



FRANCE AND GOD

Texts written in a color other than that of this one are quotations whose origin is communicated in bibliography.

CHAPTER FOURTH

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 do not know whether we must say fortunately or unfortunately, but by its membership, its size, and its position in old Europe, probably also by its temperate climate and advantageous physical geography, France was often used as an example for many peoples. It is enough to look at how much today, international tourism is visiting our country, to perceive without drawing from it the pride, the interest that it symbolizes in the world. For a majority of those who are looking for cultural bases, their interest for the whole of Europe is very natural, but we must remain concrete and ask ourselves why is France more visited than our neighbors like Germany or England?

After the gradual disappearance of the Roman Empire, and the subsequent fall for a majority of Europe, it was from the Frankish kingdom, and in particular by Charlemagne, that stable Christian structures were born which would last until nowadays over a large part of Europe. In more recent pass, however, but no less perceptible to our immediate neighbors, as well as a large part of the world colonized by this old Europe, was the revolution of 1789.

It is indeed indisputable, "it is the French Revolution which was to see formulating, for the first time, the idea of a social revolution of a communist nature, within the framework of the Conspiracy of the Equals ¹". Precursor of so many other movements around the world, it allowed the synthesis of a certain Karl Marx, main instigator of the Soviet revolution of 1917. That is why we will try to define the context of analysis of this man so to use it as a reflection guide.

1) Conspiracy of the Equals: Conjunction led by Babeuf against the Directory in 1796 and 1797, in a context of social exasperation due to the expensive life. The plot was denounced and its instigators were guillotined.

Unlike our neighbor England, whose monarchy had begun for several centuries to make concessions to a parliamentary monarchy, the French monarchy had locked itself into absolutism, of which Louis XIV was the apogee. After the revolution, this absolutism certainly declined from 1790 to 1792 then from 1815 to 1848 in favor of a constitutional monarchy, but never made the complete step towards parliamentarianism which leads to the evolution "From the sovereign king to the sovereign people".

Parliamentary monarchies are the fruit of a long mutation during which the absolute power of the monarch is gradually conquered by the bourgeoisie. Initiated by the latter, which sets up

parliaments to limit the royal power, this political system, created in England, served as a model for all European monarchies. Today, the king has only a more or less symbolic role, it is the emanation of the popular power which fixes its destiny.

In England, a country considered as the cradle of parliamentarianism and the reference of parliamentary monarchies, the mutation began as early as the fourteenth century. The incessant and sometimes violent struggles between the royal powers and this of the parliament finally benefited the latter. The transfer of the sovereign's powers to the people was gradual, thus ensuring the durability of the system in which the royal power is reduced to its simplest expression.

This stability made England the most advanced state of all European nations in the "industrial revolution", but what was the benefit for the working classes? From the countryside 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 the little land from which they had previously obtained a minimum of survival in the event of famines, they had become entirely dependent on the one who gave them work in a nascent capitalism, more organized to defend profit than social actions.

The problem posed by the rapidity of urban growth in England was dramatically underlined by a cholera epidemic in 1832, although the epidemic was sometimes just as deadly in the countryside. The new industrial cities were concentrated in very small areas, because everyone was going to work on foot. In town, the surface available to each was a function of its economic situation. The very small fraction of the population that owned land, probably less than five percent in a cotton town, often occupied fifty percent of the total area. The working population lived where factories, roads, canals, then railroads, permitted it.

The result was sordid: in the nineteenth century, cities were only smoke and stink, and expensive in rents and human lives for their inhabitants. A decent house could cost a semiskilled worker a quarter of his income, and few families was able ever afford it. Also, slums multiplied in the center of the cities, "crows' nests" of London, Liverpool and Manchester cellars, "China" of Merthyr Tydfil, or new types of "regional" dwellings according to the imagination of the owners and speculators, from Yorkshire "back-to-back" accommodations to tiny "kitchen rooms" and "gut apartments", which housed 70 percent of Glasgow families around 1870.

The housing conditions were bad, the sanitation system still worse. The better-off city-dwellers could create commissions for water supply, sewers, street lighting and roads network, but to the detriment of their poorer neighbors. In many cases, the sewage from a new middle-class neighborhood drained into the water points used by the working population.

The living conditions there were very hard and very unequal, for a large majority of the population, and this made the contemporaries of Toynbee agree, with Karl marks, that until 1848, the capitalist industrialization had not improved the condition of Working classes.

This progress would not have existed if the British bourgeoisie been perfectly upright and had used its power to establish parliamentarianism, in order to benefit all social strata. Unfortunately, this was not the case, and the ruling classes behaved like the monarchy, which they were fighting, against the working classes they were exploiting.

This was also the case in France, because in our country as in every other part of the West, the burghers were already active, rich and powerful in the Middle-Ages. Although in our predominantly Catholic country, the Counter-Reformation had stifled the bourgeoisie for nearly two centuries, the eighteenth century was limited to revive it, waiting for its complete resurrection in the nineteenth century. But the bourgeois of that time was a very diverse being, and it is good to distinguish several types. First there was the one for whom the bourgeoisie was a title and not a function: the person of independent means, the "bourgeois of Paris" for example, whose economic activity remained zero. It was paradoxical to note that the two formulas "live nobly" and live "with bourgeois manner", which seemed to oppose, both meant living without working.

Then there was the bourgeoisie of offices (ecclesiastical or civil), owners of offices, which was one of the clientele of the monarchy and was alienated from the system. These bourgeois, "officers" were gladly motionless and conservative, numbed in the past also in love with their privileges and they did not tolerate any movement other than that of opinions.

A third category included doctors, lawyers, all the liberal professions. Those were supporting relatively little on institutions and on the money. They distinguished themselves differently: by their independence and their skills. It was among them that Diderot gathered to recruit his "Encyclopedic Bourgeoisie".

Finally, the fourth group was that of the commercial professions: the masters and the merchants, those who manufactured and those who sold, but whom were confused most often, not exceeding the framework of the small enterprise; those who produced on a larger scale, and especially the merchants, who were really connected to the circuit of exchange, formed a more dynamic and already conquering bourgeoisie, but where we must see with precaution the ancestors of our capitalists.

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

Unlike its powerful English counterpart, who had been able to fight alone against the monarchy, the luck of the "weak" French bourgeoisie was not to be alone. If it found complicities despite antagonisms, on the side of the privileged persons, it possessed (despite other antagonisms) a "clientele" in the town's people.

The working world of the eighteenth century did not even have indeed a rudimentary unity, nor a touch of class consciousness. The least free among the workers were the "companions", who were bound by the regulations of the corporation and who lived under the roof of their boss, in a proximity that quickly became a solidarity, if not a dependence. The workers who worked in the manufactories of the big cities might perhaps begin to get, by the mere virtue of their gathering, a vague proletarian conscience. But the most independent and well-armed were the artisans, who worked for them on the merchant's or wholesaler's behalf, and who sometimes appeared as little bosses, gathering around them some companions. The craftsman was none the less subject to the "capitalists" on whom he depended both for the raw material and for the commercial outlet. Only his tools belonged exclusively to him.

Hatred and struggle would have been possible between the worker and the bourgeois, for while during the century the bourgeois income rose, the popular purchasing power continued to decline. But the nature and causes of such a contrast prevented it from degenerating and changed the virtual conflict into another conflict.

The difficulties or miseries of the workman were not so much due to low wages as to the price of the foodstuffs. For many years, the wage rate remained a constant, and the worker forgot it to be fascinated by the variable whose rise or fall commanded the vicissitudes of its existence: the price curve, and in particular that of the price of bread. It was the primary expense that, at it alone, consumed half of the worker's income. The consequence was that many have much less thought was given to claiming an increase in wages (a claim that would have opposed the worker to his bourgeois employer) than to demanding a taxation of prices, which diverted the popular anger towards the aristocrat possessor of the lands, beneficiary of feudal rent and hoarder of grain.

The lack of unity and collective consciousness of the townspeople was a boon to the bourgeoisie. The very people whose work it exploited paradoxically became its allies. The aristocrat thus became the common enemy: an enemy of the peasant he despoiled, an enemy of the bourgeois, whose ascension and consecration he prevented, an enemy finally of the city worker, who made him responsible for explosion in prices. So that the contrast was absolute between the structures of society, which was all at the service of the aristocracy, and the social dynamic, where all the forces converged, directly or indirectly, towards a bourgeois progression.

In contrast to the English bourgeoisie, which was persevering since long in leveraging all its weight between the different upper classes to find its place in the sun, the newly revived French bourgeoisie was confronted in the international market by its big sister from across the Channel. It was envious of the privileges obtained by it, but remained nonetheless too weak to obtain the same prerogatives quickly.

