make again ready for another "defensive" war, not one of those new-fangled "localized" wars, but a war of races—a war with the combined Scythian and Roman races.

The German working class have resolutely supported the war, which it was not in their power to prevent, as a war for German independence and the liberation of France and Europe from that pestilent incubus, the Second Empire. It was the German workmen who, together with the rural laborers, furnished the sinews and muscles of heroic hosts, leaving behind their half-starved families. Decimated by the battles abroad, they will be once more decimated by misery at home. In their turn they are coming forward to ask for "guarantees"—guarantees that their immense sacrifices have not been brought in vain, that they have conquered liberty, that the victory over the Imperialist armies will not, as in 1815, be turned into the defeat of the German people; and, as the first of these guarantees, they claim an honorable peace for France, and the recognition of the French Republic.

The Central Committee of the German Socialist Democratic Workmen's party issued, on the 5th of September, a manifesto, energetically insisting upon these guarantees. "We," they say, "we protest against the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine. And we are conscious of speaking in the name of the German working class. In the common interest of France and Germany, in the interest of peace and liberty, in the interest of Western civilization against Eastern barbarism, the German workmen will not patiently tolerate the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine. . . We shall faithfully stand by our fellow-workmen in all countries for the common International cause of the Proletariat!"

Unfortunately, we cannot feel sanguine of their immediate success. If the French workmen amidst peace failed to stop the aggressor, are the German workmen more likely to stop the victor amidst the clangor of arms? The German workmen's manifesto demands the extradition of Louis Bonaparte as a common felon to the French Republic. Their rulers are, on the contrary, already trying hard to restore him to the Tuileries as the best man to ruin France. However that may be, history will prove that the German working class are not made of the same malleable stuff as the German middle class. They will do their duty.

Like them, we hail the advent of the Republic in France, but at the same time we labor under misgivings which we hope will prove groundless. That Republic has not subverted the throne, but only taken its place become vacant. It has been proclaimed, not as a social conquest, but as a national measure of defense. It is in the hands of a Provisional Government composed partly of notorious Orleanists, partly of middle-class Republicans, upon some of whom the insurrection of June, 1848, has left its indelible stigma. The division of labor amongst the

1 On the 8th of September, 1870, two days after Napoleon III., beaten at Sedan, had surrendered to the King of Prussia, the people of Paris assembled tumultuously in the streets, and the National Guard, armed with muskets, invaded the Corps Legislatif. All the deputies were expelled except those of the Left, who were carried off to the Hôtel de Ville, and who, then and there, in compliance with the popular demands of a vast multitude, proclaimed the Republic. Then Jules Favre, Jules Simon, Jules Ferry, Gambetta, Creuzier, Emmanuel Arago, Giais-Brun, Pelletan, Carrier-Pages, and Picard, by mutual agreement proposed themselves as a Provisional Government of Defense. When their names were read by Favre, the crowd answered by adding those of well-known revolutionists, such as Delescluze and Blancot, but Favre & Co. cunningly insisted upon having no colleagues in the provisional government that were not deputies of Paris, and the crowd assented, satisfied with the addition of Rochefort. In Linauagary's words: "This phrenzy of just emancipated serfs made the [bourgeois] Left masters. Twelve individuals took possession of France. They invoked no other title than the mandate as representatives of Paris, and declared themselves legitimate by popular acclamation."—Note to the American Edition.
members of that Government looks awkward. The Orleanists have seized the strongholds of the army and the police, while to the professed Republicans have fallen the talking departments. Some of their first acts go far to show that they have inherited from the Empire, not only ruins, but also its dread of the working class. If eventual impossibilities are in wild phraseology promised in the name of the Republic, is it not with a view to prepare the cry for a "possible" government? Is the Republic, by some of its middle-class undertakers, not intended to serve as a mere stop-gap and bridge over an Orleanist Restoration?

The French working class moves, therefore, under circumstances of extreme difficulty. Any attempt at upsetting the new Government in the present crisis, when the enemy is almost knocking at the doors of Paris, would be a desperate folly. The French workmen must perform their duties as citizens; but, at the same time, they must not allow themselves to be swayed by the national souvenirs of 1792, as the French peasants allowed themselves to be deluded by the national souvenirs of the First Empire. They have not to recapitulate the past, but to build up the future. Let them calmly and resolutely improve the opportunities of Republican liberty, for the work of their own class organization. It will gift them with fresh Herculean powers for the regeneration of France, and our common task—the emancipation of labor. Upon their energies and wisdom hinges the fate of the Republic.

The English workmen have already taken measures to overcome, by a wholesome pressure from without, the reluctance of their Government to recognize the French Republic. The present dilatoriness of the British Government is probably intended to atone for the Anti-Jacobin war and the former indecent haste in sanctioning the coup d'état. The English workmen call also upon their Government to oppose by all its power the dismemberment of France, which a part of the English press is shameless enough to howl for. It is the same press that for twenty years defied Louis Bonaparte as the providence of Europe, that frantically cheered on the slaveholders to rebellion. Now, as then, it drudges for the slaveholder.

Let the sections of the International Workingmen's Association in every country stir the working classes to action. If they forsake their duty, if they remain passive, the present tremendous war will be but the harbinger of still deadlier international feuds, and lead in every nation to a renewed triumph over the workman by the lords of the sword, of the soil, and of capital.

Vive la République!

London, September 9, 1870.
THE CIVIL WAR IN FRANCE

MANIFESTO OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKINGMEN’S ASSOCIATION ON THE PARIS COMMUNE

Issued on May 30, 1871, and addressed to the members of the Association in Europe and the United States
THE CIVIL WAR IN FRANCE

CHAPTER I

THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

On the 4th of September, 1870, when the workingmen of Paris proclaimed the Republic, which was almost instantaneously acclaimed throughout France, without a single voice of dissent, a cabal of place-hunting barristers, with Thiers for their statesman and Trochu for their general, took hold of the Hôtel de Ville. At that time they were imbued with so fanatical a faith in the mission of Paris to represent France in all epochs of historical crises, that, to legitimize their usurped titles as governors of France, they thought it quite sufficient to produce their lapsed mandates as representatives of Paris. In our second address on the late war, five days after the rise of these men, we told you who they were. Yet, in the turmoil of surprise, with the real leaders of the working class still shut up in Bonapartist prisons and the Prussians already marching upon Paris, Paris bore with their assumption of power, on the express condition that it was to be wielded for the single purpose of national defense. Paris, however, was not to be defended without arming its working class, organizing them into an effective force, and training their ranks by the war itself. But Paris armed was the Revolution armed. A victory of Paris over the Prussian aggressor would have been
a victory of the French workman over the French capitalist and his State parasites. In this conflict between national duty and class interest, the Government of National Defense did not hesitate one moment to turn into a Government of National Defection.

The first step they took was to send Thiers on a roving tour to all the Courts of Europe, there to beg mediation by offering the barter of the Republic for a king. Four months after the commencement of the siege, when they thought the opportune moment had come for breaking the first word of capitulation, Trochu, in the presence of Jules Favre and others of his colleagues, addressed the assembled mayors of Paris in these terms:

"The first question put to me by my colleagues on the very evening of the 4th of September was this: Paris, can it, with any chance of success stand a siege by the Prussian army? I did not hesitate to answer in the negative. Some of my colleagues here present will warrant the truth of my words and the persistence of my opinion. I told them, in these very terms, that, under the existing state of things, the attempt of Paris to hold out a siege by the Prussian army would be folly. Without doubt, I added, it would be an heroic folly, but that would be all. . . . . . The events [managed by himself] have not given the lie to my prevision." This nice little speech of Trochu was afterwards published by M. Corbon, one of the mayors present.

Thus, on the very evening of the proclamation of the Republic, Trochu's "plan" was known to his colleagues to be the capitulation of Paris. If national defense had been more than a pretext for the personal government of Thiers, Favre & Co., the upstarts of the 4th of September, would have abdicated on the 5th—would have initiated the Paris people into Trochu's "plan," and called upon them to surrender at once, or to take their own fate into their own hands. Instead of this, the infamous impostors resolved upon curing the heroic folly of Paris by a regimen of famine and broken heads, and to dupe her in the meanwhile by ranting manifestoes, holding forth that Trochu, "the Governor of Paris, will never capitulate," and Jules Favre, the Foreign Minister, will "not cede an inch of our territory, nor a stone of our fortresses." In a letter to Gambetta, that very same Jules Favre avows that what they were "defending" against were not the Prussian soldiers, but the workingmen of Paris. During the whole continuance of the siege the Bonapartist cut-throats, whom Trochu had wisely intrusted with the command of the Paris army, exchanged, in their intimate correspondence, ribald jokes at the well-understood mockery of defense. The mask of imposture was at last dropped on the 28th of January, 1871. With the true heroism of utter self-debasement, the Government of National Defense, in their capitulation, came out as the Government of France by Bismarck's permission—a part so base that Louis Bonaparte himself had, at Sedan, shrunk from accepting it. After the events of the 18th of March, on their wild flight to Versailles, the capitulations left in the hands of Paris the documentary evidence of their treason, to destroy which, as the Commune says in its manifesto to the provinces, "those men would not recoil from battering Paris into a heap of ruins washed by a sea of blood."

To be eagerly bent upon such a consummation, some of the leading members of the Government of Defense had, besides, most peculiar reasons of their own.

1 See, for instance, the correspondence of Alphonse Simon Gulod, supreme commander of the artillery of the Army of Defense of Paris and Grand Cross of the Legion of Honor, to Suzanne, general of division of artillery, a correspondence published by the Journal Officiel of the Commune.
Shortly after the conclusion of the armistice, M. Millière, one of the representatives of Paris to the National Assembly, now shot by express order of Jules Favre, published a series of authentic legal documents in proof that Jules Favre, living in concubinage with the wife of a drunkard resident at Algiers, had, by a most daring concoction of forgeries, spread over many years, contrived to grasp in the name of the children of his adultery, a large succession, which made him a rich man, and that, in a lawsuit undertaken by the legitimate heirs, he only escaped exposure by the connivance of the Bonapartist tribunals. As these dry legal documents were not to be got rid of by any amount of rhetorical horsepower, Jules Favre, for the first time in his life, held his tongue, quietly awaiting the outbreak of the civil war, in order, then, frantically to denounce the people of Paris as a band of escaped convicts in utter revolt against family, religion, order, and property. This same forger had hardly got into power, after the 4th of September, when he sympathetically let loose upon society Pic and Taillefer, convicted, even under the Empire, of forgery, in the scandalous affair of the Étendard. One of these men, Taillefer, having dared to return to Paris under the Commune, was at once reinstated in prison; and then Jules Favre exclaimed, from the tribune of the National Assembly, that Paris was setting free all her jailbirds!

Ernest Picard, the Joe Miller of the Government of National Defense, who appointed himself Home Minister of the Republic after having in vain striven to become the Home Minister of the Empire, is the brother of one Arthur Picard, an individual expelled from the Paris Bourse as a blackleg, and convicted, on his own confession, of a theft of 300,000 francs, while manager of one of the branches of the Société Générale, rue Palestro, No. 5. This Arthur Picard was made by Ernest Picard the editor of his paper, l’Électeur Libre. While the common run of stockjobbers were led astray by the official lies of the Home Office paper, Arthur was running backwards and forwards between the Home Office and the Bourse, there to discount the disasters of the French army. The whole financial correspondence of that worthy pair of brothers fell into the hands of the Com-}

THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

Jules Ferry, a penniless barrister before the 4th of Sept-ember, contrived, as the mayor of Paris during the siege, to job a fortune out of famine. The day on which he would have to give an account of his maladministration would be the day of his conviction.

These men, then, could find, in the ruins of Paris only, their tickets-of-leave: they were the very men Bismarck wanted. With the help of some shuffling of cards, Thiers, hitherto the secret prompter of the Government, now appeared at its head, with the ticket-of-leave men for his Ministers.

Thiers, that monstrous gnome, has charmed the French bourgeoisie for almost half a century, because he is the most consummate intellectual expression of their own class-corruption. Before he became a statesman he had already proved his lying powers as an historian. The chronicle of his public life is the record of the misfortunes of France. Banded, before 1830, with the Repub-

1 See report of the Prefecture of Police, dated July 13th, 1867.

1 See report of the Prefecture of Police, dated December 11th, 1868.
Archbishop’s palace were plundered, and by acting the minister-spy upon, and the jail-accoucheur of, the Duchess de Berri. The massacre of the Republicans in the rue Transnonain, and the subsequent infamous laws of September against the press and the right of association, were his work. Reappearing as the chief of the Cabinet in March, 1840, he astonished France with his plan of fortifying Paris. To the Republicans, who denounced this plan as a sinister plot against the liberty of Paris, he replied from the tribune of the Chamber of Deputies:

“What! to fancy that any works of fortification could ever endanger liberty! And first of all you calumniate any possible Government in supposing that it could some day attempt to maintain itself by bombarding the capital. . . But that Government would be a hundred times more impossible after its victory than before.” Indeed, no Government would ever have dared to bombard Paris from the forts, but that Government which had previously surrendered these forts to the Prussians.

When King Bomba1 tried his hand at Palermo, in January, 1848, Thiers, then long since out of office, again rose in the Chamber of Deputies: “You know, gentlemen, what is happening at Palermo. You, all of you, shake with horror [in the parliamentary sense] on hearing that during forty-eight hours a large town has been bombarded—by whom? Was it by a foreign enemy exercising the rights of war? No, gentlemen, it was by its own Government. And why? Because that unfortunate town demanded its rights. Well, then, for the demand of its rights it has got forty-eight hours of bombardment. . . .

