Paris and the
Commune
1871–78

MANCHESTER
1824

Manchester University Press

Cultural History of Modern War

Series editors   Peter Gatrell, Max Jones, Penny Summerfield and
Bertrand Taithe

Already published

Jeffrey S. Reznick   *Healing the nation: soldiers and the culture of caregiving
in Britain during the great war*

Penny Summerfield and Corinna Peniston-Bird   *Contesting home defence:
men, women and the Home Guard in the Second World War*

Centre for the
Cultural History
of War

Paris and the Commune 1871–78

The politics of forgetting

~

COLETTE E. WILSON

Contents

List of illustrations

List of illustrations

〜 vii 〜

List of tables

Acknowledgements

Acknowledgements

$\sim$ x $\sim$

I dedicate this book to Alasdair

Chronology of key events 1870–80

1870	July	War with Prussia.
	August	Invasion of France.
	1 September	Napoleon III surrenders at Sedan.
	4 September	Republic declared. Government of National Defence.
	19 September	Paris besieged by Prussians
	October	Insurrection in Paris and failed attempts to launch the Commune.
1871	28 January	Armistice.
	8 February	Election of National Assembly. Theirs government.
	18 March	Government troops attempt and fail to capture city cannon in Montmartre. Popular uprising. Insurgents capture and execute generals Thomas and Lecomte. Revolutionary crowd descends on the Hôtel de Ville (City Hall).
	26 March	Election of new municipal council, the Central Committee of the National Guard.
	28 March	Commune proclaimed.
	April	Government troops (Versaillais) bombard Neuilly and Courbevoie.
	16 May	Commune pull down Vendôme Column.
	21–8 May	*La Semaine sanglant* (Bloody Week) in Paris. Communards and Versaillais burn parts of

		the city. Communards execute members of the clergy and other hostages.
	28 May	End of Commune. Executions, trials, deportations continue until 1875.
1873	May	Thiers resigns. Succeeded by MacMahon and *l'Ordre moral.*
1876	February, March	Republican electoral victories in Chamber of Deputies.
1877	16 May	MacMahon's attempted *coup d'état* ('la crise du 16 mai). Further republican electoral victory.
1878	May	Opening of *Exposition universelle* (World Fair).
	30 June	National holiday (*La Fête du 30 juin*).
1879	30 January	Mac Mahon resigns. Grévy elected President of the Republic.
	31 January	Gambetta elected President of the Chamber of Deputies.
1880	11 July	Amnesty granted to ex-Communards
	14 July	Annual national holiday established.

~1~

Introduction

> You must close the book on these last ten years, you must place the tomb-stone of oblivion over the crimes and vestiges of the Commune, and you must tell everyone – those whose absence we deplore and those whose contrary views and disagreements we sometimes regret, that there is but one France and one Republic.
>
> (Léon Gambetta, 21 June 1880)[1]

On 21 June 1880, Léon Gambetta, the recently appointed President of the Chamber of Deputies, and *de facto* 'Republican party' leader, stood up to make what would prove to be a landmark speech in favour of granting all ex-Communards amnesty. With his renowned eloquence, he exhorted his fellow members of the government, regardless of their political affiliation (Legitimist, Orléanist, Bonapartist or republican) to put aside their differences and to 'place the tombstone of oblivion' over the previous ten years in order to unite the nation and consolidate the Republic.[2] The process of state obliteration of the memory of the Commune, however, had arguably begun much earlier, straight after the final, bloody repression of the city at the end of May 1871 when some 20,000 (perhaps many more) men, women and children were killed by the 'regular' troops of the French army in just the final week of the conflict, which became known as *la Semaine sanglante* (Bloody Week). Some 43,500 people were taken prisoner, and the trials, executions and deportations continued until 1875–76. It has been estimated that Paris lost approximately 100,000 of its workers – one-seventh of its adult male working population – and the electoral registers after the conflict recorded a loss of some 90,000 voters, all male since women did not have the vote.[3] Of all the fratricidal conflicts of the nineteenth

~1~

century, the repression of the Commune was by far the bloodiest in Europe and second only perhaps to that of the American Civil War (1861–65), which just predated it, and during which 620,000 people lost their lives.[4] In the twentieth century, the Commune was to find its echo in the Russian Revolution (1917), the Spanish Civil War (1936–39), the Franco-Algerian conflict (1954–62), and the genocides in the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda in the 1990s. The Commune, like all of these wars, and so many others down the centuries, continues to be shrouded in myths, conflicting memories, and taboos.

In the following chapters I wish to demonstrate two things: firstly, how the governments of the early Third Republic attempted to efface the memory of May 1871 by means of strict censorship in all matters concerning the Commune and through the reinvention of Paris as a modern, healthy, hygienic and regenerated metropolis during the 1878 *Exposition universelle* (World Fair) and the *Fête du 30 juin* (Festival of 30 June); and, secondly, how close readings of a number of representative case studies reveal that, while writers, artists and photographers were often apparently willing to conform to the officially promoted view of the city, the memory of the recent past could not be so easily erased. In so doing, however, it is my aim, when assessing the memorialist aspects of the Paris Commune, to counter the tendency in French literary and cultural studies to concentrate on writers and artists who were either Communards themselves, such as Jules Vallès and Gustave Courbet, or at least sympathetic to the Communard cause, such as Arthur Rimbaud and Edouard Manet.[5] The focus will instead be on the ways in which broadly conservative, counter-revolutionary and reactionary collective memories and myths of this traumatic period in French history mani-fested themselves in a wide range of cultural production drawn from the illustrated press, socio-historical texts, memoirs, literary fiction and photography.

It has often been necessary in the analyses that follow to assume a certain amount of prior knowledge on the part of readers about the circumstances surrounding the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War, the fall of the Second Empire, the rise and fall of the Commune and the complex political machinations of the early Third Republic. It may be useful therefore to begin by giving a very brief account of this turbulent period in French history. Readers may also wish to refer to the chronol-ogy on pp. xii–xiii and to the special section of the Bibliography, which lists a number of texts on the history, representation and interpretation of the Commune.

The Paris Commune 1871

The Paris Commune of 1871 refers to the revolutionary government that was established by the people of Paris to administer their own city following the end of the Franco-Prussian War (1870–71). The Commune lasted only 72 days, from 18 March to 28 May 1871. It was not a planned or organized revolution and it had no one clear leader. The causes of the revolt that led to its establishment can partly be attributed to the anger and exasperation felt by many Parisians to the humiliating capitulation of the city to the Prussians on 28 January 1871, by the veteran politician Adolphe Thiers and the newly formed Third Republic, and partly to a number of unresolved social and political grievances dating back to the previous revolutions of 1830 and 1848 and which intensified during the Second Empire under Napoleon III.[6]

The Second Empire lasted from 2 December 1852 until 4 September 1870, when Napoleon III was forced to abdicate following his defeat by the Prussians at Sedan in north-east France. On 4 September 1870 the republicans effected a bloodless revolution in Paris, setting up a Government of National Defence with the aim of continuing the war against Prussia. It is important to note at this point, however, that those I have labelled 'republicans' were not a united political faction. While there were many in France at the time who believed in the re-establishment of a republican form of government, there was by no means any consensus as to exactly how such a government should be constituted. These republicans consisted of a mixture of conservatives, progressives, centrists or centre-Left moderates, and a number of utopian socialist radicals, who mostly renounced violence as a way of effecting change, as well as a few revolutionary republicans and extremists.[7] Many conservatives, led by Thiers, wished to bring the disastrous war against Prussia to an end as quickly as possible. To complicate matters further the monarchists, themselves a mixture of absolutists (Legitimists) and constitutionalists (Orléanists), hoped, in vain as it would turn out, that Thiers would help them bring the absolutist pretender the Comte de Chambord to the throne, to be succeeded in due course by the Orléanist Comte de Paris. The republican moderates on the centre-Left, led by Léon Gambetta, on the other hand, wished to continue the war in order to restore France's honour and promptly set about mobilizing the half-million or more troops at their disposal into the city's National Guard in anticipation of an imminent Prussian attack on the capital. Many on the far Left also wished to continue the war but, in addition, were very

eager to take the opportunity of Napoleon III's fall to establish a whole new social order. There was, however, little clear idea or agreement among them on exactly how this might be achieved in practice.

As the Prussians reached the outskirts of Paris and began to lay siege to the city on 19 September, the Government of National Defence opened negotiations with the enemy but refused their proposed conditions, which included the loss of the north-eastern provinces of Alsace and Lorraine. The National Guard, meanwhile, began to move further to the Left politically as some of its more moderate leaders were replaced by revolutionary republicans, men like Gustave Flourens whose life, as I will discuss later in Chapter 4, would inspire Emile Zola's portrayal of the utopian revolutionary Florent in *Le Ventre de Paris*. On 5 October, Flourens and other radicals marched on the Hôtel de Ville (City Hall) in a bid to force the government into continuing the fight against the Prussians. On 7 October, Gambetta, head of the Ministry of the Interior, controversially also assumed the role of Minister of War and left Paris to take charge of the provinces, all the time seeking to relieve the city and to continue the war to the bitter end.[8] Then on 31 October, after news finally reached Paris that the army had surrendered at Metz, Flourens, the veteran revolutionary Auguste Blanqui, and others marched once more on Paris in a further attempt to establish a new government for the city, but this early attempt to launch the Commune was quickly foiled and a negotiated settlement put an end to the insurrection.