Thus even if the bourgeois conscience condemned the aristocratic lifestyle for its sterility, its ostentatious expenditure, there was also an aristocratic consciousness to decide that the bourgeois were the most routine beings in the world, attached to their traditions and their prejudices, deprived at the same time of activity, sensibility and imagination. And when the bourgeois "achieved" or was ennobled, it was to immediately forbid to others the step he had just

crossed. No one was then more uncompromising than he to show that the inequality of conditions was required by the progress or existence of any society.

In 1789, in order to achieve its aims, this bourgeoisie having still too little power in itself, just like Archimedes said, give me a fulcrum and I will raise the earth, was going to take support on the people to move the all-powerful kingship. However, this fulcrum was going to turn against it, because of a pre-revolutionary movement in which the "Cahiers de Doléances ¹" did not claim in any way the abolition of the kingship, this bourgeoisie will be found, in the first following day, facing a popular revolution that it will have all the trouble in the world to manage in its favor.

1) Cahiers de Doléances: Under the Ancient Régime, documents in which the various assemblies recorded the claims and the wishes that their representatives had to assert during the Estates General.

From the philosophical current born of another part of itself, had already appeared a beginning of collective consciousness of the people, and in particular in some "sans-culottes ¹" Parisians, although these remained minority in number compared to a very large part of the peasantry. This peasantry of whom Michelet ² speaks to us when he evokes the French peasant in his misery ("lying on his manure, poor Job ..."), he was probably no wrong to attract of each one attention to the precariousness of the fate of the majority of the French peasants: those who, from the landless laborer to the parcel laborer or the mediocre sharecropper, fell into the category of what is called the "consumer" peasantry. For these, the eighteenth century had nothing glorious, and the rise in prices that benefited the "seller" peasantry weighed heavily on this world of consumers.

1) Sans-culottes: Revolutionary who belonged to the most popular layers and who wore at that time striped trousers and not the traditional culottes (short pants) of the ancient regime.

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

The philosophical current of the eighteenth century had not only reached the bourgeois classes, for the nobility, eager at the same time to preserve the privileges related to the absolutism of the monarchy, would, however, have liked to acquire the rights that parliamentarianism would have brought to it, without any good sure to lose any of its benefits. Thus the Revolution was the result of the "privileged people" nobility and bourgeoisie, whose political consciousness had sharpened in contact with philosophy, now close enough to the government to know its weaknesses and to wish to participate.

Until 1788, when there was a great divorce between the competing ambitions of the nobility and the bourgeoisie, the struggle against absolutism was carried out by the "Bodies ¹", supported at the court by the cabals and led to the opinion by the great hybrid body of parliaments, all united in a common opposition to "ministerial despotism", the opponent in principle almighty, but in fact solitary.

In the struggle against absolutism, the action of the privileged persons had found a paradoxical ally in the philosophy of the Lumières ² (Enlightenment), yet mortal enemy of "Bodies". As much as religious "tradition", philosophers were, in fact, opposed to "privileges" political and social, "precedents", "traditions", "uses", but especially as "distinctions" and unjustified advantages and abusive. But they were no less to the arbitrary power; and their declamations, besides the climate of revolt which they contributed to create, furnished to each group the proper arms to defend their particular interests. The number and power of privileges was such that no partial action seemed to be able to reduce their number or harmfulness.

1) 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...

2) Philosophy of the Lumières: Partisan philosophy against totalitarian religious and political oppressions, appearing from the second half of the seventeenth century and the eighteenth, motor current of many reflections generating the revolution of 1789.

The indispensable reorganization could not therefore come from the "corps" themselves, for which the advantage of each was related with the existence of analogous advantages for the others, whatever were the jealousies and contempt which were existing reciprocally. The very nature of absolute power prevented it from destroying these "Bodies", since it was through them that it ruled over the whole population.

In the powerlessness of traditional authority and the impossibility to arrive at a broad consensus, the regime proved itself incapable of reforming itself by legal and peaceful means. This absolute monarchy buried in the slump of colonial wars had also led the state coffers over-indebtedness, but was supported in this dimension by the head of the church which kept it in the idolatry of the ideas-forces of the ancient monarchy, the divine right was in a certain way, I quote: **the keystone: Anointed of the Lord, thaumaturge king, the king is a sacred person, an image of the God the Father.**

As everyone knows, this detonating set was going to find the spark that would fire the powders, to give 1789; 1789 and its revolution. A revolution which, for the majority of today a few years after their graduation from school remains only a vague memory of July 14 and the Storming of the Bastille, have nevertheless lasted ten years. Ten years in which, beyond the failure of the system, important changes in society were to emerge, and according to the observer was going to give different currents of thought throughout the world in the following generations, until today.

After the declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen, and the destruction of feudalism both accomplished in 1789, the sale of national property confiscated to the clergy, allowed the bourgeois revolution by this massive expropriation which touched nearly one tenth of the territory national, to attach by extremely strong links the group of those whom we saw, at the fire of the auctions in 1790 and 1791, to benefit from "the windfall".

Consolidation on one side, break-up on the other: the nationalization of ecclesiastical property was inseparable from the functionalized by the civil Constitution of the clergy, passed on July 12, 1790. In these same days in Paris, despite the rain and unpreparedness (palliated by the voluntary work of thousands of citizens) and especially the oath without heat of Louis XVI ¹, the feast of the Federation (July 14, 1790) was the ultimate manifestation of a Revolution which still wished to believe in its perfect unanimity.

1) Louis XVI (sixteenth) (1754-1793) Last French absolute monarch (1774-1789), then King of the French (1789-1792) was guillotined on 21 January 1793. 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 parish priests who had become elected officials within the framework of the new administrative divisions, had to take the civic oath, which did not help the cohesion. The hostility of Pope Pius VI, his formal condemnation of "Jurors" ¹ in April 1791, introduced an irremediable flaw in a revolutionary world that tried to preserve the myth of national unanimity. This break in the coming months and years would be of great importance in a popular opinion whose religious factor was an element of polarization.

1) Jurors or intruders: Appellation of the priests (less than 50%) and the totality of the bishops except five, who had taken oath to the civil Constitution of the clergy.

A year later, the scene had changed: what the revolutionary iconography presents to us on July 17, 1791 with a grim reminder of the Federation is the shooting of the Champ de Mars. Prompted by the Cordeliers club ¹, the Parisian petitioners demanded the king's deposition. Bailly, mayor of Paris, La Fayette, commander of the National Guard, had martial law proclaimed and fired against the demonstrators (revolutionaries on another side): the break was going to prove definitive between the popular revolution and a certain bourgeois revolution.

1) Club des Cordeliers: Revolutionary club founded in April 1790 had for leaders Danton, Marat, Camille Desmoulins, Hébert, Chaumette. He played a decisive role in the removal of the monarchy and disappeared in March 1794, during the elimination of his partisans by Robespierre.

This division hitherto masked by the will of everyone to use the credulity of others for its benefit, was going then generate a counter-revolution led by the forces supporting the monarchy and the clergy on the one hand, and by the other, by the a hardening of the communist tendency of the process, in what we might call the "inevitable skid" of manipulation towards its author. The bourgeoisie, who had taken the people as a fulcrum, was going therefore verify that to lift a load, any fulcrum must be more powerful than the load itself, and would necessarily generate a popular revolution if one used the people. This was the case!

Beyond the mutation that the bourgeois revolution was about to undergo, the most important for the history of France, and of many other civilizations perhaps, was at this moment at the very level of the people. From a population that was not yet aware of itself a few years, to see for some, few months before, the people was going acquire a notion of importance that was going built by the most motivated leaders.

All the renewed popular dynamism found, in fact, in the context of 1791 and 92, contexts where to be inserted: the rise of clubs and fraternal societies then covered France with a sometimes surprisingly dense network of popular societies. In Paris, the club of Cordeliers, where Danton and Marat spoke, overflowed, by its more popular recruitment, the club of Jacobins 3, which remained, then, more closed. At this date, we can say that already a whole part of the most politicized urban masses, demystified, had entered into the struggle: what we will call the "sans-culotterie" was thus elaborated between these years 1791 and 1792.