Allow me to appeal to the opinion of Europe. It is doing a service to mankind to arise, and to speak out from this tribune—the greatest, perhaps, in Europe—some resounding words [mere words, indeed] of indignation against such acts. . . When the Regent Espartero, who had rendered services to his country [which M. Thiers never did], intended bombarding Barcelona, in order to suppress its insurrection, there arose from all parts of the world a general outcry of indignation.”

Eighteen months afterwards, M. Thiers was amongst the fiercest defenders of the bombardment of Rome by a French army. In fact, the fault of King Bomba seems to have consisted in this only, that he limited his bombardment to forty-eight hours.

A few days before the Revolution of February, fretting at the long exile from place and pelf to which Guizot had condemned him, and sniffling in the air the scent of an approaching popular commotion, Thiers, in that pseudoheroic style which won him the nickname of Mirabeau-mouche, declared to the Chamber of Deputies: “I am of the party of Revolution, not only in France, but in Europe. I wish the government of the Revolution to remain in the hands of moderate men . . . but if that government should fall into the hands of ardent minds, even into those of Radicals, I shall, for all that, not desert my cause. I shall always be of the party of the Revolution.” The Revolution of February came. Instead of displacing the Guizot Cabinet by the Thiers Cabinet, as the little man had dreamt, it superseded Louis Philippe by the Republic. On the first day of the popular victory he carefully hid himself, forgetting that the contempt of the workingmen screened him from their hatred. Still, with his legendary courage, he continued to shy the public stage, until the June massacre had cleared it for his sort

---

1 Ferdinand, King of Naples, nicknamed “Bomba” (bomb), because of the barbarous bombardment of Palermo to which reference is made here. —Note to the American Edition.
of action. Then he became the leading mind of the “Party of Order” and its Parliamentary Republic, that anonymous interregnum, in which all the rival factions of the ruling class conspired together to crush the people, and conspired against each other to restore each of them its own monarchy. Then, as now, Thiers denounced the Republicans as the only obstacle to the consolidation of the Republic; then, as now, he spoke to the Republic as the hangman spoke to Don Carlos: “I shall assassinate thee, but for thine own good.” Now, as then, he will have to exclaim on the day after his victory: *L’Empire est fait*—the Empire is consummated. Despite his hypocritical homilies about necessary liberties and his personal grudge against Louis Bonaparte, who had made a dupe of him and kicked out parliamentarism—and outside of its facitious atmosphere the little man is conscious of withering into nothingness—he had a hand in all the infamies of the Second Empire, from the occupation of Rome by French troops to the war with Prussia; a war which he incited by his fierce invective against German unity, not as a cloak of Prussian despotism, but as an encroachment upon the vested right of France in German disunion. Fond of brandishing, with his dwarfish arms, in the face of Europe the sword of the First Napoleon, whose historical shoeblack he had become, his foreign policy always culminated in the utter humiliation of France, from the London convention of 1841 to the Paris capitulation of 1871, and the present civil war, when he hounds on the prisoners of Sedan and Metz against Paris by special permission of Bismarck. Despite his versatility of talent and shiftiness of purpose, this man has his whole lifetime been wedded to the most fossil routine. It is self-evident that to him the deeper undercurrents of modern society remained forever hidden; but even the most palpable changes on its surface were abhorrent to a brain all the vitality of which had fled to the tongue. Thus he never tired of denouncing as a sacrilege any deviation from the old French protective system. When a minister of Louis Philippe, he railed at railways as a wild chimera; and when in opposition under Louis Bonaparte, he branded as a profanation every attempt to reform the rotten French army system. Never in his long political career has he been guilty of a single—even the smallest—measure of any practical use.

Thiers was consistent only in his greed for wealth and his hatred of the men that produce it. Having entered his first ministry under Louis Philippe poor as Job, he left it a millionaire. His last ministry under the same king (of the 1st of March, 1840), exposed him to public taunts of peculation in the Chamber of Deputies, to which he was content to reply by tears—a commodity he deals in as freely as Jules Favre, or any other crocodile. At Bordeaux his first measure for saving France from impending financial ruin was to endow himself with three millions a year, the first and the last word of the “Economical Republic,” the vista of which he had opened to his Paris electors in 1859. One of his former colleagues of the Chamber of Deputies of 1830, himself a capitalist and, nevertheless, a devoted member of the Paris Commune, M. Beslay, lately addressed Thiers thus in a public placard: “The enslavement of labor by capital has always been the cornerstone of your policy, and from the very day you saw the Republic of Labor installed at the Hôtel de Ville, you have never ceased to cry out to France: ‘These are criminals!’” A master in small state rogery, a virtuoso in perjury and treason, a craftsman in all the petty stratagems, cunning devices, and
base perfidies of parliamentary party-warfare; never scrupling, when out of office, to fan a revolution, and to stifle it in blood when at the helm of the State; with class prejudices standing him in the place of ideas, and vanity in the place of a heart; his private life as infamous as his public life is odious—even now, when playing the part of a French Sulla, he cannot help setting off the abomination of his deeds by the ridicule of his ostenta-

tion.

The capitulation of Paris, by surrendering to Prussia not only Paris, but all France, closed the long-continued intrigues of treason with the enemy, which the usurpers of the 4th of September had begun, as Trochu himself said, on that very same day. On the other hand, it initiated the civil war they were now to wage with the assistance of Prussia, against the Republic and Paris. The trap was laid in the very terms of the capitulation. At that time above one-third of the territory was in the hands of the enemy, the capital was cut off from the provinces, all communications were disorganized. To elect under such circumstances a real representation of France was impossible, unless ample time were given for preparation. In view of this, the capitulation stipulated that a National Assembly must be elected within eight days; so that in many parts of France the news of the impending election arrived on its eve only. This Assembly, moreover, was, by an express clause of the capitulation, to be elected for the sole purpose of deciding on peace or war, and, eventually, to conclude a treaty of peace. The population could not but feel that the terms of the armistice rendered the continuation of the war impossible, and that for sanctioning the peace imposed by Bismarck, the worst men in France were the best. But not content with these precautions, Thiers, even before the secret of the armistice had been broached to Paris, set out for an electioneering tour through the provinces, there to galvanize back into life the Legitimist party, which now, along with the Orleanists, had to take the place of the then impossible Bonapartists. He was not afraid of them. Impossible as a government of modern France, and, therefore, contemptible as rivals, what party were more eligible as tools of counter-revolution than the party whose action, in the words of Thiers himself (Chamber of Deputies, January 5, 1833), "had always been confined to the three resources of foreign invasion, civil war, and anarchy"? They verily believed in the advent of their long-expected retrospective millennium. There were the heels of foreign invasion trampling upon France; there was the downfall of an Empire, and the captivity of a Bonaparte; and there they were themselves. The wheel of history has evidently rolled back to stop at the Chambre introuvable of 1816. In the assemblies of the Republic, 1848 to '51, they had been represented by their educated and trained parliamentary champions; it was the rank-and-file of the party which now rushed in—all the Pourcœugnac's of France.

As soon as this Assembly of "Rurales" had met at Bordeaux, Thiers made it clear to them that the peace preliminaries must be assented to at once, without even the honors of a parliamentary debate, as the only condition on which Prussia would permit them to open the war against the Republic and Paris, its stronghold. The counter-revolution had, in fact, no time to lose. The Second Empire had more than doubled the national debt and plunged all the large towns into heavy municipal

\[1\] The *Pourcœugnac* are an ideal creation that typifies the country nobility, *Pourcœu* meaning swine, and *gnac* being a suffix common to a number of noble names in the southern part of France; for instance, *Petignac, Cassagnac, Cassagne*, etc.—Note to the American Edition.
debts. The war had fearfully swelled the liabilities, and mercilessly ravaged the resources of the nation. To complete the ruin, the Prussian Shylock was there with his bond for the keep of half a million of his soldiers on French soil, his indemnity of five milliards and interest at 5 per cent. on the unpaid instalments thereof. Who was to pay the bill? It was only by the violent overthrow of the Republic that the appropriators of wealth could hope to shift on to the shoulders of its producers the cost of a war which they, the appropriators, had themselves originated. Thus, the immense ruin of France spurred on these patriotic representatives of land and capital, under the very eyes and patronage of the invader, to graft upon the foreign war a civil war—a slaveholders’ rebellion.

There stood in the way of this conspiracy one great obstacle—Paris. To disarm Paris was the first condition of success. Paris was therefore summoned by Thiers to surrender its arms. Then Paris was exasperated by the frantic anti-republican demonstrations of the “Rural” Assembly and by Thiers’ own equivocations about the legal status of the Republic; by the threat to decapitate and decapitalize Paris; the appointment of Orleanist ambassadors; Dufaure’s laws on over-due commercial bills and house rents, inflicting ruin on the commerce and industry of Paris; Pouyer-Quertier’s tax of two centimes upon every copy of every imaginable publication; the sentences of death against Blanqui and Flourens; the suppression of the Republican journals; the transfer of the National Assembly to Versailles; the renewal of the state of siege declared by Palikao, and expired on the 4th of September; the appointment of Vinoy, the Décembreuse, as governor of Paris—of Valentin, the Imperialist gendarme, as its prefect of police—and of

D’Aurelles de Paladine, the Jesuit general, as the commander-in-chief of its National Guard.

And now we have to address a question to M. Thiers and the men of national defense, his understrappers. It is known that, through the agency of M. Pouyer-Quertier, his finance minister, Thiers had contracted a loan of two milliards, to be paid down at once. Now, is it true or not—

1. That the business was so managed that a consideration of several millions was secured for the private benefit of Thiers, Jules Favre, Ernest Picard, Pouyer-Quertier, and Jules Simon? and—

2. That no money was to be paid down until after the “pacification” of Paris?

At all events, there must have been something very pressing in the matter, for Thiers and Jules Favre, in the name of the majority of the Bordeaux Assembly, unblushingly solicited the immediate occupation of Paris by Prussian troops. Such, however, was not the game of Bismarck, as he sneeringly, and in public, told the admiring Frankfort Philistines on his return to Germany.1

1 The four paragraphs at the end of this chapter are omitted from Longuet’s French edition, to which reference is made in our Preface. Longuet gives no reason for this suppression. It will be observed that the charges of corruption which were then currently made against Thiers, Favre and others, are presented here, not in the positive but in the interrogative form. Such charges cannot be readily proved; yet every one knows that it would have been contrary to all the principles of morality by which the relations of financiers and statesmen of France were determined in those days, for the financiers who made such an enormously profitable operation to offer no reward and for the statesman to refuse any.—Note to the American Edition.
CHAPTER II

THE EIGHTEENTH OF MARCH

Armed Paris was the only serious obstacle in the way of counter-revolutionary conspiracy. Paris was, therefore, to be disarmed. On this point the Bordeaux Assembly was sincerity itself. If the roaring rant of its Ruralists had not been audible enough, the surrender of Paris by Thiers to the tender mercies of the triumvirate of Vinoy the Décembreur, Valentin the Bonapartist gendarme, and Aurelles de Paladine the Jesuit general, would have cut off even the last subterfuge of doubt. But while insultingly exhibiting the true purpose of the disarmament of Paris, the conspirators asked her to lay down her arms on a pretext which was the most glaring, the most barefaced of lies. The artillery of the Paris National Guard, said Thiers, belonged to the State, and to the State it must be returned. The fact is this: From the very day of the capitulation, by which Bismarck's prisoners had signed the surrender of France, but reserved to themselves a numerous bodyguard for the express purpose of cowing Paris, Paris stood on the watch. The National Guard reorganized themselves and intrusted their supreme control to a Central Committee elected by their whole body, save some fragments of the old Bonapartist formation. On the eve of the entrance of the Prussians into Paris, the Central Committee took measures for the removal to Montmartre, Belleville, and La Villette of the cannon and mitrailleuses treacherously abandoned by the capitulards in and about the very quarters the Prussians were to occupy. That artillery had been furnished by the subscriptions of the National Guard. As their private property, it was officially recognized in the capitulation of the 28th of January, and on that very title exempted from the general surrender, into the hands of the conqueror, of arms belonging to the Government. And Thiers was so utterly destitute of even the flimsiest pretext for initiating the war against Paris, that he had to resort to the flagrant lie of the artillery of the National Guard being State property!

The seizure of her artillery was evidently but to serve as the preliminary to the general disarmament of Paris, and, therefore, of the Revolution of the 4th of September. But that revolution had become the legal status of France. The Republic, its work, was recognized by the conqueror in the terms of the capitulation. After the capitulation, it was acknowledged by all the foreign Powers, and in its name the National Assembly had been summoned. The Paris workingmen's revolution of the 4th of September was the only legal title of the National Assembly seated at Bordeaux, and of its executive. Without it, the National Assembly would at once have to give way to the Corps Législatif, elected in 1869 by universal suffrage under French, not under Prussian, rule, and forcibly dispersed by the arm of the Revolution. Thiers and his ticket-of-leave men would have had to capitulate for safe-conducts signed by Louis Bonaparte, to save them from a voyage to Cayenne. The National Assembly, with its power of attorney to settle the terms of peace with Prussia, was but an incident of that revolution, the true embodiment of which was still armed Paris, who had initiated it, undergone for it a five months' siege, with its horrors of famine, and made her prolonged resistance, despite Trochu's plan, the basis of
an obstinate war of defense in the provinces. And Paris was now either to lay down her arms at the insulting behest of the rebellious slaveholders of Bordeaux, and acknowledge that her revolution of the 4th of September meant nothing but a simple transfer of power from Louis Bonaparte to his royal rivals; or she had to stand forward as the self-sacrificing champion of France, whose salvation from ruin, and whose regeneration were impossible, without the revolutionary overthrow of the political and social conditions that had engendered the Second Empire, and, under its fostering care, matured into utter rottenness. Paris, emaciated by a five months’ famine, did not hesitate one moment. She heroically resolved to run all the hazards of a resistance against the French conspirators, even with Prussian cannon frowning upon her from her own forts. Still, in its abhorrence of the civil war into which Paris was to be goaded, the Central Committee continued to persist in a merely defensive attitude, despite the provocations of the Assembly, the usurpations of the Executive, and the menacing concentration of troops in and around Paris.

