



## FRANCE AND GOD

### CHAPTER 4

The people, whom, by effect of group, let himself go to justify his more low instincts towards his persecutors, stoop to reproduce what he condemned at the others!

### The revolutions

I don't know if we must say fortunately or unfortunately, but from its links, by its size, and its position in old Europe, undoubtedly also by its moderate climate and an advantageous physical geography, France was often used as example for many people. It just have to look at how much still today, international tourism visits our country, to perceive, without for that, to pride oneself from interest which it symbolizes in the world. For a majority of those who seek cultural bases in it, their interest for the whole of Europe is extremely natural, but we must remain concrete and to question us why France is more visited than our neighbors like Germany or England?

After the progressive Roman Empire's disappearance, and the fall which was followed from there for a majority of Europe, it was from frank kingdom, and in particular by Charlemagne, that were born stable Christian structures which continue until our days on a great part of Europe. Nearer to us however, but even more perceptible by our direct neighbors, as well as a great part of the colonized world by this old Europe, was the revolution of 1789.

It is undeniable indeed, "it is the French revolution that was to see formulating, for the first time, the idea of a revolution social in communist matter, within the framework of Conspiracy of the Equals 1". Precursor of so much of other movements all over the world, it allowed the synthesis by someone called Karl Marx, Soviet revolution's main instigator of 1917. This is why we will try to define the context of analysis of this man in order to be useful to us about it, like thought guides.

**1) Conspiracy of the Equals:** Conspiracy directed by Babeuf against the French Directory of 1796 and 1797. The plot was denounced and its instigators were guillotined.

Contrary to our neighbor England, of which the monarchy had started for several centuries to make concessions towards a parliamentary monarchy, French monarchy shut oneself away in the absolutism, whose Louis XIV was the apogee. After the revolution, this absolutism actually regressed from 1790 to 1792 then of 1815 to 1848 to the benefit of a constitutional monarchy, but never took the complete step towards the parliamentary government, which leads to the evolution "**From the sovereign king to the sovereign people**".

Parliamentary monarchies are the fruit of a long change during which little by little the middle-class conquers the monarch's absolute power. Initiated by this one, which establish Parliaments to limit the royal capacity, this political system, created in England, was used as model by all European monarchies. Today, the king has only a role more or less symbolic system; it is the popular authority's emanation that fixes its destiny.

In England, country considered as the cradle of parliamentary government, and the reference of parliamentary monarchies, the change started as of fourteenth century. Ceaseless and sometimes violent fights between the royal power and that of Parliament ended up benefiting this last. The shift of competences from the sovereign towards the people was done in a progressive way, thus ensuring the system's perennality in which the royal power is reduced to its simpler expression.

This stability made of England the state more in advance of all European nations, with regard to the "industrial revolution", but what was the benefit for the working classes? From campaign where they lived badly, because exploited by landowners on whom they depended directly, these suffering classes had passed to the city, in an element even more hostile to the poor. From little ground of which they were getting before a minimum survival in the event of famines, they had become entirely dependent on those whom gave them work in an incipient capitalism, more organized to defend the profit than the social actions.

The raised problem by that urban growth's speed in England was dramatically underlined by an epidemic of cholera of 1832, although the epidemic was sometimes quite as fatal in the campaigns. The new industrial towns were concentrated on very small surfaces, because everyone was walking to go to work. In town, the surface of which disposed each one was related to its economic situation. The population's very small fraction, who had land, undoubtedly less than five percent in a cotton city, were often occupying fifty percent of the total surface. The working population was living where factories, roads, channels, then railroads, allowed him.

The result was sordid: at the nineteenth century, the cities were only smoke and stinks, and their inhabitants pay a lot of rents and human lives. A suitable house could cost a semi-skilled worker the quarter of his income, and rare were families, which could offer it. And so, the slums multiplied in the cities' center, "nests to crows" of London, cellars of Liverpool and Manchester, "China" of Merthyr Tydfil, or new types of "regional" dwellings according to the owners and speculators' imagination, since the "back-to-back" Yorkshire's accommodations, to the tiny apartment "one room and kitchen" and apartments "gut", which sheltered 70 percent of the families of Glasgow around 1870.

The housing conditions were bad, but still worse was the sanitation system. The most prosperous townsmen could create commissions in charge of the water conveyance, sewers, street lighting and road works, but to the detriment of their poorer neighbors. Very often, waste water from a new middle class' district, were flowing out in the water points which used the working population.

The very unequal living conditions were very hard for a population's great majority, and this made say to the Toynbee's contemporaries, in agreement with Karl Marks, until 1848, the capitalist industrialization had not improved the working classes' condition.

This progression would have existed if the English middle-class had been upright perfectly, and had used its power to introduce the parliamentary government in order to make some profit at all social layers. It was unfortunately not thus and the dominant classes behaved towards the working classes that they exploited as the monarchy against which they fought.

It was also the case in France! Because in France, as in any occident's other part, the middle-class men were already active, rich and powerful, to the middle Ages. Even if in our country from catholic dominant, the Counter-Reformation had smothered the middle-class for nearly two centuries, the eighteenth century had been restricted to revive it, while waiting for its complete resurrection with the nineteenth century. But the middle-class man of this time was a being extremely various, and it is wise to distinguish several types from them. First there was the one for whom the middle-class was a title and not a function: the person of private means, the "Paris's middle-class man " for example, whose economic activity remained null. It is surprising to note the two formulas "to live nobly" and to live "respectably", which seemed to be opposed, were signifying both to live without working.

There secondly was the middle-class of the offices, loads owners, which constituted one of the monarchy's customers and which was alienated to the system.

These middle-class men, "officers" were readily motionless and preserving, became sluggish in the past in love them also with their privileges and they tolerated of another movement only that opinions. These middle class' members, "officers" were readily motionless and conservative, lethargic from the past and also in love from their privileges, were tolerating only the opinions movements.

A third category gathered the doctors, the lawyers, all the liberal professions. These ones were very little relying on the institutions and the money. They were distinguishing themselves differently: by their independence and their competences. It is among them, Diderot gathered to recruit his "encyclopedic bourgeoisie".

Finally the fourth group, was that of commercial professions: Masters and the storekeeper, those who manufactured and those who marketed, one another were very often confused by the people, not exceed from the management of their small company; those who produced on a vaster scale, and especially the traders, who were really connected to the exchanges' circuit, formed a more dynamic middle-class and already conquering, but where one should see only with precaution the ancestors of our capitalists.

From these four bourgeois categories, the two first were inactive, and only the last played an essential part in the economy.

Contrary to its powerful counterpart English that had been able to alone fight against monarchy, the chance of the "weak" French middle-class was to not be alone. If it found complicities in spite of antagonisms, side of the privileged people, it had at one's disposal a "clientele " (in spite of other antagonisms) in the city's people.

The work world of the eighteenth century, did not have indeed even a rudimentary unit, nor trace from class consciousness. These ones least free among the workmen were the "companions", whom the corporation's rules were binding, and who lived under the roof even of their owner, in a proximity which quickly became a solidarity, practically a dependence. The workmen who worked in manufactures of the big cities could perhaps begin, by the alone virtue of their gathering, a vague proletarian conscience. But most independent and best armed were the craftsmen, who worked on their premises on behalf of merchant or of trader and who made some time appears of small employers by bringing together around them some companions. The craftsman was however subjected to the "capitalists" on whom he depended at the same time for the raw material and for the outlet to the trade. Only his tools belonged to him own.

Hatred and the fight would have been thing possible between the workman and the middle-class man, because as century goes by raised the middle-class income, while the popular purchasing power did not cease dropping. But the nature and the causes of such a contrast prevented it from degenerating and changed the virtual conflict into another conflict.

The workman's difficulties or miseries were more due to the food products' price than the wages' weakness. During long years, the wage rate remained a constant, and the workman forgot it to let himself fascinate by the variable whose rise or fall ordered the vicissitudes of his existence: the prices' curve, and in particular that of the price of the bread. It was the paramount expenditure which devoured on it owns, a half of the working income.

The consequence was they thought a lot less to claim wage increase (claim which would have opposed the workman to his middle-class employer), than to require a price control, which diverted popular anger towards the aristocrat owner of the lands, recipient of the revenue feudal and hoarder of the grains.

The lack of unit and town peoples' collective conscience was an godsend for the bourgeoisie. These ones of whom they exploited work became paradoxically their allies. The aristocracy had thus become the common enemy: peasant's enemy whom it deprived, enemy of the middle-class man of whom it prevented the climbing and the apotheosis, enemy finally of the city's workman, who made it responsible for the leap in prices. So that contrast was absolute between the society's structures, which was all to the aristocracy's service and a social dynamics, where all the forces converged directly or indirectly towards a bourgeois progression.