1) Club of the Jacobins: First formed in Versailles by the deputies of the region, it settled in the convent of the Jacobins in Paris. Deprived then of its moderate members such as La Fayette and Sieyes, this organization passed into the hands of the most radical revolutionaries called Montagnards (mountaineer), because sitting on the highest tiers, and was dominated by the personality of Robespierre. These Montagnards, masters of power in 1793, imposed a policy of public safety called the Terror. Divided into three main periods, this "Terror" resulted in the incarceration of about 500,000 suspects, about 40,000 of whom were guillotined. **It was the main political period of dechristianization, state economic controls and the redistribution of property from the suspects to the poor.** In its last weeks of power, it abolished the judicial guarantees to the accused, and ended with the fall of Robespierre, 9 Thermidor (July 28, 1794). In the revolution that interests us, a manipulation other than that of the bourgeoisie was at the same time foiled, that of the king. In spite of his oath made to the people on July 14, 1790, and the example which he then had of England, much more in advance than France with regard to the constitutional monarchy then parliamentary, this was not going to prevent Louis XVI to persist in a resolution of the conflict by the strong way. He secretly organized an escape from France with the aim to restructure an army from a large number of officers already emigrated abroad. This escape was stopped at Varennes-en-Argonne on June 20 and 21, 1791, **and nearly two years after the first conflicts, was the carrier of the first overtures to the republican spirit.**

The pitiful fearful behavior of this king, more attracted by locksmithing than by the management of the state, was indeed going produce an inversion of revolutionary motives towards the deposition of kingship for the benefit of the republic, which until then was not even considered. These new facts were accentuated during the summer of 1791 by the intervention of the foreign sovereigns, Emperor and King of Prussia, who launched an appeal to the monarchical coalition to restore Louis XVI in his sovereignty on the one hand, to go further in forming a covenant of alliance in February 1792.

During several months the convention was divided on its capacity to make war, but the king then gave in the politics of the worst hoping that the foreign princes would restore it in his first functions, and used his influence so that the Convention engages in this war. On the 20th of April the war was declared to the King of Bohemia and Hungary. The first engagements were disastrous for a French army in the process of change, disorganized by the emigration of its officers, which seemed to give reason to the king.

Less expected, at least in its form, its extent and its maturity, was the popular reaction to this new situation. Half-improvised, the day of June 20, when the Paris demonstrators unsuccessfully invaded the Tuileries, was the prelude to a more serious mobilization. From the province arrived "sections" demanding the decay of the king, including the famous Marseillais came to defend the capital and the homeland, which the Assembly proclaimed "in danger" on July 11.

These conditions then gave rise to a counter-revolutionary impulse, which was joined to the general-in-chief of the Prussian and Austrian armies, Charles of Brunswick. The latter published his famous ultimatum on July 25, threatening to deliver Paris to a military execution and a total subversion in case of attack on the family of Louis XVI, which had the opposite effect and produced the fall of monarchy.

We often keep the image of the Storming of the Bastille as the key image of the proletarian revolution or the barricades of Faubourg Saint-Antoine. We forget then the crucial moment that was the awareness of the challenge against this Prussian army, coming from a people who had suffered many defeats in the previous fifty years, in hostilities led by yet seasoned troops.

At this crucial moment when trouble was everywhere, the front of the revolutionary bourgeoisie split in contact with a popular movement. From secondary force that it was, the most populist movement passed to the forefront of revolutionary dynamism. On August 10, these later stormed the Tuileries Palace, deserted by the royal family, after a deadly battle against the Swiss guards who defended it. The assembly voted the suspension of the king, the meeting of a new Constituent Assembly, a "Convention", the election of which will be by universal suffrage: symbolic prelude to a democratic revolution.

We must not seek to dissociate the two images on which this phase of the Revolution ended: Valmy and the massacres of September, which are there as to show that nothing really good and balanced can come out of a revolution.

The battle of Valmy, September 20, 1792, broke the Prussian offensive in Champagne: unexpected recovery after the first defeats, mediocre engagement it said, if we stick to the number of deaths; but the young French army, half improvised, without experience of fire, had compelled to the formidable Prussian troops to the retreat; at the level of ideas-forces, it was the Revolution which had just beaten the Old European Regime.

To give dates, let us recall then that on September 21, 1792 the monarchy is abolished, the 22 the republic is proclaimed.

Oh! It is obvious that it did not yet have a good look, this very controversial republic, which was far from it as nowadays in the heart of all the French or almost, because it was for the poorest, words that they understood only half, as for the richest they already saw all the loss of their privileges.

In the active participants count, the Revolution remained indeed an active minority phenomenon. In the Marseilles sections, for example, the most massive increases of popular participation never brought more than a quarter of the male adults in the neighborhood to section assemblies, either in the summer of '92 or in the federalist spring of 93. If one were to count actual "militants", the active group would shrink even more. From these revolutionary elite, however, physiognomies began to detach themselves, a revolutionary mentality emerged, and then the gap was filled up between the revolutionary masses and the heroes of the drama.

In its majority of the French people was not yet ready to assume a political role, but a first stone was laid, and the important thing is certainly the value that this first stone represented in the hearts of the most humble. **The one who began to make them aware of their dimension of man, of "Monsieur", that they were all, because all called "Citizens".**

All progression, especially in the field of collective behavior, is not usually done in a day, and "Nothing that results from human progress, can be obtained with the consent of all. Those who see the light before others are condemned to pursue it in spite of others "as it seems to me, said Christopher Columbus and why not Jesus, the Christ. If a part of the bourgeois was motivated only by their own covetousness, others were led by a great sincerity, which can nowadays seem puerile to some.

The image given by Mathiez of the Franciscan forge master Louvot, a Jacobin manufacturer who took his workers to vote for the Mountain at the sound of the clarinet during the Convention elections, would easily find many counterparts. There were, for example, the Duval brothers, glassmakers of Montmirail, who rode a horse the markets at the head of their workers to tax the

grain. This taxation of the price of foodstuffs, and in particular that of bread, was one of the major themes of the Enragés¹ claim of 1792, which best expressed popular aspirations. This is why we must not confine ourselves to an unequivocal condemnation of the bourgeois class, because many of them were sincere and motivated for the good of all. Nevertheless, the conditions of a modern class struggle were not carried out in a largely pre-capitalist world.

1) The Enraged (rabid): Factions of the most extremist Parisian militants of the sans-culottes.

Beyond that, in the course of the rise of revolutionary dynamism until 1794, there was growing aggressiveness against the rich, both in the city and in the countryside, judged in their egoism during the "Terror". Therefore, we must remember that: **"Revolutions are only parentheses of history, and generally recreate after a more or less long time systems similar to those from which they precipitated the fall"**. Everyone in his fanaticism, born of covetousness too often justified because of the bad behavior of the dominant persons, found himself reproducing what he had fought.

Counter-revolution or popular revolution, therefore, this may not be of real importance, because the consequence is quite different, and it is probably what makes it all the value still today in the world. **The people, the small people, at least its most advanced part, began to realize that each one was important, that it weighed in the social balance but especially to the eyes of God, even if it was only its exodus of Egypt.**

Until then, each one of this small people had lived only in the great men shadow whom he often idolized as "superior" people, but he began to measure the notion of his existence. We will not say, however, that this idolatry of the "superior" man has not existed since then, but it then received the first true arrow, because the idea making its way, more and more the "superior" man was called for only govern and not to dominate. This is fortunately what we find more and more in the stimulus of our current governments, but also what we have to expect for the future, without being content with "great men" with great "appearances", **as God had put it in place in the time of the Judges on Israel and that He would have wished it to continue.**

What has changed, and what we must remember as the most important with the hindsight that we have, is the birth of this new look on themselves that were able to receive all these millions of men within the people at that time and those to come.

Without this recoil, and if we deepen a little more, we would risk drawing a synthesis identical to that of a certain Karl Marx on whom our eyes will soon look at.

Many of the agricultural day laborers who had put all their savings into the purchase a small amount of land, often of poor quality, began to realize that they had fallen into a trap. Each had wanted to be a proprietor, and most of them had run after independence and happiness, abandoning the sure gain which their work from the farmers gave them, but found only misery. For others by contrast, the rich bourgeois who had "equipped themselves" with the purchase of abundant land (clergy, then national property 1789 to end 1793), we were going find them few year later in 1799, at the eve of 18 Brumaire (November 9), who was going to see the coup d'état of a Bonaparte First Consul, gather under the slogan **"I must have a king, because I am owner."** Madame de Stael noted it without tenderness, but not without humor: "The great strength of the heads of state in France is the prodigious taste that one has for occupying places [...]. Everything that is distinguishing one man from another is particularly pleasing to the French, there is no nation to which equality is less suitable, they have proclaimed it to take the place of the former superiors, they wanted to change from inequality...".

This revolution that was not ending any, was going to find in Bonaparte the one which it was needing to it to conclude. **But, what a conclusion for those who were going to analyse the results! Let's have a look!**

The Bonapartism indeed created through the personal power, an amalgam of monarchical tradition and sham of democratic. The First Consul governed and reigned in the manner of an enlightened sovereign who conceded to the accomplished fact of the Revolution, to surround himself with republican forms, but thus created a very ambiguous situation. The progressively monarchical attitude of his power, the reestablishment of a life of court, from the Consulate to the proclamation of the hereditary Empire and the coronation, all of course was the materialization of a

dream of absolute power going up to assume the forms of a universal domination, and to resurrect archaisms; Napoleon taking himself for a new Charlemagne.

