletariat, which immediately grasped the character of this National Assembly, attempted on May 15, a few days after it met, forcibly to deny its existence, to dissolve it, to disintegrate once more into its constituent parts the organic form in which the proletariat was threatened by the reactionary spirit of the nation. As is known, May 15 had no other result save that of removing Blanqui and his comrades, that is, the real leaders of the proletarian party [the revolutionary communists], from the public stage for the entire duration of the cycle we are considering.

The bourgeois monarchy of Louis Philippe can only be followed by the bourgeois republic, that is, if a limited section of the bourgeoisie, formerly ruled in the name of the king, the whole of the bourgeoisie will now rule in the name of the people. The demands of the Paris proletariat are utopian nonsense to which an end must be put. To this declaration of the Constituent National Assembly the Paris proletariat replied with the June Insurrection, the most colossal event in the history of European civil wars. The bourgeois republic triumphed. On its side stood the aristocracy of finance, the industrial bourgeoisie, the middle class, the petty bourgeoisie, the army, the lumpenproletariat organised as the Mobile Guard, the intellectual lights, the clergy, and the rural population. On the side of the Paris proletariat stood none but itself. More than three thousand insurgents were butchered after the victory, and fifteen thousand were transported without trial. With this defeat the proletariat passes into the background of the revolutionary stage. It attempts to press forward again on every occasion, as soon as the movement appears to make a fresh start, but with ever decreased expenditure of strength and always more insignificant results. As soon as one of the social strata situated above it gets into revolutionary ferment, it enters into an alliance with it and so shares all the defeats that the different parties suffer

---

1 Here and elsewhere the square brackets in the text denote passages of the first edition omitted in subsequent editions.—Ed.

2 Marx gives a characterisation of the Garde Mobile in The Class Struggles in France (1848-50); see p. 211 of the present volume.—Ed.
one after another. But these subsequent blows become steadily weaker, the more they are distributed over the entire surface of society. Its more important leaders in the Assembly and the press successively fall victims to the courts, and ever more equivocal figures come to the fore. In part it throws itself into doctrinaire experiments, exchange banks and workers’ associations, hence into a movement in which it renounces the revolutionizing of the old world by means of its own great, combined resources, and seeks, rather, to achieve its salvation behind society’s back, in private fashion, within its limited conditions of existence, and hence inevitably suffers shipwreck. It seems to be unable either to rediscover revolutionary greatness in itself or to win new energy from the alliances newly entered into, until all classes with which it contended in June themselves lie prostrate beside it. But at least it succumbs with the honours of the great, world-historic struggle; not only France, but all Europe trembles at the June earthquake, while the ensuing defeats of the upper classes are so cheaply bought that they require bare-faced exaggeration by the victorious party to be able to pass for events at all and become the more ignominious the further the defeated party is removed from the proletariat.

The defeat of the June insurgents, to be sure, had now prepared and levelled the ground on which the bourgeois republic could be founded and built up, but it had shown at the same time that in Europe there are other questions involved than that of “republic or monarchy.” It had revealed that here bourgeoïs républic signifies the unlimited despotism of one class over other classes. It had proved that in lands with an old civilisation, with a developed formation of classes, with modern conditions of production and with an intellectual consciousness into which all traditional ideas have been absorbed by the work of centuries, the republic signifies in general only the political form of the revolution of bourgeoïs-society and not its conservative form of life, as, for example, in the United States of North America, where, though classes, indeed, already exist, they have not yet become fixed, but continually change and interchange their elements in a constant state of flux, where the modern means of production, instead of coinciding with a stagnant surplus population, rather

supply the relative deficiency of heads and hands and where, finally, the feverishly youthful movement of material production, that has a new world to make its own, has left neither time nor opportunity for abolishing the old spirit world.

During the June days all classes and parties had united in the Party of Order against the proletarian class as the party of anarchy, of socialism, of communism. They had “saved” society from “the enemies of society.” They had given out the watchwords of the old society, “property, family, religion, order,” to their army as passwords and had proclaimed to the counter-revolutionary crusaders: “In this sign you will conquer!” From that moment, as soon as one of the numerous parties which had gathered under this sign against the June insurgents seeks to hold the revolutionary battlefield in its own class interests, it goes down before the cry: “Property, family, religion, order.” Society is saved just as often as the circle of its rulers contracts, as a more exclusive interest is maintained against a wider one. Every demand of the simplest bourgeois financial reform, of the most ordinary liberalism, of the most formal republicanism, of the most insipid democracy, is simultaneously castigated as an “attempt on society” and stigmatised as “socialism.” And, finally, the high priests of “religion and order” themselves are driven with kicks from their Pythian tripods, hauled out of their beds in the darkness of night, put in prison-vans, thrown into dungeons or sent into exile; their temple is razed to the ground, their mouths are sealed, their pens broken, their law torn to pieces in the name of religion, of property, of family, of order. Bourgeois fanaticism for order are shot down on their balconies by mobs of drunken soldiers, their domestic sanctuaries profaned, their houses bombarded for amusement—in the name of property, of family, of religion and of order. Finally the scum of bourgeois society forms the holy phalanx of order and the hero Crapulinsky ¹ installs himself in the Tuileries ² as the “saviour of society.”

¹ The hero of Heine’s poem, Two Knights. In this character, Heine ridicules the spendthrift Polish nobleman (“Crapulinsky” comes from the French word crapule—gluttony, greediness). Here Marx means Louis Bonaparte.—Ed.
² The residence of the head of the government in France.—Ed.
Let us pick up the threads of the development once more.