Thiers opened the civil war by sending Vinoy, at the head of a multitude of sergents-de-ville and some regiments of the line, upon a nocturnal expedition against Montmartre, there to seize, by surprise, the artillery of the National Guard. It is well known how this attempt broke down before the resistance of the National Guard and the fraternization of the line with the people. D’Au- relles de Paladine had printed beforehand his bulletin of victory, and Thiers held ready the placards announcing his measures of coup d’état. Now these had to be replaced by Thiers’ appeals, imparting his magnanimous resolve to leave the National Guard in the possession of their arms, with which, he said, he felt sure they would

rally round the Government against the rebels. Out of 300,000 National Guards only 300 responded to this summons to rally round little Thiers against themselves. The glorious workingmen’s revolution of the 18th of March took undisputed sway of Paris without striking a blow. The Central Committee was its provisional government. Europe seemed, for a moment, to doubt whether the recent sensational performances of state and war had any reality in them, or whether they were the dreams of a long bygone past.

From the 18th of March to the entrance of the Versailles troops into Paris, the proletarian revolution remained so free from the acts of violence in which the revolutions, and still more the counter-revolutions, of the “better classes” abound, that no facts were left to its opponents to cry out about but the execution of Generals Lecomte and Clement Thomas, and the affair of the Place Vendôme.

One of the Bonapartist officers engaged in the nocturnal attempt against Montmartre, General Lecomte, had four times ordered the 81st line regiment to fire at an unarmed gathering in the Place Pigale, and on their refusal fiercely insulted them. Instead of shooting women and children, his own men shot him. The inveterate habits acquired by the soldiery under the training of the enemies of the working class are, of course, not likely to change the very moment these soldiers change sides. The same men executed Clement Thomas.

“General!” Clement Thomas, a malcontent ex-quartermaster-sergeant, had, in the latter days of Louis Philippe’s reign, enlisted at the office of the Republican newspaper Le National, there to serve in the double capacity of responsible man-of-straw (gérant responsable) and of duelling bully to that very combative journal. After the
revolution of February, the men of *Le National* having got into power, they metamorphosed this old quartermaster-sergeant into a general on the eve of the butchery of June, of which he, like Jules Favre, was one of the sinister plotters, and became one of the most dastardly executioners. Then he and his generalship disappeared for a long time, to again rise to the surface on the 1st of November, 1870. The day before, the Government of Defense, caught at the Hôtel de Ville, had solemnly pledged their parole to Blanqui, Flournoy, and other representatives of the working class, to abridge their usurped power into the hands of a commune to be freely elected by Paris. Instead of keeping their word, they let loose on Paris the Bretons of Trochu, who now replaced the Corsicans of Bonaparte. General Tamisier alone, refusing to sully his name by such a breach of faith, resigned the commandship-in-chief of the National Guard, and in his place Clement Thomas for once became again a general. During the whole of his tenure of command, he made war, not upon the Prussians, but upon the Paris National Guard. He prevented their general armament, pitted the bourgeois battalions against the workingmen’s battalions, weeded out the officers hostile to Trochu’s “plan,” and disbanded, under the stigma of cowardice, the very same proletarian battalions whose heroism has now astonished their most inveterate enemies. Clement Thomas felt quite proud of having reconquered his June preeminence as the personal enemy of the working class of Paris. Only a few days before the 18th of March, he laid before the War Minister, Leflo, a plan of his own for “finishing off la fine fleur (the cream) of the Paris canaille.” After Vino’s rout, he must needs appear upon the scene of action in the quality of an amateur spy. The Central Committee and the Paris workingmen were as much responsible for the killing of Clement Thomas and Lecomte as the Princess of Wales was for the fate of the people crushed to death on the day of her entrance into London.

The massacre of unarmed citizens in the Place Vendôme is a myth which M. Thiers and the Rolutions persistently ignored in the Assembly, entrusting its propagation exclusively to the servants’ hall of European journalism. “The men of order,” the reactionists of Paris, trembled at the victory of the 18th of March. To them it was the signal of popular retribution at last arriving. The ghosts of the victims assassinated at their hands from the days of June, 1848, down to the 22d of January, 1871, arose before their faces. Their panic was their only punishment. Even the *sergents-de-ville*, instead of being disarmed and locked up, as ought to have been done, had the gates of Paris flung wide open for their safe retreat to Versailles. The men of order were left not only unharmed, but allowed to rally and quietly to seize more than one stronghold in the very center of Paris. This indulgence of the Central Committee—this magnanimity of the armed workingmen—so strangely at variance with the habits of the “party of order,” the latter misinterpreted as mere symptoms of conscious weakness. Hence their silly plan to try, under the cloak of an unarmed demonstration, what Vino had failed to perform with his cannon and mitraillesses. On the 22d of March a riotous mob of swells started from the quarters of luxury, all the *petits crevés* in their ranks, and at their head the notorious familiars of the Empire—the Heeckeren, Coëlogon, Henri de Pène, etc. Under the cowardly pretense of a pacific demonstration, this rabble, secretly armed with the weapons of the bravos, fell into marching order, ill-treated and disarmed the detached patrols and
sentries of the National Guard they met with on their progress, and, on debouching from the Rue de la Paix, with the cry of "Down with the Central Committee! Down with the assassins! The National Assembly forever!" attempted to break through the line drawn up there, and thus to carry by surprise the headquarters of the National Guard in the Place Vendôme. In reply to their pistol shots, the regular summons (the French equivalent of the English Riot Act) were made, and, proving ineffective, fire was commanded by the general of the National Guard. One volley dispersed into wild flight the silly coxcombs, who expected that the mere exhibition of their "respectability" would have the same effect upon the revolution of Paris as Joshua's trumpets upon the walls of Jericho. The runaways left behind them two National Guards killed, nine severely wounded (among them a member of the Central Committee), and the whole scene of their exploit strewn with revolvers, daggers, and sword-canées, in evidence of the "unarmed" character of their "peaceful" demonstration.

When, on the 13th of June, 1849, the National Guard made a really peaceful demonstration in protest against the felonious assault of French troops upon Rome, Chagnac, then general of the party of order, was acclaimed by the National Assembly, and especially by M. Thiers, as the saviour of society, for having launched his troops from all sides upon these unarmed men, to shoot and sabre them down, and to trample them under their horses' feet. Paris, then, was placed under a state of siege. Dufaure hurried through the Assembly new laws of repression. New arrests, new proscriptions—a new reign of terror set in. But the lower orders manage these things otherwise. The Central Committee of 1871 simply ignored the heroes of the "peaceful demonstration";

so much so, that only two days later they were enabled to muster, under Admiral Saiset, for that armed demonstration, crowned by the famous stampede to Versailles. In their reluctance to continue the civil war opened by Thiers' burglarious attempt on Montmartre, the Central Committee made themselves, this time, guilty of a decisive mistake in not at once marching upon Versailles, then completely helpless, and thus putting an end to the conspiracies of Thiers and his Rurals. Instead of this, the party of order was again allowed to try its strength at the ballot-box, on the 26th of March, the day of the election of the Commune. On that day, at the polls, they, these men of order, were blandly exchanging words of conciliation with their too generous conquerors, while muttering in their hearts solemn vows to exterminate them in due time.

Now, look at the reverse of the medal. Thiers opened his second campaign against Paris in the beginning of April. The first batch of Parisian prisoners brought into Versailles was subjected to revolting atrocities, while Ernest Picard, with his hands in his trousers' pockets, strolled about jeering them, and while Mesdames Thiers and Favre, in the midst of their ladies of honor (?) applauded, from the balcony, the outrages of the Versailles mob. The captured soldiers of the line were massacred in cold blood; our brave friend, General Duval, the ironfounder, was shot without any form of trial. Galliflet, the kept man of his wife, so notorious for her shameless exhibitions at the orgies of the Second Empire, boasted in a proclamation of having commanded the murder of a small troop of National Guards, with their captain and lieutenant, surprised and disarmed by his chasseurs. Vincy, the runaway, was appointed Grand Cross of the Legion of Honor by Thiers, for his
general order to shoot down every soldier of the line taken in the ranks of the Federals. Desmaretz, the gendarme, was decorated for the treacherous butcher-like chopping in pieces of the high-soled and chivalrous Flourins, who had saved the heads of the Government of Defense on the 31st of October, 1870. "The encouraging particulars" of his assassination were triumphantly expatiated upon by Thiers in the National Assembly. With the elevated vanity of a parliamentary Tom Thumb, permitted to play the part of a Tamerlane, he denied the rebels against his littleness every right of civilized warfare, up to the right of neutrality for ambulances. Nothing more horrid than that monkey allowed for a time to give full fling to his tigerish instincts, as foreseen by Voltaire.

After the decree of the Commune of the 7th of April, ordering reprisals and declaring it to be its duty "to protect Paris against the cannibal exploits of the Versailles banditti, and to demand an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth," Thiers did not stop the barbarous treatment of prisoners, moreover insulting them in his bulletins as follows: "Never have more degraded countenances of a degraded democracy met the afflicted gaze of honest men"—honest, like Thiers himself and his ministerial ticket-of-leave men. Still the shooting of prisoners was suspended for a time. Hardly, however, had Thiers and his Decembrist generals become aware that the Communal decree of reprisals was but an empty threat, that even their gendarme spies caught in Paris under the disguise of National Guards, that even servents-de-ville taken with incendiary shells upon them, were spared—when the wholesale shooting of prisoners was resumed and carried on uninteruptedly to the end. Houses to which National Guards had fled were surrounded by gen-

darmes, inundated with petroleum (which here occurs for the first time in this war), and then set fire to. The charred corpses being afterwards brought out by the ambulance of the Press at the Ternes. Four National Guards having surrendered to a troop of mounted chasseurs at Belle Épine, on the 25th of April, were afterwards shot down, one after another, by the captain, a worthy man of Gallifet's. One of his four victims, left for dead, Sheffer, crawled back to the Parisian outposts, and deposed to this fact before a commission of the Commune. When Tolain interpellated the War Minister upon the report of this commission, the Rurals drowned his voice and forbade Leflô to answer. It would be an insult to their "glorious" army to speak of its deeds. The flippant tone in which Thiers' bulletins announced the bayonetings of the Federals surprised asleep at Moulin Saquet, and the wholesale fusillades at Clamart shocked the nerves even of the not over-sensitive London Times. But it would be ludicrous to-day to attempt recounting the merely preliminary atrocities committed by the bombardiers of Paris and the fomenters of a slaveholders' rebellion protected by foreign invasion. Amidst all these horrors, Thiers, forgetful of his parliamentary laments on the terrible responsibility weighing down his dwarfish shoulders, boasts in his bulletins that l'Assemblée siège paisiblement (the Assembly continues meeting in peace), and proves by his constant carousals, now with Decembrist generals, now with German princes, that his digestion is not troubled in the least, not even by the ghosts of Lecomte and Clement Thomas.
CHAPTER III

THE HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE OF THE COMMUNE

On the dawn of the 18th of March, Paris arose to the thunderburst of "Vive la Commune!" What is the Commune, that sphinx so tantalizing to the bourgeois mind? The proletarians of Paris," said the Central Committee in its manifesto of the 18th of March, "amidst the failures and treasons of the ruling classes, have understood that the hour has struck for them to save the situation by taking into their own hands the direction of public affairs. . . . They have understood that it is their imperious duty and their absolute right to render themselves masters of their own destinies, by seizing upon the governmental power." But the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made State machinery, and wield it for its own purposes.

The centralized State power, with its ubiquitous organs of standing army, police, bureaucracy, clergy, and judiciary—organs wrought after the plan of a systematic and hierarchic division of labor— originates from the days of absolute monarchy, serving nascent middle class society as a mighty weapon in its struggles against feudalism. Still, its development remained clogged by all manner of medieval rubbish, seignorial rights, local privileges, municipal and guild monopolies, and provincial constitutions. The gigantic broom of the French Revolution of the eighteenth century swept away all these relics of bygone times, thus clearing simultaneously the social soil of its last hindrances to the superstructure of the modern State.

edifice raised under the First Empire, itself the offspring of the coalition wars of old semifeudal Europe against modern France. During the subsequent regimes the Government, placed under parliamentary control—that is, under the direct control of the propertied classes—became not only a hotbed of huge national debts and crushing taxes; with its irresistible allurements of place, pelf, and patronage, it became not only the bone of contention between the rival factions and adventurers of the ruling classes; but its political character changed simultaneously with the economic changes of society. At the same pace at which the progress of modern industry developed, widened, intensified the class-antagonism between capital and labor, the State power assumed more and more the character of the national power of capital over labor, of a public force organized for social enslavement, of an engine of class despotism. After every revolution marking a progressive phase in the class struggle, the purely repressive character of the State power stands out in bolder and bolder relief. The Revolution of 1830, resulting in the transfer of government from the landlords to the capitalists, transferred it from the more remote to the more direct antagonists of the workingmen. The bourgeois Republicans, who, in the name of the Revolution of 1848, took the State power, used it for the June massacres, in order to convince the working class that "social" republic meant the republic ensuring their social subjection, and in order to convince the royalist bulk of the bourgeois and landlord class that they might safely leave the cares and emoluments of government to the bourgeois "Republicans." However, after their one heroic exploit of June, the bourgeois Republicans had, from the front, to fall back to the rear of the "Party of Order"—a combination formed by all the rival
fractions and factions of the appropriating class in their
now openly declared antagonism to the producing classes.
The proper form of their joint stock Government was
the Parliamentary Republic, with Louis Bonaparte for its
President. Theirs was a régime of avowed class ter-
rorism and deliberate insult towards the “vile multitude.”
If the Parliamentary Republic, as M. Thiers said, “di-
vided them [the different factions of the ruling class]
least,” it opened an abyss between that class and the whole
body of society outside their spare ranks. The restraints
by which their own divisions had under former régimes
still checked the State power, were removed by their
union; and in view of the threatening upheaval of the
proletariat, they now used that State power mercilessly
and ostentatiously as the national war engine of capital
against labor. In their uninterrupted crusade against the
producing masses they were, however, bound not only
to invest the executive with continually increased powers
of repression, but at the same time to divest their own
parliamentary stronghold—the National Assembly—one
by one, of all its own means of defense against the Execu-
tive. The Executive, in the person of Louis Bonapar-
tete, turned them out. The natural offspring of the
“Party-of-Order” Republic was the Second Empire.