The proclamation of the Empire and the perpetual reinforcement of personal power, were however all manners of consolidating the achievements of the Revolution in France and defying the European Counterrevolution. The coronation and anointment, in this perspective, is interpreted less as a masquerade around an parvenu, than as a singularly daring political act by which the Revolution was going to take again from its adversaries their own weapons.

Many freedoms were however taken again, the freedom of expression was brutally reduced; from the beginning of 1800, 60 out of 73 Parisian newspapers were suppressed, and the survivors did not have to publish articles "contrary to the social pact, to the sovereignty of the people and to the glory of the armies," and many of them "the Moniteur" or "Journal des débats" were sheets "inspired" by the imperial power.

But Napoleon, very quickly, went much further. He cared about to define a social and political elite on a basis that was not that of the feudal nobility **"not on the distinctions of the blood, which is an imaginary nobility, since there is only one race of men, he said! Nor that of wealth, "of which one cannot make a title, of all aristocracies, that one seemed to me the worst,"** will say the Emperor at St. Helena, having always considered, or pretended to considered, that the various forms of fortune, whether movable or immovable, arose from their origins in robbery and rapine.

The genius of the workman being nevertheless to know how to use the materials he has at hand, the families of the former nobility entered however, **because of their "ready-made fortunes" and their influence had to be put to the service of the government, which was not rich enough to pay everyone.**

The foundations of the imperial aristocracy were thus the personal merit and the "service" provided to the state. Thus he proclaimed, "Our epoch is that of merit; we must let the sons of the peasants go up with talents and services in the first rank... Wherever I found talent and courage, I raised and put it in its place. My principle was to keep the career open to talent. Thus will be born a "historical" and "national" nobility, substituting to the parchments the "beautiful actions, and to the private interests the interests of the fatherland".

Napoleon therefore saw in the creation of an aristocracy of a new type, just as in the institution of a hereditary Empire, not a reaction or treason towards the Revolution, but, on the contrary, a consolidation of the new order. "The institution of a national nobility was not contrary to equality" for him; it was "eminently liberal and at one and the same time able to consolidate the social order and to annihilate the vain pride of the nobility". It was one of those "masses of granite" which he intended to throw on the soil of France to definitively establish the republic. In a mixture, which was quite in his authoritarian manner, in the affirmation of the principles and the cynicism of their execution, he found in the temperament of the French the justification for a new scale of titles: **"They need distinctions because it is with rattles that men are led."**

From 1804 until 1808, that is to say from the proclamation of the empire until the decree on the organization of the imperial nobility, Napoleon's social policy developed with greater complexity, including the Legion of Honor itself in a meticulously hierarchical system. At the top: The family of Napoleon Bonaparte. Around her: **"an organization of the imperial palace in conformity to the dignity of the throne and the greatness of the nation."** A Court to which Napoleon assigned as a function, however very badly fulfilled, to set the tone for French society by setting an example, at the top of the fusion of the elites. In the first rank of the great officers, eighteen marshals whose promotion meant both, firstly all the price attached by the Emperor to titles acquired on the field of honor, and secondly the importance he gave to the army. as an instrument of social elevation.

At the time of the creation of the first noble titles in 1807, he made Marshal Lefebvre, duke of Gdańsk on purpose, because he said: "This marshal had been a simple soldier, and everyone in Paris had known him sergeant at the French guards ". The mere fact of belonging to the Legion of Honor conferred the title of Knight, the lowest in the ladder. The civil services found just as much their place and their rewards, in the 1500 or so holders, excluded knights, created in eight years: Talleyrand became prince of Benevento alongside a Berthier prince of Neuchâtel; Fouché was Duke of Otranto, or Gaudin, Duke of Gaeta, among so many marshals-dukes; At the ranks of

count and baron, the prefects, mayors, general councilors, and high officials mingled with the generals.

It was at the level of imperial nobility's organization that the most equivocal aspects of Napoleonic social legislation were located. Being very preoccupied, indeed, with putting "his" nobility in a state of maintaining as regards appearances the competition of the old aristocracy and of resulting in a fusion of the elements, the Emperor incontestably transgressed the principle of civil equality and reintroduced into France the features of feudalism identical to the preceding ones. This was particularly the case with the inheritance of nobiliary titles (Royal and noble ranks), the creation of large hereditary fiefdoms with substitution of the domain and transmission of the title to the eldest son, the distribution of annuity endowments, the institution of majorats over the on the initiative of the government or at the request of private individuals, in other words, of inalienable family property intended to guarantee to the heir of a title of nobility a fortune sufficient to honor this title, & c. It should also be noted that the most abundantly awarded title of "Baron" was not hereditary; That this of Chevalier could be attributed on simple justification of an income of 3 000 francs a year; that the fiefs and endowments were most often confiscated on the vassal kingdoms, therefore in foreign land.

The fate of the population had in opposite not really changed. As the rural exodus was not yet begun, as was the case in England, the population of the cities was only fifteen to twenty per cent. The eighty-five percent, therefore, continued to pile up in the plains and mountains. The misery of some crowded rural districts was more important phenomenon than that of the urban misery of the workers, at a time when the industrial Revolution was only in its infancy.

The peasants had wished, with passion and sometimes with fury, to free themselves from the feudal and seigniorial exploitation, from the burden of the tithe, the champart (the amount due varied between $\frac{1}{6}$ and $\frac{1}{12}$, and typically $\frac{1}{8}$ of the cereal crop) and other taxes. On this point, some of them had obtained only a purely verbal satisfaction. The appellation of taxes had indeed disappeared from the vocabulary, but not from the economic reality for all those sharecroppers and farmers who were obliged to take leased land. The revolutionary legislation, from the Constituent Assembly to the Convention and then to the Directory, had, in effect, left the owner- lessor free to introduce into the contracts, mark-up clauses transferring to his profit the burden represented by the royalties quoted. This situation having been combined with a continuous increase in rents whose value was linked to the grain prices movement, **only the owner, and not the farmer, had thus benefited from their abolition. The historian Albert Soboul (1914-1982), emphasized those facts in which the bourgeoisie of the owners, urban or rural, consolidated feudalism in its economic form, the consequences of the support of the wealthy elements of estates of the Third Estate, who still conceived , consciously or not, the Revolution as a transfer or extension of privileges to new privileged people.**

Let's add to this that, under the Consulate and the Empire, the return of a certain number of emigrants to what remained of their lands and the restoration of the prestige of the clergy developed in the countryside, particularly in the West and the Southwest, an atmosphere of reaction, a deaf threat of re-feudalization, a moral pressure from the lord of the manor and the parish priest. They kept, in campaigns which asked only to live under a conservative regime, a ferment of revolutionary agitation, which the only appearances of Napoleonic authority did not suffice to appease. Other elements of discontent, of which the regime was itself the source, came also to sour the small owners such as the tax inquisition which was the source of local troubles, in the vineyard regions by the perception of the new rights on drinks, as well as a total hardness of the collector in the recovery of the land contribution. It was customary for him to be paid in services or in kind for the interests of delays in the payment of dues, or that he recalls, by sending of military detachments, the worst memories of the Ancient regime.

It's evident that the image of the French Revolution and its direct evolution towards the more or less well-disguised dictatorship of the first Napoleonic Empire that one receives on school benches, resembles only weakly the summary of the very a good book referenced in the bibliography, which highlights the social repercussions, beyond the perpetual wars. In this way, we find again the currents of thought that certain contemporary observers of this period, attached to hasty and concrete results, were able to bring out prematurely. We have certainly already touched on the basic awareness of the people and their human dignity, in relation to that of the simple

"domestic" ever more domestic, but it was largely covered up by the aims of a bourgeoisie more concerned to equip itself, than to liberate the people.

The philosophy already rich in the eighteenth century of utopian ideas, was therefore not going to remain indifferent from the analyzes and conclusions to be drawn from this great lesson in history and civilization. If there had been nothing particularly concrete for centuries to sustain these currents of thought, there was now matter to great reflections.