By early November, all men between the ages of twenty and forty had been mobilized and the Parisian National Guard reorganized into active units, as the Prussians continued to shell the walls and outskirts of city. Those Parisians who were obliged to stay in the city suffered starvation and terrible hardship aggravated by an exceptionally harsh winter. Then, after a siege that had lasted four months, Thiers's government finally agreed, on 28 January 1871, to an armistice for all but the east of the country and to the capitulation of Paris with a provision for an immediate war indemnity of 200 million francs to be paid for by the city itself. The general election held on 8 February resulted in a monarchist majority in the National Assembly in favour of peace at any price. This was not a surprising outcome given that, save for radical cities like Lyons, Toulouse and Marseilles, the provinces remained deeply conservative. On his election as leader of the National Assembly, but significantly not President of the Republic, Thiers agreed to the annexation by Prussia of Alsace and Lorraine, with the attendant loss of that region's valuable coal, iron and salt mines, and to an indemnity of 5,000 million francs.

The restoration of the monarchy was now a real possibility. This fact, coupled with Thiers's acceptance of the punitive peace terms and his bungled attempt, on 18 March 1871, to disarm the National Guard by sending in troops to recapture the city cannon stationed on the Butte Montmartre (the hilltop working-class district in the north of the city), proved to be the final straw for the people of Paris, resulting in a spontaneous popular uprising against the national government. The initially peaceful protest saw the women of Montmartre preventing the soldiers from taking control of the cannon and pleading with them to join in their common cause against a government they regarded as cowardly, treacherous and unpatriotic. Many of the soldiers, themselves Parisians, fraternized with the crowd that quickly gathered about them. Events then took on a violent turn as some of the soldiers, egged on by the crowd, turned on their own officers, capturing and executing two unpopular generals, Clément Thomas and Claude Lecomte. The crowd then proceeded to march to the Hôtel de Ville.

A proletarian government was established for the city shortly afterwards and on 26 March a new municipal council, the Central Committee of the National Guard, was duly elected. Two days later the Commune, named in memory of the Commune of 10 August 1792, was inaugurated outside the Hôtel de Ville. Thiers, who had recalled the government troops back to Versailles, where the National Assembly had moved during the last stages of the war with Prussia, abandoned the city to its fate. The choice of Versailles as the nation's new capital was deeply symbolic, given the town's royalist associations. It is estimated that some 300,000 men and women supported the Commune, but there were plenty of other Parisians who were either indifferent or even hostile to it and, as the revolution progressed, many more would also turn against it.[9]

The seventy-nine elected members of the Commune consisted of veterans who had fought during the 1848 Revolution, labour militants, a few radical intellectuals, writers and journalists, and several National Guardsmen or *fédérés* as they became known, again in memory of 1792. The Commune also numbered among its supporters the writers and feminists Louise Michel, Paule Mink, Elizabeth Dmitrieff and André Léo. A few women like Michel also took up arms and fought on the barricades while thousands of others came out in support of the *fédérés*, providing food and first aid for them.[10] For many of their detractors, all Communards were considered to be the 'descendants' of the revolutionaries of Robespierre's 'Reign of Terror' (1792–93), when tens of thousands of people opposed to his dictatorship were executed, but it

was the women in particular who were demonized by the right-wing press and in government propaganda, which represented them as savage whores and inebriated *pétroleuses* (female incendiaries) setting the city alight during the *Semaine sanglante*. Hundreds of women were shot or deported to the penal colonies in Cayenne and New Caledonia, many for simply being out in the street poorly dressed or for carrying a milk bottle thought to be filled with paraffin.[11] The image of the *pétroleuse* so captured the bourgeois imagination that the Commune itself came to be thought of metaphorically as a diseased prostitute, an aspect that I shall explore further in chapter 3.

While many workers had become politicized in the 1830s and 1840s and had supported the 1848 Revolution, the majority of the Commune's supporters were not activists but ordinary working-class men and women who had suffered the effects of economic growth and recession for years and who had bravely undergone all the privations of the Prussian war and siege while proudly defending their city against the foreign invader. And, for a short while at least, before Thiers finally sent in the government troops (the Versaillais) to recapture the city, an atmosphere of relief, jollity and carnival prevailed. With Paris cut off from the rest of the country, it felt as if the city was living in a time outside of ordinary time, it was 'Le Temps des cerises' (Cherry time), after a popular song written by Jean-Baptiste Clément in 1867.[12]

Because of its importance as the nation's capital, Paris had traditionally been administered by the national government and, regardless of the political regime in power during the nineteenth century, the city had consistently been denied any form of municipal government of its own.[13] The Commune has typically been seen, therefore, as the first real attempt by the people of Paris to reclaim their city after many had been forced out of the city centre into the urban wastelands on the periphery as a result of Baron Haussmann's building schemes of the 1850s and 1860s.[14] The general assumption that the Communards were all Parisians returning to the city centre to reclaim 'their space', however, has been challenged by Robert Tombs, who argues that there is little hard evidence to suggest that Communards from the *faubourgs* actually were returning exiles. There is reason to believe that some were just visiting sightseers, while most *fédérés* were in fact migrants to the city with little or no memory of pre-Haussmann Paris.[15] William Serman also draws attention to the fact that only fourteen of the seventy-nine elected members of the Commune were actually born in Paris.[16] It is perhaps not surprising that in Zola's novel *L'Assommoir* (also to be discussed in

Chapter 4), only two people among the rowdy, carnivaleque wedding party that descends on the city centre from the heights of Montmartre, in what turns out to be a coded parody of the Commune, have ever been to the centre of Paris before; the bridegroom Coupeau and his neighbour Madinier. The only times the bride and heroine, Gervaise, a 'naturalized' Parisian originally from Provence, leaves her *quartier* are on her wedding day and, many years later, to visit Coupeau at the hospital at Sainte-Anne. From the point of view of the social history of the period, this is consistent with the habits of many working-class Parisians, the majority of whom lived, worked, and sought their entertainment almost exclusively within their own neighbourhood.[17]

Nevertheless, whether the *fédérés* were, strictly speaking, returning Parisians or not, there is still much to be said for Henri Lefebvre's contention that the Commune cannot be explained merely in socio-historical terms as the result of the patriotism of the urban masses and an apparently corresponding unpatriotic reaction on the part of the ruling class. Haussmannization did indeed result in the segregation of social groups and it did mark the contrast between the bourgeois city centre and its working-class periphery. As Lefebvre has argued, urban space is far from geographically and geometrically neutral; it is a setting for confrontation where competing social and political strategies are deployed and played out.[18] Haussmann's demolition of many slum areas may have opened up the city and turned west, and particularly the centre, of Paris into a new bourgeois residential and entertainment space but, as David Harvey suggests, the more city space was opened up physically, the more it had to be partitioned and closed off through social practice.[19] For example, in *L'Assommoir* again, much is made of the social and cultural difference between the working-class characters and the smart bourgeois Parisians they encounter on their way into the city. And, as we shall see in Chapter 2, some of the articles and illustrations which appeared in the illustrated weekly journal *Le Monde illustré* during the Commune highlight the fact that the Parisian bourgeoisie were greatly angered by, and fearful of, the invasion of 'their' city by what they considered to be working-class undesirables. The consequences of such policies and attitudes to the partitioning of urban space can be seen to persist into the twenty-first century, as evidenced by the riots that erupted in the Parisian *banlieues* in 2005–6.

The Commune, therefore, can be interpreted as an attempt to break down existing hierarchies and social barriers and to improve the lot of the working classes. Once in power, its leaders proceeded to propose a

number of measures for the benefit of the Parisian workforce, including, for example: the reimbursement of debts; the free return of pawned goods; the promotion of workers' co-operatives; financial support for orphans and all women, whether married or not, whose partners had been killed fighting for the National Guard and the defence of Paris; the provision of a state education for women and children; and the separation of church and state. Before many of these measures could be brought into effect, however, Thiers decided the time was right to suppress the revolt. For six weeks, starting on 2 April, Paris was bombarded yet again, this time by the Versaillais. The city's defences were finally breached in early May 1871 and from 21 to 28 May, *la Semaine sanglante*, the Versaillais repression became increasingly savage. Before being beaten into submission, the retreating Communards burned parts of the city and some public buildings, including two Renaissance gems: the Tuileries Palace, the city residence of kings and emperors, and the Hôtel de Ville. They also executed some 150 members of the clergy whom they had taken hostage, including Darboy, the Archbishop of Paris. These killings, together with those earlier of the generals Thomas and Lecomte, and the destruction of the city including the ritualized demolition of the Vendôme Column and Thiers's own house, were to form the basis of the justification of the repression, with writers such as Maxime Du Camp ready to cast the blame for all the slaughter on to the Communards themselves. Thus was born the so-called 'bourgeois' memory and myth of the Commune. The term 'bourgeois' was used by Communards at the time to describe anyone who opposed them, whatever their political affiliation – Legitimist, Orléanist, Bonapartist or republican – and is still used today by members of Les Amis de la Commune, the organization founded in 1882 by those Communards who returned to France from exile after the amnesty of 1880.[20]

The period that followed *la Semaine sanglante* was one of unmitigated political, social, cultural and artistic repression and censorship. The trials, deportations and executions of the Communards, and anyone else suspected of having supported them, continued under Marshal MacMahon's government of Moral Order (*l'Ordre moral*), which took over in 1873 after Thiers was forced to resign from office, having lost the support of the monarchists. The monarchists, however, though still in the majority in the National Assembly, had become a spent force by 1874, having made themselves increasingly unpopular with the general population on several counts.[21] There was, firstly, their campaign in favour of the absolutist Comte de Chambord, who refused to accept the

tricolore flag and insisted instead on the royal *fleur de lys* as the nation's emblem; secondly, their close identification with the Catholic Church; and, finally, their worrying talk of declaring war on Italy in order to restore papal control. MacMahon therefore found himself losing ground to the Bonapartists, who were growing in number in the National Assembly and, with a potential new leader in the Prince Imperial, Napoleon III's son, were emerging as a potential right-wing alternative to *l'Ordre moral*, going on to enjoy a certain amount of electoral success in 1874 and 1875. Despite passing a number of measures to counter both the Bonapartist and republican threats, the monarchists were further weakened by the republican victories in the election of Deputies in 1876. MacMahon's *coup d'état* on 16 May 1877 ('la crise du 16 mai'), a desperate bid to ensure that only those Deputies who supported him would be returned to office in that year's elections, nevertheless still resulted in a further victory for the republicans, after which they came to be recognized as potentially capable of uniting and leading the country. With the differences between all political factions, and within the divided republican camp itself, temporarily put to one side during the successful staging of the *Exposition universelle* and the *Fête du 30 juin* in 1878, thousands of Parisians came out on to the streets to show their overwhelming support for the Republic.

