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Abstract

The fight for the liberty of the press was an ongoing struggle in France since the French Revolution in 1789 and it remained a factor until July 1881, when liberal press laws were enacted by the Republican officials in charge of governing the country at the time. The press was the life and soul of political life in nineteenth-century France. Prints formed a core currency of communication; they were the most important vehicle of visual information as they reached a far greater percentage of the population than did artworks in other media, and they had the force to unite people. As will be discussed over the course of this study, prints can help breakdown the complexity of political stakes of a nation at any moment in time to make them legible to a broad array of the viewing public.

Between 1867 and 1881, the direction of the French regime hung in the balance. This dissertation argues that the prints of Honoré Daumier, André Gill, Alfred Le Petit, and Édouard Manet sustained the Republic at a crucial moment in French history. These four artists shared a republican ideology and they advanced a specific political agenda during a turbulent fifteen-year period in France. Their political prints helped shape the decisions of French citizens in coming to terms with the benefits that a republican governing body had to offer to the nation. Examining this relationship provides a network of related artistic efforts by a diverse group of artists within the visual language of satire in a manner that has not been explored before in a scholarly project.

The period between 1867 and 1881 can be roughly broken down into four phases, and those distinct moments act as markers for my chapters. Each chapter examines artworks by each artist, some of which have never been reproduced before, or considers a particular event that has marked the individual’s career as a republican artist, to trace a large arc of republican sentiment. The years 1867 to 1870 formed part of the liberal phase of the Second Empire. Yet, Napoléon III
was still viewed by many as an oppressor who barred the re-establishment of a republic. The first chapter investigates how the four artists mentioned above asserted freedom of political and artistic expression. After the collapse of the Second Empire, the Franco-Prussian War and the Paris Commune overshadowed the early Third Republic in 1870-1871. The Republic was at its most fragile during this time, since it lacked a sense of direction and was marred by violence and turmoil. Chapter 2 considers the causes that Daumier, Manet, Gill, and Le Petit supported at a time when different shades of republicanism emerged. As a consequence of the civil disorder, a monarchical government headed the Third Republic from 1871 to 1877. From a political standpoint, this period was highly conservative, and unsettling to republicans. The third chapter examines political prints that were effective at discrediting the gouvernement de l’Ordre moral and other conservative forces in the first half of the 1870s. 1877 marked the first year republicans gained majority vote in national elections. From 1877 to 1881, though not without its controversies, the roots of a strong republican system started to take hold, effectively bringing to an end the “era of revolutions” in France. Chapter 4 addresses the key events that led to the spread of republican principles, and how this impacted what was tolerated and who became targets of opposition in political imagery.

At a time when visual culture interrelated with historical events and political debates, I contend that Daumier, Manet, Gill, and Le Petit not only contributed to a spirit of republican resistance but were successful in creating a visual discourse of opposition prior to the passage of the liberal press laws in 1881. These artists were pivotal figures who fought for the liberty of expression that many other artists have been able to experience since then. Thus, the political prints Daumier, Manet, Gill, and Le Petit produced during a tumultuous and complex period of France’s history had served their purpose.
Introduction

Artists are often moral leaders dedicated to ideological and humanitarian principles. Throughout the history of art, artists have used their artworks as venues to contest societal beliefs and political virtues. In many different countries, including France, artists have served as representatives and have joined forces with revolutionary activists to support specific causes. As this study will show, especially through the lens of prints, art and politics in France have not been separable since the days of the French Revolution. Nineteenth-century France, with all the constitutional changes it underwent – the country witnessed multiple regime changes with kings, emperors, and republican leaders all taking turns governing the nation – particularly lends itself to political scrutiny, and at the time, this manifested itself substantially through the art of caricature. From the end of the Napoleonic Wars in 1815 through the last decade of the nineteenth century, France developed a rich tradition of caricature making. Its heyday covered a period of fifty years between 1830 – when Charles Philipon (1800-1862) first began publishing satirical illustrated journals – and 1881 – when France passed liberal press laws that enabled broad political critique, an event that significantly impacted the nation’s output of caricatures.