The philosopher's peculiarity being his idealistic character of the developed theory, he becomes with fragility above average, if he feels an implementation in opposition to his ideals, going so far as to justify the limits of his own theory. I do not say so beforehand in order to be able to accuse the various philosophers that we will quote from too much haste to analyze, but on the contrary, so that no one judges them in their ideals, and burden them with the full responsibility of the revolutions that this synthesis was going to bring about. Conflicts such as they had lived themselves were perhaps not without having marked them, as to the poor results obtained compared with the daily suffering lived by all the populations in the world for the only wellbeing of a few. Probably many of our contemporaries, confronted almost daily by their activities, in contact with such human misery, would easily dream that all this will one day stop. But is not this the proper of the man to seek the improvement of his living conditions? Is not it a little for this purpose that we are together? **Yet, not being able to change itself, and each being different from the other, can man really build himself an ideal universe to his own dimension?**

To name but a few of these philosophers, they called themselves Saint Simon ¹ or Hegel ². The first, although of a somewhat distant ideology, was to give birth to our current French socialist party, as for the second, his work was going to be one of the most important in the current of ideas to which a certain Karl Marx ³ was going to adhere as well as his friend and work companion less known Engel ⁴.

1) Saint-Simon: (Claude Henri de Rouvroy, Earl of Saint-Simon), philosopher and French economist (Paris 1760-1825). He took part in the war of American independence and from the beginning of the French revolution; he broke with his nobility state. Basing himself on a religion of science and the constitution of a new class of industrialists, he sought to define a planning and technocratic socialism [Catéchisme des Industriels (Industrialists) 1823-24], which had a great influence on certain industrialists of the Second Empire.

2) Hegel (Friedrich), German philosopher (Stuttgart 1770-Berlin 1831). His philosophy identifies being and thought in a single principle, the concept; of the latter, Hegel describes development by means of dialectic, of which he makes not only a rational method of thought, but the very life of the concept and its history. We owe him: The Phenomenology of Spirit or the phenomenology of the mind (1807), The Science of Logic (1812-1816), Elements of the Philosophy of Right (1821).

3) Marx (Karl), philosopher, economist and theorist of the German Socialist (Trier 1818-London 1883) born of a Jewish lawyer father, converted to Protestantism to practice his profession of lawyer. Inspired by Hegel's dialectic, while criticizing his philosophy of history, he discovered Feuerbach's critique of religion, Saint-Simon's socialism, and Adam Smith's economy. He thus progressively elaborates "Historical Materialism", that is to say the scientific theory of all social science (Thesis on Feuerbach, 1845, German Ideology, 1846, Misery of Philosophy, 1847). In contact with the working class, he wrote with Friedrich Engels The Manifesto of the Communist Party (1848). Expelled from Germany then from France, he fled to Great Britain, where he wrote Class Struggles in France (1850), Foundations of Criticism of Political Economy (written in 1858, published in 1939-1941) and published in 1867 the first of the three volumes of his great work, Capital. In 1864, he was one of the leading leaders of the First International and gave him his objective: the abolition of capitalism. For Karl Marx, human history is based on the class struggle: the proletariat, if it wants to eliminate the exploitation of which it is the victim, must organize itself at the international level, seize power and, at during this phase (dictatorship of the proletariat), abolish the classes themselves, which will lead to the ultimate phase, in which the state will extinguish itself (The communism). The doctrine of Marx was baptized against his will Marxism.

4) Engels (Friedrich), German socialist theorist (Barmen, now integrated in Wuppertal, 1820 - London 1895), friend of Karl Marx. He wrote the *Situation of the Working Class in England* (1845), where some ideas-forces of Marxism were elaborated. He writes together with Marx, *The Holy Family* (1845), the *German ideology* (1845-46) where he lays the foundations of Historical Materialism, and the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* (1848).

He attacks the theses of E. Dühring in the *Anti-Dühring* (1878), and analyzes dialectical materialism (the *Dialectic of Nature*, 1873-1883, published in 1925). He ensures the publication of *Capital* after the death of Marx. He continues the historical reflection of Marxism in the *Origin of the Family, State Property*, (1884). He is at the center of the creation of the Second International.

The whole of their works was going produce the advents of communism in a Russia of the tsars remained in a disconcerting feudalism, until the beginning of the twentieth century, and generate the USSR (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), one of the two Major world powers for seventy years.

For those who have read at least the description of their work above-mentioned, there can be no doubt that these different characters were not short of passion for their ideal. However, there is one thing that life can learn, "all passion devours, what surrounds the passionate, but also the people around him". In other words, some of those I was, are saying "The end justifies the means". Even if we do not have to question certain proverbs in their maxims, the precepts that emerge from them are not always of a dimension to the glory of God. They can indeed bring into their everyday uses a relation in which the value of the human being disappears, and lead to certain heresies of our history, that of humanity.

It is important not conclude that these men had forgotten this essential value that we owe to the human being, perhaps even they were too attached to it, as an almost hereditary injustice, an injustice of god if he had existed or at least an injustice that he allowed to do. Many of them, moreover, classed this "god" as an ideology full of superstitions of weak cowards who were afraid of death, as was my case before my own meeting with Jesus. Like these philosophers, I always interpreted to their disadvantage, the behavior of the rich that I judged in their selfishness, without realizing that my gaze was sometimes more distorted by my own egocentrism than by their bad behavior. Like these philosophers, I always analyzed my own frustrations to the detriment of the greedy and manipulative dominant classes, recommending themselves from a god who did not exist, to better fool and enslave their fellow men.

If for my part I was always motivated by the only necessity of bringing out anyone of his heresy of believing in the one everyone called God, in order to bring it into what I considered freedom, others, like these more passionate philosophers that I of the future of the greatest number, endeavored not only to demonstrate the necessity to eradicate the idea of the existence of God by any good human will, intelligent and scientific, but introducing to their ideology, some inhuman rights which justified it. The notions of the Divine Law no longer existing at their level, so they added to their bitter rantings, ravings and inhuman utopias that others were going interpret as a right of justice to eliminate the rich declared manipulative because of their only wealth. Like gods upholder of their own law, they gave themselves the right of life and death, and in the following decades, they were going undertake an extermination that they considered just, of those who had always fooled them, and often mistreated, in the name of this god. which did not exist.

As we will see later, it is certainly not because of their only unreason that they were going to be led to the abominations of 1917 that everyone knows, but also because of the great stubbornness of those who thought themselves invested with divine rights, the reason why God did not want human kings, so let's not go too fast.

What these philosophers did not know, because of having for hastily rejecting Him, is that God gives intelligence and clairvoyance to him who asks it to Him, but not to the one who does not believe of Him. He who believes that he possesses all quality in himself, by his instruction or by his own analyzes of life, receives an intelligence limited to the man, to the human spirit, and not to the Spirit of God, as we shall see. over the next chapters.

Through the result of this first revolution, they saw only a tomfoolery of history. The few little advantages acquired by the people were not very different from the long and derisory path taken by the English for one or other of the methods to be plausible in the long term. Idealists of a social

equality, key to them of all the happiness, the various situations of the time had begun to prove to them that the source of all the human miseries was actually called: God!

From the period of 1789 and its counter-reaction, by the Empire and then paroxysm of the irony for them, a new monarchy; their analyzes were making good progress. They were going all the more mark the last born that were Karl Marx or Engel, that before the stabilization of the intellectual redundancy, a new earthquake was going strengthen them in their conclusions, and especially to bring them the convictions of the need of another type of action for setting up their ideal.

A concept that they had perhaps too minimized, had nevertheless been created in the collective memory of the French, "Only the republic was favorable to the people". So this people reached the revolution of 1848, always led by the bourgeoisie, to put in place the object of their hopes: the "Republic", and in addition: the "Good Republic"!

Of "good", it got perhaps the idea, this revolution of 1848, but as for the republic, the second, it was going soon behave a little like its older sister of 1792. Unemployment was already very present, and the employment of the unemployed was going be done, as some would like to see it implemented still today, by jobs in public good tasks, then called "National Workshops".

The execution was going to be entrusted to Mary as Minister of Public Works. He immediately began to enlist the unemployed Parisians, for whom he used young pupils of the Central School to supervise them. It seems, however, that Marie saw in the National Workshops so conceived, not only the advantage of not attacking the rights of private employers, but also of subtracting a large number of unemployed Parisians from the seductions of the street, political clubs and socialist manifestations. Conversely, on the socialist side, this type of maneuver and the conservative orientation of the government were very early on perceived.

The reply was formulated by a popular demonstration which demanded the creation of a Ministry of Labor, that is, the explicit introduction of social reforms as to be part of State's duty. The government escaped to this, by granting it much less: the creation of a commission composed of workers' delegates who were going to sit with dignity at the Palace of the Luxembourg (seat of the Senate), in the chairs of the peers of France, under the presidency of Louis Blanc ¹ and Albert ², who would study social problems.

Certainly, Louis Blanc remained a member of this supreme collective executive that was the Provisional Government but beyond what was a minority, he still had no ministerial department to manage, so no hold on a portion of real. In Luxembourg, problems were indeed studied, some arbitrations useful in minor social conflicts, were fulfilled, and the various socialist theories of time were exposed at length and public, which greatly contributed to frighten the bourgeois. **As will indeed write Karl Marx, two years later with bitterness, "While in Luxembourg they were looking for the Philosopher's stone, one struck at the City hall, the currency that was current..."**.