The Empire, with the coup d’état for its certificate of
birth, universal suffrage for its sanction, and the sword
for its sceptre, professed to rest upon the peasantry, the
large mass of producers not directly involved in the strug-
gle of capital and labor. It professed to save the work-
ing class by breaking down parliamentarism, and, with
it, the undisguised subserviency of Government to the
propriety classes. It professed to save the propertyed
classes by upholding their economic supremacy over
the working class; and, finally, it professed to unite
all classes by reviving for all the chimera of national
glory. In reality, it was the only form of government
possible at a time when the bourgeoisie had already lost,
and the working class had not yet acquired, the faculty
of ruling the nation. It was acclaimed throughout the
world as the saviour of society. Under its sway, bour-
geoisie society, freed from political cares, attained a de-
development unexpected even by itself. Its industry and
commerce expanded to colossal dimensions; financial
swindling celebrated cosmopolitan orgies; the misery of
the masses was set off by a shameless display of gorgeous,
meretricious, and debased luxury. The State power, ap-
parently soaring high above society, was at the same time
itself the greatest scandal of that society and the very
hotbed of all its corruptions. Its own rotteness, and
the rotteness of the society it had saved, were laid bare
by the bayonet of Prussia, herself eagerly bent upon
transferring the supreme seat of that régime from Paris
to Berlin. Imperialism is, at the same time, the most
prostitute and the ultimate form of the State power which
nascent middle-class society had commenced to elaborate
as a means of its own emancipation from feudalism, and
which full-grown bourgeois society had finally trans-
formed into a means for the enslavement of labor by
capital.

The direct antithesis to the Empire was the Commune.
The cry of “Social Republic,” with which the revolution
of February was ushered in by the Paris proletariat, did
but express a vague aspiration after a Republic that was
not only to supersede the monarchical form of class-rule,
but class-rule itself. The Commune was the positive
form of that Republic.

Paris, the central seat of the old governmental power,
and, at the same time, the social stronghold of the French
working class, had risen in arms against the attempt of
Thiers and the Rurals to restore and perpetuate that old
governmental power bequeathed to them by the Empire.
Paris could resist only because, in consequence of the
siege, it had got rid of the army and replaced it by a
National Guard, the bulk of which consisted of working-
men. This fact was now to be transformed into an in-
stitution. The first decree of the Commune, therefore,
was the suppression of the standing army, and the sub-
stitution for it of the armed people.

The Commune was formed of the municipal council-
lors, chosen by universal suffrage in various wards of the
town, responsible and revocable at short terms. The
majority of its members were naturally workingmen, or
acknowledged representatives of the working class. The
Commune was to be a working, not a parliamentary,
body, executive and legislative at the same time. Instead
of continuing to be the agent of the central Government,
the police was at once stripped of its political attributes
and turned into the responsible and at all times revocable
agent of the Commune. So were the officials of all
other branches of the administration. From the mem-
bers of the Commune downwards, the public service had
to be done at workmen’s wages. The vested interests
and the representation allowances of the high dignitaries
of State disappeared along with the high dignitaries
themselves. Public functions ceased to be the private
property of the tools of the central Government. Not
only municipal administration, but the whole initiative
hitherto exercised by the State was laid into the hands
of the Commune.

Having once got rid of the standing army and the
police, the physical force elements of the old Govern-
ment, the Commune was anxious to break the spiritual

force of repression, the "parson-power," by the disestablish-
ment and disendowment of all churches as proprietary
bodies. The priests were sent back to the recesses of
private life, there to feed upon the aims of the faithful
in imitation of their predecessors, the Apostles. The
whole of the educational institutions were opened to the
people gratuitously, and at the same time cleared of all
interference of Church and State. Thus, not only was
education made accessible to all, but science itself freed
from the fetters which class prejudice and governmental
force had imposed upon it.

The judicial functionaries were to be divested of that
sham independence which had but served to mask their
abject subserviency to all succeeding governments to
which, in turn, they had taken, and broken, the oaths of
allegiance. Like the rest of public servants, magistrates
and judges were to be elective, responsible, and revoca-
ble.

The Paris Commune was, of course, to serve as a model
to all the great industrial centers of France. The com-
munal régime once established in Paris and the second-
ary centers, the old centralized Government would in the
provinces, too, have to give way to the self-government
of the producers. In a rough sketch of national organi-
ization which the Commune had no time to develop, it is
clearly stated that the Commune was to be the political
form of even the smallest country hamlet, and that in the
rural districts the standing army was to be replaced by a
national militia, with an extremely short term of service.
The rural communes of each district were to adminis-
ter their common affairs by an assembly of delegates in
the central town, and these district assemblies were again
to send deputies to the National Delegation in Paris, each
delegate to be at any time revocable and bound by the
mandat impératif (formal instructions) of his constituents. The few but important functions which still would remain for a central government were not to be suppressed, as has been intentionally misstated, but were to be discharged by communal, and therefore strictly responsible, agents. The unity of the nation was not to be broken; but, on the contrary, to be organized by the Communal Constitution, and to become a reality by the destruction of the State power which claimed to be the embodiment of that unity independent of, and superior to, the nation itself, from which it was but a parasitic excrescence. While the merely repressive organs of the old governmental power were to be amputated, its legitimate functions were to be wrested from an authority usurping precedence over society itself, and restored to the responsible agents of society. Instead of deciding once in three or six years which member of the ruling class was to represent the people in Parliament, universal suffrage was to serve the people, constituted in Communes, as individual suffrage serves every other employer in the search for the workmen and managers in his business. And it is well known that companies, like individuals, in matters of real business generally know how to put the right man in the right place, and, if they for once make a mistake, to redress it promptly. On the other hand, nothing could be more foreign to the spirit of the Commune than to supersede universal suffrage by hierarchic investiture.

It is generally the fate of completely new historical creations to be mistaken for the counterpart of older and even defunct forms of social life, to which they may bear a certain likeness. Thus, this new Commune, which breaks the modern State power, has been mistaken for a reproduction of the medieval communes, which first preceded, and afterwards became the substratum of, that very State power. The Communal Constitution has been mistaken for an attempt to break up into a federation of small States, as dreamt of by Montesquieu and the Girondins, that unity of great nations which, if originally brought about by political force, has now become a powerful coefficient of social production. The antagonism of the Commune against the State power has been mistaken for an exaggerated form of the ancient struggle against over-centralization. Peculiar historical circumstances may have prevented the classical development, as in France, of the bourgeois form of government, and may have allowed, as in England, to complete the great central State organs by corrupt vestries, jobbing councillors, and ferocious poor-law guardians in the towns, and virtually hereditary magistrates in the counties. The Communal Constitution would have restored to the social body all the forces hitherto absorbed by the State parasite feeding upon, and clogging the free movement of, society. By this one act it would have initiated the regeneration of France. The provincial French middle class saw in the Commune an attempt to restore the sway their order had held over the country under Louis Philippe, and which, under Louis Napoleon, was supplanted by the pretended rule of the country over the towns. In reality, the Communal Constitution brought the rural producers under the intellectual lead of the central towns of their districts, and there secured to them, in the workmen, the natural trustees of their interests. The very existence of the Commune involved, as a matter of course, local municipal liberty, but no longer as a check upon the now superseded State power. It could only enter into the head of a Bismarck—who, when not engaged on his intrigues of blood and iron, always likes to resume his old
trade, so befitting his mental calibre, of contributor to Kladderadatch (the Berlin Punch)—it could only enter in such a head, to ascribe to the Paris Commune aspirations after that caricature of the old French municipal organization of 1791, the Prussian municipal constitution, which degrades the town governments to mere secondary wheels in the police machinery of the Prussian State. The Commune made that catchword of bourgeois revolutions, cheap government, a reality, by destroying the two greatest sources of expenditure—the standing army and State functionarism. Its very existence presupposed the non-existence of monarchy, which, in Europe at least, is the normal incumbrance and indispensable cloak of class-rule. It supplied the Republic with the basis of really democratic institutions. But neither cheap government nor the “true Republic” was its ultimate aim; they were its mere concomitants.

The multiplicity of interpretations to which the Commune has been subjected, and the multiplicity of interests which construed it in their favor, show that it was a thoroughly expansive political form, while all previous forms of government had been emphatically repressive. Its true secret was this. It was essentially a working-class government, the product of the struggle of the producing against the appropriating class, the political form at last discovered under which to work out the economic emancipation of labor.

Except on this last condition, the Communal Constitution would have been an impossibility and a delusion. The political rule of the producer cannot co-exist with the perpetuation of his social slavery. The Commune was therefore to serve as a lever for uprooting the economic foundations upon which rests the existence of classes, and therefore of class rule.

The Significance of the Commune

With labor emancipated, every man becomes a workingman, and productive labor ceases to be a class attribute.

It is a strange fact. In spite of all the talk and all the immense literature, for the last sixty years, about emancipation of labor, no sooner do the workingmen anywhere take the subject into their own hands with a will, than uprisings at once all the apologetic phrasology of the mouthpieces of present society with its two poles of Capital and Wage-slavery (the landlord now is but the sleeping partner of the capitalist), as if capitalist society was still in its purest state of virgin innocence, with its antagonisms still undeveloped, with its delusions still unexploded, with its prostitute realities not yet laid bare. The Commune, they exclaim, intends to abolish property, the basis of all civilization! Yes, gentlemen, the Commune intends to abolish that class-property which makes the labor of the many the wealth of the few. It aimed at the expropriation of the expropriators. It wanted to make individual property a truth by transforming the means of production, land and capital, now chiefly the means of enslaving and exploiting labor, into mere instruments of free and associated labor. But this is Communism, “impossible” Communism! Why, those members of the ruling classes who are intelligent enough to perceive the impossibility of continuing the present system—and they are many—have become the obstreperous and full-mouthed apostles of cooperative production. If cooperative production is not to remain a sham and a snare; if it is to supersede the capitalist system; if united cooperative societies are to regulate national production upon a common plan, thus taking it under their own control, and putting an end to the constant anxiety and periodical convulsions which are the fatality of capitalist
production—what else, gentlemen, would it be but Communism, "possible" Communism?

The working class did not expect miracles from the Commune. They have no ready-made utopias to introduce par décret du peuple. They know that in order to work out their own emancipation, and along with it that higher form to which present society is irresistibly tending, by its own economic agencies, they will have to pass through long struggles, through a series of historic processes, transforming circumstances and men. They have no ideals to realize, but to set free the elements of the new society with which old collapsing bourgeois society itself is pregnant. In the full consciousness of their historic mission, and with the heroic resolve to act up to it, the working class can afford to smile at the coarse invective of the gentlemen’s gentlemen with the pen and inkhorn, and at the didactic patronage of well-wishing bourgeois-doctrinaires, pouring forth their ignorant platitudes and sectarian crotchets in the oracular tone of scientific infallibility.

When the Paris Commune took the management of the revolution in its own hands; when plain workingmen for the first time dared to infringe upon the governmental privilege of their “natural superiors,” and, under circumstances of unexampled difficulty, performed their work modestly, conscientiously, and efficiently—performed it at salaries the highest of which barely amounted to one-fifth of what, according to high scientific authority, is the minimum required for a secretary to a certain metropolitan school board—the old world withered in convulsions of rage at the sight of the Red Flag, the symbol of the Republic of Labor, floating over the Hôtel de Ville.

And yet, this was the first revolution in which the working class was openly acknowledged as the only class capable of social initiative, even by the great bulk of the Paris middle class—shopkeepers, tradesmen, merchants—the wealthy capitalist alone excepted. The Commune had saved them by a sagacious settlement of that ever recurring cause of dispute among the middle class themselves—the debtor and creditor accounts. The same portion of the middle class, after they had assisted in putting down the workingmen’s insurrection of June, 1848, had been at once unceremoniously sacrificed to their creditors by the then Constituent Assembly. But this was not their only motive for now rallying round the working class. They felt there was but one alternative—the Commune, or the Empire—under whatever name it might reappear. The Empire had ruined them economically by the havoc it made of public wealth, by the wholesale financial swindling it fostered, by the props it lent to the artificially accelerated centralization of capital, and the concomitant expropriation of their own ranks. It had suppressed them politically, it had shocked them morally by its orgies, it had insulted their Voltaireanism by handing over the education of their children to the Frères Ignorants, it had revolted their national feeling as Frenchmen by precipitating them headlong into a war which left only one equivalent for the ruins it made—the disappearance of the Empire. In fact, after the exodus from Paris of the high Bonapartist and capitalist Bohémien, the true middle-class Party of Order came out in the shape of the Union Républicaine, enrolling themselves under the colors of the Commune and defending it against the wilful misconstruction of Thiers. Whether the gratitude of this great body of the middle class will stand the present severe trial, time must show.