Now surrounded by republicans, and perhaps fearing impeachment following the fallout from his failed *coup d'état*, MacMahon took the decision not to see out his full seven-year term in office and tendered his resignation on 30 January 1879. The Senate duly elected the moderate republican Jules Grévy as President of the Republic. Gambetta's election as President of the Chamber of Deputies took place the next day, 31 January. On 10 February 1879, the republican daily newspaper *Le Siècle* triumphantly announced the return of the National Assembly to Paris, the harsh winter of 1878–79 having dealt a fatal blow to the provincial capital of Versailles ('Le retour [du gouvernement] à Paris est décidé. L'hiver 1878–1879, avec ses neiges et ses frimas, a porté le coup mortel à la capitale rurale.')

The inauguration of the 'republican' Republic following the demise of *l'Ordre moral* thus brings us back full-circle to Gambetta's speech of reconciliation and forgetting on 21 June 1880. His oratory finally convinced the Chamber of Deputies to approve the amnesty bill, which was eventually passed on 11 July 1880 after the Senate had insisted on an amendment denying amnesty to anyone found guilty of arson or assassination.[22] The official adoption in 1879 of *La Marseillaise* as the national

anthem followed, in 1880, by the Communard amnesty, the adoption of the *tricolore* flag as the national emblem, and the inauguration of the 14 July (Bastille Day) as an annual national holiday, together put the final seal on the new Third Republic but, in the process, condemned the memory of the Commune to oblivion.[23]

Remembering and forgetting the Commune

Since the 1980s and the rise in Holocaust studies in particular, much critical attention has focused on the problematic relationship between the past and the present.[24] In the 1990s there then followed what has been described by Susannah Radstone as 'an explosion of interest in memory studies' across a wide range of disciplines as commentators tried to understand how memory is *produced* or *(re)constructed* by both individuals and societies; how memory is continually open to contestation; how there are always a multiplicity of 'memories' of events; how the importance or usefulness of different versions of memory shift and change over time; and how sometimes it is perhaps better just to forget and let go of the past.[25] This book was born out of this persisting and widening interest in social or cultural memory studies and finds its basis in such debates.

As I embarked on my research and proceeded to analyse a range of cultural production to discover the ways in which 'bourgeois' (anti-Communard) memories of Paris and the Commune were constructed, transmitted, remembered and, over time, discarded or obliterated, I soon realized that it was important to begin by considering the main nineteenth-century theories of memory. It was a common belief during this period that the experiences and memories acquired by an individual are somehow inscribed within or on the surface of his or her body in the same way that, for example, a monument can be physically inscribed. Such theories of so-called 'organic memory' (advanced, for example, by Jean Baptiste Lamarck, Théodule Ribot and Valentin Magnan) also suggest that acquired experiences can be 'inherited' by future generations just like physical and behavioural characteristics and that as a consequence, there can be a transfer of collective human memory and history from one generation to the next.[26] An understanding of the pervasive importance of 'organic', 'generational' or 'inherited' memory theories is central to any analysis of the reaction of the contemporary dominant classes in France to the people and events of the Commune. Such theories formed an integral part of the language and rhetoric of all

sorts of texts, not just medical treaties but also novels and articles in popular newspapers, reflecting the widespread preoccupation with the perceived degeneration and decadence of the human race.[27] Nineteenth-century theories of organic memory, therefore, go some way to help explain why the majority of bourgeois Parisians appeared so ready to accept the Versaillais repression of the Commune, for the insurgents and their supporters were routinely perceived as the inheritors of the 'revolutionary temperament' of their putative ancestors, the men and women of the Terror.

It is Nietzsche, however, who, perhaps better than any other contemporary commentator, encapsulates the political, historical, philosophical and physiological aspects of memory and forgetting in the wake of the Franco-Prussian War (in which he himself participated) and the Paris Commune.[28] Marc Sautet, for example, has shown how Nietzsche was influenced by both these events in his early work, *The Birth of Tragedy*.[29] Sautet argues that Nietzsche's hostility to the Commune was based on a pre-existing fear of, and general hostility towards, worker emancipation and a belief in a feudal, aristocratic system where slavery and exploitation of those on the bottom rungs of society was the mark of a civilized society (pp. 14–17). Though not born out of any corresponding support for bourgeois capitalism on his part, Nietzsche's condemnation of the Commune on the grounds that it represented a terrible, barbarous threat to the established order resonates throughout anti-Communard discourse. Nietzsche's assessment of the Judeo-Christian view of justice and punishment and the way this manifests itself in the form of cruelty, torture, spectacle and theatricality also provides a theoretical context for the hostile representation of Paris and the Commune. His argument in favour of the deliberate forgetting of those elements of an individual's or a nation's past that are deemed contrary to the interests of the present and what he calls the 'hygiene of life', meanwhile, provides an intellectual framework for interpreting the reconstruction and reinvention of Paris during the 1878 *Exposition universelle*, and echoes also Gambetta's Amnesty speech of 1880.[30] It is thus not my intention to discuss Nietzsche at a philological level in this book, but instead to historicize him and to use him as a model for understanding the post-Commune universe inhabited by Zola, Maxime Du Camp and their contemporaries.

Nietzsche contends that the ability to forget is an active phenomenon that is necessary to the proper functioning of the body; what is required in human beings as well as in nations is a '*tabula rasa* of consciousness, making room for the new', for without such 'active forgetfulness' there

can be no present.[31] However, he also states that humans, unlike the 'beasts in the field', are psychologically incapable of forgetting and are forever chained to the past: 'however far and fast [Man] may run, this chain runs with him.'[32] For Nietzsche, this inherent human propensity for memory is the result of 'an active will not to let go', and there is, he claims, 'perhaps nothing more frightening and more sinister in the whole prehistory of man than his *technique for remembering things*'.[33] In terms that find their sinister echo in the Versaillais repression of the Commune and its long-drawn-out aftermath under *l'Ordre moral*, as well as in the fundamentalism of the Roman Catholic revival of the period, Nietzsche describes how, historically and psychologically, human beings have been conditioned to remember by means of the infliction of physical and mental pain:

> 'Something is branded in, so that it stays in the memory: only that which *hurts* incessantly is remembered' . . . Things never proceeded without blood, torture, and victims, when man thought it necessary to forge a memory for himself. The most horrifying sacrifices and offerings . . . the most repulsive mutilations . . . , the cruellest rituals of all religious cults (and all religions are at their deepest foundations systems of cruelty) – all these things originate from that instinct which guessed that the most powerful aid to memory was pain. (pp. 42–3)

This passage exemplifies the paradox of life under the early Third Republic. On the one hand, the reprisals against the Communards and the working-class people of Paris were so terrible that no one who experienced or witnessed them could possibly forget them and, therefore, would be actively discouraged from fomenting revolution ever again. Thus, the repression ensured that the memory was not only inscribed in stone in the form of the Sacré-Cœur Basilica, built specifically to expiate the 'sins' of the nation, but that it was also branded into the minds, and often on to the bodies, of those who had supported, or been suspected of supporting, the Commune. Such a memory of events could then be passed on to future generations. On the other hand, the Republic after 1879 practised a form of 'active forgetfulness' where the material city – and, by extension, the consciousness of the nation itself – was indeed turned into a *tabula rasa* for the physical and moral good health of all. This process was facilitated by the *Exposition universelle* in 1878 and, as I will argue in Chapter 5, found its sublime expression in Charles Marville's photographic exhibition, *Travaux* (Public Works). Both Du Camp and Zola, however, as we shall see in Chapters 3 and 4,

are unwilling to, or incapable of shaking off the chains that bind them to the past. At the same time, however, certainly in Zola's case generally and in aspects of Du Camp's *Paris: Ses organes, ses fonctions et sa vie dans la seconde moitié du dix-neuvième siècle* (1875), a brave effort is never-theless often made to try to forget the past and move on.

The Du Camp of *Les Convulsions de Paris* (1878–80), by contrast, epitomizes the desire on the part of the reactionaries of *l'Ordre moral* to remember the Commune 'out of anger at harm done' to society (to borrow Nietzsche's words), a crime for which those who are held to be responsible must be made to repay their debt to society (p. 45). This helps to explain why the granting of amnesty to ex-Communards was so completely out of the question for Du Camp and many others. As Nietzsche goes on to observe, again with relevance to the reactionary governments of Thiers and MacMahon, 'each weakening and deeper endangering of the community brings the return of harsher forms' (p. 53).