1) Louis Blanc, historian and French politician (Madrid 1811-Cannes 1882). Won over to the socialist ideas, he contributed by his writings (History of ten years, 1841-1844) to join the growing number of the opposition against the monarchy of July. Member of the provisional government, in February 1848, he saw his project of National Workshops fail, and had to go into exile after the June days. Returning to France in 1870, he was a extreme left-wing MP in the National Assembly.

2) Albert, a highly controversial mechanic worker, put in subordinate position in the Provisional Government, as if to give the exchange to a competing list, in a bourgeois majority.

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

From the day after the elections for the establishment of the National Constituent Assembly of April 23, the first bloodsheds were going to take place in Rouen, then ravaged by the crisis, and total and massive unemployment. The Commissioner of the Republic, Deschamps, who had organized National Workshops for the relief of the workers, was popular among them, and he was among those few who inclined to socialism. The bourgeoisie, whose leader was the Attorney General Senard, Republican of the finely-shaded of the National, (party in opposition to socialism) was exasperated by the new taxes which were used to cover the expense of National Workshops, it is true, little productive if not as a work of charity. The account was settled during the elections:

Senard and his party were elected, Deschamps and his friends beaten, the votes of the entire department easily overwhelmed those of the city center. On April 26, the results known, a workers' demonstration took place in front of the city hall.

Did the workers want, as was said, to protest the outcome of the vote, or even to impose the appointment of Deschamps, or more likely, to recall their needs and protest preemptively against the suppression of the National Workshops (their only resource); suppression that the victory of the men of "order" allowed to predict?

They were driven roughly back by the National Guard, remained of bourgeois composition. The confused blows carried in the rush and then the cavalry charges were felt as a provocation by the workers, who, ending their central manifestation returned to their quarters, where they raised barricades. In the evening and the next day, Sénard will require the troop, and even the cannon, and the barricades will be swept without loss for the law enforcement, but at the cost of a dozen dead workers.

Our attention to this event is not as disproportionate as it seems: it is an important thing in itself, not as a difference of opinion between Republican groups, but as the first bloody conflict, which broke on a line of class struggle, the euphoria of the new fraternity, on which the people had mobilized themselves.

What happened in Rouen in April was going to happen again in June of that same year in Paris. From that first date, the liquidation of National Workshops had become the main concern of the majority. First, because it wanted to end social experiments, even lost, and especially since they were expensive! Secondly, because their second function of political neutralization played only less and less: do not we see reconciliations between workers of the National Workshops and workers of the socialist clubs? Did not we also hear, in some of their gatherings, cries of "Long live Napoleon!"? Lastly, the third reason, the fear; in Lamartine's entourage was the daring idea of linking the question of National Workshops to that of the railways: this manpower would have been used on the railway yards interrupted by the crisis, but that the state would have taken over.

1) Lamartine: Alphonse de Prêt de Lamartine (known as Lamartine): poet, diplomat and French politician (Mâcon 1790 / Paris 1869). Deputy member of the National Assembly opposed to the regime, he published in 1847 a "History of Girondins". February 24, 1848, it is he who proclaims the republic at the City Hall of Paris. Member of the Provisional Government in 1848, in the post of Minister of Foreign Affairs, he lost his charisma after the "Days of June". After a bitter failure in the presidential elections, he abandons politics and returns to his first love, poetry.

The merits that the poet finds in this solution are already sensed: humanity (liquidating the National Workshops without too much drama) and economic progressivism (the great work of the railways, for which he had almost Saint-Simonian sentiments). But the majority of the Assembly did not want a nationalization, which would have felt too much socialism to the detriment of the bourgeoisie; perhaps it did not want to avoid the tragedy.

To read certain statements of the time, certain Memoirs or Recollections, including those of Karl Marx or Henri Guillemin, one can also have the impression that the drama was not only accepted, but provoked: the dissolution of the National Workshops, the almost certain revolt that would ensue and the repression that would come in turn, would definitely remove the threats of the street and socialism. In any case, it was the plan that it went. The game was conducted, in the name of the majority of the Assembly of which the monarchist right was the marching wing, by a special commission whose the reporter was the Comte de Falloux.

On the government side, less account was taken of the Executive Commission than of the ministers, and especially of the new Minister of War, General Cavaignac.¹ This character became then the man of the day. Military through and through, fiercely antisocialist and friend of "the order", he had on the other generals the additional advantage of being clearly Republican, as son of Conventional and brother of a fervent activist of the years 30. Now, given the composition of the Assembly, the Republic was a guarantor whose "order" could not yet to go without.

1) General Louis Eugene de Cavaignac (Paris 1802 - Ourne, 1857). Minister of War during the Second Republic, he was invested in June 1848 with dictatorial powers, which allowed him to

crush the workers' insurrection, then was appointed head of the executive power. Candidate for the presidency of the Republic, he was defeated in December by Louis Napoleon, future Emperor Napoleon III.

On the 21st of June, the dissolution of the National Workshops was declared, and the workers were left with the sole faculty to enlist in the army or of clearing the marshy Sologne.

The desperation of the workers, had first expressed on the 22nd by rallies and parades in the streets, then on the 23rd by the setting up of barricades. A fierce three-day battle then began along the north-south line which, at the level of the City Hall, separated the bourgeois Paris of the west from the eastern workers' Paris. The Mobile guard, the National guard of the bourgeois quarters, and especially the army, went into action, with a slowness perhaps calculated.

In a private conversation reported by Victor Hugo in his *Things seen*, Lamartine was clearly accusing Cavaignac of having allowed the riot to swell, as if to be able to give the repression more scope. On the 26th, at noon, the battle was won, after heavy losses, but, as always, unequally shared, especially since many insurgents had been massacred after the combat.

1) Victor Hugo: Great French novelist, Peer of France (1802-1885) He developed his work in many genres. Led by a moralist and visionary ideal, he generally tried to express through his works a political meaning. A fervent Christian of anticlerical faith, he dispersed into occult practices, particularly after the death of his daughter Léopoldine at the age of 19.

On the side of the "order", where one had wanted to see in the insurrection an explosion of brigandage and savagery, the good conscience was perfect, and the rebel workers were imputed not only to the killing of two men generals, but also that of the Archbishop of Paris, Mgr. Affre, struck during an attempt at mediation by a bullet fired from a house of the Faubourg by an isolated stranger.

If Saint-Simon and Hegel had then died for twenty-five years, this did not fail to confirm the "already understood" of Karl Marx and Engel. For these idealists who were going the master thinkers of the Soviet revolution of October, a far greater farce was still prepared by the arrival of the first presidential elections.

For most partisans of a constitution, the French Washington could only be Cavaignac, but Cavaignac was a republican, and most of the ruling classes had not yet taken sides for the republic. The right of the Assembly, separating itself from the men of the National, constituted themselves into a committee and began to monopolize the expression of party of the "order". The royalists adhered to it all the more easily since none of the two dynasties possible at that time offered pretenders who were willing or able to run the chance of universal suffrage, and that the monarchy remained in the majority idea, the keystone necessary for a serious conservative system. The party of "the order" therefore decided to adopt as candidate for the presidency of the Republic Louis Napoleon Bonaparte.

His career as an adventurer, the debts of which he was covered, his physical appearance itself, quite ungrateful, in which nothing at first revealed his intellectual aptitudes or his will, all this made one think that one will always have governance on him. Moreover, the popularity of his name among the masses, a little disturbing in itself, was obviously advantageous in this circumstance.

The political maneuvering was going 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, presented single-handed (8 000).

On December 20 Cavaignac left the role of leader of the Provisional Government and the President of the Republic took possession of it. The Constituent Assembly acclaimed the first as a new Cincinnatus, and it received with an attentive gravity the official oath of the second: Louis Napoleon Bonaparte solemnly swore to remain faithful to the Constitution, this Constitution which was formally obliging him to become again four years later, a citizen like the others.

The outcome, although known, can appear to us to be very ridiculous today. Before the four-year deadline, this Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, this adventurer, was going of course conducting his coup d'état. He was even carrying the joke until to do it, at the same time perhaps as a mystical superstition, at the same time perhaps as a prefiguration of his second crime, to accomplish it on

December 2, 1851, the anniversary of the imperial coronation of 1804, of the victory of Austerlitz in 1805, and its future imperial coronation thus in 1852.

How was it possible that such inconsistencies did not mark the observers who were our philosophers? Was this December 2nd something other than a repetition of history?