The history of the Constituent National Assembly since the June days is the history of the domination and the liquidation of the republican section of the bourgeoisie, of that section which is known by the names of tricolour republicans, pure republicans, political republicans, formalist republicans, etc.

Under the bourgeois monarchy of Louis Philippe it had formed the official republican opposition and consequently a recognised, component part of the political world of the day. It had its representatives in the Chambers and a considerable sphere of influence in the press. Its Paris organ, the National, was considered just as respectable in its way as the Journal des Débats. Its character corresponded to this position under the constitutional monarchy. It was not a section of the bourgeoisie held together by great, common interests and marked off by specific conditions of production. It was a coterie of republican-minded bourgeois—writers, lawyers, officers and officials—that owed its influence to the personal antipathies of the country to Louis Philippe, to memories of the old republic, to the republican faith of a number of enthusiasts, above all, however, to French nationalism, whose hatred of the Vienna treaties and of the alliance with England it stirred up perpetually. A large part of the following that the National had under Louis Philippe was due to this concealed imperialism, which could consequently confront it later, under the republic, as a deadly rival in the person of Louis Bonaparte. It fought the aristocracy of finance, as did all the rest of the bourgeois opposition. Polemics against the budget, which were closely connected in France with fighting the aristocracy of finance, procured popularity too cheaply, and material for puritanical leading articles too plentifully, not to be exploited. The industrial bourgeoisie was grateful to it for its slavish defence of the French protectionist system, which it accepted, however, more on national grounds than on grounds of political economy; the bourgeoisie as a whole was grateful to it for its vicious denunciation of communism and so-

1 On February 24, 1848, Louis Philippe, frightened at the revolutionary uprising, signed his abdication from the throne in favour of his grandson, the Count of Paris. Since the latter was a minor, it was proposed that his mother, the Duchess of Orleans, act as regent.—Ed.
proletariat against capital, a rising laid low with grape-shot. What it had pictured to itself as the most revolutionary happening, turned out in reality to be the most counter-revolutionary. The fruit fell into its lap, but it fell from the tree of knowledge, not from the tree of life.

The exclusive rule of the bourgeois republicans lasted only from June 24 to December 10, 1848. It is summed up in the drafting of a republican constitution and in the state of siege of Paris:

The new Constitution was at bottom only the republicanised edition of the constitutional Charter of 1830. The narrow electoral qualification of the July monarchy, which even excluded a large part of the bourgeoisie from political rule, was incompatible with the existence of the bourgeois republic. In lieu of this qualification, the February Revolution had at once proclaimed direct, universal suffrage. The bourgeois republicans could not revoke this event. They had to content themselves with adding the limiting proviso of a six months' domicile in the constituency. The old organisation of government, of the municipal system, of the administration of law, of the army, etc., continued to exist inviolate, or, where the Constitution changed them, the change concerned the table of contents, not the contents; the name, not the thing.

The inevitable general staff of the liberties of 1840, personal liberty, liberty of the press, of speech, of association, of Assembly, of education and of religion, etc., received a constitutional uniform, which made them invulnerable. Each of these liberties, namely, is proclaimed as the absolute right of the French citoyen, but always with the marginal note that it is unlimited so far as it is not restricted by the "equal rights of others and the public safety" or by "laws" which are intended to secure just this harmony of the individual liberties with one another and with the public safety. For example: "The citizens have the right of association, of peaceful and unarmed assembly, of petition and of the free expression of opinions, whether in the press or otherwise. The enjoyment of these rights has no limit save the equal rights of others and the public safety." (Chapter II of the French Constitution, § 8.)—"Education is free. Freedom of education shall be enjoyed under the conditions fixed by law and under the general supervision of the state." (Ibidem, § 9.)—"The domicile of every citizen is inviolable except in the forms prescribed by law." (Chapter II, § 3.) Etc., etc.—The Constitution, therefore, constantly refers to future organic laws, which are to put into effect those marginal notes and regulate the enjoyment of these unrestricted liberties so that they collide neither with one another nor with the public safety. And later, the organic laws were brought into being by the friends of order and all those liberties regulated in such a way that the bourgeoisie in its enjoyment of them does not come into collision with the equal rights of the other classes. Where it forbids these liberties entirely to "the others" or permits enjoyment of them under conditions that are just so many police traps, this always happens solely in the interest of the "public safety," that is, the safety of the bourgeoisie, as the Constitution prescribes. In the sequel, both sides accordingly appeal with complete justice to the Constitution, the friends of order, who suspended all these liberties, as well as the democrats, who demanded them back. Each paragraph of the Constitution, namely, contains in itself its own antithesis, its own Upper and Lower House, namely liberty in the general phrase, suspension of liberty in the marginal note. So long, therefore, as the name of freedom was respected and only its actual realisation prevented, of course in a legal way, the constitutional existence of liberty remained intact and inviolate, however mortal the blows dealt to its everyday existence.