To the contrary of English middle-class, which persevered for long time to make lever of all its weight between the various higher classes to find one's place in the sun, the just resurrected French middle-class was confronted on the international market to its top sister on the Channel's other side. It was envious of privileges obtained by this one, but remained too weak to quickly obtain these same prerogatives.

Thus, if the middle-class conscience condemned the aristocratic life style for its sterility, its ostentatious expenditure, it existed an aristocratic conscience to say the middle-class men were the creatures more of habit of the world, attaches to their traditions and their prejudices, deprived all at the same time of activity, sensitivity and imagination. And when the bourgeois "was managing to achieve himself" or was ennobled, he was forbidding to the others, the step that it had just overcome. No one was then more intransigent than him to show than conditions' inequality alone was required by the progress or even the existence of any society.

of 1789, in order to reach its objectives, this bourgeoisie haven't got enough powerful in itself, with the very image of Archimedes when he says, give me fulcrum and I will raise the ground, was going to take "fulcrum" on the people to raise the royal absolute power. This support was however going to be turned over against it, because of a pre revolutionary movement in which the "book of grievances <sup>1</sup>" did not claim any monarchy abolition, this bourgeoisie will be found at the first following day with a popular revolution that it will have the devil's own job to manage in its favor.

- 1) **Book of grievances:** At that time, documents in which the assemblies that prepared the General Statement consigned the complaints and the wishes that their representatives were to put forward.

From the philosophical current born from another part of itself, had already appeared a beginning of the people's collective conscience, and in particular in certain Parisian " the sans-culottes <sup>1</sup>", although these ones remained minority numbers compared to a very great part of the peasantry. This peasantry

about which Michelet<sup>2</sup> speaks to us when he evokes the French peasant in his misery ("lying down on his dunghill, poor Job..."), he was undoubtedly not wrong, to attract the attention to the precariousness of fate of the French peasants' major share: Those who, from the day laborer without ground, to the farm laborer or the poor sharecropper, all were included in the category called the "consumer" peasantry. For those ones, the eighteenth century didn't have anything glorious, and price increase whose profited to the peasantry "selling", weighed heavily on this world of consumers.

**1) Sans-culottes:** Revolutionist who belonged to the most popular layers and who carried trousers in striped homespun at this period.

**2) Michelet:** Great French Historian (Paris 1798 - Hyères 1874).

The philosophical current of eighteenth had not reached that the bourgeois classes, because the nobility eager at the same time to preserve its privileges related to the absolutism of monarchy, would have however liked to acquire rights that parliamentarism would have brought to him, without of course losing any of its advantages. The Revolution was thus the "privileged people's acts", nobility and middle classes, whose political conscience had been sharpened in contact with philosophy, from now on rather close to the government to know its weaknesses and to wish to take part in it.

Until 1788, when the great divorce between the nobility's competing ambitions and the middle class occurred, the fight against the absolutism were the fact of the "Bodies 3", supported at the court by the cabals and led in front of the opinion by the Parliaments' large hybrid body, all united in an opposition common to the "ministerial despotism", in theory the all-powerful adversary, but in fact solitary.

**3) Bodies:** Parts of the State whose members aren't elected, such as senior civil servants recruited through the "Prestigious University-level College" prestigious university-level college preparing students for senior posts in the civil service and public management, Court of Auditors, administrations, justice...

In the fight against the absolutism, the privileged persons' action had found an ally paradoxical in the "philosophy of the Lights 4", even so mortal enemy of the "bodies". As much as to the religious "tradition", the philosophers, indeed, were opposed to the preceding privileges "social and political", "traditions", "usages", but especially to the "distinctions" such unjustified and abusive advantages. But they equally it were, against the arbitrary capacity; and their declamations, in addition to the revolt climate which they contributed to create, provided to each group the suitable weapons to defend their private interests. The number and the power of the privileges were such, than any partial action didn't seem to be able to reduce the number or harmfulness of it.

**4) Philosophy of the Lights:** Partisane philosophy with new ideas at the eighteenth century, precursory sign of the revolution of 1789.

The essential reorganization could not thus come from the "bodies" themselves for which advantages of each one was related to the similar existing advantages for the others, whatever were otherwise the jealousies and the contempt, whom they went reciprocally. The nature even of the absolute monarchy prevented it to destroy these "bodies", since it was by them it reigned on the population whole.

In the powerlessness of the traditional authority and its impossibility to lead to a broad consensus, the regime appeared unable to reform itself by the legal and peaceful means. This absolute monarchy inserted in the slump of the colonial wars had moreover led the State coffers to the excessive debt, but was supported in this dimension by the church's head which maintained it in idolatry of the old monarchy's strong points, the divine law was in fact, I quote: **the keystone; Lord's anoint, thaumaturge king, the king is a sacred person, an image from God the father.**

Like each one knows, this explosive set was going to find the spark which would put fire at the powders, to give 1789; 1789 and its revolution. A revolution that, for the today's majority a few years after their exit of studies, remain only a vagueness of memory on July 14 and the storming of the Bastille, has however lasted ten years. Ten years during which, beyond the failure of the system, important evolutions of society were going to be born, and according to the observer was going to give the world various currents in public opinion in the following generations, until today.

After the Declaration of Human and Civic Rights and the destruction of feudalism, both carried out in 1789, the sale of the national properties confiscated to the clergy, made it possible the bourgeois revolution by this massive expropriation which touched nearly the tenth of the French territory,

attached to it, by extremely strong ties, the group of those which one saw, at the heart of the action in 1790 and 1791, to benefit from "bargain".

Consolidation on a side, break of the other: the nationalization of the ecclesiastical possessions was inseparable from the officialization that the civil Constitution of the clergy undertook, voted on July 12, 1790.

In these same days in Paris, in spite of the rain and lack of preparation (mitigated by the voluntary work of thousands of citizens) and especially the oath without heat of Louis the sixteenth <sup>1</sup>, the Federation's festival (July 14, 1790) were the ultimate demonstration of a Revolution which wanted to still believe in its perfect unanimity.

- 1) **Louis the sixteenth:** Last French absolute monarch (1774-1791), then king of the French (1791-92). The young king will appear indecisive, subjected to the influences of his entourage, particularly to that of the queen.

By this new civil Constitution of the clergy, bishops and priests were became civil servant elected within the framework of new administrative divisions, had to take the civic oath, what didn't arrange cohesion. The hostility of the pope "Pie VI", his formal condemnation of the "Swearers 1" in April 1791, introduced an irremediable fault into a revolutionary world that endeavored to safeguard the national unanimity's myth. In the months and the years to come, this break had to take a great importance in a popular opinion whose religious factor was an element of polarization.

**1) Swearers:** Designation of the priests who, at that time, had to take oath to the clergy's civil Constitution.

One year later, the scene had changed: what the revolutionary iconography presents to us at the date of July 17, 1791 by squeaking recall of the Federation, it's the gunfight of the March Field. Animated by the club of Cordeliers <sup>2</sup>, the Parisian petitioners claimed the forfeiture of the king.

**2) The club of Cordeliers:** Revolutionary club of left founded in April 1790 and whose leaders were Danton, Marat, Desmoulins, Hébert, and Chaumette. It played a decisive part in the deposal of monarchy and disappeared in March 1794, at the time of the elimination of its partisans by Robespierre.

Bailly, mayor of Paris, La Fayette, ordering the national guard, made proclaim the martial law and to fire against the demonstrators (revolutionary of another side): the break was going to prove to be final between the popular revolution and a certain bourgeois revolution.

What was launched was going to make its way, by the counter-revolution led by the forces supporting monarchy and the clergy in first, and in addition, by the distortion toward the left of the process, in what we could call, the "inevitable skid" of a handling towards its author. The bourgeoisie that had taken the people like point of support, was thus going to check to raise a load, any point of support must be more powerful than the load itself, and would generate obligatorily a popular revolution if one were employing the people. It was the case!

Beyond from the change that this bourgeois revolution was going to live, most important for the French history, and much of other civilizations perhaps, happened at this time on the level even from the people. From a population that wasn't yet conscious about it a few years, to see certain a few months before, the people was going to acquire a concept of importance that was going to be built by the most motivated ones.

All the renewed popular dynamism found indeed in the context of 1791 and 92 of the environments where to fit: the rapid growth of the clubs and fraternal companies then covered France of a network sometimes surprisingly dense of popular organizations. In Paris, the club of Cordeliers, where Danton and Marat were speaking, outnumbered, by its more popular recruitment, the club of the Jacobins <sup>1</sup>, which remained, then, more closed. At this date, one can say that already a great part of the most politicized urban masses, had opened the eyes, and had got into fight: "The sans-culottes" like one will call, was thus developed between these years 1791 and 1792.