In order to explain fully how counter-revolutionary memories of Paris and the Commune were initially constructed, however, we need to take account also of theories that see memory as an external, material and socially based phenomenon. This tradition goes back to Aristotle by way of Saint Augustine, Spinoza, Montesquieu, Leibniz, Auguste Comte, Nietzsche (again) and Emile Durkheim, finding its modern expression in the writings on memory by the French social scientist Maurice Halbwachs.[34]

Halbwachs, like his teacher Durkheim, maintains that all memory has a social foundation. All memories, recent or distant, are thus evoked through the use of a stable structural mechanism which he calls the 'cadres sociaux de la mémoire' (social frameworks of memory). These frameworks are situated in *collective* time and space, and subject to *present circumstances*, and they conform to a given social group's own internal logic and vision of the world.[35] They serve to unify certain general pat-terns of thought, beliefs and core values and are representative of how the group perceives its own past (pp. 141–2). For Halbwachs, it follows that these social frameworks on which memory depends are representa-tive only of the memory of the dominant social class. Furthermore, the dominant class only assimilates, and thus 'remembers', what it con-siders to be relevant and useful to itself within the context of the present. In this respect, therefore, Halbwachs's theories recall those of Nietzsche on active forgetting and the 'usefulness' of history for present genera-tions. The passage of time and rapidly changing circumstances inevitably

consign much of the past to oblivion. Individuals, however, according to Halbwachs, are still able to reconstruct the past by 'borrowing' material and cultural data from the present; in other words, from other people, the social milieu, language, objects, artefacts and, with particular relevance to the focus of this book, from place (*le lieu*). This concept is further developed in Pierre Nora's vast project on the construction of French collective memory and identity, *Les Lieux de mémoire*.[36]

Halbwachs is not concerned, like those believers in organic memory, with actually *locating* memory in the brain or indeed anywhere else in the body: nor, like his contemporary Henri Bergson, does he hold that memory is a 're-living' of images from the past that lie buried within the individual.[37] On the contrary, he rejects Bergson's view of memory as subject to a Cartesian mind/body distinction and instead posits that memory is at once image *and* reason. Memory for Halbwachs is always a rational, if involuntary, reconstruction of the past based on those elements and mechanisms that are to be found within the consciousness of the social group, to which every individual is in some way connected. For Halbwachs, much like his other contemporary Marcel Proust, memory can be aroused by a material object or, more precisely, by the involuntary sensation that the object arouses.[38] But whereas Bergson and Proust are primarily concerned with the memory of the individual, Halbwachs takes account of the reconstruction of memory by both the individual and the whole social group, since he believes that it is through their interaction with others that individuals acquire their memories, remember them, and locate them.[39]

The term 'mémoire collective' (collective memory) was first coined by Halbwachs in *Les Cadres sociaux de la mémoire* but its full definition appears in his later work *La Mémoire collective*. Halbwachs argues that collective memory is not the same as history. Whereas history only needs to be recorded when tradition ends and the social memory is fading or breaking up, collective memory manifests itself as a continuous current of thought that remains in the consciousness of a given group and is, by definition, only of relevance to that group. So long as there are people within that group to whom such memories are significant in some way, then those memories will continue to be preserved. Once they are no longer deemed worthy of remembrance, because they are no longer considered relevant or useful to present-day life, they will be forgotten.[40] The other key difference between history and the collective memory identified by Halbwachs is that history is unitary, whereas there are multiple collective memories (p. 137). For Halbwachs, the sort of

history which is recorded in history books is an external, artificial construct that is a function of the ruling class's representation of events and which, therefore, stands in opposition to history as it is interpreted by the working class.

Halbwachs himself, growing up in the decades following the Commune, had personal experience of the effects of the deliberate denial of working-class memories of the Commune in favour of an alternative, overriding history created by the ruling class. While preparing the fourth manuscript of *La Mémoire collective* between 1943 and 1944, he was also living in Paris under the German occupation, and thus whereas in *Les Cadres sociaux de la mémoire* the socialist and republican Halbwachs argues in favour of one unifying collective memory which embraces all classes, in the later work he becomes acutely aware of the dangers of the establishment of one universal history, and argues instead for the preservation of the past in spite of the present, and for the right to the existence of multiple collective memories. Halbwachs's recognition, under a totalitarian regime, of the importance of the preservation of multiple collective memories has its obvious parallels with the denial of pro-Commune memory in the 1870s by Thiers, MacMahon and Gambetta, each according to his own political agenda. It is this recognition of the need for multiple collective memories that ensures that Halbwachs's work continues to resonate.[41] For, as Paul Connerton also reminds us, 'the mental enslavement of the subjects of a totalitarian regime begins when their memories are taken away'.[42]

While certainly retaining a keen awareness of the existence and importance of the multiple collective memories, myths and interpretations of the Commune, my concern in this book is with those of the dominant social group of the 1870s, the anti-Communard bourgeoisie. For it was this group's 'memory' of Paris and the Commune which was to crystallize into the accepted 'history' of this event as exemplified by Du Camp's *Les Convulsions de Paris*, and which was to have the longest-lasting influence on how the French establishment continued to perceive this period well into the twentieth century, with the result that, even today, the subject remains contentious.[43] And, most importantly, it was this dominant group that was responsible for the reconstruction of Paris in a concerted effort to efface all material traces of the Commune. So effective was this effacement that – with the notable exception of the *Mur des fédérés* with its simple plaque erected in 1909 and inscribed 'Aux morts de la Commune 21–28 mai 1871' ('To the dead of the Commune 21–28 May 1871') and now the Place de la Commune inaugurated

in 2000 in the Butte aux Cailles, and the Square Louise Michel opposite the Sacré-Cœur in 2004 – the city centre's topography displays virtually no trace of what took place there between 18 March and 28 May 1871, at least for the uninitiated.[44]

The case studies

Choosing case studies and using them to interpret historical events is always problematic. In making my selection, I asked myself several questions. For example, are these texts and images exemplary of conservative and reactionary thought in the aftermath of the Commune, or are they only isolated instances, or indeed are they actually only the tip of a very large iceberg? How is it possible, for example, to assess something as vast as the press, or even just one illustrated weekly newspaper? Clearly, this was an impossibly large project for one person to undertake. Each year, for example, just one edition of *Le Monde illustré* comprised about 500 illustrations and double or treble that amount of texts of various kinds, figures that would need to be multiplied over and over again to cover all the years from 1871 to 1878. Obviously, decisions had to be made in relation to the years and months studied and the specific editions, articles and illustrations to be included for detailed examination. Choices had to be made too regarding the fictional and historical texts and photographs to include over and above my initial decision to concentrate on broadly conservative, anti-Communard texts and images. Which writers appeared best to represent the conservative or reactionary position and, of those writers, which of their texts were the most appropriate?

As far as the photographic representation of the Commune was concerned, again I had to be selective but in focusing on images of the city, rather than on portraits, the choice was immediately narrowed down. In opting to analyse only certain photographers and by focusing on the years 1871 to 1878, the choice was narrowed down still further. Nevertheless, as in all undertakings of this kind, limits had to be set and reset throughout my research.

The representative cross-section of cultural production on which I finally settled comprises: *Le Monde illustré*, an ostensibly non-political, conservative, and family-orientated weekly illustrated journal; Maxime Du Camp's monumental *Paris: Ses organes, ses fonctions et sa vie dans la seconde moitié du dix-neuvième siècle* (1869–75) and his reactionary history of the Commune, *Les Convulsions de Paris* (1878–80);[45] three novels

~ 16 ~

by Emile Zola, *Le Ventre de Paris* (1873), *L'Assommoir* (1877) and *Une page d'amour* (1878);[46] and selected images from four photographic collections, Charles Soulier's *Paris incendié: mai 1871* (1871), Edouard-Denis Baldus's album of heliogravures, *Les Principaux Monuments de France* (1875), and Charles Marville's *Album du vieux Paris* and *Travaux*, which were displayed at the *Exposition universelle* in 1878.

Perhaps the best way to describe my project is to take a cue from Du Camp, Zola and the rest, and to employ a medical metaphor. I like to think of all these individual texts, illustrations and photographs as akin to the multiple pictures or 'slices' of a body taken from all angles by a magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) scanner. Such slices, when assembled together by a computer program, create a three-dimensional screen image of the body under examination that can be rotated in all directions to reveal the organs and soft tissues contained within it. Like the results of an MRI scan, an analysis of these case studies similarly reveals a picture that is greater than the sum of its parts.

The inclusion of a newspaper, especially an illustrated journal, is relevant because of the prime role of the press in the nineteenth century in the dispersal of news and information, the promulgation of official propaganda, and the reflection of readers' opinions, all of which contributed to the creation and transference of public memories and gave rise to what Matt Matsuda calls a 'typographic memory of events'.[47] For many people in the nineteenth century, the newspaper was their education. Improvements in paper production, composition and printing techniques, as well as advances in telecommunications and transportation, had rendered newspapers relatively cheap and widely available. Newspapers thus helped many people to learn to read and to form their view of the world. This is the case, for example, with several of Zola's working-class characters: for example, Lantier in *L'Assommoir* and his son, Etienne, in the later novel *Germinal*. Marcel Proust (at first sight perhaps an unlikely commentator in this respect), writing with specific reference to the Third Republic, and significantly after the implementation of the freedom of the press laws and educational reforms of 1881, goes further and suggests not only that newspapers were more influential than the education system, but that they were also even more important than the Church in their insidious promulgation of official ideology.[48] Maurice Mouillaud goes further still and suggests that there exists a tripartite relationship evoked by the name of a given newspaper, which acts as an inspirational touchstone for the reader or an all-seeing eye placed on high surveying all that is said in its name: that of its

founder (God the Father), its director or editor-in-chief (Christ the Son), and the 'person' of the paper itself (the Holy Ghost).[49] For Mouillaud, it is through this all-seeing 'eye', which after the Revolution of 1789 is deemed to be the 'eye of Reason' (rather than of God), that the reader is made to see and interpret the world.