This Constitution, made inviolable in so ingenious a manner, was nevertheless, like Achilles, vulnerable in one point, not in the heel, but in the head, or rather in the two heads in which it issued—the Legislative Assembly, on the one hand, the President, on the other. Glance through the Constitution and you will find
that only the paragraphs in which the relationship of the President to the Legislative Assembly is determined are absolute, positive, non-contradictory, incapable of distortion. Here, that is to say, the issue for the bourgeois republicans was to safeguard themselves. §§ 45-70 of the Constitution are so worded that the National Assembly can remove the President constitutionally, whereas the President can only remove the National Assembly unconstitutionally, only by setting aside the Constitution itself. Here, therefore, it challenges its overthrow by force. It not only sanctifies the division of powers, like the Charter of 1830, it widens it into an intolerable contradiction. The play of the constitutional powers, as Guizot termed the parliamentary squabble between the legislative and executive authorities, is in the Constitution of 1848 continually played va-banque. ¹ On one side are seven hundred and fifty representatives of the people, elected by universal suffrage and eligible for re-election; they form an uncontrollable, indissoluble, indivisible National Assembly, a National Assembly that enjoys legislative omnipotence, decides in the last instance on war, peace and commercial treaties, alone possesses the right of amnesty and, by its permanence, perpetually holds the front of the stage. On the other side is the President, with all the attributes of royal power, with authority to appoint and dismiss his ministers independently of the National Assembly, with all the resources of the executive power in his hands, bestowing all posts and disposing thereby in France over at least a million and a half existences, for so many depend on the five hundred thousand officials and officers of every rank. He has the whole of the armed forces behind him. He enjoys the privilege of pardoning individual criminals, of suspending National Guards, of discharging, in agreement with the Council of State, the general cantonal and municipal councils elected by the citizens themselves. Initiative and direction are reserved to him in all treaties with foreign countries. While the Assembly constantly performs on the boards and is exposed to the searching light of day, he leads a hidden life in the Elysian fields, and that with Article 45 of the Constitution before his eyes and in his heart, crying to him daily: "Frère, il faut mourir!" ¹ Your power ceases on the second Sunday of the lovely month of May in the fourth year after your election! Then the glory is at an end, the piece is not played twice and if you have debts, look to it betimes that you pay them off with the six hundred thousand francs granted you by the Constitution, unless, perchance, you should prefer to go to Clichy, ² on the second Monday of the lovely month of May!—Thus, if the Constitution assigns actual power to the President, it seeks to secure moral power for the National Assembly. Apart from the fact that it is impossible to create a moral power by paragraphs of law, the Constitution here suspends itself once more, by having the President elected by all Frenchmen through direct suffrage. While the votes of France are split up among the seven hundred and fifty members of the National Assembly, they are, on the contrary, here concentrated on a single individual. While each separate representative of the people represents only this or that party, this or that town, this or that bridge-head, or even the mere necessity of electing one of the seven hundred and fifty, in which neither the cause nor the man is closely examined, the President is the elect of the nation and the act of his election is the trump that the sovereign people plays once every four years. The elected National Assembly stands in a metaphysical relation, but the elected President in a personal relation to the nation. The National Assembly indeed, exhibits in its individual representatives the manifold aspects of the national spirit, but in the President this national spirit finds its incarnation. As against the Assembly, he possesses a sort of divine right, he is President, by grace of the people.

Thetis, the sea goddess, had prophesied to Achilles that he would die in the bloom of youth. The Constitution, which, like Achilles, had its weak spot, had also, like Achilles, its presentiment that it must go to an early death. It was sufficient for the constitution-making, pure republicans to cast a glance from the cloud-kingdom of their ideal republic at the profane world, in order to perceive how the arrogance of the royalists, the Bona-

¹Staking all on one hazard.—Ed.
²The debtors' prison in Paris.—Ed.
partists, the democrats, the communists as well as their own discredit grew daily in the same measure as they approached the completion of their great legislative work of art, without Thetis on this account having to leave the sea and communicate the secret to them. They sought to cheat destiny by constitutional cunning, through § 111 of the Constitution, according to which every motion for the revision of the Constitution must have at least three-quarters of the votes cast for it in three successive debates between which an entire month must always lie, with the added proviso that not less than five hundred members of the National Assembly must vote. Thereby they merely made the impotent attempt to exercise as a parliamentary minority, as which they already saw themselves prophetically in their mind’s eye, a power which at the moment when they commanded a parliamentary majority and all the resources of governmental authority was slipping daily more and more from their feeble hands.

Finally the Constitution, in a melodramatic paragraph, entrusts itself “to the vigilance and the patriotism of the whole French people and every single Frenchman,” after it had previously entrusted the “vigilant” and “patriotic” in another paragraph to the tender, painstaking care of the High Court of Justice, of the “haute cour,” established by it for the purpose.

Such was the Constitution of 1848, which on December 2, 1851, was overthrown not by a head, but fell at the touch of a mere hat; this hat, to be sure, was a three-cornered, Napoleonic hat.

While the bourgeois republicans in the Assembly were busy elaborating, discussing and voting this Constitution, outside the Assembly Cavaignac maintained the state of siege of Paris. The state of siege of Paris was the accoucheur of the Constituent Assembly in its travail of republican creation. If the Constitution is subsequently put out of existence by bayonets, it must not be forgotten that it was likewise by bayonets, and these turned against the people, that it had to be protected in its mother’s womb and by bayonets that it had to be brought into existence. The forefathers of the “honest republicans” had sent their symbol, the tricolour, on a tour round Europe. They now, in turn, also produced an invention that made its way by itself over the whole continent, but returned to France with ever renewed love until it has now acquired citizen rights in half her departments—the state of siege. It was a splendid invention, periodically employed in every ensuing crisis in the course of the French Revolution. But barrack and bivouac, which were periodically laid on French society’s head to compress its brain and make a quiet man of it; sabre and musket, which were periodically allowed to direct and administer, hold in tutelage and act as censor, play policeman and do night-watchman’s duties; moustache and uniform, which were periodically trumpeted as the highest wisdom and master of society—were not barrack and bivouac, sabre and musket, moustache and uniform, finally bound to hit upon the idea of saving society, rather, once and for all, by proclaiming their own regime as the highest and freeing bourgeois society from all the trouble of governing itself? Barrack and bivouac, sabre and musket, moustache and uniform, were bound to hit upon the idea all the more as they might then also expect better cash payment for their higher services, whereas from the merely periodical state of siege and the transient rescues of society at the bidding of this or that bourgeois faction they gained little of substance beyond some killed and wounded and some friendly bourgeois grimaces. Should not the military, at length, likewise one day play the state of siege in their own interest and for their own interest and at the same time besiege the bourgeois bourses? Moreover, be it remarked in passing, one must not forget that Colonel Berhard, the same president of the military commission who under Cavaignac had 15,000 insurgents deported without trial, is at this moment again at the head of the military commissions active in Paris.