Karl Marx, one of the first, make short work of this analogy by naming Louis Bonaparte's Eighteenth Brumaire the following he gave to his work, "Class conflict in France." The parallel could go further, moreover. Had not we seen the image of these left-wing extremists called "Montagnards" in 1792? **For this philosopher, it was the whole of the second Republic, and not only its final episode, which had the value of repetitive jest; Ledru-Rollin (1843) after Robespierre (1793), as Badinguet¹ (nickname of Napoleon III) after Napoleon, it was the farce after the tragedy.**

1) Badinguet: Nickname attributed to Napoleon III and which was none other than the name of the worker who lent him his clothes during his escape in 1846 from Fort Ham, according to one of the two versions given.

Before taking the next step and the revolution of October 1917, given the hindsight we have today, we must draw a less severe pre-conclusion from the second Republic, because it brought a rooting of the Republican idea and an example of mass lived, which the former had not really highlighted. The republican idea overflowed the intellectual elites, those of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois cadres organized in post or neo-Jacobine societies, in order to win mass popular sympathies in some regions. This did not go without complicating the problem for the most hesitant to the republic, because by winning the people, the republican idea was necessarily combined with the other aspirations of the people, social aspirations, aspirations to greater welfare, without extinguishing during its three years of life, the idea that had emerged in 1848.

In the explosion of spontaneous expressions that accompanied the insurrections of December 1851, a formula often came back indeed: the "good", the "good republic", "We are going to bring back the good republic"... What was that to say, except that the republic that governed France from May 48 to December 51 by keeping the people in their usual difficulties of life was not the "good", not the true, not the real, in other words that the true republic could only be a republic favorable to the people of modest means?

The lessons learned by the French were going certainly to bring much more than Karl Marx could have foreseen, since his synthesis of events led his followers to make a clean sweep of every form of rich persons and their wealth to come to life again from the ashes a new civilization, beautiful. Once again, this man enlightened in the perception of the heresies of the hour, would give birth in the heart of many, to an even more heretical practice, for the realization of the "happiness" of each one. Contrary to the socialist methods that will be much harder to impose later, because more reasonable and gentler in their creation, **his determination to create an ideal world forever marked human history with a deep mark. This one, however, may appear to us today as having been necessary, by the only fact that it has enabled the world, to measure how impossible it is for man to set up by force, what God wants to do by Love!**

Another people was going to take over from the French people to be the demonstrator of that. A people very poor, moreover, but a people, I was a witness of it, who were made up of formidable men and women, and yet not more honest than others.

It is true that one who is already in misery, does not risk anything much! If the French had to complain, there are now more than two centuries, just eighty-five years ago, this people lived the throes of a monarchy not even worthy of our thirteenth or fourteenth century. Its king was not called king, but tsar, who comes from the Latin Caesar. **They claimed to be descendants of Augustus, the anointed of the Lord, and received worship to the "worshipped" Tsar, like the Oriental sovereigns.**

With 174 million subjects and 21,784,000 km², the Russian half-European and half-Asian empire was a complex and original world in 1914. Tsarism was a dictatorial system of government, [...] however difficult to compare with the French monarchy of the old regime.

Russia until 1905 received no democratic structure, no egalitarian tradition. In the struggle against the domination of the Mongols in the fifteenth century, the princes of Moscow unified Russia and

created a centralized and despotic state. Resulting from nobility, tsarism continued to be its protective shield while reducing it to a relatively negligible political role.

Ivan III (known as the Great) ¹ had married Sophia Palaiologina, the niece of the last Byzantine emperor, in second marriage. He proclaimed himself "tsar of all the Russias" successor of the Byzantine Empire. Autocrat he adopted the rites and ceremonial of the Byzantine court. His coat of arms was also of Byzantine origin: the two-headed eagle. From the Byzantine tradition the tsars preserved not only the whole of titles, the ceremonial, the symbols, but also methods of government, hence the importance of court intrigues, secrecy, bureaucracy, worship to the tsar "worshiped", as the Eastern sovereigns.

1) Ivan III (called the Great) (1462-1505), liberated Russia from Mongol suzerainty (1480) and adopted the autocratic title of tsar, making him an absolute ruler. Married to the niece of the last Byzantine emperor, name given to the Eastern Roman Empire whose capital was Constantinople and which lasted from 395 to 1453, he wanted to be the heir of Byzantium. **This Christian and Greco-Eastern empire** extended in the 6th century to the Balkans, Asia Minor and the Near East, from Syria to Egypt, as well as to the south of Italy, Sicily and North Africa. He reached his golden age in the tenth and eleventh centuries and then declined, whereas prevailed a new international order dominated by the Latin Occident.

Until 1905, tsarist despotism was total. The imperial family was numerous and constituted the "imperial house of Russia". The tsar was the largest landowner in the country and his private possessions were added "imperial's possessions", state property intended to support the members of the imperial family. The court intrigues played an important role in the government of the empire and this phenomenon became even more widespread in the early twentieth century under the reign of Nicholas II. He was 46 years old in 1914 and had been reigning since 1894. **Of mediocre value, he finds hardly any defender nowadays. Full of his authority, he conceived of his role as that of an absolute despot.**

Upon his accession, he declared: "Let everyone know, that devoting all my strength to the happiness of my people, I will defend the principles of the autocracy as immutably as the late father, I openly proclaim it." It was a dictatorship that did not leave little space for the slightest freedom, even the most formal.

At the borders, a severe surveillance was carried out on all travelers carrying newspapers, magazines, books. Pages of books judged to be subversive were cut off; it was passed on newspaper articles, stamps loaded with a greasy printing ink, then sprinkled with sand, so that they were no longer legible. The most diverse information until the worldly notebooks were "blue-penciled".

Publications in "colonial" languages, meaning those of the non-Russian nationalities of the Empire, were assimilated to foreign publications. To escape censorship, copied manuscripts were passed at the great risk of his freedom. A large number of books, newspapers and magazines were printed abroad. This was particularly the case of the newspaper *Kolokol* (Колокол - The Bell) of Herzen; Russian revolutionary writer who died in exile in Paris in 1870. Often the authors preferred to censor themselves to avoid publication bans.

Self-censorship had thus become the most pernicious form of censorship. The reading of Darwin was prohibited, however in 1872 Marx's *Capital* was authorized, but in German language. The censor, a little in a hurry, had probably not seen a malice in a very arduous work of political economy. This was however the first shell fired against the Winter Palace.

Arbitrary arrests were par for the course, and convictions for political offenses very heavy: the prison, deportation to Siberia, in some cases the exile could be pronounced without trial, it was enough for that to proclaim the state of siege. At times, police surveillance was carried out on the families of the convicts, victims themselves, in some cases, of the repression. Nothing protected the individual against the omnipotence of the state, the bureaucrats and the police officers.

The Orthodox Church, with the bureaucracy, the police and the army, was one of the four main pillars of the regime. All the subjects of the empire were certainly not orthodox; there were the Jews (about 5 million), the Catholics of Poland and the Baltic States, the Muslims of the Caucasus and Central Asia, the Protestants of Finland and the Baltic States, but it enjoyed many privileges.

It was a state church and the tsar was the head of the Orthodox Church as the Lord's anointed. As the first councilor of Nicolas II, Pobiedonostsev, wrote at the end of the century: **"The state cannot confine itself to representing the material interests of society, because it would then strip itself of its moral strength and destroy its spiritual union with the nation, and it is only on this condition that the people maintain a sense of legality, respect for the law and confidence in power. "**

This Orthodox Church was born in 1054 from the schism of the 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 that time were probably important in the eyes of theologians, but to the outside observer they did not seem fundamental.

Under the domination of the whole system, the people were kept in a very great destitution. Living conditions, even survival, were extremely difficult, especially for women. As the Great Russian poet Nekrasov wrote in the middle of the nineteenth century, the situation of the woman was particularly dramatic: "Ah! It is a poor lot that your lot, Russian woman, where to find more painful fate? That before the age you are wilted, nothing astonishing, Mother of the Russian people able to bear everything, Mother suffering so much suffering! "

Famine remained threatening and famine was not uncommon. The health situation was catastrophic. There was a shortage of doctors in rural areas. The epidemics of typhus and cholera were frequent. In 1910, there were 185,000 cases of cholera for the whole empire. Malaria and scabies have durably raged. For example, in 1910, there were 225,000 cases of malaria in the Samara government, 167,000 in Saratov, 400,000 cases of scabies in the Viatka government.

The outward splendor of Russian civilization in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries must not conceal the real situation experienced by the people, and in particular the fact that culture was reserved only to a tiny minority. **Lenin ¹ considered, not without reason, I quote: that "there is no longer, anywhere in Europe outside of Russia, only one country so savage, where the popular masses are so profoundly devoid of education, culture and general knowledge. "**

Aulard, the French historian on the Revolution of 1789, noted precisely in a collective work published in 1922: **The History of the Soviets, "that from an intellectual point of view, the night was deeper in Russia of 1917 than in the France of 1789 "**.