The fifteen-year period leading up to 1881 is especially intriguing because it is one of the most popular periods of study in French art history, owing to the fact that the Impressionists came to the fore at this exact moment, yet the political climate that marked those years has largely been addressed through the lens of canonical artists. For this reason, the Impressionist movement is far better known today, than, for instance, the political prints that Honoré Daumier (1808-1879), Édouard Manet (1832-1883), André Gill (1840-1885), and Alfred Le Petit (1841-1909) created in the late Second Empire and the early Third Republic. Studying the art of artists such as Claude Monet (1840-1926), Pierre-Auguste Renoir (1841-1919), Camille Pissarro (1830-
1903), Edgar Degas (1834-1917), Berthe Morisot (1841-1895), Gustave Caillebotte (1848-1894),
and Alfred Sisley (1839-1899) has its merits; however, it does not provide a full account of
artistic creation in France in the last third of the nineteenth century. The emphasis on
Impressionist paintings within the framework of recent curriculum has, by and large, misled
people to view the 1870s as a time of peace and stability in French history, when clearly different
political factions were vying for power and aimed to govern the nation according to their own set
of rules. Prints, especially lithographs, were used to comment on different political developments
during this period. Accordingly, they offer viewers with a better understanding of the quotidian
challenges and confrontations that French citizens had to face during a volatile period, in
comparison to many of the Impressionist paintings, which remain idyllic or banal in nature. Art
historians need to familiarize themselves more with artworks that were made in direct dialogue
with the everyday, because they express common experiences that impacted all strands of
society, not only that of distinct patrons, collectors, dealers, and art critics. As such, this
dissertation will consider art in the service of ideas rather than art for art’s sake. In short, my
analysis will explore certain crossroads where art history and history meet.

The press was the life and soul of political life in nineteenth-century France. Prints formed a
core currency of communication – they were the most important vehicle of visual information –
because they could unite words and images in a manner unlike that of any other artistic media.
The vast majority of artworks discussed in this dissertation are lithographs; lithographs were the
cheapest form of print production at the time, and they remained highly popular even after the
advent of newer printmaking techniques. The relative ease with which one could design a
lithograph meant that the printmaking technique lent itself to a broad range of image-makers and
satirical purposes, and as a result, lithography has long been associated with political criticism
and protest in France (one of the earliest known French lithographic caricatures was produced by
the Romantic painter Eugène Delacroix (1798-1863) in the early 1820s (fig. 1).\(^1\) Therefore,
caricature formed part of everyday life in Paris throughout the second half of the nineteenth
century.

Caricatures predominantly appeared in illustrated journals and were intended for wide
dissemination. Journal subscribers were primarily from the bourgeoisie; however, circulation
numbers of a specific journal bore no resemblance to a newspaper’s actual readership. Individual
newspaper copies could have a large number of readers. The clientele of cafés and taverns were
exposed to newspapers on a daily basis, making prints and caricatures accessible to the
politically active sections of the urban population. Furthermore, neighbors and members of
literary circles would commonly share the costs of journal subscriptions either informally or
through literary societies.\(^2\) French citizens could also gain access to journals in *cabinets de
lecture* (fig. 2), public establishments that were first introduced in France in the eighteenth
century and remained popular well into the nineteenth century. Paris alone counted over a
hundred *cabinets de lecture* in the nineteenth century, many of which would have carried
illustrated journals, where for a fraction of the cost of a subscription to a single newspaper,

\(^{\text{1}}\) For more on Delacroix’s experimentation with caricatures and lithography’s associations to
political criticism, see Nina Maria Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, *Eugène Delacroix: Prints, Politics
and Satire 1814-1822* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991), and Theodore Reff, “The
Street as Battleground,” in *Manet and Modern Paris: One Hundred Paintings, Drawings, Prints,
and Photographs by Manet and His Contemporaries*, ed., Reff (Washington: National Gallery of
Art, 1982), 208.