- 1) **Club of the Jacobins:** Constituted initially in Versailles by the province's deputies, it was moved in convent of the Jacobins in Paris. Deprived then from its moderate members such as La Fayette and Sieyès, this organization fell into the hands of revolutionists the most radicals, called Montagnards, because sitting on the highest tiers, was dominated by the personality of

Robespierre. These "Montagnars", Power's Masters in 1793, imposed a policy of public salvation, called The Terror. Divided into three principal periods, this "Terror" resulted in the imprisonment of approximately 500 000 suspects, of whom approximately 40 000 were guillotined. **It was the principal political period of dechristianization, economic supervision by the state and the redistribution of the suspects's possessions to the poor.** In its last weeks of power, it removed the judicial guarantees at the accused, and was finished with the fall of Robespierre, in Thermidor 9 (July 28, 1794).

In the revolution that interests us, a manipulation other than the bourgeois middle-class went in same time being thwarted, that of king. In spite of its oath makes to the people on July 14, 1790, and the example which it then had of England, much more in advance that France with regard to the constitutional monarchy then parliamentary, this was not going to prevent Louis the sixteenth to persist in one's error and settle the conflict by the strong manner. He secretly organized an escape from France with an aim to bring an army back together with many officers already emigrated abroad. This one was stopped in Varennes-in-Argonne June 20, and 21 1791, **and nearly two years after the first conflicts, was carrying the first openings to the republican spirit.**

The very poor shy behaviors of this king, more attracted by the iron work than state's management, were going indeed to produce an inversion of revolutionary motivations towards the monarchy's dismissal in favor of republic, which hitherto was not even considered. These new data were accentuated during the summer 1791 by the intervention of the foreign monarchs, Emperor and king of Prussia, who launched a call with the monarchical coalition to restore Louis the sixteenth in his sovereignty.

He got into deep the policy of the worst, and like to justify himself to his attackers he accepted a constitutional monarchy, and formed in March 1792 a government known as Girondins because of origin of a good number from them. April 20 he declared war against Bohemia and Hungary's king, and was more than justified since the first engagements were disastrous for a French Army in full change, disorganized by the emigration of its officers.

Less waited, at least in its forms, its scope and its maturity, was the popular reaction to this new situation. Half-improvised, the day of June 20, where the Parisian demonstrators invaded without success The Tuileries Palace, was a prelude to a more serious mobilization. From province arrived "sections" for asking the king's forfeiture, from whom famous "Marseillais" come to defend the capital and the fatherland, that assembly proclaimed "under threat" on July 11.

These conditions have then carried an unreservedly counter-revolutionary, which formed a unit with the general-in-chief of the Prussian and Austrian armies, Charles of Brunswick. This one launched his famous ultimatum on July 25, threatening to deliver Paris to a military execution and a total subversion for these ones who would had attack the Louis sixteenth family. That made an opposite effect and produced the fall of the monarchy.

One often keeps the picture of the storming of the Bastille as proletarian revolution's key picture or the barricades of the "Faubourg Saint-Antoine". One forgets then this crucial moment when the people became awake of the challenge against this Prussian army, coming from people which had wiped considerable defeats in the fifty previous years, in hostilities carried out however by trained troops.

Into this crucial moment where the disorder was everywhere, the middle-class's revolutionary front was split into two to the contact with a popular movement. From second force that it was, the most populist movement passed in first-rate of revolutionary dynamism. August 10, this one took by storm the Tuileries Palace, deserted by the royal family, after a murderous battle against the Swiss Guard that defended it. The assembly voted the king's suspension, the meeting of a news Constituante, a "Convention", whose election will be done by vote with universal suffrage: It will be a prelude to symbolic system for a democratic revolution.

One should not seek to dissociate the two pictures on which this phase of the Revolution was completed: Valmy and massacres of September, which are there like showing that nothing of balanced and really good, can emerge from a revolution.

The battle of Valmy, September 20, 1792, broke the Prussian offensive in Champagne: un hoped-for recovery after the first defeats, engagement poor says one, if one counts to the number of deaths; but the young French half-improvised Army, without experiment of fire, had constrained to the retirement the frightening Prussian troops. On the mainstay's level, it was the Revolution that had just beaten the Former Régime European.

Let us thus recall few dates, on September 21, 1792 monarchy is abolished, the 22, republic is proclaimed.

Oh! It is obvious that it didn't have style yet this very discussed republic, which was far to be like nowadays in the heart of all French or almost, because it was for poorest, words which they understood only with half, as-with richest it saw there already all the loss of their privileges.

If we would have the counting of its active participants, the Revolution remained indeed a phenomenon of active minority. In the sections of Marseilles for example, the most massive pushes of popular participation never brought more the quarter from male adults of district to the meetings of sections, that it had at summer 92 or federalist spring of 93. If one passed in counting with true "militants», the active group would be reduced even more. From this revolutionary elite different aspects however began to be detached, a revolutionary mentality appeared, and then the gulf restricted itself between the revolutionary masses and the drama's heroes.

In his majority the French people wasn't yet on the point of assuming a political share, but it was lay the foundations, and the important thing is certainly the value which this first foundations in the heart of humblest then represented. **This began to make them become aware of their man dimension, "Mister", whom they were all, because all called "citizens".**

Any progression, especially as regards collective behavior, is not generally done in a day, and "Nothing that results from human progress, is obtained with the approval of all. Those whom see the light before the others, are condemned to continue it, in spite of the others "as had said, it seems to me, Christopher Columbus and why not Jesus, Christ. If a share of middle-class men, were motivated only by their own covetousness, it was for others a great sincerity, even if for some peoples this can appear a little as puerile.

The picture that Mathiez gave of the Jacobin Louvot, master of smithy frank-comtois, manufacturing who led his workmen to vote for the Mountain with the clarinet's sound, at the time of the elections of Convention, would find easily good numbers homologous. There were for example the brothers Duval, glassmakers from Montmirail, who were going to the markets on horseback at the head of their workmen to tax there the grain. This price control of food products and in particular that of bread, was one of major claim's topics from "the Enragés" of 1792, which expressed best the popular aspirations. This is why, in order to avoid any possibility of misunderstanding we mustn't judge the middle-class, because many of them were sincere and motivated by the happiness of all. It nonetheless true that the conditions of class struggle with modern type were not carried out in a world, in good share, pre-capitalist.

### 1) The Enragés: Factions of militants more extremists of the Parisian sans-culottes.

Beyond developed, indeed during the rise of the revolutionary dynamism until 1794, an increasing aggressiveness against the rich persons, at city as in countryside, judged in their selfishness at the "Terror" time. This is why, we must remember that: **"the revolutions are only brackets of the history, and generally recreate after a more or less long time, similar systems to those of which they precipitated the fall"**. Each one in its fanaticism, born from covetousness too often justified in view of the bad behavior of richest, was reproducing what it had fought.

Counter-revolution or popular revolution thus, that does not have a real importance, because the consequence is very different, and it is undoubtedly what makes all the value of it still today all over the world. The people, the lower people's classes, at least the most evolved parties, started to understand that they had importance, and they weighed in the balance and with the God's eyes, even if they were only at their exit of Egypt.

They had until then lived only in the dark of great men they often idolized like "higher" persons, but they then started to measure the notions of their existence. We will not say however this idolatry of the "higher" man didn't exist any more since, but it then received the first genuine arrow, because the idea making its way, more and more the higher man had to only govern and not to dominate. It is extremely fortunately what we find more and more, in the stimulus of our today's governments, but also what we must expect for the future, without us to satisfy with "great men" to only great "appearances".

What changed, and what we must retain as being most important with the benefit of hindsight, is the birth of this new glance on themselves whom could have all these million men within the people in this time and those to come. Without this benefit, and if we deepen still a little, we would be likely to go out a synthesis identical to that from certain Karl Marx to whom our glance will relate soon.

The great number of the agricultural day laborer who had placed all their economies in the purchase of little lands, often even of bad quality, began to realize that they had fallen into a trap. Each one had wanted to be owner, and the majority from them had run after independence and happiness, abandoning the sure profit from their work in the farmers, but found only misery. For others on the other hand, the rich bourgeois who were "provided themselves" with the purchase in abundance property confiscated from nobles and clergy, we were going to find them seven years later, in 1799,

the day before the 18 Brumaire (November 9), which was going to see the putsch of Bonaparte first consul, to gather under the slogan **"It is necessary for a king to me, because I am owner"**.

Mrs. de Staël noted it without tenderness, but humorously: "the great force of the Heads of the State in France, it is the extraordinary taste which one has there to occupy of the positions [...]. All that distinguishes a man from another is particularly pleasant to the French; there isn't nation for which the equality agrees less; they proclaimed it to take the place of the former superiors; they wanted to change inequality...".