1) Lenin (Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov, known as), Russian politician (Simbirsk 1870, Gorky 1924). In 1888 he joined a Marxist circle, spent three years in deportation to Siberia (1897-1900) and then to Switzerland, where he founded the newspaper Iskra (Искра - The Spark) and displayed in "What to do?", (1902), his centralized conception of the Revolutionary Party. This one wins at the second RSDLP Congress (Russian Social Democratic Labor Party) (1903) and Lenin's followers now form the Bolshevik faction of the party, opposed to its Menshevik faction. Set for a time in Paris (1908-1911), then in Krakow, he returned to Switzerland in 1914 and traces to the Russian revolutionaries their aim: to fight the war and turn it into a revolution. In April 1917, he crossed Germany and returned to Petrograd, where he imposed his views on P.O.S.D.R. and the soviets, and directs the October uprising. President of the Council of People's Commissars (Oct. Nov. 1917-1924), he signed with Germany the peace of Brest-Litovsk and considered international expansion of the revolutionary movement, creating the Communist International (1919). But the civil war in Russia and the failure of the revolutionary movement in Europe led him to devote himself to the construction of socialism in the USSR, which he founded in 1922. After the period of "war communism" (1918- 1921), it adopts in the face of economic difficulties and internal resistance, the New Economic Policy, or "NEP". In 1922, Lenin was stricken by Hemiplegia. Man of action, he was also a theorist (materialism and Empiricriticism, 1909; imperialism, the supreme Stage of Capitalism, 1916; The state and the Revolution, 1917; the infantile disease of communism, the "Leftism", 1920).

This so poor and unfortunate people was going therefore serve as an example to the world in this tragic utopia, both in its "**purification**" phase and in that of so-called "**socialist**" ¹ **practice, which never happened**, but remained until the last breath under the influence of an authoritarian government. Tragic, because it began in bloodshed, a very useless blood, just as 1789 was for France, but even more perhaps because of the moral asphyxia that the system put in place produced in this large population. It may also have made some people aware of their value as a

man, but it is still too early to realize that. **What she created, on the other hand, were other bourgeois, no more certainly honest than those of whom Napoleon spoke.**

1) Socialist period that never happened: For memory, in the initial communist ideology, this utopian period was supposed to occur from itself after the period of "purification", so much happiness would be great in a people thus edified.

A curtain rises however for humanity, and that is obviously what we must look at. This veil of violence, placed before the human spirit to better dominate it, is manifested by itself through these examples of the bloodthirsty revolutions, which brought or the first Napoleonic Empire or the Second Empire still Napoleonic or the Proletarian Empire. No doubt we must banish the idea that emerges and any form of revolution, which were and will remain only parenthesis of history, but destructive parenthesis. What prevailed over the humanist socialism of "good feeling", itself limited as we shall see later, was none other than the human spirit in all its misery. A spirit often devoid of common sense, because it can reproduce only what it knows, whereas what it knows is none other than what prints it, deforms it, destroys it through its sufferings and its fears.

The man seeks what he covets at the others, and that is why, when he has received the object of his desires, he uses it even more badly than the one he was jealous of. **Happiness, on the other hand, is only ephemeral and does not mark us deeply if they are not located in God. That is why it is so difficult, until it is impossible to come out victorious from a revolution.** When, man demeans himself to follow his carnal impulses, the trap is closed sooner or later on his author, whether man or state.

These Philosophers, therefore, relied too much on common sense and human integrity. Could they imagine that some of them, sometimes those who appeared to be the most incorruptible persons, were precisely the ones who were going to behave the very opposite of the values they defended so fiercely?

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

God probes hearts and can give discernment to those who follow Him, whereas in their human psychological dimension they only had the suspicion at their disposal. **The natural man does not possess in himself the basic qualities on which these philosophers founded their theories.** They did not lack sincerity for all that, and perhaps they had a lot in common to an ideal that God wants to give to the world of tomorrow, but their process of setting up such a system and its management, are not from human dimension. What were they getting available, put at the disposal of everyone and especially the most humble? **Of God! But they did not know it!**

They did not know it because those who claimed themselves the worthy representatives of God had given reason to a monarchy that would have come as from God himself. From a God thus, who would have sought and wanted to crush the weak in favor of the always stronger! He who said "be submissive to one another", whereas this submission on earth only existed in the "dominating / crushed" sense by a worshiped monarchy as an idol, as if it were the very image of God on earth.

Jesus, His Son, said to us, "Love one another as I have loved you." What shall we say then of those who commended themselves as coming from Him, His disciples, His church, and supported the tyrants in His name, flouting all His precepts? We will not blame them anymore because just like us they were only men. If we would to stoop to condemn our peers in their mistakes, would we not take the risk of doing worse than them before God?

This bad carnal practice of the good precepts of God will soon disappear. In their too good human will and their precipitation due to their condemnation of this God, by confusion with those who claimed themselves His representatives, these sincere men who were our philosophers did not look to their predecessors, the apostles of Jesus Christ. We are not talking about their method of implementation which was opposed, but of the expected result. These apostles of whom we can look at the example and remember that they too, but led them by the Holy Spirit of God, began to live a beginning of social life.

This first system, just as the following was ephemeral, because the religiosity of man was soon going to prevail over the Spirit of God, just as in the second example, the personal egoism of man was not going to take delay in taking precedence over the diabolical illusion of the most sincere. Shall we say in this that God has not done better than man or vice versa? Or shall we simply say that it was not the time, and that God has left it for us so that more people can benefit?

We must first to take a postulate, God is not The One who wants to crush or destroy, but The One who wants us to grow up, to elevate us to His image, from whatever environment we come and from whatever race we are, we can all be His children. We alone forbid Him this happiness! The theory is one thing, the result is another, and will never be the same result for one who stoops to kill, rather than to Love.

There is another revolution that is growing in the world today by the new rise of the extremes and which have also borne already the name of "socialism", whose fruit we know. We have all already noticed the abominations on the people of God, in the person of Jews or Gypsies during the last world war. All remember, except their executioners! Shamelessly, as only the demon can do, they deny the story and rewrite it in their own way. Those appear as being very convinced and that is why they are convincing, but just as the masses had followed the bourgeois of 1789, they are followed by weak persons who often believe more in a religion of man than to true faith in God.

In an arrogant, but meaningless way, they place themselves as victims of classes already rejected by many as Hitler lashed out at the Jews, disabled persons or Gypsies. Because the history repeats itself, to pay homage to all the persecuted persons, past, present and unfortunately no doubt to come, we will finish this chapter, taking the time to read a text of Primo LEVI that speaks so well of human eloquence and the scourges it can convey.

No doubt he had learned it to his cost, but if only we all know how to take it into account: **"All we need to know, or remember that when they spoke in public Hitler and Mussolini were believed, applauded, admired, worshiped like gods.** They were "charismatic rulers", they possessed a mysterious power of seduction which owed nothing to the credibility or the accuracy of the remarks which they held but which came from the suggestive way in which they expressed them, to their eloquence, to their histrionic fluency, perhaps innate, perhaps patiently studied and perfected. The ideas they proclaimed were not always the same and were in general aberrant, stupid or cruel; and yet they were acclaimed and followed until their death by thousands of worshippers.

It must be remembered that these worshippers, and among them the zealous executors of inhuman order, were not born executioners, outwards exception they were not monsters, they were ordinary men. Monsters exist, but they are too few to be really dangerous; those who are really dangerous are the ordinary men, the officials who are ready to believe and obey without argument, like Eichmann, like Hoss, the commander of Auschwitz, like Stangl, the commander of Treblinka, like twenty years after the French military who killed in Algeria and, thirty years later, the American soldiers who killed in Vietnam.

We must therefore be wary of all those who want to convince us by other means than by reason, in other words, charismatic leaders: we must carefully weigh our decision before delegating to someone else the power to judge and to want in our place. (...)

It is possible that a new fascism, with its attendant of intolerance, abuse and servitude, is born outside our country to be imported, or that it is unleashed from the inside with violence capable of overthrowing all barriers. Then, the wisdom councils will only serve if we find in God the strength to resist: in this too, the memory of what happened in the heart of Europe, not so long ago will be able to serve as a help and warning. "...

In conclusion of these historical realities, we have only confirmed the biblical text that we have quoted on which all these writings rest: **The carnal man is unable of doing the good he would like to do, but practices the evil that he would not want to do** (see Romans 7-18 / 20).

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

It is against this carnal psychology and against its guide called Satan or the devil that we must fight with the help of God, against him that we must lead our real fight without condemning each other, then we will know what it 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
Company registration number 444 684 427 00016