Du Camp, writing in 1855, was perhaps one of the first to recognize the modern reader's preference for the newspaper over the novel which, he claimed, was no longer capable of offering anything new and original, just boring reworkings of outworn ideas and useless nonsense, whereas the newspaper could offer everything and anything from the morning's headline news to tales of the previous night's back-street murders.[50] The reading public, according to Du Camp, is neither ungrateful nor indifferent, it simply asks to be informed and entertained.

The art historian Tom Gretton also compares newspapers to cities, pointing out that they have a topography and that they invite the reader, like the *flâneur*, to indulge in random encounters, take numerous different pathways, and leaf his or her way through fragments gathered from the outside world.[51] For Mouillaud, the newspaper is thus even more Bakhtinian than the novel, reflecting a world which has lost its central unifying core, if it ever possessed one in the first place.[52] It is this inherently random, unstable, fragmentary, polyphonic and polymorphous nature of the newspaper which in the nineteenth-century is the key difference between the newspaper and the novel.[53] This not only helps to explain the popularity and proliferation of newspapers and journals in this period but also the ambiguities and conflicts of interest or point of view that surface over and over again in their coverage of events.

There are several reasons for deciding to focus on *Le Monde illustré* rather than one of the other popular illustrated journals of the period. As part of the Paul Dalloz empire, which also owned *Le Moniteur universel*, the government's quasi-official newspaper, *Le Monde illustré*, can be taken as a good barometer of the establishment view but unlike *L'Illustration*, its major rival in the conservative quality press, however, *Le Monde illustré* was not officially classified as a political journal, a fact that, as we shall see in Chapter 2, did not prevent its contributors from engaging with political issues. As a consequence of its 'apolitical' status, and much to the annoyance of *L'Illustration*, *Le Monde illustré* was spared the payment of the special government levy applied to the political press, thus enabling the journal to keep its cover charge relatively low.[54] In 1871 *Le Monde illustré* sold for 35 centimes per copy in Paris and 40 centimes at railway stations, rising to 50 centimes by 1878. *L'Illustration*,

however, was obliged to charge 75 centimes per copy during the same period. Quality daily broadsheets without any illustrations sold for between 10 and 20 centimes, and the satirical *Le Charivari*, which typically carried only one illustration, charged 25 centimes while, at the other end of the scale, the 'canards' or penny-dreadfuls sold for 5 centimes a copy. To put this apparently low sum into its period context, 5 centimes already represented some 12.5 per cent of the price of a kilo of bread, or 17 per cent of the price of a litre of milk. Thus newspapers were a relative luxury for some and usually shared between readers or, more commonly, rented by the hour in the *cabinets de lecture* where they reached a far wider and socially diverse audience.[55]

Surprisingly, given the fact that the illustrations that appeared in the *Le Monde illustré* form part of a well-known general corpus of Franco-Prussian-War and Commune imagery, commentators have invariably divorced these images from their accompanying texts, thus overlooking the potential for further interpretative analysis.[56] Indeed, neither *Le Monde illustré* nor any other French illustrated newspaper has yet been the subject of a detailed analysis, or at least not within the context of the representation of Paris and the collective memory of the Commune. The majority of both contemporary and modern scholars who have taken an interest in the press of the Third Republic have tended, on the whole, to produce general histories, or else have concentrated on the Communard, the reactionary right wing or the satirical press.[57]

Tom Gretton is perhaps the only commentator to have focused specifically on text and image relations in the illustrated weekly press, taking *Le Monde illustré* as a model, but he has done so in order to position the illustrated weekly as a genre within the hierarchy of the visual arts, and not to examine the political or memorialist implications of the articles and illustrations published by the journal.[58] Even Paul Lidsky's dissection of the hostile reaction of many French writers to the events of 1871 stops short of analysing the work of jobbing journalists, preferring instead to focus mainly on canonical names.[59] The historian J.M. Roberts, whilst he examines how the Right has mythologized the Commune, does not nevertheless discuss the role of the conservative illustrated press in perpetuating these same myths.[60] Adrian Rifkin, on the other hand, certainly does acknowledge the importance of popular prints and the press as an influence on, and reflection of, public opinion, but limits his analysis mainly to the Second Empire and the period of the Commune itself.[61] Matsuda, meanwhile, highlights the importance of the press and the function of the written text in general as a key factor in the creation

~ 19 ~

and transference of public memories, but again does not go on to analyse the actual contribution of press articles to the transference of memory in the early Third Republic.[62] Chapter 2, therefore, aims to provide the fullest analysis to date of the relationship between text and image in a contemporary newspaper. The choice of key texts and illustrations is taken from a selection that appeared in *Le Monde illustré* in the months following the *Semaine sanglante*. These posthumous articles on the Commune and early responses to its demise are then compared and contrasted with a representative selection of texts and illustrations appearing in the journal during the *Exposition universelle*, *Fête du 30 juin*, and other festivities hosted by the city in 1878. In so doing, I seek to demonstrate how, by drawing on the shared cultural heritage of its intended bourgeois readers, *Le Monde illustré* was very well placed to help lay the foundations, along with anti-Communard histories such as that by Du Camp, of the collective memory and myth of the events of Paris and the Commune.

Du Camp's extensive body of work, though often cited, has not to date commanded much critical attention in its own right either. And yet, while his friend Gustave Flaubert was still struggling to make a name for himself, Du Camp was already a very well-known and popular poet, novelist and journalist before then going on to undertake, among many other projects, a series of social-historical studies of Paris and its institutions, an account of the Commune, and a number of volumes of literary history and memoirs.[63] Modern scholars are typically apt to accuse him of being envious of Flaubert and to dismiss him as being a mendacious, malicious, upper-class reactionary who was deeply hostile to the Commune, a view which even the revival of interest in his work as a pioneering photographer of Egypt in the 1840s and Gérard de Senneville's highly sympathetic biography have done little to change.[64]

For Lidsky, Du Camp is an *arriviste* and *Les Convulsions de Paris* are 'la bible de la littérature anticommunarde' (the 'Bible' of anti-Communard literature).[65] There is certainly no disputing the fact that *Les Convulsions* exemplifies the reaction against the Commune and was a key text in the construction and promulgation of the reactionary memory of the Commune. In fact, the work was so in tune with the conservative establishment's conception of the Commune that Du Camp was elected to the Académie française in December 1880 on the strength of it. As further proof of Du Camp's contemporary popularity, both *Paris: ses organes* and *Les Convulsions* remained in print until 1905 and later accounts of the Commune, such as those by Lucien Nass (1914)

and Henri D'Alméras (1927), clearly owe a debt to his tendentious interpretation of events.[66] Writing from a different political perspective in 1936, and significantly during the Spanish Civil War, Frank Jellinek describes *Les Convulsions de Paris* as one of the most important reactionary histories of the Commune and warns his readers that it 'must be used with extreme caution'.[67]

Rather than just dismiss Du Camp as the archetypal reactionary and enemy of the Commune, therefore, I would like instead to re-evaluate *Les Convulsions*, as well as his earlier *Paris: ses organes* – a work which is too often read merely as a nostalgic evocation of 'le vieux Paris' (bygone Paris) – as part of a much wider political, historical and memorialist discourse on the Commune and its aftermath. In so doing, my focus will be specifically on reinterpreting the definitive 1876 edition of *Paris: ses organes*, and volume VI in particular, as a potentially politically subversive text which on the one hand attempts to reconstitute the textual and topographical archive of pre-Communard Paris and to preserve the memory of the Second Empire but which, on the other hand, also provides an unexpectedly ironic commentary on *l'Ordre moral* and the political preoccupations of the period. Taken together, *Paris: ses organes* and *Les Convulsions* provide a useful touchstone for the reinterpretation of Zola's literary representations of Paris and their Commune subtext.

The most obvious of Zola's novels to examine in a book on the memory of the Commune would have been *La Débâcle* (1892), the penultimate volume of the *Rougon-Macquart* and effectively the cycle's conclusion in terms of its great social and political themes.[68] However, apart from the fact that *La Débâcle* was written outside of the self-imposed timeframe of this book, the choice of this novel would have been too limiting. Better, I thought, to select novels that on the surface at least do not purport to engage with the memory of 1871 and to see how the themes and imagery that characterize the later novel were in fact already covertly present in Zola's Paris-set novels of the 1870s. The three novels I chose to examine were selected primarily because each one was written and published at a significant moment in the city's history; the immediate aftermath of the Commune in *Le Ventre de Paris*, the period when *l'Ordre moral* was unravelling in *L'Assommoir*, and during the 1878 festivities in *Une page d'amour*.