The Commune was perfectly right in telling the peas-
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ants that "its victory was their only hope." Of all the
ties hatched at Versailles and reëchoed by the glorious
European penny-a-liner, one of the most tremendous
was that the Rurals represented the French peasantry.
Think only of the love of the French peasant for the
men to whom, after 1815, he had to pay the milliard of
indemnity! In the eyes of the French peasant, the very
existence of a great landed proprietary is in itself an en-
croachment on his conquests of 1789. The bourgeoisie,
in 1848, had burthened his plot of land with the additional
tax of forty-five centimes in the franc; but then it did so
in the name of the revolution; while now it had fomented
a civil war against the revolution, to shift on the peas-
ant's shoulders the chief load of the five milliards of
indemnity to be paid to the Prussian. The Commune, on
the other hand, in one of its first proclamations, de-
clared that the true originators of the war would be
made to pay its cost. The Commune would have de-

erived the peasant of the blood tax, would have given
him a cheap government, transformed his present blood-
suckers, the notary, advocate, executor, and other judicial
vampires, into salaried communal agents, elected by, and
responsible to, himself. It would have freed him of the
tyranny of the garde champêtre,¹ the gendarme, and the
prefect; would have put enlightenment by the school-
master in the place of suffocation by the priest. And
the French peasant is, above all, a man of reckoning.

¹ The garde champêtre is a rural guard, appointed in each rural commune
(corresponding in size to the smallest of our eastern townships), for the
protection of crops, cattle and other farm property. While the mounted
gendarmes police the national and departmental highways, he polices the
fields and communal by-ways, enforces the communal ordinances and the
game laws, arrests poachers, etc. On account of his acquaintance with every
man, woman, and child residing in the commune, and of his dependence
upon the bourgeois officials for his position, he is frequently required
to act the part of a political spy and can in many small ways be very
troublesome or even tyrannical.—*Note to the American Edition.*

would find it extremely reasonable that the pay of the
priest, instead of being extorted by the tax-gatherer,
should only depend upon the spontaneous action of the
parishioners' religious instincts. Such were the great
immediate boons which the rule of the Commune—and
that rule alone—held out to the French peasantry. It is,
therefore, quite superfluous here to expiate upon the
more complicated but vital problems which the Commune
alone was able, and at the same time compelled, to solve
in favor of the peasant, viz., the hypothecary debt (mort-
gage), lying like an incubus upon his parcel of soil, the
proletariat foncier (land-holding proletariat), daily grow-
ing upon the land, and his expropriation from it enforced,
at a more and more rapid rate, by the very development
of modern agriculture and the competition of capitalist
farming.

The French peasant had elected Louis Bonaparte presi-
dent of the Republic; but the Party of Order created the
Empire. What the French peasant really wants he com-
menced to show in 1849 and 1850, by opposing his mayor
to the Government's prefect, his schoolmaster to the Gov-
ernment's priest, and himself to the Government's gen-
darme. All the laws made by the Party of Order in
January and February, 1850, were avowed measures of
repression against the peasant. The peasant was a
Bonapartist, because the Great Revolution, with all its
benefits to him, was, in his eyes, personified in Napoleon.
This delusion, rapidly breaking down under the Second
Empire (and in its very nature hostile to the Rurals),
this prejudice of the past, how could it have withstood
the appeal of the Commune to the living interests and
urgent wants of the peasantry?

The Rurals—this was, in fact, their chief apprehension
—knew that three months' free communication of Com-
municipal Paris with the provinces would bring about a general rising of the peasants, and hence their anxiety to establish a police blockade around Paris, so as to stop the spread of the rinderpest.

If the Commune was thus the true representative of all the healthy elements of French society, and therefore the truly national Government, it was, at the same time, a workingmen's Government, as the bold champion of the emancipation of labor, emphatically international. Within sight of the Prussian army, that had annexed to Germany two French provinces, the Commune annexed to France the working people all over the world.

The Second Empire had been the jubilee of cosmopolitan blacklegism, the rakes of all countries rushing in at its call for a share in its orgies and in the plunder of the French people. Even at this moment the right hand of Thiers is Ganescu, the foul Wallachian, and his left hand is Markowski, the Russian spy. The Commune admitted all foreigners to the honor of dying for the immortal cause. Between the foreign war lost by their treason, and the civil war fomented by their conspiracy with the foreign invader, the bourgeoisie had found the time to display their patriotism by organizing police-hunts upon the Germans in France; the Commune made a German workingman its Minister of Labor. Thiers, the bourgeoisie, the Second Empire, had continually deluded Poland by loud professions of sympathy, while in reality betraying her to, and doing the dirty work of, Russia; the Commune honored the heroic sons of Poland by placing them at the head of the defenders of Paris. And, to broadly mark the new era of history, it was conscious of initiating, under the eyes of the conquering Prussians on the one side and of the Bonapartist army, led by Bonapartist generals, on the other, the Commune pulled down that colossal symbol of martial glory, the Vendôme column.

The great social measure of the Commune was its own working existence. Its special measures could but be taken the tendency of a government of the people by the people. Such were the abolition of the nightwork of journeyman bakers; the prohibition, under penalty, of the employers' practice to reduce wages by levying upon their workpeople fines under manifold pretexts—a process in which the employer combines in his own person the parts of legislator, judge, and executioner, and filches the money to boot. Another measure of this class was the surrender, to associations of workmen, under reserve of compensation, of all closed workshops and factories, no matter whether the respective capitalists had ascended or preferred to strike work.

The financial measures of the Commune, remarkable for their sagacity and moderation, could only be such as were compatible with the state of a besieged town. Considering the colossal robberies committed upon the City of Paris by the great financial companies and contractors, under the protection of Haussmann, the Commune would have had an incomparably better title to confiscate their property than Louis Napoleon had against the Orleans family. The Hohenzollern and the English oligarchs, who both have derived a good deal of their estates from Church plunder, were, of course, greatly shocked at the Commune clearing but 8,000 francs out of secularization. While the Versailles Government, as soon as it had recovered some spirit and strength, used the most violent means against the Commune; while it put down the free expression of opinion all over France, even to the forbidding of meetings of delegates from the large towns; while it subjected Versailles and the rest of France to
an espionage far surpassing that of the Second Empire; while it burned by its gendarme inquisitors all papers printed at Paris, and sifted all correspondence from and to Paris; while in the National Assembly the most timid attempts to put in a word for Paris were howled down in a manner unknown even to the Chambre introuvable of 1816; with the savage warfare of Versailles outside, and its attempts at corruption and conspiracy inside Paris—would the Commune not have shamefully betrayed its trust by affecting to keep up all the decencies and appearances of liberalism as in a time of profound peace? Had the Government of the Commune been akin to that of M. Thiers, there would have been no more occasion to suppress Party-of-Order papers at Paris than there was to suppress Communal papers at Versailles.

It was irritating, indeed, to the Rurals that at the very same time they declared the return to the Church to be the only means of salvation for France, the infidel Commune unearthed the peculiar mysteries of the Pius X nunnery and of the St. Laurent Church. It was a satire upon M. Thiers that, while he showered grand crosses upon the Bonapartist generals, in acknowledgment of their mastery in losing battles, signing capitulations, and turning cigarettes at Wilhelmshohe, the Commune dismissed and arrested its generals whenever they were suspected of neglecting their duties. The expulsion from, and arrest by, the Commune of one of its members who had slipped in under a false name, and had undergone at Lyons six days’ imprisonment for simple bankruptcy, was it not a deliberate insult hurled at the forger, Jules Favre, then still the Foreign Minister of France, still selling France to Bismarck, and still dictating his orders to that paragon Government of Belgium? But, indeed, the Commune did not pretend to infallibility, the invariable at-

tribute of all governments of the old stamp. It published its doings and sayings, it initiated the public into all its shortcomings.

In every revolution there intrude, at the side of its true agents, men of a different stamp; some of them survivors of and devotees to past revolutions, without insight into the present movement, but preserving popular influence by their known honesty and courage, or by the sheer force of tradition; others mere bawlers, who by dint of repeating year after year the same set of stereotyped declamation against the Government of the day, have sneaked into the reputation of revolutionists of the first water. After the 18th of March some such men did also turn up, and in some cases contrived to play preeminent parts. As far as their power went, they hampered the real action of the working class, exactly as men of that sort have hampered the full development of every previous revolution. They are an unavoidable evil; with time they are shaken off; but time was not allowed to the Commune.

Wonderful, indeed, was the change the Commune had wrought in Paris! No longer any trace of the mercetricious Paris of the Second Empire. No longer was Paris the rendezvous of British landlords, Irish absentee; American ex-slaveholders and shoddy men, Russian ex-serf-owners, and Wallachian boyards. No more corpses at the morgue, no nocturnal burglaries, scarcely any robberies; in fact, for the first time since the days of February, 1848, the streets of Paris were safe, and that without any police of any kind. “We,” said a member of the Commune, “hear no longer of assassination, theft, and personal assault; it seems, indeed, as if the police had dragged along with it to Versailles all its conservative friends.” The cocottes had refound the scent of their.
protectors—the absconding men of family, religion, and, above all, of property. In their stead, the real women of Paris showed again at the surface—heroic, noble, and devoted, like the women of antiquity. Working, thinking, fighting, bleeding Paris—almost forgetful, in its incubation of a new society, of the cannibals at its gates—radiant in the enthusiasm of its historic initiative!

Opposed to this new world at Paris, behold the old world at Versailles—that assembly of the ghouls of all defunct régimes, Legitimists and Orleans, eager to feed upon the carcass of the nation—with a tail of antediluvian Republicans, sanctioning, by their presence in the Assembly, the slaveholders' rebellion, relying for the maintenance of their Parliamentary Republic upon the vanity of the senile mountebank at its head, and caricaturing 1789 by holding their ghastly meetings in the Jeu de Paume. There it was, this Assembly, the representative of everything dead in France, propped up into a semblance of life by nothing but the swords of the generals of Louis Bonaparte. Paris all truth, Versailles all lie; and that lie vented through the mouth of Thiers.

Thiers tells a deputation of the mayors of the Seine-et-Oise—"You may rely upon my word, which I have never broken!" He tells the Assembly itself that "it was the most freely elected and most liberal Assembly France ever possessed"; he tells his motley soldiery that it was "the admiration of the world, and the finest army France ever possessed"; he tells the provinces that the bombardment of Paris by him was a myth: "If some cannon-shots have been fired, it is not the deed of the army of Versailles, but of some insurgents trying to make believe that they are fighting, while they dare not show their faces." He again tells the provinces that "the artillery of Versailles does not bombard Paris, but only cannonades it." He tells the Archbishop of Paris that the pretended executions and reprisals (!) attributed to the Versailles troops were all moonshine. He tells Paris that he was only anxious "to free it from the hideous tyrants who oppress it," and that, in fact, the Paris of the Commune was "but a handful of criminals."

The Paris of M. Thiers was not the real Paris of the "vile multitude," but a phantom Paris, the Paris of the francs-fileurs, the Paris of the Boulevards, male and female—the rich, the capitalist, the gilded, the idle Paris, now thronging with its lackeys, its blacklegs, its literary bohèmes, and its cocottes at Versailles, Saint-Denis, Rueil, and Saint-Germain; considering the civil war but an agreeable diversion, eyeing the battle going on through telescopes, counting the rounds of cannon, and swearing by their own honor and that of their prostitutes that the performance was far better got up than it used to be at the Porte St. Martin. The men who fell were really dead; the cries of the wounded were cries in good earnest; and, besides, the whole thing was so intensely historical.

This is the Paris of M. Thiers, as the Emigration of Coblenz was the France of M. de Calonne.
CHAPTER IV

THE REPRESSION

The first attempt of the slaveholders' conspiracy to put down Paris by getting the Prussians to occupy it, was frustrated by Bismarck's refusal. The second attempt, that of the 18th of March, ended in the rout of the army and the flight to Versailles of the Government, which ordered the whole administration to break up and follow in its track. By the semblance of peace-negotiations with Paris, Thiers found the time to prepare for war against it. But where to find an army? The remnants of the line regiments were weak in number and unsafe in character. His urgent appeal to the provinces to succor Versailles, by their National Guards and volunteers, met with a flat refusal. Brittany alone furnished a handful of Choudas fighting under a white flag, every one of them wearing on his breast the heart of Jesus in white cloth, and shouting "Vive le Roi!" (Long live the King!) Thiers was, therefore, compelled to collect, in hot haste, a motley crew, composed of sailors, marines, Pontifical Zouaves, Valentin's gendarmes, and Piëtri's sergents de ville and mouchards. This army, however, would have been ridiculously ineffective without the instalments of imperialist war-prisoners, which Bismarck granted in numbers just sufficient to keep the civil war a-going, and keep the Versailles Government in the abject dependence on Prussia. During the war itself, the Versailles police had to look after theVersailles army, while the gendarmes had to drag it on by exposing themselves at all posts of danger. The forts which fell were not taken but bought. The heroism of the Federals convinced Thiers that the resistance of Paris was not to be broken by his own strategic genius and the bayonets at his disposal.

Meanwhile, his relations with the provinces became more and more difficult. Not one single address of approval came in to gladden Thiers and his Rurals. Quite the contrary. Deputations and addresses demanding, in a tone anything but respectful, conciliation with Paris on the basis of the unequivocal recognition of the Republic, the acknowledgment of the Communal liberties, and the dissolution of the National Assembly, whose mandate was extinct, poured in from all sides, and in such numbers that Dufaure, Thiers' Minister of Justice, in his circular of April 23d to the public prosecutors, commanded them to treat "the cry of conciliation" as a crime. In regard, however, to the hopeless prospect held out by his campaign, Thiers resolved to shift his tactics by ordering, all over the country, municipal elections to take place on the 30th of April, on the basis of the new municipal law dictated by himself to the National Assembly. What with the intrigues of his prefects, what with police intimidation, he felt quite sanguine of imparting, by the verdict of the provinces, to the National Assembly that moral power it had never possessed, and of getting at last from the provinces the physical force required for the conquest of Paris.