This revolution that didn't finish any, was going to find in Bonaparte the one who was necessary to him to conclude. **But, what conclusion for those whom were going to analyze their results! Let us look just little!**

The Bonapartism created the personal power indeed, amalgamates monarchical tradition and sham democracy. The First consul controlled and reigned with the way of an enlightened sovereign who conceded at the Revolution's accomplished fact, with surrounding of republican forms, but thus created an extremely ambiguous situation. His power progressively in monarchical attitude, the life of court was restored, since from Consulate until the proclamation of the hereditary Empire and coronation, all was of course materialization of a dream of absolute power going until taking the forms of a universal domination, and to revive of the archaisms, Napoleon being caught for new Charlemagne.

The proclamation of the Empire and the perpetual reinforcements toward personal power were however as many means of consolidating the Revolution's established privileges in France and defying the European Counter-revolution. The coronation and anointment, from this aspect, is less interpreted like one masquerade around a parvenu, than as a singularly daring political act by which the Revolution was going to take again their own weapons to its adversaries.

Many freedoms were however suppressed, the freedom of expression was brutally reduced; just on first days 1800, 60 Parisian newspapers out of 73 were removed, and the survivors did not have to publish contrary articles "to social pact, people's sovereignty and the glory of the armies", moreover, several of them like "the Moniteur" or "le Journal des débats", were sheets "inspired by the imperial power".

But Napoleon, very quickly, went much further. He wanted to define an elite social and political on a basis which was not nor that of feudal nobility **"not on the distinctions of blood, which is an imaginary nobility, since there is only one kind of men, he said!"**, nor that of richness, **"which one cannot make a title, of all the aristocracies, this one seemed to me the worst"**, will say the Emperor to Sainte-Hélène, having always held, or pretends to hold, whom the various forms of fortune, movable or real, came by their origins of flight and plunder.

The workman's genius being nevertheless to know to employ materials that it has under the hand, the families of old nobility entered often near Napoleon, **because their fortunes already existent and their influence were put at the government's service that was not enough rich to pay everyone.**

The imperial aristocracy's bases were thus the personal merit and the "service" rendered to the State. Thus Napoleon was proclaiming, "Our time is that of merit; it is necessary to let sons of the peasants to rise by talents and services to the first rank... Where I found the talent and courage, I raised it and put at his place everywhere. My principle was to open the careers to the talents, thus, "will be born a historical" and "national" nobility", substitute to the parchments the "beautiful actions, and to the private interests the fatherland's interests".

Napoleon thus lives in the creation of a new type aristocracy, just like in the institution of a hereditary Empire, not a reaction or a treason with regard to the Revolution, but on the contrary a consolidation of the new order. "A national nobility's institution was not contrary with the equality" for him; it was "eminently liberal and was able with the time, to consolidate the social order and destroy the nobility's vain pride". It was one of these "granite masses", which he intended to throw on the ground of France to base the republic definitively. In a mixture, which was well in his authoritarian manners, the assertion of principles and the cynicism of their execution, he found in the French's temperament the justification of a new scale of titles: **"they need distinctions, because it is with rattles that one leads the men"**.

From 1804 until 1808, i.e. from empire's proclamation until the decree on the organization of the imperial nobility, the social policy of Napoleon developed with a greater complexity, including the Legion of honor itself in a organize along hierarchical meticulous lines. At summit: The Napoleon Bonaparte's family. Around it, **"an organization of the imperial palate conforms to the dignity of the throne and the size of the nation"**. Let us perceive: A Court to which Napoleon assigned for function, however very badly carry out, to give the flavor to the French society with the good example, at summit by fusion of the elites. At the first rank of great officers, eighteen marshals whose their



promotion meant at same time, firstly all the price attached by the Emperor to the titles acquired to the field of honor, secondly the importance whom he granted to the army like instrument social rise.

At the creation's time of first titles in 1807, he made for example the marshal Lefebvre, duke of Dantzig intentionally, because he says: "This marshal had been private, and everyone in Paris had known him sergeant in the French guards". The only fact of belonging to the Legion of Honor conferred the title of knight, lowest on the scale. The non-military national services found as much their place and their rewards, in the few 1500 the persons with title, knights excluded, created in eight years: Talleyrand became prince-of-Bénévent and Berthier prince-of-Neuchâtel; Fouché was duke-of-Otranto or Gaudin duke-of-Gaète among so much marshals-dukes; to the ranks of count and baron, the prefects, the mayors, the general advisers, the senior officials mingled with the Generals.

It's on the level of imperial nobility's organization that the more equivocal aspects of the Napoleon's social legislation were. Being very preoccupied indeed, to put "his" nobility in a position to support as for appearances the competition of old aristocracy, and to lead to a fusion of elements, the Emperor incontestably transgressed the principle from the civil equality and reintroduced in France, features of feudality identical to the precedents. It was what arose in particular from the heredity of titles, the creation of great hereditary fiefs by substitution of property and transmission of titles to the elder son, the distribution of endowment in pension, the institution of the majorats on the government initiative or the private individuals request, in other words of inalienable properties of family intended to guarantee to the heir a title of nobility a sufficient fortune to honor this title, etc. It is however wise to notice that the title most abundantly decreed, that of "baron", was not hereditary; the one of knight could be granted on simple justification of an income of 3 000 franks per annum; That the fiefs and equipments were generally taken on the vassal kingdoms, therefore on foreign ground.

The population's fate had absolutely not changed. The rural migration not being started yet, like it was the case in England, the population of cities accounted for only fifteen to twenty percent. The eighty-five percent thus, continued to crowd in the plains and the mountains. The misery of certain overpopulated rural districts was a phenomenon then more important than workmen's urban misery, in a time when the industrial revolution was only at its beginnings.

The peasants had wished, with passion and sometimes with fury, to release themselves from the feudal and seigniorial exploitation, the tithes' burden, the champart and other taxes. On this point, a share of them had obtained only one purely verbal satisfaction. The taxes' name had indeed disappeared from the vocabulary, but not from economic reality for all those, sharecroppers and farmers, who were obliged to take land with lease.

The revolutionary legislation, from Constituent to Convention until the Directory, indeed in practice, had left the owner-lessor free to introduce into the contracts, clauses of increase transferring to its profit the load represented by the quoted royalties. This situation being combined with a continuous farm rent's rise, whose value was related to the trend of prices of grains, **only the owner, and not the farmer, had thus benefited from their abolition.**

**The historian Albert Soboul (1914-1982), underlined these facts in which the bourgeois owners' middle-class, townsmen or rural, consolidated to its profit feudal system in an economic form, consequences from the wealthy elements of the third state always had worked support, consciously or not, at the Revolution time, like a transfer or an extension of privileges towards new privileged people.**

Let us add to that, under the Consulate and the Empire, the return of a great number of emigrants on their lands, when they remained to them and the clergy's prestige restoration, had developed in the campaigns, particularly in the West and South-west, an atmosphere of reaction, a deaf threat of Re-feudalism, a moral pressure of lord of the manor and priest. They maintained stirs up of revolutionary agitation, in campaigns that required only living with a conservative regime, and the alone appearances of Napoleonic authority was not enough to calm the minds. The power was itself the source of other elements of dissatisfaction, such "tax inquisition" that came for example embitter the small owners, which was the source of local disorders, in the vineyard's countries by the levying of new taxations on drinks, as well as a total hardness of the tax collector in the recovery of the land tax. It was common that he is made pay in services or in kind the interests on arrears in and he recalls by the sending of military detachments the worst memories of Old System.

It's evident that the French revolution's picture and of its direct evolution towards the "dictatorship" of the first Napoleonic empire which one receives on the school's benches, resembles only slightly the summary of the very good work whose reference is in bibliography, which emphasizes well the social repercussions, in spite of perpetual wars. We thus find there the ways of thinking that certain contemporary observers of this time could answer off the top of their head, attached at too hasty and concrete results. We already approached the fundamental people's awakening and its man dignity, in

report with the simple "servant" increasingly domestic, but it was largely occulted by objectives of a bourgeoisie more concerned to equip oneself, than to release the people.

Already rich philosophy at the eighteenth century of utopian ideas has thus quickly learnt a lesson from many analyses and conclusions from this great period of history and civilization. If it had occurred anything from particularly concrete lasting the centuries to feed these ways of thinking, there were a lot of things to be said about that, in very great thoughts.