The initial serializations of Zola's novels in influential, though low-circulation, newspapers guaranteed him a degree of notoriety but, as has often been noted, it was *L'Assommoir* that placed him on the best-seller list (*RM*, II, 1534–5, 1558–68). This success did much to stimulate sales

of his earlier novels and created an eager audience for the future volumes of *Les Rougon-Macquart*. However, despite the undoubted popularity of the serializations, which no doubt broadened his audience base, there is strong evidence to suggest that Zola was not much read by the working and lower middle classes, and even less so by women in these groups.[69] The core of his readership in the 1870s consisted primarily of other writers and intellectuals and, importantly, the bourgeoisie; people who had the education, money and spare time required to read novels.[70] This is not to deny Zola's later popularity among some sections of the working classes and the members of the Socialist and Communist parties, and the success of *Germinal* in particular among these groups but, as Anne-Marie Thiesse shows in her study of the reading of popular literature during the Belle Epoque, it was *bourgeois* rather than working-class readers of the period who appear to have been the more profoundly influenced by the novels they read in terms of their own personal development and in the adoption of their ideological stance (p. 55). An appreciation of the importance of Zola's influence on his middle-class readers, particularly in his depiction of the working classes, therefore, is of some importance. As Nelly Wolf argues, so successful was Zola's mid-nineteenth-century bourgeois conception of the working class in *L'Assommoir* and *Germinal* as alcohol-sodden, violent, degenerate, exhausted and starving, that it greatly influenced many other writers after him.[71] A careful reading of his novels of the 1870s, particularly those which are not overtly political such as *L'Assommoir* and *Une page d'amour*, therefore, not only enhances our understanding of Zola's own reaction to the events of May 1871 but also highlights the ways in which he was both influenced by, and a promulgator of, collective memories of Paris during the Commune. Zola was certainly not alone among writers in his adoption of the Commune as an intertext, but the unique blending in his novels of the pedagogical with the 'lisible' (readerly) and the 'scriptible' (writerly), to borrow the terms coined by Roland Barthes,[72] ensured that they endured the test of time whereas the literary fiction of most of his counter-revolutionary contemporaries such as Pierre Zaccone, Pierre Bion, and Elémir Bourges, for example, did not.[73]

In Chapter 5, I go on to trace how some of the same themes and images discussed in relation to *Le Monde illustré* and the Du Camp and Zola texts were interpreted through the medium of contemporary photography. The thousands of photographs taken in the aftermath of the Commune only became the focus of serious critical analysis during the 1970s. Jean-Claude Gautrand's analysis, written not long after May 1968

～ 22 ～

and the centenary of the Commune (and very much of its time), was perhaps the first real attempt to identify and discuss the subject in any detail; though his somewhat uncritical assessment of the photographer Bruno Braquehais as pro-Communard, on the basis that he produced several close-up shots of Communards posing alongside the Vendôme Column or on barricades, has subsequently been challenged by Linda Nochlin, who points out that Braquehais also photographed Versaillais soldiers.[74]

Building on Gautrand's early work, Donald English's perceptive 1981 study remains the best introduction yet to the whole subject of photography and the Commune, since it draws particular attention to the wider political, social, commercial, cultural and aesthetic contexts in which these photographs were produced and circulated.[75] Christine Lapostolle has also attempted to classify photographs taken during the Commune and its aftermath according to subject matter and ideological viewpoint (pro- or anti-Communard). In so doing, she questions the received opinion that Ernest Eugène Appert's photomontages, for example, were just anti-Communard propaganda and argues, convincingly, that such images should be reinterpreted within the context of contemporary notions of photography and 'reality' and what was deemed acceptable as a 'historical document'.[76] Elsewhere, Lapostolle has also highlighted the extensive use of the ruin as a photographic theme in line with contemporary political and literary discourse.[77] Alisa Luxenberg has taken up and developed this line of argument, citing Jules Claretie's descriptions in *L'Illustration* and Théophile Gautier's *Tableaux de sièges: Paris, 1870– 1871* (1871) as the textual equivalents of Jules Andrieu's album 'Désastres de guerre'.[78] Luxenberg, however, like English and Lapostolle, stops short of any detailed comparative analysis between the photographic image of the ruin and contemporary discourse. My aim, therefore, is to focus on Charles Soulier's representation of the Tuileries Palace ruins, in order to explore the full ideological, symbolic, cultural and aesthetic purchase of the ruin at this particularly significant historical moment.

To date, commentators have tended to focus on the images produced by Braquehais, Andrieu, Appert, and Alphonse Justin Liébert. By contrast, the albums and collections produced in the 1870s by Soulier, Edouard-Denis Baldus and Charles Marville, all recognized as important Second Empire photographers, have escaped full analysis within the context of the production and consumption of images of Paris after the Commune. My aim is to redress the balance by looking at some of the political and memorialist implications of their images and to argue

that their representations of Paris, each in their own way, in fact exemplify the collective political and aesthetic response of the conservative bourgeoisie – the intended purchasers of their photographs – to the demise of the Second Empire and the repression of Commune. Contrary to received opinion, Baldus's post-Commune vision of Paris, for example, is far from free of political or ideological bias, as the analysis in Chapter 5 will show.[79]

The full political implications of Marville's officially commissioned displays of photographs depicting the old, pre-Haussmann Paris set alongside the new Paris of the early Third Republic for the 1878 *Exposition universelle* have similarly not been much discussed by commentators. This exhibit, as I will demonstrate, effectively created a new photographic 'art of memory' designed to reflect the healthy and hygienic Paris of the new Republic, a Paris which had been suitably purged of both its Second Empire and Communard past. While Marie de Thézy draws attention to the inclusion of Marville's photographs in the 1878 *Exposition*, and while she sheds much light on his contribution to the documentation of the building projects of the Third Republic, she tends to see these projects as a straightforward continuation of Second Empire Haussmannization. In her comprehensive catalogue of Marville's œuvre, Thézy makes only a passing reference to the Commune and no mention at all of the ideological and political agenda that underpinned the reconstruction of the city during the Third Republic.[80] The same holds true of a piece which appeared in the journal *Foncier mensuel*. Marville's photographs of the reconstruction of the Vendôme Column are seen featured alongside interviews with Thézy and the photographer Tom Drahos about his own series of photographs entitled 'La Colonne Vendôme', but the political and memorialist significance of this monument are again left unexplored.[81] Instead, it is left to Jean-Pierre Dufreigne, in his review of Thézy's book on Marville, to politicize the photographer's work of the 1870s. For Dufreigne, Marville depicts the bourgeois, absolutist 'Paris du Thiers-Etat' (a quibble on the Third Estate (Government) and the name of its leader, Adolphe Thiers).[82] Dufreigne, however, goes no further with this provocative line of argument. A reappraisal of Marville's work within the context of post-Commune Paris and the 1878 *Exposition* would therefore seem to be overdue.

Necessarily limited as this choice of case studies is, it did however reveal to me a number of memorialist constructs based on a consistent set of cultural values and assumptions on behalf of the writers, artists and photographers in question. Many of the materials studied, for

example, share the same obsession with decadence and attempt to explain the destruction of the city as a form of divine retribution. There is dependence also on a shared literary canon consisting principally of the Bible, Shakespeare, Corneille, Voltaire, and Victor Hugo, all of which are plundered in order to find ways to come to terms with the horror of the *Semaine sanglante* and to describe events deemed to be indescribable. The shared imagery, language, rhetoric, and narrative form are all put to work in order to rationalize and excuse or at least legitimize the repression of the Commune and to suppress the cruelty of the Versaillais and the suffering of their victims.

Now that I have outlined the aims and scope of this book, it is perhaps useful to end this general introduction by noting briefly what I have specifically *not* aimed to do. It has not been my intention to write another history of the Commune and the early Third Republic or to offer another history of nineteenth-century photography or the 'golden age' of the French press. Also, it has not been my intention to provide a further analysis of Zola's politics or another general study of Paris within *Les Rougon-Macquart*. Still less have I aimed to provide a critical philosophical or theoretical assessment of memory theory. What I have tried to do throughout, however, is to remain very closely focused on a selection of case studies in order to explore the ways in which memories of Paris and the Commune were constructed and repressed in the 1870s. In drawing comparisons between different forms and genres of texts and images I have tried to shed new light on our understanding of a particular flashpoint in French history.

Notes

1 Extract from the speech delivered to the French National Assembly translated by J.P.T. Bury in *Gambetta's Final Years: 'The Era of Difficulties' 1877–1882* (London and New York: Longman, 1982), p. 167. Throughout this book all translations into English, unless otherwise attributed, are my own, and reference is given to the original text. Further references to a cited text will appear in brackets after quotations; passages without page reference are from the last-cited page. Unless otherwise noted, all italics are the author's and all ellipses mine.

2 For a comprehensive account of the political machinations surrounding the granting of the amnesty and Gambetta's involvement see Bury, *Gambetta's Final Years*, ch. 8, and Jean T. Joughin, 'The Paris Commune in French Politics 1871–1880', *The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science*, 73: 1 (1955).

3 Jacques Rougerie, *La Commune de 1871* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1988), pp. 117–19.

4 Robert Cook, *Civil War America: Making a Nation 1848–1877* (London: Pearson Longman, 2003), p. 114. On the parallels between the two conflicts see Wolfgang Schivelbusche, *The Culture of Defeat: On National Trauma, Mourning, and Recovery*, trans. by Jefferson Chase (London: Granta Books, 2003).

5 For example: Walter Redfern, *Feet First: Jules Vallès* (Glasgow: University of Glasgow French and German Publications, 1992); Rachael Langford, *Jules Vallès and the Narration of History: Contesting the French Third Republic in the 'Jacques Vingtras' Trilogy* (Bern: Lang, 1999); Kristin Ross, *The Emergence of Social Space: Rimbaud and the Paris Commune* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988); Jane Mayo Roos, 'Within the "Zone of Silence": Monet and Manet in 1878', *Art History*, 11: 3 (September 1988), 374–407 and *Early Impressionism and the French State (1866–1874)* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996), chs 9, 10; Jacquelynn Baas, 'Edouard Manet and *Civil War*', and Ronda Kasl, 'Edouard Manet's "Rue Mosnier": Le pauvre-a-t-il une patrie?', in *Art Journal*, 45: 1 (spring, 1985), 36–42 and 49–58; Jean Péridier, *La Commune et les artistes: Pottier-Courbet-Vallès-J.-B. Clément* (Paris: Nouvelles éditions latines, 1980); Albert Boime, *Art and the French Commune: Imagining Paris after War and Revolution* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1995); and John House, *Impressionism, Paint and Politics* (New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 2004). A notable exception is Paul Lidsky's *Les Ecrivains contre la Commune*, 2nd edn (Paris: La Découverte, 1999), but even he concentrates mainly on canonical names. See also J.M. Roberts, 'La Commune considérée par la droite: dimensions d'une mythologie', *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine*, 19 (1972), 187–205.