If, with the state of siege in Paris, the honest, the pure republicans founded the nursery in which the pretorians of Decem-

1 Pretorians was the name given in ancient Rome to the personal bodyguard of any general or emperor: this guard was in his pay, and was given various privileges. Mercenary, corrupt pretorians usually played a large part in the various palace revolutions. Here Marx is referring to the “Society of December 10,” the bodyguard of Louis Bonaparte.—Ed.
ber 2, 1851, were to grow up, on the other hand they deserve praise for the reason that, instead of exaggerating the national sentiment as under Louis Philippe, they now, when they have command of the national power, crawl before foreign countries, and, instead of setting Italy free, let her be reconquered by Austrians and Neapolitans. Louis Bonaparte's election as president on December 10, 1848, put an end to the dictatorship of Cavaignac and the Constituent Assembly.

In § 44 of the Constitution it is stated: "The President of the French Republic must never have lost his status as a French citizen." The first President of the French Republic, L. N. Bonaparte, had not merely lost his status as a French citizen, had not only been an English special constable, he was even a naturalised Swiss.

I have worked out elsewhere the significance of the election of December 10. I will not revert to it here. It is sufficient to remark here that it was a reaction of the peasants, who had had to pay the costs of the February Revolution, against the remaining classes of the nation, a reaction of the countryside against the town. It met with great approval in the army, for which the republicans of the National had provided neither glory nor additional pay, among the big bourgeoisie, which hailed Bonaparte as a bridge to monarchy, among the proletarians and petty bourgeoisie, who hailed him as a scourge for Cavaignac. I shall have an opportunity later of going more closely into the relationship of the peasants to the French Revolution.

The period from December 20, 1848, until the dissolution of the Constituent Assembly in May 1849, comprises the history of the downfall of the bourgeois republicans. After having founded a republic for the bourgeoisie, driven the revolutionary proletariat out of the field and reduced the democratic petty bourgeoisie to silence for the time being, they are themselves thrust aside by the mass of the bourgeoisie, which justly imputes this republic as its property. This bourgeois mass was, however, royalist. One section of it, the large landowners, had ruled during the Restoration

1 On December 20, 1848, Louis Bonaparte appointed his first ministry, headed by Odilon Barrot.—Ed.

and was accordingly Legitimist. The other, the aristocrats of finance and big industrialists, had ruled during the July Monarchy and was consequently Orleanist. The high dignitaries of the army, the university, the church, the bar, the academy and the press were to be found on either side, though in different proportions. Here in the bourgeois republic, which bore neither the name Bourbon nor the name Orleans, but the name capital, they had found the form of state in which they could rule conjointly. The June Insurrection had already united them in the "Party of Order." Now it was necessary, in the first place, to remove the coterie of bourgeois republicans, who still occupied seats in the National Assembly. Just as these pure republicans were brutal in their misuse of physical force against the people, to the same degree were they now cowardly, downcast, broken-spirited and incapable of fighting in their retreat, when it was a question of maintaining their republicanism and their legislative rights against the executive power and the royalists. I do not have to relate here the ignominious story of their dissolution. They were not destroyed; they passed away. Their history has come to an end forever, and, both inside and outside the Assembly, they figure in the following period only as memories, memories that again seem to become living whenever the mere name, republic, is once more the issue and as often as the revolutionary conflict threatens to sink down to the lowest level. I may remark in passing that the journal which gave its name to this party, the National, went over to socialism in the following period.

Before we finish with this period we must still cast a retrospective glance at the two powers, one of which annihilates the other on December 2, 1851, whereas from December 10, 1848, until the exit of the Constituent Assembly they lived in conjugal

1 The Restoration—the period from the downfall of Napoleon I (1814) to the July Revolution of 1830, when the dynasty of the Bourbons, which had been overthrown by the French Revolution, was again in power. The supporters of this dynasty, which represented the interests of the big landowners, called themselves Legitimists (they considered the Bourbon monarchy the only legitimate government). The Orleanists were the supporters of the Orleans dynasty, which represented the interests of the bankers, the financial aristocracy, and which came into power after the July Revolution of 1830.—Ed.
relations. We mean Louis Bonaparte, on the one hand, and the party of the royalist coalition, the Party of Order, of the big bourgeois, on the other. On his entry into the presidency, Bonaparte at once formed a ministry of the Party of Order, at the head of which he placed Odilon Barrot, the old leader, *nota bene*, of the most liberal section of the parliamentary bourgeoisie. M. Barrot had at last secured the portfolio, the spectre of which had haunted him since 1830, and what is more, the premiership in the ministry; but not, as he had imagined under Louis Philippe, as the most advanced leader of the parliamentary opposition, but with the task of killing a parliament, and as the confederate of all his arch-enemies, Jesuits and Legitimists. He brought the bride home at last, but only after she had become a prostitute. Bonaparte, appeared to efface himself completely. This party acted for him.