His banditti-warfare against Paris, exalted in his own bulletins, and the attempts of his Ministers at the establishment, throughout France, of a reign of terror, Thiers was from the beginning anxious to accompany with a little byplay of conciliation, which had to serve more than one purpose. It was to dupe the provinces, to inveigle the middle-class element in Paris, and, above all, to afford
the professed Republicans in the National Assembly the opportunity of hiding their treason against Paris behind their faith in Thiers. On the 21st of March, when still without an army, he had declared to the Assembly: "Come what may, I will not send an army to Paris." On March 27th he rose again: "I have found the Republic an accomplished fact, and I am firmly resolved to maintain it." In reality, he put down the revolution at Lyons and Marseilles in the name of the Republic, while the roars of his Rurals drowned the very mention of its name at Versailles. After this exploit, he toned down the "accomplished fact" into an hypothetical fact. The Orleans princes, whom he had cautiously warned off Bordeaux, were now, in flagrant breach of the law, permitted to intrigue at Dreux. The concessions held out by Thiers in his interminable interviews with the delegates from Paris and the provinces, although constantly varied in tone and color, according to time and circumstances, did in fact never come to more than the prospective restriction of revenge to the "handful of criminals implicated in the murder of Lecomte and Clement Thomas," on the well-understood premise that Paris and France were unreservedly to accept M. Thiers himself as the best of possible Republics, as he, in 1830, had done with Louis Philippe. Even these concessions he not only took care to render doubtful by the official comments put upon them in the Assembly through his Ministers; he had his Dufaure to act. Dufaure, this old Orleanist lawyer, had always been the judiciary of the state of siege, as now in 1871, under Thiers, so in 1839, under Louis Philippe, and in 1849, under Louis Bonaparte's presidency. While out of office he made a fortune by pleading for the Paris capitalists, and made political capital by pleading against the laws he had himself originated. He now hurried through the National Assembly not only a set of repressive laws which were, after the fall of Paris, to extirpate the last remnants of Republican liberty in France; he foreshadowed the fate of Paris by abridging the, for him, too slow procedure of courts-martial, and by a new-fangled, Draconic code of deportation. The Revolution of 1848, abolishing the penalty of death for political crimes, had replaced it by deportation. Louis Bonaparte did not dare, at least not in theory, to reestablish the régime of the guillotine. The Rural Assembly, not yet bold enough even to hint that the Parisians were not rebels, but assassins, had therefore to confine its prospective vengeance against Paris to Dufaure's new code of deportation. Under all these circumstances Thiers himself could not have gone on with his comedy of conciliation, had it not, as he intended it to do, drawn forth shrieks of rage from the Rurals, whose ruminating mind could understand neither the play, nor its necessities of hypocrisy, tergiversation, and procrastination.

In sight of the impending municipal elections of April 30th, Thiers enacted one of his great conciliation scenes on April 27th. Amidst a flood of sentimental rhetoric, he exclaimed from the tribune of the Assembly: "There exists no conspiracy against the Republic but that of Paris, which compels us to shed French blood. I repeat it again and again. Let those impious arms fall from the hands which hold them, and chastisement will be arrested at once by an act of peace excluding only the small number of criminals." To the violent interruption of the Rurals he replied: "Gentlemen, tell me, I implore you, am I wrong? Do you really regret that I could have stated the truth that the criminals are only a handful? Is it not fortunate in the midst of our misfortunes that those who have been capable to shed the blood of Clement
Thomas and General Lecomte are but rare exceptions?"

France, however, turned a deaf ear to what Thiers flattered himself to be a parliamentary siren's song. Out of 700,000 municipal councillors returned by the 35,000 communes still left to France, the united Legitimists, Orleanists, and Bonapartists did not carry 8,000. The supplementary elections which followed were still more decidedly hostile. Thus, instead of getting from the provinces the badly needed physical force, the National Assembly lost even its last claim of moral force, that of being the expression of the universal suffrage of the country. To complete the discomfiture, the newly-chosen municipal councils of all the cities of France openly threatened the usurping Assembly at Versailles with a counter Assembly at Bordeaux.

Then the long-expected moment of decisive action had at last come for Bismarck. He peremptorily summoned Thiers to send to Frankfort plenipotentiaries for the definitive settlement of peace. In humble obedience to the call of his master, Thiers hastened to despatch his trusty Jules Favre, backed by Poyer-Quertier. Poyer-Quertier, an "eminent" Rouen cotton-spinner, a fervent and even servile partisan of the Second Empire, had never found any fault with it save its commercial treaty with England, prejudicial to his own shop-interest. Hardly installed at Bordeaux as Thiers's Minister of Finance, he denounced that "inholy" treaty, hinted at its near abrogation, and had even the effrontery to try, although in vain (having counted without Bismarck), the immediate enforcement of the old protective duties against Alsace, where, he said, no previous international treaties stood in the way. This man, who considered counter-revolution as a means to put down wages at Rouen, and the surrender of French provinces as a means to bring up the price of his wares in France, was he not the one predestined to be picked out by Thiers as the helpermate of Jules Favre in his last and crowning treason?

On the arrival at Frankfort of this exquisite pair of plenipotentiaries, bully Bismarck at once met them with the imperious alternative: "Either the restoration of the Empire, or the unconditional acceptance of my own peace terms!" These terms included a shortening of the intervals in which the war indemnity was to be paid, and the continued occupation of the Paris forts by Prussian troops until Bismarck should feel satisfied with the state of things in France; Prussia thus being recognized as the supreme arbiter in internal French politics! In return for this he offered to let loose, for the extermination of Paris, the captive Bonapartist army, and to lend them the direct assistance of Emperor William's troops. He pledged his good faith by making payment of the first installment of the indemnity dependent on the "pacification" of Paris. Such a bait was, of course, eagerly swallowed by Thiers and his plenipotentiaries. They signed the treaty of peace on the 10th of May, and had it endorsed by the Versailles Assembly on the 18th.

In the interval between the conclusion of peace and the arrival of the Bonapartist prisoners, Thiers felt the more bound to resume his comedy of conciliation, as his Republican tools stood in sore need of a pretext for blinking their eyes at the preparations for the carnage of Paris. As late as the 18th of May he replied to a deputation of middle-class conciliators: "Whenever the insurgents will make up their minds for capitulation, the gates of Paris shall be flung wide open during a week for all except the murderers of Generals Clement Thomas and Lecomte."

A few days afterwards, when violently interpelled on
these promises by the Rurals, he refused to enter into any explanations; not, however, without giving them this significant hint: "I tell you there are impatient men amongst you, men who are in too great a hurry. They must have another eight days; at the end of these eight days there will be no more danger, and the task will be proportionate to their courage and to their capacities."

As soon as McMahon was able to assure him that he could shortly enter Paris, Thiers declared to the Assembly that "he would enter Paris, with the laws in his hands, and demand a full expiation from the wretches who had sacrificed the lives of soldiers and destroyed public monuments." As the moment of decision drew near he said to the Assembly, "I shall be pitiless!"; to Paris, that it was doomed; and to his Bonapartist banditti, that they had State license to wreak vengeance upon Paris to their heart's content. At last when treachery had opened the gates of Paris to General Donat, on the 21st of May, Thiers, on the 22d, revealed to the Rurals the "goal" of his conciliation comedy, which they had so obstinately persisted in not understanding. "I told you a few days ago that we were approaching our goal; today I come to tell you the goal is reached. The victory of order, justice, and civilization is at last won!"

So it was. The civilization and justice of bourgeois order comes out in its lurid light whenever the slaves and drudges of that order rise against their masters. Then this civilization and justice stand forth as undisguised savagery and lawless revenge. Each new crisis in the class struggle between the appropriator and the producer brings out this fact more glaringly. Even the atrocities of the bourgeois in June, 1848, vanish before the ineffable infancy of 1871. The self-sacrificing heroism with which the population of Paris—men, women, and children—fought for eight days after the entrance of the Versaillaise reflects as much the grandeur of their cause as the infernal deeds of the soldiery reflect the innate spirit of that civilization of which they are the mercenary vindicators. A glorious civilization, indeed, the great problem of which is how to get rid of the heaps of corpses it made after the battle was over!

To find a parallel for the conduct of Thiers and his bloodhounds we must go back to the times of Sulla and the two Triumvirates of Rome. The same wholesale slaughter in cold blood; the same disregard, in massacre, of age and sex; the same system of torturing prisoners: the same proscriptions, but this time of a whole class; the same savage hunt after concealed leaders, lest one might escape; the same denunciations of political and private enemies: the same indifference for the butchery of entire strangers to the feud. There is but this difference, that the Romans had no mitrailleuses for the despatch, in the lump, of the proscribed, and that they had not "the law in their hands," nor on their lips the cry of "civilization."

And after those horrors, look upon the other, still more hideous, face of that bourgeois civilization as described by its own press!

"With stray shots," writes the Paris correspondent of a London Tory paper, "still ringing in the distance, and unintended wounded wretches dying amid the tombstones of Père la Chaise—with 6,000 terror-stricken insurgents wandering in an agony of despair in the labyrinth of the catacombs, and wretches hurried through the streets to be shot down in scores by the mitrailleuse—it is revolting to see the cafés filled with the votaries of absinthe, billiards, and dominoes; female profligacy perambulating the boulevards, and the sound of revelry disturbing the night from the cabinets particuliers of fashionable restau-
rants.” M. Edouard Hervé writes in the *Journal de Paris*, a Versaillists journal suppressed by the Commune: “The way in which the population of Paris (1) manifested its satisfaction yesterday was rather more than frivolous, and we fear it will grow worse as time progresses. Paris has now a fête-day appearance, which is sadly out of place; and, unless we are to be called the Parisiens de la décadence, this sort of thing must come to an end.” And then he quotes the passage from Tacitus: “Yet, on the morrow of that horrible struggle, even before it was completely over, Rome, degraded and corrupt, began once more to wallow in the voluptuous slough which was destroying its body and polluting its soul—ali praetia et vulnera, alibi balnea popinaceae—here fights and wounds, there baths and restaurants.” M. Hervé only forgets to say that the “population of Paris” he speaks of is but the population of the Paris of M. Thiers—the franco-fileurs returning in throngs from Versailles, Saint Denis, Rueil, and Saint-Germain—the Paris of the “Decline.”

In all its bloody triumphs over the self-sacrificing champions of a new and better society, that nefarious civilization, based upon the enslavement of labor, drowns the moans of its victims in a hue-and-cry of calumny, reverberated by a world-wide echo. The serene workingmen’s Paris of the Commune is suddenly changed into a pandemonium by the bloodhounds of “order.” And what does this tremendous change prove to the bourgeois mind of all countries? Why, that the Commune has conspired against civilization! The Paris people die enthusiastically for the Commune in numbers unequalled in

any battle known to history. What does that prove? Why, that the Commune was not the people’s own government, but the usurpation of a handful of criminals! The women of Paris joyfully give up their lives at the barricades and on the place of execution. What does this prove? Why, that the demon of the Commune has changed them into Megeras and Hecate! The moderation of the Commune during two months of undisputed sway is equalled only by the heroism of its defence. What does that prove? Why, that for months the Commune carefully hid, under a mask of moderation and humanity, the bloodthirstiness of its fiendish instincts, to be let loose in the hour of its agony!

The workingmen’s Paris, in the act of its heroic self-holocaust, involved in its flames buildings and monuments. While tearing to pieces the living body of the proletariat, its rulers must no longer expect to return triumphantly into the intact architecture of their abodes. The Government of Versailles cries, “Incendiarism!” and whispers this cue to all its agents, down to the remotest hamlet, to hunt up its enemies everywhere as suspected of professional incendiarism. The bourgeoisie of the whole world, which looks complacently upon the wholesale massacre after the battle, is convulsed by horror at the degradation of brick and mortar!

When governments give state-licenses to their navies to “kill, burn, and destroy,” is that a license for incendiarism? When the British troops wantonly set fire to the Capitol at Washington and to the summer palace of the Chinese Emperor, was that incendiarism? When the Prussians, not for military reasons, but out of the mere spite of revenge, burnt down, by the help of petroleum, towns like Châteaudun and innumerable villages, was that incendiarism? When Thiers, during six weeks,
bombarded Paris, under the pretext that he wanted to set fire to those houses only in which there were people, was that incendiarism? In war, fire is an arm as legitimate as any. Buildings held by the enemy are shelled to set them on fire. If their defenders have to retire, they themselves light the flames to prevent the attack from making use of the buildings. To be burnt down has always been the inevitable fate of all buildings situated in the front of battle of all the regular armies of the world. But in the war of the enslaved against their enslavers, the only justifiable war in history, this is by no means to hold good! The Commune used fire strictly as a means of defense. They used it to stop up to the Versailles troops those long straight avenues which Haussmann had expressly opened to artillery fire; they used it to cover their retreat, in the same way as the Versaillaise, in their advance, used their shells which destroyed at least as many buildings as the fire of the Commune. It is a matter of dispute, even now, which buildings were set fire to by the defense, and which by the attack. And the defense resorted to fire only then, when the Versaillese troops had already commenced their wholesale murdering of prisoners. Besides, the Commune had, long before, given full public notice that, if driven to extremities, they would bury themselves under the ruins of Paris, and make Paris a second Moscow, as the Government of Defense, but only as a cloak for its treason, had promised to do. For this purpose Trochu had found them the petroleum. The Commune knew that its opponents cared nothing for the lives of the Paris people, but cared much for their own Paris buildings. And Thiers, on the other hand, had given them notice that he would be implacable in his vengeance. No sooner had he got his army ready on one side, and the Prussians shutting up the trap on the other, than he proclaimed: “I shall be pitiless! The expiation will be complete, and justice will be stern!” If the acts of the Paris workmen were vandalism, it was the vandalism of defense in despair, not the vandalism of triumph, like that which the Christians perpetrated upon the really priceless art treasures of heathen antiquity; and even that vandalism has been justified by the historian as an unavoidable and comparatively trifling concomitant to the Titanic struggle between a new society arising and an old one breaking down. It was still less the vandalism of Haussmann, razing historic Paris to make place for the Paris of the sightseer!