6 See David A. Shafer, *The Paris Commune: French Politics, Culture, and Society at the Crossroads of the Revolutionary Tradition and Revolutionary Socialism* (New York and Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), chs 1–2.

7 See Pamela M. Pilbeam, *Republicanism in Nineteenth-Century France* (London: Macmillan, 1995), p. 19, for an analysis of the different republican factions and the often blurred distinctions between conservative republicans and liberal monarchists.

8 See J.P.T. Bury, *Gambetta and the Making of the Third Republic* (London: Longman, 1973), p. 7.

9 William Serman, *La Commune de Paris (1871)* (Paris: Fayard, 1986), p. 281; Rougerie, *La Commune de 1871*, p. 62.

10 See Edith Thomas, *Les Pétroleuses* (Paris: Gallimard, 1963); Gay L. Gullickson, *Unruly Women of Paris: Images of the Commune* (Ithaca, NY, and London: Cornell University Press, 1996); and Carolyn J. Eichner, *Surmounting the Barricades: Women in the Paris Commune* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004).

11 Maxime Du Camp, *Paris: ses organes, ses fonctions et sa vie dans la seconde moitié du XIXe siècle*, 6 vols (Paris: Hachette, 1884–95), VI, p. 318.

12 Henri Lefebvre, *La Proclamation de la Commune* (Paris: Gallimard, 1965), p. 133.

13 David Harvey, *Consciousness and the Urban Experience* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1985), pp. 205–29.

14 See Lefebvre, *La Proclamation de la Commune*, p. 133.

15 Robert Tombs, *The Paris Commune, 1871* (London: Longman, 2000), p. 106.

16 Serman, p. 277.

17 David H. Pinkney, *Napoleon III and the Rebuilding of Paris* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1958), p. 17.

18 Lefebvre, 'La Classe ouvrière et l'espace' (1972), in *Espace et politique*, 2nd edn (Paris: Anthropos, 2000), pp. 168–9. Lefebvre develops this theme in greater detail in *La Production de l'espace* (Paris: Anthropos, 1974).

19 Harvey, pp. 205–29.

20 For details of the campaigning activities and documentation provided by Les Amis de la Commune, visit the group's website at < http://lacomune.club.fr> [accessed 7 April 2006].

21 For a concise history of this period see Keith Randell, *France: The Third Republic 1870–1914* (London: Edward Arnold, 1986), pp. 27–34.

22 See Bury, *Gambetta's Final Years*, p. 167.

23 See Stéphane Gacon, 'L'Oubli institutionnel', in *Oublier nos crimes: L'Amnésie nationale: une spécificité française?*, ed. by Dimitri Nicolaïdis (Paris: Editions Autrement, 1994), pp. 98–111 (p. 105).

24 See, for example, Fredric Jameson, *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1981); Pierre Nora, ed., *Les Lieux de mémoire*, 3 vols (Paris: Gallimard, 1984–93); Andreas Huyssen, *Twilight Memories: Marking time in a Culture of Amnesia* (New York and London: Routledge, 1995) and *Present Pasts: Urban Palimpsests and the Politics of Memory* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2003); and Edward S. Casey, *Remembering: A Phenomenological Study*, 2nd edn (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2000). For an introduction to the whole subject of cultural memory see Susannah Radstone, ed., *Memory and Methodology* (Oxford: Berg, 2000); Susannah Radstone and Katherine Hodgkin, eds, *Regimes of Memory* (London: Routledge, 2003); Noel Packard and Christopher Chen, 'From Medieval Mnemonics to a Social Construction of Memory', *American Behavioral Scientist*, 48: 10 (June 2005), 1297–319; and J. Candau, *Anthropologie de la mémoire* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1996).

25 Radstone, *Memory and Methodology*, p. 1.

26 For a discussion of Lamark's *Recherches sur l'organisation des corps vivants* (1802), Ribot's *L'Hérédité: Etude psychologique sur ses phénomènes, ses lois, ses causes, ses conséquences* (1873), and *Les Maladies de la mémoire* (1881),

and for an introduction to the whole concept of organic memory theory, see Laura Otis, *Organic Memory: History and the Body in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century* (Lincoln, NE, and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1994).

27 Matt Matsuda, *The Memory of the Modern* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), pp. 9–10.

28 The seminal texts are Nietzsche, 'On the Uses and Disadvantages of History for Life', in *Untimely Meditations* (1874), ed. by J.P. Stern and trans. by R.J. Hollingdale (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983) and *On the Genealogy of Morals* (1887), ed. and trans. by Douglas Smith (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), essays 1 and 2.

29 Marc Sautet, *Nietzsche et la Commune* (Paris: Le Sycomore, 1981).

30 See Nietzsche, 'On the Uses and Disadvantages of History for Life', and *On the Genealogy of Morals*, essays 1 and 2.

31 Nietzsche, *On the Genealogy of Morals*, p. 39.

32 Nietzsche, 'On the Uses and Disadvantages of History for Life', pp. 60–1.

33 Nietzsche, *On the Genealogy of Morals*, pp. 40, 42.

34 The seminal texts are Maurice Halbwachs, *Les Cadres sociaux de la mémoire* (1925), ed. by Gérard Namer (Paris: Albin Michel, 1997), and *La Mémoire collective* (1950), ed. by Gérard Namer (Paris: Albin Michel, 1997).

35 Halbwachs, *Les Cadres*, p. vi.

36 'Les lieux de mémoire ne sont pas *ce* dont on se souvient, mais *là* où la mémoire travaille; non la tradition elle-même, mais son laboratoire'. Nora, *Les Lieux de mémoire*, vol. 2. (1986), *La Nation*, I, vii–x. The concept of the 'lieu de mémoire' (site/locus of memory) – which holds that memory is spatially created and can be ascribed to, or inscribed on, a space or place – goes back to antiquity. See Frances Yates, *The Art of Memory* (London: Routledge & Paul Kegan, 1966).

37 Henri Bergson, *Matière et mémoire: essaie sur la relation du corps à l'esprit* (Paris: Quadrige/Presses universitaires de France, 1997).

38 Halbwachs, *La Mémoire collective*, p. 244. For an account of the development of Halbwachs's thought see also Namer's 'Postface' to *Les Cadres*; Laurent Mucchielli, 'Pour une psychologie collective: l'héritage durkheimien d'Halbwachs et sa rivalité avec Blondel durant l'entre-deux guerres', *Revue d'histoire des sciences humaines*, 1 (1999), pp. 103–41; and one of Halbwachs's own source texts, Emile Durkheim, 'Représentations individuelles et représentations collectives', in *Sociologie et philosophie* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1967), pp. 1–38.

39 Halbwachs, *Les Cadres*, p. vi.

40 Halbwachs, *La Mémoire collective*, pp. 131–2.

41 Halbwachs, *Les Cadres*, pp. 300, 367.

42 Paul Connerton, *How Societies Remember* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p. 14.

〜 28 〜

43 See Gacon, for example. Evidence of the Commune's continuing capacity to provoke strong feelings was provided by the controversy that surrounded the showing on French television of the film *La Commune* (1999) by the British filmmaker Peter Watkins. See his website <www.mnsi.net/~pwatkins> [accessed 7 April, 2006]. See also Shafer, p. 186.

44 Other official references to the Commune include the metro station 'Louise Michel' (originally called Vallier and renamed on 1 May 1946) and a number of streets named after other Commune leaders between 1882 and 1930. For a complete list of these see Jean Braire, *Sur les traces des Communards: Enquête dans les rues de Paris d'aujourd'hui* (Paris: Editions Amis de la Commune, 1988), p. 224. Braire (p. 182) also highlights the fact that the bas-relief by Paul Moreau-Vauthier entitled 'Aux Victimes des Révolutions' and situated in the Square Gambetta adjacent to Père Lachaise, and often mistaken for the *Mur des fédérés*, is in fact an inclusive memorial which pays tribute not only to the Parisians who died during the Commune but equally to the hundred or so Versaillais who also died in the combat. On the mythology of the *Mur* see Tombs, *The Paris Commune*, p. 195, and Madeleine Rebérioux, 'Le Mur des fédérés' in Nora, *Les Lieux de mémoire*, vol. 1 (1984), *La République*, pp. 619–49.

45 Hereafter referred to in the body of the text as *Paris: ses organes* and *Les Convulsions* respectively. All interpolated references giving volume and page number are abbreviated to *PSO* and *LC* and unless otherwise stated are taken from *Paris: ses organes, ses fonctions et sa vie dans la seconde moitié du XIXe siècle*, 6 vols (Paris: Hachette, 1884–95), I (1893), II (1883), III (1895), IV (1894), V (1884), VI (1884), and *Les Convulsions de Paris*, 4 vols, 5th edn (Paris: Hachette, 1881).