The first council of ministers at once resolved on the expedition to Rome, which they agreed to undertake behind the back of the National Assembly and the means for which they agreed to obtain from it by false-pretences. Thus they began by swindling, the National Assembly and secretly conspiring with the absolutist powers abroad against the revolutionary Roman republic. In the same manner and with the same manoeuvres Bonaparte prepared his coup of December 2 against the royalist Legislative Assembly and its constitutional republic. Let us not forget that the same party which formed Bonaparte's ministry on December 20, 1848, formed the majority of the Legislative National Assembly on December 2, 1851.

In August the Constituent Assembly had decided to dissolve only after it had worked out and promulgated a whole series of organic laws that were to supplement the Constitution. On January 6, 1849, the Party of Order had a deputy named Rateau move that it should let the organic laws go and, rather, decide on its own dissolution. Not merely the ministry, with Odilon Barrot at its head, but all the royalist members of the National Assembly bullyingly told it at this moment that its dissolution was necessary for the restoration of credit, for the consolidation of order, for putting an end to the indefinite provisional arrangements and for establishing a definite state of affairs; that it hampered the productivity of the new government and sought to prolong its existence merely out of malice; that the country was tired of it. Bonaparte took note of all this invective against the legislative power, learnt it by heart and proved to the parliamentary royalists on December 2, 1851, that he had learnt from them. He reiterated their own catchwords against them.

The Barrot ministry and the Party of Order went further. They caused *petitions to the National Assembly* to be made throughout France, in which this body was most politely requested to disappear. Against the National Assembly, the constitutionally organised expression of the people, they thus led its unorganised masses into the fire. They taught Bonaparte to appeal from the parliamentary assemblies to the people. At length, on January 29, the day had come on which the Constituent Assembly was to decide concerning its own dissolution. The National Assembly found the building where its sessions were held occupied by the military; Changarnier, the general of the Party of Order, in whose hands the supreme command of the National Guard and troops of the line had been united, held a great review in Paris, as if a battle were impending, and the royalists in coalition threateningly declared to the Constituent Assembly that force would be employed if it were not docile. It was docile and only bargained for a short extra term of life. What was January 29 but the *coup d'etat* of December 2, 1851, only carried out by the royalists with Bonaparte against the republican National Assembly? They did not observe or did not wish to observe that Bonaparte availed himself of January 29, 1849, to have a portion of the troops march past him in front of the Tuileries and seized with avidity on just this first public calling out of the military power against the parliamentary power to foreshadow Caligula.‡ They, to be sure, saw only their Changarnier.

One motive, in particular, that actuated the Party of Order in forcibly cutting short the duration of the Constituent Assembly's

‡ Caligula—the third Roman emperor (37-41.) A crazy despot, put on the throne by the army. To humiliate the Senate—the shadowy remnant of the institutions of Republican Rome—he made his horse a senator.—Ed.
life consisted in the organic laws supplementing the Constitution, such as the education law, the law on religious worship, etc. To the royalists in coalition it was most important that they should make these laws themselves and not let them be made by the republicans, who had grown distrustful. Among these organic laws, however, was also a law on the responsibility of the President of the republic. In 1851 the Legislative Assembly was occupied with the drafting of just such a law, when Bonaparte anticipated this coup with the coup of December 2. In their parliamentary winter campaign of 1851 what would the royalists in coalition not have given to have found the Responsibility Law ready to hand, and drawn up, at that, by a distrustful malicious republican Assembly!

After the Constituent Assembly had itself shattered its last weapon on January 29, 1849, the Barrot ministry and the friends of order hounded it to death, left nothing undone that could humiliate it and wrested from its self-despairing weakness laws that cost it the last remnant of respect in the eyes of the public. Bonaparte, occupied with his fixed Napoleonic idea, was bold enough to exploit publicly this degradation of the parliamentary power. That is to say, when on May 8, 1849, the National Assembly passed a vote of censure on the ministry because of the occupation of Civita Vecchia by Oudinot, and ordered it to bring back the Roman expedition to its ostensible purpose, Bonaparte published the same evening in the Moniteur a letter to Oudinot, in which he congratulated him on his heroic exploits and, in contrast to the ink-slinging parliamentarians, already posed as the generous protector of the army. The royalists smiled at this. They regarded him simply as their dupe. Finally, when Marrast, the President of the Constituent Assembly, believed for a moment that the safety of the National Assembly was endangered and, relying on the Constitution, requisitioned a colonel and his regiment, the colonel declined, took refuge in discipline and referred Marrast to Changarnier, who scornfully refused him with the remark that he did not like baionnettes intelligentes. In November 1851, when the royalists in coalition wished to begin the decisive struggle with Bonaparte, they sought to push through in their notorious Quas...
the revolution far enough to be unable to follow it further, still less to go ahead of it, it is thrust aside by the bolder ally that stands behind it and sent to the guillotine. The revolution thus moves along an ascending line.

It is the reverse with the Revolution of 1848. The proletarian party appears as an appendage of the petty-bourgeois democratic party. It is betrayed and dropped by the latter on April 16, May 15, and in the June days. The democratic party, in its turn, leans on the shoulders of the bourgeois-republican party. The bourgeois-republicans no sooner believe themselves well established than they shake off the troublesome comrade and support themselves on the shoulders of the Party of Order. The Party of Order hunches its shoulders, lets the bourgeois-republicans tumble and throws itself on the shoulders of armed force. It fancies it is still sitting on its shoulders when, one fine morning, it perceives that the shoulders have transformed themselves into bayonets. Each party strikes from behind at that pressing further and leans from in front on that pressing back. No wonder that in this ridiculous posture it loses its balance and, having made the inevitable grimaces, collapses with curious capers. The revolution thus moves in a descending line. It finds itself in this state of retrogressive motion before the last February barricade has been cleared away and the first revolutionary authority constituted.