The idealistic character from developed theory being unique to philosopher, he becomes of brittleness higher than the vast majority, if he feels an opposite practical application with his ideals, going until justifying the limits of his own theory. I don't say it in advance in order to be able to accuse the various philosophers whom we will quote a too great precipitation of analysis, but quite to the contrary so that nobody judges them in their ideals, and give to them entire responsibility for the revolutions which were going to be born from it. Conflicts such as they had just lived themselves had perhaps marked deeply them. If we represent ourselves the number of deaths, executed cold-bloodedly for the only reason of richness or membership of a social class, I think that it is simple for a majority among us who didn't live themselves such atrocities, to easily judge those whom wanted to institute laws of a human ideal. Undoubtedly many from our contemporaries confronted almost daily from their activities, in contact with such a human misery, would easily dream also that all this stops one day. Isn't it the characteristic of man to seek the improvement of his living conditions? Isn't because we have the same aim that we are together? **However, not being able to change him, and each one being different of other, can the man really build an ideal universe with his own dimension?**

To quote only some of these philosophers, they were named Saint Simon<sup>1</sup> or Hegel<sup>2</sup>. The first, although from a "relationship" remote enough, was going to give rise to our today's French socialist party, as for the second, his works was going to be more important in the current of ideas to which was going to adhere one certain Karl Marx<sup>3</sup> like his friend and fellow traveler less known, Engel<sup>4</sup>.

**1) Saint-Simon:** (Claude Henri de Rouvroy, Count of), French philosopher and economist (Paris 1760-1825). He taken share at the war of American independence and from the French revolution's start he broke his title status. Being based on a religion of science, and the constitution of a new class of industrialists, he sought to define an economic planning and technocratic socialism (the industrialists' catechism, 1823-24), which had a great influence on certain industrialists of second empire.

**2) Hegel (Friedrich),** German philosopher (Stuttgart 1770-Berlin 1831). His philosophy identifies the being and the thought in a single principle, the concept; from this last, Hegel describes the development by means of dialectic, of which he makes not only one rational method of thought, but the life even of concept and his history.

**3) Marx (Karl),** Philosopher, economist and German Socialism's theorist (Trier 1818-London 1883) born from a father, Jewish lawyer, converted to Protestantism by fear of the anti-Semitism. Drew one's inspiration from the dialectic by Hegel, while criticizing his philosophy of the history, he discovers the criticism of the religion at Feuebach, socialism at Saint-Simon and the economy in Adam Smith. He thus gradually develop the "historical materialism", i.e. the scientific theory of any social science (Thesis on Feuebach, 1845; the German Ideology, 1846; Misery of philosophy, 1847). After his contacts with the working class, he wrote with Friedrich Engels, The Manifesto of the Communist Party (1848). Expelled of Germany then of France, he takes refuge in the United Kingdom, where it writes the Fights of classes in France (1850), Foundation of the criticism of the political economy (written in 1858; published in 1939-1941) and provides the foundations of his great work, The Capital. On 1864, he is one of the principal leaders of the first meeting "The International" and gives its objective: the abolition of capitalism. In Karl Marx's opinion, the human history rests on the class struggle: proletariat, if he wants to make disappear the exploitation of which he is victim, must organize himself on an international scale, seize the power and, during this phase (dictatorship of the proletariat), abolish the classes themselves, which will bring the ultimate phase, where the state will die out itself (Communism). The Marx's doctrines were baptized against his liking, the Marxism.

**4) Engels (Friedrich),** German socialist theorist (Barmen, integrated today in Wuppertal, 1820 - London 1895), friend of Karl Marx. He wrote the Situation of the working class in England (1845), where some key ideas of the Marxism are worked out. He wrote in common with Marx, the Holy Family (1845, the German ideology (1845-46) where he provided the foundations of the historical materialism, and The Manifesto of the Communist Party (1848).

He fought the theses of E. Dühring in *The Anti-Dühring* (1878), and analyzed dialectic materialism (*Dialectic of the nature*, 1873-1883; published into 1925). He ensured the publication of the *Capital* after the death of Marx. He continued the historical thought of the Marxism in the *Origin of the family, of the state-owned property*, (1884). He was in the center of the creation of second International.

The whole of their works was going to produce the advent of Communism in Russia of the tsars remained in a disconcerting feudality, until the beginning of twentieth century, and to generate the former USSR (Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics), one from both principal world powers during seventy years.

For those who will have read at least the description of their work enclosed, it can remain no doubt; these various characters didn't miss passion for their ideal. It is however a thing which the life can learn, "any passion devours, this and those ones, which surrounds it". In other words, some of those I was say, "the end, justifies the means". Even if we don't put into doubt some proverbs in their maxims, the precepts that emerge from them are not always of one dimension to the glory of God. They can indeed bring in their daily uses a relation in which the human value disappears, and lead to certain heresies of our history, that of humanity.

We'd better not make the conclusion that these men forgot this essential value owed to human being, perhaps even they too much attach to it, like a injustice quasi hereditary, a injustice of God if He had existed or at least a injustice that He let make. Number of them assimilated this "god" to an ideology from weak cowards like I did it, maintained in this reasoning by confusion between the majesty whom He represents in a child's heart, and observation of selfishness of a dominant class, covetous and manipulator, recommending itself of God. For these philosophers God didn't exist and was only one heresy that it was necessary to remedy by all human goodwill, intelligent and scientific.

What these philosophers could not know to have too precipitately rejected it, it is that God gives the intelligence and perspicacity to those who ask it to him, but not to those who fights Him. The one who believes to have any quality in himself, by his instruction or his own life's analyses, receives an intelligence limited to the man, the human spirit, and not the God's Holy-Spirit like we will see it, in the next chapters.

Through result of this first revolution, they saw there only a buffoonery of history. The few small advantages acquired by the people, were too similar, according to them, at those acquired by the English with their long and ridiculous way, so that one or the other methods can be plausible to long-term. Idealists of a social equality, key for them of all happiness, the various situations of this time had started to prove to them that the source of all human miseries was called indeed: God!

From period 1789 and its negative feedback, by the Empire then in a paroxysm of irony for them, after the empire a new monarchy, their analysis are rife. They were especially to mark all the youngest, that before the stabilization of intellectual redundancy, a new seism was going to consolidate them in their conclusions, and to especially to bring them the need's convictions of another type of actions and the setting-up of their ideal.

A concept that they had minimized perhaps too much, had however been created in the French collective memory, "only the republic was favorable to the people". It's why the people arrived at the revolution of 1848, always led by the middle-class, for laying down the object of their hopes: the "Republic", and by addition: the "Good Republic"!

Perhaps of good it had the idea this revolution of 1848, but as regards the republic, the second was not going to be long to behave a little like its big elder sister of 1792. Unemployment was already extremely present, and the use of unemployed was going to be done, like some would like to see it still nowadays implemented, by employment in works of public interest, then called "the national workshops".

Its execution was going to be entrusted at Labor Secretary "Marie". He began to impress the unemployed Parisian persons that he made managed by central School's young pupils. It seems however that Marie saw in the national workshops thus conceived, not only the advantage not to infringe upon the rights of private employers, but also withdrawing a great number of unemployed Parisian from the street's seductions, political clubs and socialist demonstrations. Reciprocally, on the socialist side, one very early perceived this kind of operations and the preserving of government's orientation. Reciprocally, on the socialist side, one very early perceived this kind of operations and the government's conservative orientation.

The rejoinder was formulated by a popular demonstration that required the creation of a Ministry of Labor, i.e. the explicit setting of the social reforms to status of State's duties. The government came out on top granting to him much less: the creation of a formed commission of workers' delegates who

would sit with dignity at the Palace of Luxembourg, in the armchairs of the pars of France, with in the chair Louis Blanc <sup>1</sup> and Albert <sup>2</sup>, and who would study the social problems.

Louis Blanc remained indeed member of this supreme collective executive that was the provisional Government but beyond what he was minority; he did not have still a government department to manage, therefore null hold on a portion of reality. In Luxembourg, one studied indeed the problems, one made some arbitrations useful in minor social conflicts, and one exposed in greater details and publicly the various socialist theories of time, which contributed much to frighten the bourgeois man.

**As will indeed write Karl Marx two years later, with much bitterness, "while in Luxembourg one sought the philosopher stone, one struck at the Town hall the currency that had trading rate..."**.

This was for what we could call the "conciliating republic", that is to say between February and May 1848. Reversals of situations identical to July 17, 1791, were however not going to delay.

As soon as the following day of the elections for installation of constituent French National Assembly of April 23, the first bloodshed were going to take place in Rouen, then devastated by the crisis, and a total and massive unemployment. The commissioner of the Republic, Deschamps, who had organized national workshops to help the workmen, was popular among them, and he was from them, rare, who inclined to the socialism. The bourgeoisie, of which the leader was the district attorney General Sénard, republican with National's nuance, (party in opposition to socialism) was exasperated by the new taxes that was used to cover the national workshops' expenditure, admittedly not very productive, and not like charitable organization. Old scores between two parties was regulated at the time of the elections: Sénard and friends were elected, Deschamps and his friends beaten, the whole department's votes having easily submerged those from big town. April 26, the known results, a working-class demonstration progressed in front of the town hall.