46 Unless otherwise stated, all references to these novels, giving volume and page number, are taken from the *La Pléiade* edition, *Les Rougon-Macquart*, ed. by Henri Mitterand, 5 vols (Paris: Gallimard, 1960–67), which is abbreviated to *RM*.

47 Matsuda, pp. 13, 88.

48 See Michael Sprinker, *History and Ideology in Proust: A la recherche du temps perdu and the Third French Republic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 36–47.

49 Mouillaud, 'Le Journal: un texte sous tension', in *Textologie du journal*, ed. by Pierre Rétat (Paris: Minard, 1990), p. 154.

50 Du Camp, *Les Chants modernes*, 2nd edn (Paris: Librairie nouvelle, 1860), p. 4.

51 Gretton, 'Difference and Competition: the Imitation and Reproduction of Fine Art in a Nineteenth-century Illustrated Weekly News Magazine', *Oxford Art Journal*, 23: 2 (2000), pp. 143–62.

52 Mouillaud, p. 155. On Mikhail Bakhtin see Sue Vice, *Introducing Bakhtin* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1997).

53 *Polyphonic text*: a text in which several voices or points of view interact on more or less equal terms. The term is used by Bakhtin in *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (1929) as an equivalent to *dialogic* and refers to the responsive nature of dialogue as opposed to the single-mindedness of monologue.

54 See Jean-Noël Marchandiau, *L'Illustration 1843–1944: Vie et mort d'un journal* (Toulouse: Editions Privat, 1987), pp. 52, 108, 115, 332.

55 Anne-Marie Thiesse, *Le Roman du quotidien: lecteurs et lectures populaires à la Belle Epoque* (Paris: Seuil, 2000), pp. 10–11; and Richard Terdiman, *Discourse/Counter-Discourse: Theory and Practice of Symbolic Resistance in Nineteenth-Century France* (Ithaca, NY, and London: Cornell University Press, 1985), ch. 2.

56 For example Boime; Roos, 'Within the "Zone of Silence"'; John Milner, *Art, War and Revolution in France 1870–1871: Myth, Reportage and Reality* (New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 2000); and James A. Leith, ed., *Images of the Commune* (Montreal and London: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1978).

57 For contemporary accounts of the press see, for example, Eugène Dubief, *Le Journalisme* (Paris: Hachette, 1892). The most comprehensive modern survey of the press during the Second Empire, Commune and the Third Republic is Claude Bellanger et al., *Histoire générale de la presse française*, 4 vols (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1972), II and III. On the press and the law see Irene Collins, *The Government and the Newspaper Press in France, 1814–1881* (London: Oxford University Press, 1959); and Robert Justin Goldstein, *Censorship of Political Caricature in Nineteenth-century France* (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1989). On the press and the Commune, see Aimé Dupuy, *1870–1871: La Guerre, la Commune et la presse* (Paris: Armand Colin, 1959). On the illustrated press in general, see Louis Guéry, *Visages de la presse: La Présentation des journaux des origines à nos jours* (Paris: Editions du Centre de formation et de perfectionnement des journalistes, 1997), and Jean Watelet, *La Presse illustrée en France*, *1814–1914*, 11 vols (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Université Panthéon-Assas, Paris II, 17 January 1998), III. On the satirical press, see Philippe Régnier, ed., *La Caricature entre République et censure: L'Imagerie satirique en France de 1830–1880: un discours de résistance?* (Lyons: Presses universitaires de Lyon, 1996); and Philippe Roberts-Jones, *La Presse satirique illustrée entre 1860 et 1890* (Paris: Institut français de la presse, 1956), and *De Daumier à Lautrec: Essai sur l'histoire de la caricature française* (Paris: Les Beaux Arts, 1960).

58 Gretton, 'Difference and Competition'.

59 Lidsky, *Les Ecrivains contre la Commune.*

60 Roberts, 'La Commune considérée par la droite'.

61 See Rifkin, 'No Particular Thing to Mean', *Block*, 8 (1983), pp. 36–45; 'Well Formed Phrases: Some Limits of Meaning in Political Print at the End of the Second Empire', *The Oxford Art Journal*, 8: 1 (1985), pp. 20–8; and

also 'Cultural Movement and the Paris Commune', *Art History*, 2 (1979), pp. 51–61.

62 Matsuda, pp. 13, 88.

63 See Emile Zola, *Œuvres complètes*, ed. by Henri Mitterand, 15 vols (Paris: Cercle du livre précieux, 1966–69), XI, p. 141; and Enid Starkie, *Flaubert: The Making of the Master* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1967), pp. 234, 237–8.

64 See Michel Dewachter, Daniel Oster and Jean Leclant, eds, *Le Nil*, in *Un Voyageur en Egypte vers 1850: 'Le Nil' de Maxime Du Camp* (n.p.: Sand/Coni, 1987); Sylvie Aubenas and Jacques Lacarrière, *Voyage en Orient* (Paris: Hazan, 1999); and Senneville, *Maxime Du Camp: Un spectateur engagé du XIXe siècle* (Paris: Editions Stock, 1996).

65 Lidsky, p. 57.

66 Lucien Nass, *Le Siège de Paris et la Commune* (Paris: Plon, 1914); Henri D'Alméras, *La Vie parisienne pendant le Siège et sous la Commune* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1927).

67 Jellinek, *The Paris Commune* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1937), pp. 425–6.

68 See Robert Lethbridge's introduction to Zola, *La Débâcle*, trans. by Elinor Dorday (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. vii–xxviii (p. xii). See also Zola himself on *La Débâcle*: 'Mon plan à toujours été d'aller jusqu'à la Commune, car je considère la Commune comme une conséquence immédiate de la chute de l'empire et la guerre' (*RM*, V, 1416).

69 Thiesse, pp. 38, 70–1.

70 See Paule Lejeune, *'Germinal': un roman antipeuple* (Paris: Nizet, 1978), pp. 33–4; Edouard Rod, *A Propos de 'L'Assommoir'* (Paris: Marpon & Flammarion, 1879); Emile Faguet, *Propos littéraires*, 5 vols (Paris: Société française d'imprimerie et de librairie, 1902–9), III (1905), pp. 247, 271–2; and Colette Becker, 'L'Audience d'Emile Zola', *Les Cahiers naturalistes*, 47 (1974), pp. 40–69.

71 Nelly Wolf, *Le Peuple dans le roman français de Zola à Céline* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1990), pp. 15, 264.

72 See Barthes, *S/Z* (Paris: Seuil, 1970), p. 265. *Lisible/Scriptible*: *lisible* denotes texts, typically popular novels (one might say 'airport novels'), written in a realist style that involves little participation/interpretative analysis from the reader other than the consumption of a fixed meaning, whereas *scriptible* refers to, usually, Modernist texts that challenge the reader to produce his/her own meaning from a choice of possibilities.

73 On the Commune in literature see Roger Bellet and Philippe Régnier, eds, *Ecrire la Commune: Témoignages, récits et romans (1871–1931)* (Tusson, Charente: Editions du Lérot, 1994); and Madeleine Rebérioux, 'Roman, théâtre et chanson: quelle Commune?', and Anne Roche and Gérard Delfau, 'La Commune et le roman français', both in *Le Mouvement social*, 79 (April/June 1972), pp. 273–92, 293–318.

74 Claude Gautrand, '1870–1871: Les Photographes et la Commune', *Photo-Ciné-Revue* (February 1972), pp. 53–63; John Wiener, 'Paris Commune Photos at a New York Gallery: An Interview with Linda Nochlin', *Radical History Review*, 32 (1985), pp. 59–70. Daryl Lee's 'Braquehais: photographie, ruines, Paris', in *Bruno Braquehais, un photographe de la Commune. Exposition du 9 mars au 19 juin 2000, Musée d'art et d'histoire, Saint-Denis*, ed. by Sylvie Gonzalez (Saint-Denis: n.pub., 2000), pp. 3–5, does not take account of Nochlin and also automatically assumes that Braquehais 'demeure sympathique aux communards'.

75 Donald E. English, *Political Uses of Photography in the Third French Republic, 1871–1914* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Research Press, 1981), chs 1–2. For an account of the use of photographs of the Commune by the state and the police, see also Pierre Gaudin and Claire Revercheron, 'Une image renversée: Les Photographies des barricades de la Commune', in *La Barricade*, ed. by Alain Corbin and Jean-Marie Mayeur (Paris: La Presse de la Sorbonne, 1997), pp. 337–40.

76 Christine Lapostolle, 'Plus vrai que le vrai: stratégie photographique et Commune de Paris', *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, 73 (June 1988), pp. 67–76.

77 Christine Lapostolle, 'De la barricade à la ruine', *La Recherche photographique*, 6 (June 1989), pp. 20–8.

78 Alisa Luxenberg, 'Creating *Désastres*: Andrieu's Photographs of Urban Ruins in the Paris of 1871', *Art Bulletin*, 80: 1 (March 1998), pp. 113–36. See also Luxenberg's 'Le spectacle des ruines', in Quentin Bajac, ed., *La Commune photographiée* (Paris: Editions de la Réunion des musées nationaux, 2000), pp. 25–36.

79 See Malcolm Daniel in *Edouard Baldus, photographe*, ed. by Phyllis Lambert (New York, Montreal, Paris: Reunion des Musées nationaux, 1994), p. 96.

80 Marie de Thézy, *Marville. Paris* (Paris: Hazan, 1994), pp. 26–36, 121–7.

81 'Photographies capitales: Charles Marville, Tom Drahos', *Foncier mensuel* (November 1994), pp. 1–4.

82 Pierre Dufreigne, 'Images d'un Paris perdu', *L'Express*, 17 November 1994, pp. 120–2.