The period that we have before us comprises the most motley mixture of crying contradictions: constitutionalists who conspire openly against the Constitution; revolutionaries who are confessedly constitutional; a National Assembly that wants to be omnipotent and always remains parliamentary; a Mountain that finds its vocation in patience and counts its present defeat by prophesying future victories; royalists who form the patres conscripti of the republic and are forced by the situation to keep the hostile royal houses, to which they adhere, abroad, and the republic, which they hate, in France; an executive power that finds its strength in its very weakness and its respectability in the contempt that it calls forth; a republic that is nothing but the combined infamy of two monarchies, the Restoration and the July Monarchy, with an imperial label—combinations, whose first proviso is separation; struggles, whose first law is indecision; wild, empty agitation in the name of peace, most solemn preaching of peace in the name of revolution; passions without truth, truth without passion; heroes without heroic deeds, history without events; development, whose sole driving force seems to be the calendar, wearying with constant repetition of the same tensions and relaxations; antagonisms that periodically seem to reach a high pitch only in order to lose their acuteness and fall away without being able to find a solution; pretentiously paraded exertions and bourgeois terror at the danger of the downfall of the world and at the same time the pettiest intrigues and court comedies played by the world redeemers, who in their laissez aller remember us less of the Day of Judgment than of the times of the Fronde—the official collective genius of France brought to naught by the artful stupidity of a single individual; the collective will of the nation, as often as it speaks through universal suffrage, seeking its appropriate expression through the ancient enemies of the mass interests, until at length it finds it in the self-will of a filibuster. If any section of history has been painted grey on grey, it is this. Men and events appear inverted Schelmihls, as shadows that have lost their substance. The revolution itself paralyses its own bearers and endows only its adversaries with passionate forcefulness. When the "red spectre," continually conjured up and exercised by the counter-revolutionaries, finally appears, it appears not with the Phrygian cap of anarchy on its head, but in the uniform of order, in red breeches.

We have seen that the ministry which Bonaparte installed on

1 Schelmihl—the hero of “Peter Schelmihl,” by Chamisso (1781-1838). He sold his shadow for wealth, and went seeking it all over the world.—_Ed._

2 Letting things take their course._—Ed._

3 The Fronde period in France (1648-53). The period of the regency of Anne of Austria before Louis XIV came of age—a period characterised by the opposition movement of the so-called parliamentary Fronde and the Fronde princes. This movement, which was directed against the absolute power of the king, was extremely weak, petty and irresolute._—Ed._

Conscript fathers. In ancient Rome every Senator began his speech to the Senate with this appellation._—Ed._
December 20, 1848, on his Ascension Day, was a ministry of the Party of Order, of the Legitimist and Orleanist coalition. This Barrot-Falloux ministry had outlived the republican Constituent Assembly, whose term of life it had more or less violently cut short, and found itself still at the helm. Changarnier, the general of the allied royalists, continued to unite in his person the general command of the first division of the army and the National Guard of Paris. The general elections had finally secured the Party of Order a large majority in the National Assembly. Here the deputies and peers of Louis Philippe encountered a hallowed host of Legitimists, for whom numerous ballot papers of the nation had become transformed into admission cards to the political stage. The Bonapartist representatives of the people were too few to be able to form an independent parliamentary party. They appear merely as the mauvaise queue 1 of the Party of Order. Thus the Party of Order was in possession of the governmental power, the army and the legislative body, in short, of the whole power of the state, while it had been morally strengthened by the general elections, which made its rule appear as the will of the people, and by the simultaneous triumph of counter-revolution over the whole continent of Europe.

Never did a party open its campaign with greater resources or under more favourable auspices.

The shipwrecked pure republicans found themselves reduced to a clique of some fifty men in the National Assembly, the African generals—Cavaignac, Lamoricière and Bedau—at their head. The great opposition party, however, was formed by the Mountain. The Social-Democratic Party had given itself this parliamentary name. It commanded more than two hundred of the seven hundred and fifty votes of the National Assembly and was consequently at least as powerful as any one of the three factions of the Party of Order taken by itself. Its relative minority compared with the entire royalist coalition seemed compensated by special circumstances. Not only did the elections in the Departments show that it had gained a considerable following among the rural population.

---

1 Evil appendage.—Ed.

THE EIGHTEENTH BRUMAIRE OF LOUIS BONAPARTE

It counted in its ranks almost all the deputies from Paris; the army had made a confession of democratic faith by the election of three non-commissioned officers, and the leader of the Mountain, Ledru-Rollin, in contradistinction to all the representatives of the Party of Order, had been raised to the parliamentary peerage by five Departments, which had pooled their votes for him. In view of the inevitable clashes of the royalists among themselves and of the whole Party of Order with Bonaparte, the Mountain seemed to have all the elements of success before it on May 29, 1849. A fortnight later it had lost everything, honour included.