Did the workers want, like one had said, to dispute the ballot result, to see imposing the Deschamps' nomination? Or, more probably, to point out their needs and to protest on suspicion against the national workshops' removal (their alone resource), suppression that the victory of the men "of order" enabled to foresee?

**1) Louis Blanc**, French historian and politician (Madrid 1811-Cannes 1882). Supporter to the socialist ideas, he contributed in his writings (ten years History, 1841-1844) to enlarge the opposition against the monarchy of July. Member of the temporary government, in February 1848, he saw his workshops project to fail, and had to exile himself after the days of June. Returned to France in 1870, he was deputy (Congressman) of extreme left at the French National Assembly.

**2) Albert**, mechanic who was very controversial, put in position subordinate in the temporary government, like to give the exchange to a rival list in a bourgeois majority.

They were pushed back harshly by the National Guard, remained of bourgeois composition. Blows confused carried in the scuffle sustained by the loads of cavalry were felt like a provocation by the workmen, who, finishing their central demonstration, surged back in their areas where they built barricades. In evening and the following day, Sénard will require the troop, and even the cannon, and barricades were swept without loss for the police force, but with cost of ten workmen deaths.

Our attention to this event is not as disproportionate as it appears: it is an important thing in itself, not like difference in opinions between republican groups, but like first bloody conflict, which broke on a line of fight of classes, the euphoria of new fraternity, on which the people had mobilized themselves.

What had happened in Rouen in April was going to reproduce in June of this same year in Paris. As of this first date, the national workshops' liquidation had become the majority's principal concern. Firstly, because she wanted to finish some with the social experiments, even lost, and more especially because they were expensive. Secondly, because their function second of political neutralization played only less and less: because one saw to bring together themselves workmen from the workshops and socialist clubs' workmen! One heard moreover, in some their gatherings, cries of "Long lives Napoleon"! Lastly, third reason of fear, in the entourage of Lamartine <sup>1</sup> some advanced the daring idea to bind the national workshops' question to that of railroads: one would have to use this labor on the railway building sites stopped by the crisis, but the State would absorb then on its account.

**1) Lamartine**: Alphonse de Prât of Lamartine (**known as Lamartine**): French poet, diplomat and politician (Mâcon 1790/Paris 1869). Deputy opposed to the mode, he publishes in 1847 a "History of Girondins". February 24, 1848, it is him that proclaims the republic at the Town hall of Paris. Provisional government's member in 1848, in the function of Foreign Minister, he loses of his charisma after the "days of June". After one stinging failure at the presidential elections, he gives up the policy and turns over to his first loves, poetry.

One imagines all merits that the poet in this solution found: humanity (to liquidate without too much drama the workshops) and economic progressionism (the railroads' Magnum Opus, for which it had feelings almost Saint-Simoniens). But the Parliament's majority didn't want nationalization, which had a little too much smelled socialism to the bourgeoisie's detriment; perhaps also it didn't want to avoid the drama.

If we read certain declarations of time, some Reports or Memories, whose those of Karl Marx or Henri Guillemin, we can also have the impression the drama was not only accepted, but caused: the workshops' dissolution, the almost unavoidable revolt that would follow and the repression that would come in its turn, would make possible definitively to make a complete brake with the threats of the street and socialism. It's in any case the plan that occurred. The pattern was carried out, in the name of Parliament's majority whose monarchist right side was the going wing, by a special subcommittee whose recorder was the count de Falloux.

From Government's side, one counted less on the executive Commission than on the ministers, and in particular on the new Minister for the War, the Cavaignac General <sup>1</sup>. This character then became the man of the moment. Soldier until his fingertips, fiercely antisocial and friend of "the order", he had on the other Generals the additional advantage to be unquestionably republican, as son of Conventional and brother of an ardent militant of the Thirties. However, taking into account the composition of the Parliament, the republic was a guarantee whose "order" could not forget yet.

**1) General Louis Eugene de Cavaignac :** (Paris 1802 - Ourne, 1857). Minister for the War during the second Republic, he was invested in June 1848 of dictatorial capacities, which enabled him to crush the working-class insurrection, then nominated executive branch's chief. Candidate at the presidency of the Republic, it was beaten in December by Louis Napoleon, future Emperor Napoleon III.

June 21, the dissolution of the national workshops was declared, and was left to the workmen the alone ability to engage themselves in the army or to go to clear the marshy Sologne.

The workmen's despair was expressed initially the 22 by gatherings and march in the streets, then the 23 by the erection of barricades. A hard battle began then during three days, along the North-South line on the Town hall's level, which separated Parisian bourgeoisie of west from working-class of east. The Mobile Guard, the National Guard of the residential districts, and especially the army entered in action, with a perhaps calculated slowness.

In a private conversation brought back by Victor Hugo <sup>1</sup> in his book "Things seen", Lamartine was clearly accusing Cavaignac to have let enlarge the riot, like being able to give to repression more magnitude. The 26 on midday, the battle was gained, after heavy losses, but, like always, unequally shared, the more so that many insurrectionists had been massacred after the combat.

**1) Victor Hugo:** Great French novelist, Pair of France (1802-1885). He developed his work in many kinds. Led by a human ideal and visionary he generally tried to express through his work a political direction.

Side of "the order", where one had wanted to see in insurrection an burst of armed robbery and unsociability, the clear conscience was perfect, and one imputed to the workmen rebel not only the putting to death of two Generals, but also that of the archbishop of Paris, Mgr Affre, struck during an attempt at mediation by a bullet shot from boulevard's house by an isolated unknown.

Even if that had not failed to confirm "the already understood" of Karl Marx and Engel, Saint-Simon and Hegel having then died for twenty five years, for those who were going to be the Masters philosophers of the Soviet revolution of October, a much greater trick still prepared by the arrival of first presidential elections.

For the partisans' majority of constitution, the French "Washington" could be only Cavaignac, but Cavaignac was republican, and the greatest share of the leading classes had not taken yet favor for republic. The right of National Assembly, separating itself this time from the men of the National, constituted a committee and started to monopolize the expression of party of "the order". The royalists adhered to it easier than none of the two possible dynasties offered at that time a pretender eager or able to try his chance at the universal suffrage, and that monarchy remained in the majority idea, the keystone necessary to a Conservative system. The party of "the order" thus decided to have for candidate at the Republic's presidency, Louis Napoleon Bonaparte.

His career of adventurer, the debts of which he was covered, his physical appearance even, rather ungrateful in that nothing revealed at first sight his intellectual capacities nor his will, all that made

believe that one could always overcome on him. Extra, the popularity of his name in the masses, a little worrying in itself, was in the obviously advantageous circumstance.

The operation was going to prove to be good, since on December 10, 1848, the voters chose Bonaparte by 5 434 000 votes; followed Cavaignac (1 448 000), Ledru-rollin (371000), Raspail (37 000), Lamartine, introduced in solitaire (8 000).

December 20 Cavaignac left the role of provisional government's leader and the Republic's President took possession of it. The constituent Assembly acclaimed Cavaignac like new Cincinnatus, and it accepted with an attentive gravity the official oath of President: Louis Napoleon Bonaparte swore solemnly to remain loyal to the Constitution, this Constitution that obliged him in a formal way to become again four years later, a citizen like the others.

The outcome, although known, can appear extremely ridiculous to us today. Before the four years expiry this Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, this adventurer, was going of course to carry out his putsch. He was even going to take the joke, at the same time perhaps like a mystical superstition, at the same time perhaps like a prefiguration of his second failure in duty, to achieve it on December 2, 1851, at birthday of the imperial coronation and anointment of 1804, victory of Austerlitz in 1805, and his future imperial coronation and anointment thus in 1852.

How was it possible that such inconsistencies didn't mark the observers whom were our philosophers? Was this 2 December itself other thing that a repetition of history?

**Karl Marx, one of the first, made a fate to this analogy by calling "Dix-Huit-brumaire of Louis Bonaparte" the sequel that he gave to his work "classes Fights in France". A striking parallel could go further moreover. Hadn't another look the image of these extremists from left which one called "Montagnards" in 1792? For this philosopher, it was the whole of the second Republic, and not only its final episode, which had value of repetition bouffonne; Ledru-rollin (1843) after Robespierre (1793), like Badinguet 1 (nickname of Napoleon III) after Napoleon, it was the joke after the tragedy.**

**1) Badinguet:** Nickname which was allotted to Napoleon 3 and which was not other than the name of the workman who lent to him his clothes at the time of his escape in 1846 from the fort of Ham)

One is less severe today, insofar as better is appreciated what the second Republic brought again compared to the first: one could say deep-rootedness. The republican idea overflowed the intellectual elites, those of the middle class executives and small middle class organized in companies post- or néo-jacobines, to gain in few regions, popular sympathies of mass. That would go considerably to complicate the problem for most hesitant at the republic, because by gaining the people, the republican idea necessarily combined with the other aspirations of the people, social aspirations, aspirations at the greater comfort.