But the execution by the Commune of the sixty-four hostages, with the Archbishop of Paris at their head! The bourgeoisie and its army in June, 1848, re-established a custom which had long disappeared from the practice of war—the shooting of their defenseless prisoners. This brutal custom has since been more or less strictly adhered to by the suppressors of all popular commotions in Europe and India; thus proving that it constitutes a real “progress of civilization”! On the other hand, the Prussians, in France, had re-established the practice of taking hostages—innocent men, who, with their lives, were to answer to them for the acts of others. When Thiers, as we have seen, from the very beginning of the conflict, enforced the humane practice of shooting down the Communal prisoners, the Commune, to protect their lives, was obliged to resort to the Prussian practice of securing hostages. The lives of the hostages had been forfeited over and over again by the continued shooting of prisoners on the part of the Versailles. How could they be spared any longer after the carnage with which McMahon’s pretorians celebrated their entrance into Paris?
THE CIVIL WAR IN FRANCE

Was even the last check upon the unscrupulous ferocity of bourgeois governments—the taking of hostages—to be made a mere sham of? The real murderer of Archbishop Darboy is Thiers. The Commune again and again had offered to exchange the archbishop, and ever so many priests in the bargain, against the single Blanqui, then in the hands of Thiers. Thiers obstinately refused. He knew that with Blanqui he would give to the Commune a head; while the archbishop would serve his purpose best in the shape of a corpse. Thiers acted upon the precedent of Cavaignac. How, in June, 1848, did not Cavaignac and his men of order raise shouts of horror by stigmatizing the insurgents as the assassins of Archbishop Affre! They knew perfectly well that the archbishop had been shot by the soldiers of order. M. Jacquemet, the archbishop's vicar-general, present on the spot, had immediately afterwards handed them in his evidence to that effect.

All this chorus of calumny, which the party of order never fail, in their orgies of blood, to raise against their victims, only proves that the bourgeois of our days considers himself the legitimate successor to the baron of old, who thought every weapon in his own hand fair against the plebeian, while in the hands of the plebeian a weapon of any kind constituted in itself a crime.

The conspiracy of the ruling class to break down the Revolution by a civil war carried on under the patronage of the foreign invader—a conspiracy which we have traced from the very 4th of September down to the entrance of MacMahon's pretorians through the gate of St. Cloud—culminated in the carnage of Paris. Bismarck gloats over the ruins of Paris, in which he saw perhaps the first instalment of that general destruction of great cities he had prayed for when still a mere Rural
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In the Prussian Chambre introuvable of 1849. He gloats over the cadavers of the Paris proletariat. For him this is not only the extermination of revolution, but the extinction of France, now decapitated in reality, and by the French Government itself. With the shallowness characteristic of all successful statesmen, he sees but the surface of this tremendous historic event. When has history ever exhibited before the spectacle of a conqueror crowning his victory by turning into, not only the gendarme, but the hired bravo of the conquered government? There existed no war between Prussia and the Commune of Paris. On the contrary, the Commune had accepted the peace preliminaries, and Prussia had announced her neutrality. Prussia was, therefore, no belligerent. She had acted the part of a bravo, a cowardly bravo, because incurring no danger; a hired bravo, because stipulating beforehand the payment of her blood-money of five hundred millions on the fall of Paris. And thus, at last, came out the true character of the war, ordained by Providence as a chastisement of godless and debauched France by pious and moral Germany! And this unparalleled breach of the law of nations, even as understood by the old-world lawyers, instead of arousing the "civilized" governments of Europe to declare the felonious Prussian Government, the mere tool of the St. Petersburg Cabinet, an outlaw amongst nations, only incites them to consider whether the few victims who escape the double cordon around Paris are not to be given up to the hangman at Versailles!

That after the most tremendous war of modern times, the conquering and the conquered hosts should fraternize for the common massacre of the proletariat—this unparalleled event does indicate, not as Bismarck thinks, the final repression of a new society upheaving, but the
crumbling into dust of bourgeois society. The highest heroic effort of which old society is still capable is national war; and this is now proved to be a mere governmental humbug, intended to defer the struggle of the classes, and to be thrown aside as soon as that class struggle bursts out in civil war. Class rule is no longer able to disguise itself in a national uniform; the national Governments are one as against the proletariat!

After Whit-Sunday, 1871, there can be neither peace nor truce possible between the workingmen of France and the appropriators of their produce. The iron hand of a mercenary soldiery may keep for a time both classes tied down in common oppression. But the battle must break out again and again in ever-growing dimensions, and there can be no doubt as to who will be the victor in the end—the appropriating few, or the immense working majority. And the French working class is only the vanguard of the modern proletariat.

While the European Governments thus testify, before Paris, to the international character of class rule, they cry down the International Workingmen's Association—the international counter-organization of labor against the cosmopolitan organization of capital—as the head fountain of all these disasters. Thiers denounced it as the despot of labor, pretending to be its liberator. Picard ordered that all communications between the French Internationals and those abroad should be cut off. Count Jaubert, Thiers's mummified accomplice of 1835, declares it the great problem of all civilized governments to weed it out. The Rurals roar against it, and the whole European press joins the chorus. An honorable French writer, completely foreign to our Association, speaks as follows: "The members of the Central Committee of the National Guard, as well as the greater part of the members of

the Commune, are the most active, intelligent, and energetic minds of the International Workingmen's Association; . . . men who are thoroughly honest, sincere, intelligent, devoted, pure, and fanatical in the good sense of the word." The police-tinged bourgeois mind naturally figures to itself the International Workingmen's Association as acting in the manner of a secret conspiracy, its central body ordering, from time to time, explosions in different countries. Our Association is, in fact, nothing but the international bond between the most advanced workingmen in the various countries of the civilized world. Wherever, in whatever shape, and under whatever conditions the class struggle obtains any constituency, it is but natural that members of our Association should stand in the foreground. The soil out of which it grows is modern society itself. It cannot be stamped out by any amount of carnage. To stamp it out, the Government would have to stamp out the despotism of capital over labor—the condition of their own parasitical existence.

Workingmen's Paris, with its Commune, will be forever celebrated as the glorious harbinger of a new society. Its martyrs are enshrined in the great heart of the working class. Its exterminators, history has already nailed to that eternal pillory from which all the prayers of their priest will not avail to redeem them.
APPENDIX

ANTI-PLEBISCITE MANIFESTO

(See notes, pages 23 and 24.)

In the notes on pages 23 and 24 relative to the plebiscite submitted to the French people by Louis Bonaparte, reference is made to the ”Anti-Plebiscite Manifesto” issued by the Paris Sections of the International in conjunction with the Federal Chamber of Labor Societies. The following translation of the manifesto has been made especially for this edition of The Paris Commune:

ANTI-PLEBISCITE MANIFESTO ISSUED BY THE FEDERATED PARISIAN SECTIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKINGMEN’S ASSOCIATION AND THE FEDERAL CHAMBER OF LABOR SOCIETIES.

To All French Workingmen:

Citizens—After the Revolution of 1789 and the Declaration of Rights of 1793, the sovereignty of labor is the only constitutive basis upon which modern society should rest.

Labor is, in effect, the supreme law of humanity, the source of public wealth, and the most efficient cause of individual wellbeing.

The workingman alone is entitled to the esteem of his fellow-citizens; he imposes even upon those who exploit him a sense of his honesty; he is called upon to regenerate the old order.

This is why we say to the urban and rural workers, to the small manufacturers, to the small businessmen, and to all those who sincerely desire the reign of liberty founded upon equality: It is not enough to answer by a purely negative vote this plebiscite that they have the audacity to thrust upon us; not enough to prefer the constitution of 1870 to that of 1882—a parliament—
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The government to a personal one. Out of the ballot-box must come the absolute condemnation of the monarchist regime. The complete, the radical affirmation of the only form of government that can give scope to our legitimate aspirations—the Social and Democratic Republic.

In灌溉 is he who would believe that the constitution of 1870 would enable him, any more than that of 1852, to assure to his children the benefits of integrity, free, and obligatory instruction for all.

That it would allow the reformation and the reorganization of the great public services (mines, canals, railroads, banks, etc.) for the benefit of all, instead of being as they are to-day, a means of exploitation for the feudalism of capital?

The complete changing of the mode of levying taxes, which until now have been progressive in the direction of poverty?

The restoration to the public domain of the properties which the clergy, secular and regular, have seized upon by subterfuge in defiance of the laws of 1789 and 1790!

The putting an end to the abuse of power by all the governmental functionaries great and small (constables, juges d'instruction, commissaires de police, etc.), whose arbitrary conduct is to-day covered by article 75 of the Constitution of the year VIII!

And finally, the suppression of the blood-tax (the standing army) by abolishing the conscription.

No! Citizens, such could not be the case. Despotism has the fatal quality of being able to engender only despotism. The test has been made.

And, moreover, we refuse to recognize in the executive the right to question us. This right would imply on our part a subjection against which the very name of the power that arrogates it protests: that power indicates that he is not the master, but only and nothing more than the executor of the sovereign will of the nation.

If them, with us, you desire to put an end to all the defilements of the past; if you desire that the new social compact, consented to by citizens, equals in rights as in duties, shall assure to each of you peace and liberty, equality and work; if you want to affirm the Social and Democratic Republic, the best means as we see it is either to refuse to vote or else vote against the constitution—and this without excluding the other modes of protestation.

Workers of all crafts, remember the massacres at Aubin and at la Ricamarie, the convictions at Autun and the acquittal at Tours; and, while you take your ballots to show that you are not indifferent to your civic duties, remember to abstain from voting.

Workers of the country districts! Like your city brothers you bear the crushing burdens of the present social system; you produce without ceasing, and the most of the time you lack the necessaries of life, while the tax, the usurer, and the proprietors thrive at your expense.

The Empire, not satisfied at crushing you with taxes, takes

ANTI-PLEISICITE MANIFESTO

from you your sons, your only support, to make papal soldiers of them, or to strew their abandoned corpses over the desert plains of Syria, Cochín-China and Mexico.

We likewise advise you to abstain from voting, because abstention is the protest that the author of the coup d'État fears the most; but if you are compelled to cast your ballot, let it either remain blank or bear the words: Radical change in taxation! No more conscription! The Social and Democratic Republic!

For the Federated Parisian Sections of the International Workingmen's Association:

A. COMBault, rue de Vaugirard, 269.
REYMond, rue de l'Ouest, 80.
GERMAIN CAser, rue de Maubeuge, 94.
BERTHOUMIEU, member of the Commission of the International.
LAFARGE, member of the Vaugirard Section.
E. LEFèVRE, rue des Martyrs, 99.
JULIEN JONNARD, rue d'Aboukir, 126.
J. FRANQUIN, rue de la Verrerie, 42.

For the Federal Chamber of Labor Societies:

A. THEIZ, carver, rue de Jessaint, 12.
CAMELINAT, bronze-mounter, rue Polie-Méricourt, 34.
AVRIAL, machinist, passage Raspail, 15.
D. ANDRÉ, cabinet-maker, rue Neuve-des-Boulets, 17.
DÉSÉTTI, rue des Boulanger, 16.
PINOY, joiner, rue du Faubourg-du-Temple, 17.
ROBILLARD, gilder, rue des Sèvres, 113.
ROUVRE, goldsmith, rue Lesage, 16.
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"BLOODY WEEK"


By Lucien Sanial.

(See page 98.)

The atrocities of the "Bloody Week"—Semaine Sanglante is the name under which that terrible week has passed into history—were but in part, and we may say in very small part, known to Marx when he wrote these lines: for at that particular moment, and for several days thereafter, he had no other source of information than the incomplete and disconnected reports of the London dailies. In order to form an approximate idea of their extent and savagery, it is necessary to read the thrilling account which Lissagaray gives of them in his History of the Commune. As the merit of his narrative is not only in its accuracy, but in its consecutiveness, and as we cannot here reproduce it in full, we shall not mutilate it into extracts. But the contemporary testimony of the capitalist press, which is not now so readily accessible as Lissagaray's book, has also a special value, and to Marx's quotation from a "Tory organ" we may add a few others, typical of the many of the same sort that might be made from the published letters of newspaper correspondents and editorial utterances of journalists who witnessed the horrible scenes which they described.

The Paris Temps stated that "immense pits ten meters (thirtythree feet) square and equally deep have been dug at the Montmartre cemetery, in which layers of twenty corpses each, covered with lime, are superposed." According to the Paris Liberté the Champs de Mars was used for a similar purpose, and the bodies were thrown pellmell into deep trenches. The Théâtre
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François Square, the Pigalle Square, and many other places were used for hasty burial, in fear of pestilence. "There are," stated that paper, "streets in Paris in which the dead bodies are being accumulated and in every house of which a number of corpses are awaiting interment." . . . "On the Saint Michel Boulevard, stages are driven to each barricade and may then be seen slowly filling up as with a tide of cadavers. The sight of limbs hanging out of these stages is ghastly beyond expression." Numbers of those who had been shot at the Loban barracks and other places in proximity to the river were expeditiously thrown into it. The reporter of a conservative paper, says Camille Pelléat, took the trouble of counting those he had seen floating in the course of a short walk along the quay: he called that "la pêche au fédéré." The Petite Presse noticed a long and persistent streak of blood in the river, passing under the second arch of the Tuileries bridge and running swiftly far out of sight.