Before we pursue parliamentary history further, some remarks are necessary to avoid common misunderstandings regarding the whole character of the period that lies before us. Looked at in the democratic way, the period of the Legislative National Assembly is concerned with what the period of the Constituent Assembly was concerned, viz., the simple struggle between republicans and royalists. The movement itself, however, they sum up in the stock word "reaction"—a night in which all cats are grey and which permits them to reel off their night-watchman's commonplace. And, to be sure, at first sight the Party of Order reveals a maze of different royalist factions, which not only intrigue against each other so that each may elevate its own pretender to the throne and exclude the pretender of the opposing party, but also all unite in common hatred of and common onslaughts on the "republic." In opposition to this royalist conspiracy the Mountain, for its part, appears as the representative of the "republic." The Party of Order appears to be perpetually engaged in a "reaction," which directs itself against press, association and the like, neither more nor less than in Prussia, and which, as in Prussia, is carried out in the form of brutal police intervention by the bureaucracy, the gendarmerie and the law courts. The "Mountain," for its part, is again just as continually occupied in warding off these attacks and thus defending the "eternal rights of man," as every so-called people's party has done, more or less, for a century and a half. Looking at the situation and the parties more closely,
however, this superficial appearance which veils the class struggle and the peculiar physiognomy of this period disappears.

Legitimists and Orleanists, as we have said, formed the two great sections of the Party of Order. Was that which held these sections fast to their pretenders and kept them apart from one another nothing but lily and tricolour, house of Bourbon and house of Orleans, different shades of royalty, was it the confession of faith in royalty at all? Under the Bourbons, large landed property had governed with its priests and lackeys; under the Orleans, high finance, large-scale industry, wholesale trade, that is, capital, governed with its retinue of lawyers, professors and orators. The Legitimate Monarchy was merely the political expression of the hereditary rule of the lords of the soil, as the July Monarchy was only the political expression of the usurping rule of the bourgeois parvenus. What kept the two sections apart, therefore, was not any so-called principles, it was their material conditions of existence, two different kinds of property, it was the old contrast of town and country, the rivalry between capital and landed property. That at the same time old memories, personal enmities, passions and hopes, prejudices and illusions, sympathies and antipathies, convictions, articles of faith and principles bound them to one or the other royal house, who is there that denies this? Upon the different forms of property, upon the social conditions of existence rises an entire superstructure of distinct and characteristically formed sentiments, illusions, modes of thought and views of life. The entire class creates and forms them out of its material foundations and out of the corresponding social relations. The single individual who derives them through tradition and education may imagine that they form the real motives and the starting point of his activity. If Orleanists and Legitimists, if each section sought to make itself and the other believe that loyalty to their two royal houses separated them, it later proved to be the case that it was rather their divided interests which forbade the uniting of the two royal houses. And as in private life one distinguishes between what a man thinks and says of himself and what he really is and does, still more in historical struggles must one distinguish the phrases and fancies of the parties from their real organism and their real interests, their conception of themselves from their reality. Orleanists and Legitimists found themselves side by side in the republic with equal claims. If each side wished to effect the restoration of its own royal house against the other, that merely signifies that the two great interests into which the bourgeoisie is split—landed property and capital—sought each to restore its own supremacy and the subordination of the other. We speak of two interests of the bourgeoisie, for large landed property, despite its feudal coquetry and pride of race, has been rendered thoroughly bourgeois by the development of modern society. Thus the Tories in England long imagined that they were enthusiastic about the monarchy, the church and the beauties of the old English Constitution, until the day of danger wrung from them the confession that they are only enthusiastic about ground rent.

The royalists in coalition carried on their intrigues against one another in the press, in Ems, in Claremont, 1 outside parliament. Behind the scenes they dozed their old Orleanist and Legitimist livers again and engaged in their old tourneys once more. But on the public stage, in their principal and state actions, as a great parliamentary party, they put off their respective royal houses with formal obeisances and adjourn the restoration of the monarchy in infinitum. They do their real business as the Party of Order, that is, under a social, not under a political title; as representatives of the bourgeoisie world-order, not as knights of errant princesses; as the bourgeois class against other classes, not as royalists against the republicans. And as the Party of Order they exercised more absolute and sterner domination over the other classes of society than ever previously during the Restoration or during the July Monarchy, a domination which, in general, was only possible under the form of the parliamentary republic, for only under this form could the two great divisions of the French bourgeoisie unite, and therefore put the rule of their class instead of the regime of a privileged section of it on the order of the day. If, nevertheless, they, as the Party of Order,

1 For Ems and Claremont, see note 2 on p. 270 of the present volume.—Ed.
also insult the republic and express their repugnance to it; this happens not merely from royalist memories. Instinct taught them that the republic, indeed, perfects their political rule, but at the same time undermines its social foundation, since they must now confront the subjugated classes and contend against them without intermediation, without the concealment afforded by the crown, without being able to divert the national interest through their subordinate struggles with one another and with the monarchy. It was a feeling of weakness that caused them to recoil from the pure conditions of their own class rule and to sigh for the more incomplete, more undeveloped and consequently less dangerous forms of this rule. On the other hand, as often as the royalists in coalition come in conflict with the pretender that confronts them, with Bonaparte, as often as they believe their parliamentary omnipotence endangered by the executive power, as often, therefore, as they must put forward the political title to their rule, they come forward as republicans and not as royalists, from the Orleanist Thiers, who warns the National Assembly that the republic divides them least, to the Legitimist Berruyer, who, as a tribune swathed in a tricoloured sash, harangues the people assembled before the town hall of the tenth arrondissement on December 2, 1851, in the name of the republic. To be sure, a mocking echo calls back to him: Henry V! Henry V!