In the explosion of spontaneous expressions that accompanied the insurrections of December, a formula often came back: the "good", the "good republic", "We will bring back the good republic"... What was this to say, if not the republic that had governed France from May 1848 to December 1851 while maintaining the people in his usual difficulties of life was not the "good", not the true one, not the real one, in other words that the true republic could be only one republic favorable to the people of modest means?

The lesson that the French learnt some, was certainly going to bring much more than Karl Marx could then consider it, since his synthesis of this events led his disciples to wipe the slate clean of any rich person shape and their riches to make reappear ashes a new civilization, beautiful. Once again, this man enlightened in the heretical perception of moment, was going to give birth in the realize heart of many, with a practical application even more heretic, to the "happiness" of each one. Contrary to the socialist methods, which will have much more difficulty to stand out thereafter, because more reasonable and softer in their creation, **his eagerness to create an ideal world, had borne for always the human history of a heavy stamp. This one can however seem to us today having been necessary, by the only fact that it allowed the world, to measure how much it is impossible to the man to set up by the force, which God wants to do by the Love.**

Another people was going to take over to French people to be demonstrator all that. A People very poor what's more, but a people I was eyewitness, which was made up formidable men and women, but no more just than others.

It is true the one who is already in misery, does not risk the worst! If the French had to complain, there is now more than two centuries, just eighty-five years ago, these people lived the pangs of a monarchy not even worthy from our thirteen or fourteenth century. Its king was not called king, but tsar, which comes from Latin, Caesar. **They claimed were descendant of Auguste, the anoints of the Lord and received a worship to the "adored" tsar, like the Eastern sovereigns.**

With 174 million subject, and 21 784 000 square kilometer the Russian semi-European and semi-Asian Empire constituted in 1914 a complex and original world. Czarism was a system of government dictatorial, there can however be no comparison with the French monarchy of Hold System.

Russia until 1905 got no democratic structure, no egalitarian tradition. In the fight against the Mongols' domination in fifteenth century, princes de Moscovie had unified Russia and created a centralized and despotic state. Resulting from the nobility, czarism continued to be the protective shield for this nobility all while reducing it to a relatively negligible political role.

Ivan III (known as The Grand) <sup>1</sup> had married in second weddings Sophie Paléologue, niece of the last Byzantine emperors. He proclaimed himself, "tsar of all Russia", and successor of Byzantine Empire. Autocrat he adopted the rites and the Byzantine court's ceremonial. His armorial bearings were also of Byzantine origin: the eagle with two-headed. From Byzantine tradition the tsars kept always his same titles, the ceremonial, the symbols, but also the methods of government, from where importance of intrigues of court, the secrecy, the bureaucracy, the worship to the "adored" tsar, like the Eastern sovereigns.

**1)Ivan III** (known as the Large one) (1462-1505), he released Russia from Mongolian suzerainty (1480) and adopted the title of autocrat, making of him an absolute monarch. Married with the niece of the last Byzantine emperor, name given to the Roman Empire of East whose capital was Constantinople and which lasted from 395 to 1453; he wanted to be the heir to Byzance. **This Christian gréco-Eastern empire** extended to the sixth century on Balkans, Asia Mineure and the Middle East, from Syria in Egypt, as well as on south of Italy, Sicily and North Africa. It reached one's peak with tenth and eleventh centuries then declined whereas a new international order dominated by the Latin Occident was standing out.

Until 1905, the despotism tsarist was total. The imperial family was numerous and constituted the "imperial house of Russia". The tsar was the land greatest landowner of all country and to his private possessions, the "goods of oudiels were added", State's properties intended to support the members of the imperial family. The court intrigues played an important part in the government of the empire and this phenomenon still became more extensive at the beginning of the twentieth century under the reign of Nicolas II. He was 46 years old in 1914 and reigned since 1894. Of poor value, he hardly finds defender nowadays. **Full of one's own importance and of his authority, he conceived his role, like this of an absolute despot.**

**As of his accession, he declared: "Each one must know, dedicating all my forces to the happiness of my people, I will defend the autocracy's principles as immutably as late my father, I proclaim it openly." This dictatorship hardly left place for least freedoms, even most formal.**

At the borders, a severe overseeing was exerted on all travellers transporting newspapers, reviews, books... One cut books' pages considered to be subversive; one passed on newspapers' articles, ink pad charged with a very fatty printing ink, then sprinkled with sand, so that they aren't readable any more. One prohibited the Victor Hugo's texts translated into Russian; the only original texts were authorized!

The publications in "colonial" languages, in other words those of empire's not Russian nationalities, were comparable with foreign publications. To escape from the censure, one made manuscripts copied at great risk of his freedom. A great number of works, newspapers, reviews, were thus abroad printed. It was particularly the case of the newspaper Kolokol (the Bell), of Herzen, Russian revolutionary writer died in exile in Paris in 1870. Often the authors preferred to censure themselves to avoid bans of publication.

The self-censure had thus become the most censure pernicious form. The reading of Darwin was prohibited, however in 1872 the Capital of Karl Marx was authorized, but in German language. The censor, rushed a little, had undoubtedly not seen harm in extremely difficult work of political economy. It was however the first shrapnel shot against the Palate from Winter.

The arbitrary arrests were current use, and the judgments for political offences very heavy: the prison, the deportation in Siberia, in certain cases the exile could be pronounced without judgment, to do, it was enough to proclaim the besiege situation. Sometimes, the police surveillance was even exerted on the families of condemned, victims themselves, in certain cases, of repression. Nothing protected the individual against omnipotence from the State, the bureaucrats and the police officers.

The orthodox church, with the bureaucracy, the police and the army, was one of the four large pillars of regime. All the subjects of the empire were however not orthodox; there were the Jews (approximately 5 million), the Catholics of Poland and the Baltic States, the Moslems of Caucasus and Central Asia, the Protestants of Finland and the Baltic States, but it enjoyed very many privileges. **It**

**was a church of State and the tsar was the orthodox Church's chief as anoint of the Lord. As wrote it at the end of century, the first adviser of Nicolas II, Pobiedonostsev: "the State cannot be restricted to represent the society's material interests, because it would then strip itself of its moral power and would destroy its spiritual union with the nation; it is only in this condition that are maintained in the people the feeling of legality, the respect of law and confidence in the power".**

This Orthodox Church had been born in 1054 from the schism with Catholic Church, whose branches resulting from the Byzantine Empire and the Patriarchate of Constantinople had separated. The differences between the Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church of this time were undoubtedly important at the eyes of theologians, but for the external observer, they didn't appear fundamental.

Under the whole's domination of this system, the people were maintained in a very great destitution. The living conditions, to see survival, were extremely difficult, in particular for the women. How wrote it, the Russian great poet Nekrassov in the medium of nineteenth century the woman's situation was particularly dramatic: "Ah! Your prize is a poor prize, Russian woman! Where to find more painful fate? That before age you would be faded, nothing astonishing, Russian people's Mother who is able to support all, Mother suffering so much sufferings! "

The famine remained threatening and the food shortage was not rare. The medical situation was catastrophic. One was lacking doctors in the rural areas. The epidemics of typhus, of cholera were frequent. On 1910, there were 185 000 cases of cholera for all the empire. The malaria and scabies prevailed durably. For example, in 1910, one announced 225 000 cases of malaria in the government of Samara, 167 000 in that of Saratov, 400 000 cases of scabies in the government of Viatka.

The external brilliance of Russian civilization at nineteenth and beginning of twentieth century, should not hide the real situation lived by the people, and in particular the fact that the culture was reserved only for one negligible minority. **Lenin considered, not without reason, I quote: "there is no more, nowhere in Europe apart from Russia, only one so wild country, where the popular masses are so deeply deprived of instruction, culture and general knowledge"**. Aulard, the French historian about the Revolution of 1789, precisely noted in a collective work published in 1922: **Soviets' History, "from the intellectual point of view, the night was deeper in Russia of 1917 than in France of 1789"**.