In his testimony before the legislative Commission of inquiry, instituted with a view to whitewashing the Versailles government, the bourgeois senator Cambon had to declare that in his opinion the number of prisoners shot by the troops had been greater than the actual number of fighting men behind the barricades.

The last stand of the Parisian proletariat was at the Père la Chaise cemetery. In commenting on this final scene of the great drama, the Temps said two days later: "More than ten thousand Federals, killed at that place and in its immediate neighborhood, have already been buried. Many corpses are still lying piled up in family chapels. They were not all, of course, killed in battle. Many prisoners—men, women, and children—had been taken, two hundred at the time, to the foot of a wall now known as the Mur des Fédérés (the Federals' Wall), and been shot with mitrailleuses, their bodies immediately falling into a deep, wide, and long trench dug in front of them. On the day following the adjournment of the International Congress of 1900, the delegates went in procession to the Mur des Fédérés. But the Millerand-Galiffet-Waldeck police cut the procession into several small bodies and would not allow more than one speech to be delivered.

The London Daily News of June 8, 1871, printed the following from its Paris correspondent:

The column of prisoners halted in the Avenue Uhrich, and was drawn up, four or five deep, on the roadway facing to the road. General Marquis de Galiffet and his staff dismounted
and commenced an inspection from the left of the line. Walking down slowly and eying the ranks, the General stopped here and there, tapping a man on the shoulder or beckoning him out of the rear ranks. In most cases, without further parley, the individual thus selected was marched out into the center of the road, where a small supplementary column was thus formed.

It was evident that there was considerable room for error. A mounted officer pointed out to General Gallifet a man and a woman for some particular offense. The woman, rushing out of the ranks, threw herself on her knees, and, with outstretched arms, protested her innocence in passionate terms. The General waited for a pause, and then with most impassable face and unmoved demeanor said: "Madame, I have visited every theater in Paris, your acting will have no effect on me" (ce n'est pas la peine de jouer la comédie).

It was not a good thing on that day to be noticeably taller, dirtier, cleaner, older, or uglier than one's neighbors. One individual in particular struck me as probably owing his speedy release from the ills of this world to his having a broken nose. . . . Over a hundred being thus chosen, a firing party told off, and the column resumed its march, leaving them behind. A few minutes afterwards a dropping fire in our rear commenced, and continued for over a quarter of an hour. It was the execution of these summarily-convicted wretches.

This Gallifet, "the kept man of his wife, so notorious for her shameless exhibitions at the orgies of the Second Empire," went during the war by the name of the French "Ensign Pistol." And it was with this Gallifet, as Minister of War, that the "Socialist" Millerand, as Minister of Commerce, entered the Waldeck-Rousseau cabinet of the so-called Republican Defense, formed at the time of the Dreyfus affair! The murderer Gallifet and the traitor Millerand! Fit colleagues indeed in a bourgeois conspiracy having in view the disorganization of the socialist movement and the consequent perpetuation of wage-slavery!

The London Evening Standard of June 8, 1871, printed this paragraph from its Paris correspondent:

"The troops, which is a careful journal, and not given to sensationalism, tells a dreadful story of people imperfectly shot and buried before life was extinct. A great number were buried in the square round St. Jacques-la-Boucherie; some of them very superficially. In the daytime the roar of the busy streets prevented any notice being taken; but in the stillness of the night the inhabitants of the houses in the neighborhood were roused by distant moans, and in the morning a clenched hand was seen protruding through the soil. In consequence of this, exhumations were ordered to take place. . . . That many wounded have been buried alive I have not the slightest doubt. One case I can vouch for. When Brunel was shot with his mistress on the 24th, in the courtyard of a house in the Place Vendome, the bodies lay there until the afternoon of the 27th. When the burial party came to remove the corpses, they found the woman living still, and took her to an ambulance. Though she had received four bullets, she is now out of danger.

Other details of the capitalist atrocities during the "Bloody Week" appeared in the capitalist papers of Paris. A few extracts gleaned at random are here given:

In the early morning a thick cordon of troops is drawn in front of the Chatelet Theater, where sits a provost court. From time to time groups of fifteen to twenty persons, composed of national guards, civilians, women, and children fifteen or sixteen years old, are seen coming out of the theater. They were taken in arms (?) or "otherwise convicted of participation in the resistance." Death is their sentence. They walk two by two, surrounded by chasseurs, and, following the quay, soon reach the Loban barracks. A minute later a musketry fire is heard: they are dead. — From the Paris Débats, May 31, 1871.

It is at the Bourse [Stock Exchange; a fit place, to be sure, for this sort of business] that there was to-day the largest number of executions. The doomed men who attempted to resist were bound to the iron railing. — From the Paris Français, May 28, 1871.

The Military School and the Monceau Park have been transformed into prisons. Executions are also taking place there. Some of the doomed men are displaying extraordinary indifference and energy. Compelled to pass over the corpses of those who have already been shot, they jump quite smartly. — From the Paris Petit Presse, May 26, 1871.

In the Madeleine church, our soldiers did not rest until they had killed with the bayonet every one of the many insurgents who had taken refuge there. — From the Paris Soir.
JULES FAVRE ON THE INTERNATIONAL

The following letter appeared in the London Times of June 12, 1871. It was written by the Secretary of the International Workingmen's Association, and affords a good insight into the character of Jules Favre. The few lines of comment following the letter are taken from the standard German edition of The Civil War in France, edited by Frederick Engels and published in Berlin in 1871:

To the Editor of the Times:

Sir—On June 6, 1871, M. Jules Favre issued a circular to all the European Powers, calling upon them to hunt down the International Workingmen's Association. A few remarks will suffice to characterize that document.

In the very preamble of our statutes it is stated that the International was founded "September 28, 1864, at a public meeting held at St. Martin's Hall, Long-acre, London." For purposes of his own, Jules Favre puts back the date of its origin beyond 1862.

In order to explain our principles, he professes to quote their [the International's] sheet of the 25th of March, 1859. And then what does he quote? The sheet of a society which is not the International. This sort of manoeuvre he already resorted to when, still a comparatively young lawyer, he had to defend the National newspaper, prosecuted for libel by Cabot. Then he pretended to read extracts from Cabot's pamphlets while reading interpolations of his own—a trick exposed while the court was sitting, and which, but for the indulgence of Cabot, would have been punished by Jules Favre's expulsion from the Paris bar.

Of all the documents quoted by him as documents of the International, not one belongs to the International. He says, for instance, "The Alliance declares itself Atheist, says the General Council, constituted in London in July, 1866. The General Council never issued such a document. On the contrary, it issued a document which quashed the original statutes of the "Alliance"—L'Alliance de la Democratie Socialiste at Geneva—quoted by Jules Favre.

Throughout his circular, which pretends in part also to be directed against the Empire, Jules Favre repeats against the International but the police inventions of the public prosecutors of the Empire, and which broke down miserably even before the law courts of that Empire.

It is known that in its two addresses (of July and September last) on the late war, the General Council of the International denounced the Prussian plan of conquest against France. Later on Mr. Rettinger, Jules Favre's private secretary, applied, though of course in vain, to some members of the General Council for getting up by the Council a demonstration against Bismarck, in favor of the Government of National Defense; they were particularly requested not to mention the Republic. The preparations for a demonstration with regard to the expected arrival of Jules Favre in London were made—certainly with the best of intentions—in spite of the General Council, which in its address of the 9th of September had distinctly forewarned the Paris workmen against Jules Favre and his colleagues.

What would Jules Favre say if in its turn the International were to send a circular on Jules Favre to all the cabinets of Europe, drawing their particular attention to the documents published at Paris by the late M. Milliere?

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

John Hales

Secretary to the General Council of the International Workingmen's Association.

256 High Holborn St., W.C., June 12, 1871.

In an article on the "International Association and Its Objects," the London Spectator, like the pious informer that it is, quotes, among other similar meritorious performances, and even more fully than Jules Favre has done it, the above mentioned document of the "Alliance" as the work of the International; and that was done eleven days after the publication of the above rejoinder in the Times. This does not surprise us. Long ago, Frederick the Great used to say that of all the Jesuits the Protestant ones are the worst.
PERSONNEL OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF
THE INTERNATIONAL

The two manifestoes of the International Workingmen’s Association on the Franco-Prussian War carried the following signatures:

THE GENERAL COUNCIL

Robert Aplegarth
Martin J. Boon
Fred. Bradnick
Cahill
John Hales
William Hales
George Harris
Fred Lessner
Laysatine
B. Lucraft
George Milner

Thomas Mottershead
Charles Murray
George Oger
James Parnell
Pfänder
Rühl
Joseph Shepherd
Cowell Stephney
Stoll
Schmitz

CORRESPONDING SECRETARIES

Eugene Dupont, for France.
Karl Marx, for Germany and Russia.
A. Servais, for Belgium, Holland and Spain.
Hermann Jung, for Switzerland.

William Townshend, Chairman.
John Weston, Treasurer.
J. George Eccarius, General Secretary.

The manifesto on the Civil War in France carried the following signatures:

M. J. Boon
Fred. Bradnick
G. H. Buttery
Cahill
William Hales
Koll
Lessner
B. Lucraft
George Milner

Thomas Mottershead
Charles Murray
George Oger
Pfänder
Rühl
Sadler
Cowell Stephney
William Townshend

CORRESPONDING SECRETARIES

Eugene Dupont, for France.
Karl Marx, for Germany and Holland.
Frederick Engels, for Belgium and Spain.
Hermann Jung, for Switzerland.

P. Giovacchini, for Italy.
Zeny Maurice, for Hungary.
Anton Zaricke, for Poland.
J. C. Cohen, for Denmark.
J. G. Eccarius, for the United States.

Hermann Jung, Chairman.
John Weston, Treasurer.
George Harris, Financial Secretary.
John Hales, General Secretary.

THE BALANCE-SHEET OF BOURGEOIS VENGEANCE

Twenty-five thousand men, women, and children killed during the battle or after; three thousand at least dead in the prisons, the pontoons, the forts, or in consequence of maladies contracted during their captivity; thirteen thousand seven hundred condemned, most of them for life; seventy thousand women, children, and old men deprived of their natural supporters or thrown out of France; one hundred and eleven thousand victims at least. That is the balance-sheet of the bourgeois vengeance for the solitary insurrection of the eighteenth of March.

What a lesson of revolutionary vigor given to the workingmen! The governing classes shoot in a lurch without taking the trouble to select hostages. Their vengeance lasts not an hour; neither years nor victims appease it; they make of it an administrative function, methodical and continuous.

Lissoiray’s “History of the Commune of 1871.”

The State is the curse of the individual. How is the strength of the state of Prussia purchased? By the absorption of the individual into the political and geographic concept. The butler makes the best soldier. The opposite may be exemplified by the Jews, the nobility of the race. How have they maintained their individuality in isolation, in poetry, notwithstanding all the brutality of the outside world? Through the fact that they have had no State to enumber them.... The State must be abolished.... Changes in the form of government are nothing else than different degrees of trifling, a little more, or a little less—absurd folly. The State has its root in time; its top will culminate in time.... —HENRIK IBSEN.

The existence of the State is inseparable from the existence of slavery. —KARL MARX.
The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte
By Karl Marx
(Translated by Daniel De Leon)

This book is to the political scene what "Capital" is to the economic scene. De Leon said that this is the Marxian work that "makes" Socialists.

Marx deals specifically with an adventurer who used his name and cunning, and the corruption, divisions and fears of the ruling class, as stepping stones to a throne, from which he ruled in the collective interest of the propped class while pretending to represent "all" classes.

Marx's great political analysis has direct application to the American political scene of today. The reader is constantly presented with "jolts of understanding" that enable him to apply Marx's lessons to McCarthyism, witch-hunting politics, etc.

208 pages—Illustrated
Price, postage paid: 75 cents, paper covers; $2.00, clothbound

The Class Struggles in France, 1848-50
By Karl Marx

In his introduction, Frederick Engels states that this work represents Marx's first attempt to explain a segment of contemporary history by means of his materialist conception of history. The book, which provides background for "The Eighteenth Brumaire," bases the innermost social relations of society.

Engels' introduction exposes the futility and absurdity of relying on pure and simple physical force for accomplishing the revolutionary act. It fully demonstrates the need for the De Leonist program of Socialist Industrial Unionism. Translated by Henry Kuhn.

220 pages—$1.75, postage paid

NEW YORK LABOR NEWS COMPANY,
61 Cliff St., New York 38, New York, N.Y.

Crises in European History
By Gustav Bang

The rise of Christianity, the Protestant Reformation and the French Revolution were great turning points in the history of Europe and of the world.

In this work, Dr. Bang, a Danish Marxist historian, applies Marx's materialist conception of history to these great crises. The translator, Arnold Petersen, states in his preface that "Dr. Bang here employs to the best advantage the Marxian key, and succeeds in unraveling what to the average reader usually appears to be mysteries or near-mysteries."

The author shows that Christianity, in its first and purest form, was a religion of the proletariat and that its social ideal was the communism of property and consumption. The essays on the Reformation and French Revolution are studies in the material motivations of propertied classes that challenged the power of the State and the feudal lords.

56 pages—15 cents, postage paid

The French Revolution
By E. Belfort Bax

Bax's "French Revolution" furnishes understanding for a study of the development of capitalism and Socialism. It provides lessons in the material motivations that activated certain "champions of liberty"—and lessons in the selfless adherence to principle that guided others. Above all, it demonstrates the capitalist character of the French Revolution, which De Leon states in his preface is an inexhaustible quarry for the student of history and social relations.

Cloth edition, 152 pages, $1.50; paper covers, 140 pages, 75 cents; postage paid

NEW YORK LABOR NEWS COMPANY,
61 Cliff St., New York 38, New York, N.Y.