As against the coalition of the bourgeoisie, a coalition between petty bourgeois and workers had been formed, the so-called Social-Democratic Party. The petty bourgeoisie saw that they were badly rewarded after the June days of 1848, their material interests imperilled and the democratic guarantees which were to ensure the enforcement of these interests endangered by the counter-revolution. Accordingly, they came closer to the workers. On the other hand, their parliamentary representation, the Mountain, thrust aside during the dictatorship of the bourgeois republicans, had in the last half of the life of the Constituent Assembly reconquered its lost popularity through the struggle with Bonaparte and the royalist ministers. It had concluded an alliance with the socialist leaders. In February 1849, banquets celebrated the reconciliation. A joint programme was drafted, joint election committees were set up and joint candidates put forward. From the social demands of the proletariat the revolutionary point was broken off and a democratic turn given to them; from the democratic claims of the petty bourgeoisie the purely political form was stripped off and their socialist point thrust forward. Thus arose Social-Democracy. The new Mount, the result of this combination, apart from some supernumeraries from the working class and some socialist sectarians, contained the same elements as the old Mount, only numerically stronger. But in the course of development it had changed with the class that it represented. The peculiar character of Social-Democracy is epitomised in the fact that democratic-republican institutions are demanded not as a means of doing away with both the extremes, capital and wage labour, but of weakening their antagonism and transforming it into harmony. However different the means proposed for the attainment of this end may be, however much it may be trimmed with more or less revolutionary notions, the content remains the same. This content is the transformation of society in a democratic way; but a transformation within the bounds of the petty bourgeoisie. Only one must not form the narrow-minded notion that the petty bourgeoisie, on principle, wishes to enforce an egoistic class interest. Rather, it believes that the special conditions of its emancipation are the general conditions under which modern society can alone be saved and the class struggle avoided. Just as little must one imagine that the democratic representatives are all shopkeepers or enthusiastic champions of shopkeepers. According to their education and their individual position they may be separated from them as widely as heaven from earth. What makes them representatives of the petty bourgeoisie is the fact that in their minds they do not go beyond the limits which the latter do not go beyond in life, that they are consequently driven theoretically to the same tasks and solutions to which material interest and social position practically drive the latter. This is in general the relationship of the political and literary representatives of a class to the class that they represent.

1 District of a French Department; in Paris, a city ward.—Ed.
After the analysis given, it is obvious that if the Mountain continually contends with the Party of Order for the republic and the so-called rights of man, neither the republic nor the rights of man are its final end, any more than an army which it is desired to deprive of its weapons and which sets about defending itself has taken the field in order to remain in possession of its own weapons.

Immediately, as soon as the National Assembly met, the Party of Order provoked the Mountain. The bourgeoisie now felt the necessity of making an end of the democratic petty bourgeoisie, as a year before it had realised the necessity of settling with the revolutionary proletariat. Only the situation of the adversary was a different one. The strength of the proletarian party lay in the streets, that of the petty bourgeoisie in the National Assembly itself. It was therefore a question of decoying them out of the National Assembly into the streets and causing them to smash their parliamentary power themselves, before time and circumstances could consolidate it. The Mountain rushed headlong into the trap.

The bombardment of Rome by the French troops was the bait that was thrown to it. It violated Article 54 of the Constitution, which forbids the French republic to employ its military forces against the freedom of another people. In addition to this, Article IV also prohibited any declaration of war on the part of the executive power without the assent of the National Assembly, and by its resolution of May 8, the Constituent Assembly had disapproved of the Roman expedition. On these grounds Ledru-Rollin brought in a bill of impeachment against Bonaparte and his ministers on June 11, 1849. Provoked by the wasp stings of Thiers, he actually let himself be carried away to the point of threatening that he would defend the Constitution by every means, even by force of arms. The Mountain arose as one man and repeated this call to arms. On June 12, the National Assembly rejected the bill of impeachment, and the Mountain left the parliament. The events of June 13 are known: the proclamation issued by a section of the Mountain, declaring Bonaparte and his ministers “outside the Constitution”; the street processions of the democratic National Guards, who, unarmed as they were, were dispersed in the encounter with the troops of Changarnier, etc., etc. A part of the Mountain fled abroad; another part was arraigned before the High Court at Bourges, and a parliamentary regulation subjected the remainder to the schoolmasterly surveillance of the President of the National Assembly. Paris was again declared in a state of siege and the democratic section of its National Guard dissolved. Thus the influence of the Mountain in parliament and the power of the petty bourgeoisie in Paris were broken.

Lyons, where June 13 had given the signal for a bloody insurrection of the workers, was, along with the five surrounding Departments, likewise declared in a state of siege, a condition that has continued up to the present moment.

The bulk of the Mountain had left its advance guard in the lurch, having refused to subscribe to its proclamation. The press had deserted, only two journals having dared to publish the pronunciamento. The petty bourgeoisie betrayed their representatives, in that the National Guards either stayed away or, where they appeared, hindered the erection of barricades. The representatives had duped the petty bourgeoisie, in that the alleged allies from the army were nowhere to be seen. Finally, instead of gaining an accession of strength from it, the democratic party had infected the proletariat with its own weakness and, as is usual with the great deeds of democrats, the leaders had the satisfaction of being able to charge their “people” with desertion, and the people the satisfaction of being able to charge its leaders with selling it.

Seldom had an action been announced with more noise than the impending campaign of the Mountain, seldom had an event been trumpeted with greater certainty or longer in advance than the inevitable victory of democracy. Most assuredly, the democrats believe in the trumpets before whose blasts the walls of Jericho fell down. And as often as they stand before the ramparts of despotism, they seek to imitate the miracle. If the Mountain wished to triumph in parliament, it should not have called to arms. If it called to arms in parliament, it should not have acted in parliamentary fashion on the streets. If the peaceful demonstration was seriously intended, then it was folly not to foresee that it would