These people so pauper were however going to be used as example at world in this tragic Utopia, as well in its phase **"of purification"** as in that of practical application known as **"Socialist", which never arrived**, but until its dying day is remained under authoritarian government thumb. Tragedy, because it began in a bloodshed, a quite useless blood, just like 1789 was it for France, but even perhaps because of moral idleness than the system set up, produced in this large population. Perhaps it also brought to some an awakening of their man value, but he is still too early to realize it. **What it created on the other hand, they are other bourgeois, not more honest undoubtedly than those about whom Napoleon spoke.**

A veil is drawing itself over the humanity however, and it is obviously at that we must look at. This Spirit's veil that are the revolutions of violence, which brought or first Napoleon Empire or the still Napoleon Empire second or proletarian Empire. Undoubtedly we must to banish idea that highlight from it and any shape of revolution, which were and will remain only the history's interludes, but of destructive interludes. What prevailed on the humanist socialism of "finer feelings", itself limited like we will see it further, was nothing other than the human spirit in all its misery. A mind often deprived of good direction, because it can reproduce only what it knows, whereas what it knows is nothing more than that prints it, deforms it, destroys it through its sufferings and its fears.

1) Lénine (Vladimir Ilitch Oulianov, known as), Russian politician (Simbirsk 1870, Gorki 1924). He adheres since 1888 to a Marxist club, spends three years in deportation to Siberia (1897-1900) then gains Switzerland, where he melts the Iskra newspaper and exposes in "What to do? "(1902) his centralized concept of the revolutionary party. This one carries it at second congress of the P.O.S.D.R. (1903) and the Lenin's partisans form from now on the bolchevic fraction of the party, opposed to its menchevic fraction. After a time in Paris (1908-1911), then to Cracow, he turns over to Switzerland in 1914 and indicates to the Russian revolutionists their objective: to fight the war and to transform it into revolution. In April 1917, he crosses Germany and returns in Petrograd, where he imposes his views on the P.O.S.D.R. and to the Soviets, and directs the insurrection of October. President of committee of the people's police chiefs (Oct. Nov. 1917-1924), he makes sign with Germany the peace of Brest-Litovsk and imagining to the international extension of the revolutionary movement, he creates the international Communist (1919). But the civil war in Russia and the failure of the revolutionary movement in Europe lead him to be devoted to the construction of socialism in the U.S.S.R., which he melts in 1922. After the period of the "Communism of war" (1918-1921), he adopts in front of the



economic difficulties and interior resistances, the New Economic policy, or "N.E.P". In 1922, Lenin is struck of hemiplegia. Man of action, he was also a theorist (Materialism and empiriocriticism, 1909; Imperialism, supreme stage of capitalism, 1916; the State and the revolution, 1917; the infantile disease of Communism, "leftism", 1920).

The man seeks what he covets at the others, and it is for that when he received the object of his desires, he employs it still more badly than these one of whom he was jealous. **Happiness as for them, are only transitory and they don't mark us deeply if they aren't located in God's Spirit. It's for that it's so difficult, until impossible to leave victorious a revolution.** The one who stoops to follow his carnal impulses, must expect that the trap will snap shut early or late on him, whether he is man or nation.

These Philosophers counted too on the only common sense and the human integrity. Could they imagine that some of them, sometimes those whom seemed most incorruptible, were precisely those whom at the following day would act to opposite even values whom they defended so bitterly?

What did they have at their disposal these idealists of a civilization of balance, in which each one could live in a perfect harmony with his neighbor, because perfectly equal as regards the social aspects? What could they get to differentiate the words from a "Jesus or Judas"?

God probes the hearts and can give the discernment to those whom follow him, whereas in their dimension of flesh and blood they had them only suspiciousness at their disposal. The natural man does not have in him basic qualities on which these philosophers built their theories. They however didn't miss sincerity, and perhaps were they close to an ideal that God wants to give to the tomorrow's world, but their process of installation and their management, was not of human size. What did they have, placed at the disposal of each one and especially of humblest? **Of God! But they didn't know it!**

They did not know it because those, whom claimed themselves the worthy representatives of God, had given reason to a monarchy that would stem like from God himself. One god thus who would have sought and wanted crushed the weak one with the profit of always more strong man. Him who said, "Submitting yourselves one another", whereas this submission on ground exists only in the sense "dominating / crush" by monarchy venerated as an idol, as if it were the image even of God on ground. Him who said, "Have love one for another; even as I have had love for you", when those who "succeed" and go to Mass every Sunday, are only money-grabbing, self-seeking and pretentious, egoistic, even dominating and scornful vis-a-vis with those whom have not "fruits". About which fruits do speak they? Are this of success and glory or fortune and property, or again, always better for them and more badly for poorest?

This richness and these fruits there will disappear soon. In their too human goodwill and their condemnation of God, by confusion between Him and them claimed themselves His worthy representatives, these sincere men who were our philosophers did not look to their predecessors, the Jesus-Christ's apostles. We do not speak about their method of implementation that was opposed, but their expected result. These apostles of whom we can look at the example and remember that them also, but for them led by the Holy Spirit of God, started to live a beginning of social life.

This first system, just like the following was transitory, because the man's religiosity was not going to be long to prevailing on the Spirit of God, just like in the second the personal selfishness of man was not going to be long to take precedence on the integrity of most sincere. Will we say in that God did not do better than the man or reciprocally? Or will we say quite simply that it was not time, and God has reserved this one to us so that a greater number, profit of it?

We must above all pose one postulate, God is not this who wants to crush or destroy, but well this who wants to make us grow, to raise us to His image, from all walks of life that we came and from some race that we are, we all can be His children. We only prohibit this happiness to him! The theory is a thing, the result is another, and will be never the same for the one who stoop to kill, rather than to love. There is another revolution that is raising today and carried it also the name of "socialism", from which we know the fruit. Anybody have already noted the abominations on the people of God, in the Jews or even the Gypsy during the last world war. All remember, except their torturers! Shamelessly, as only the demon can do it, they deny the history and remake it with their way. Those seem fort convinced and it is for that they are convincing, but just like the popular masses had followed the bourgeois of 1789, they are followed by the weak ones whom often believe more in one religion of the man than to the true faith in God.

In arrogant way, but deprived of sense, they pass oneself off as victims of the classes already rejected by much as Hitler was putting the blame to the Jews, disabled person or Gypsy. Because the history is repeated, in order to pay homage to all persecuted, passed, present and unfortunately undoubtedly, to

come, we will finish this chapter, by taking time to read a text of Primo LEVI, which speaks to us so well about the human eloquence and the plagues that it can convey.

No doubt that he had learned it at his costs, but so long as we all can worry about it: **"All we must know, or to remember us that when they spoke in public, Hitler and Mussolini were believed, applauded, admired, adored like gods.** They were "charismatic chiefs", they had a mysterious capacity of seduction that didn't owe anything at the credibility or the accuracy of the remarks that they held but which came in the suggestive way in which they held them, at their eloquence, with their flow of words of politician who likes to play to the crowd, perhaps innate, perhaps patiently studied and developed. The ideas they proclaimed were not always the same ones and were in general aberrant, stupid or cruel; but they were acclaimed and followed until their death by thousands of devotees.

It's necessary to remember that these devotees, and among them the zealous executors of order inhuman, was not born torturer, they were not except rare exceptions, of monsters, they were average men. The monsters exist, but they are too very few to be really dangerous; those who are really dangerous, they are the ordinary men, the civil servants ready to believe and obey without discussing, like Eichmann, like Hôss, the commander d' Auschwitz, like Stangl, the commander de Treblinka, like twenty years after the French soldiers who killed in Algeria, and like, thirty years after, the American soldiers who killed in Vietnam. **It's thus necessary to be distrustful of all those who want to convince us by other ways that the reason, in other words of the charismatic chiefs: we must well weigh our decision before delegating to somebody of other the power to judge and want in our place (...)**

It may be that a new Fascism, with its procession of intolerances, abuse and constraints, is born out of our country to be imported in, or that it breaks out from interior with a violence able to reverse all the barriers. Then, the wisdom councils will be useful only if we find in God the force to resist: in that also, the memory from what occurred to the heart of the Europe, there isn't so long time, will be used to us as assistance and warning "...

In conclusion of these historical realities, we made only confirm the biblical text that we quoted on which rests all these writings: **the carnal man is unable to make it although he would like to make, but practical the evil that he would not like to make** (see Romans 7-18/20).

**This is why in the next chapter we will turn to the spiritual field that built our history, that of our carnal psychology.** It is of it that are born all these conflicts and by it that we are always led in our third millennium, as long as we are not victorious according to God from our wretched human nature.

**It is against it and against its guide that we must fight with the assistance of God, against it we must carry out our real combat without to condemn one another, then we will know what wants to say, To Love!**

This work cannot be sold. It is offered free of charge for information by Association CHRETIENS DE L'ESPOIR, 2 Impasse Saint Jean - 26110 - VINSOBRES - France.  
Tel. (33) 0954705737 – Fax (33) 0959705737 - E-mail: [christianofthehope@free.fr](mailto:christianofthehope@free.fr)

Company registration number 444 684 427 00016