\(^{\text{2}}\) For more on how groups of individuals came together to minimize subscription costs, see David
S. Kerr, *Caricature and French Political Culture 1830-1848: Charles Philipon and the
individuals could read dozens of different journals. Window fronts of print shops functioned as free public galleries (fig. 3), and people from all walks of life were exposed to street signs on the boulevards of the French capital as noticeable in Théophile-Alexandre Steinlen’s (1859-1923) La Rue (fig. 4). Newspaper kiosks, which were dispersed throughout Paris, served as other public spaces where people could access printed images in large quantities. Vendors most often displayed illustrated papers on the page where the image could be found (figs. 5 and 6) to draw attention to the visual component of journals. The printed image had heightened significance because it addressed itself to individuals of all ages and both sexes. As Jules Grandjouan’s (1875-1968) print illustrates (fig. 6), kiosks operated as the caricaturists’ equivalent to the Salon. Simply put, at a time when Paris was the center of the art world, caricatures could be found in all corners of the metropolis.

Caricature was a massive industry in nineteenth-century Paris, and it played a pivotal part in breaking down barriers between fine art and popular art. As an art form it was commonly used for Salon criticism, developing into its own subgenre known as salons caricaturaux (figs. 7 and 8). The salons caricaturaux witnessed their epitome during the Second Empire, and artists such as Cham (1818-1879), Bertall (1820-1882), Nadar (1820-1910), and Gill were the primary contributors to its efflorescence. The role that these caricatures took on was nearly on par with that of Salon critics in determining the reception that a particular artwork or artist received in

---

3 Kerr discusses how cabinets de lecture were a cultural phenomenon of paramount importance for the consumption of newspapers and caricatures for many decades in the nineteenth century, in Caricature and French Political Culture 1830-1848, 130-137.

4 The caricature was, undeniably, the most important component of illustrated journals. Hans-Jürgen Hellwig, “Honoré Daumier – Un combattant pour la République,” in La vie politique de Daumier à nos jours, Noëlle Lenoir, ed. (Paris: Somogy, 2005), 83.
public. Several caricature journals had lengthy publishing histories, including *Le Charivari* (1832-1893), *L’Illustration* (1843-1943), and *Le Journal amusant* (1856-1928). The satirical images in these journals had the ability to ignite passions, as noted by the prolific writer Maxime du Camp (1822-1894):

*Le Charivari ... exerçait une très réelle influence sur l’opinion publique, non point par sa rédaction même qui ne dépassait guère la raillerie courante familière à tous les petits journaux, mais par ses estampes qui étaient fort recherchées et restaient facilement dans le souvenir ... dès qu’une satire un peu vive du gouvernement avait été crayonnée par *le charivari*, on peut dire que toute la population de Paris en avait connaissance en moins de vingt-quatre heures.*

It was illustrated journals such as these that paved the way for the foundation of later ones, including those that were established during the fifteen-year period I will address in my dissertation. Though shorter-lived, there were a number of significant illustrated satirical papers operating during the late Second Empire and early Third Republic. The list contains titles such as: *L’Assommoir* (1880-1881), *La Caricature Politique* (1871), *Le Carillon* (1876-1883), *La Charge* (1870-1871 and 1888-1890), *Les Contemporains* (1880-1881), *Le Cri-Cri* (1872-1873), *Le Don Quichotte* (1874-1893), *L’Éclair* (1877), *L’Éclipse* (1868-1876), *L’Esprit gaulois* (1881-1882), *La Fronde* (1874-1875), *Le Frou-Frou* (1871-1872), *Le Grelot* (1871-1907), *La Jeune...

---


6 *Le Journal pour rire* (1848-1855) was the precursor of *Le Journal amusant*. The editing team, led by Charles Philipon, and the format of the journal were the same for both papers – only the name changed.

7 “*Le Charivari ... exerted a very real influence on public opinion, not through its writing which barely exceeded the taunt familiar to small journals at the time, but through its prints which were highly in demand and easily remained in the memory [of people] ... as soon as a slightly biting satire of the government was produced by *Le Charivari*, we can say that all of Paris knew about it in less than twenty-four hours.” Maxime du Camp, *Les ancêtres de la Commune: L’attentat Fieschi* (Paris: G. Charpentier, 1877), 51.
Garde (1877-1880 and 1885-1905), La Lune (1865-1868), La Lune rousse (1876-1879), Le Monde comique (1869-1898), Le Monde pour rire (1868-1876), Le Pétard (1877-1879) La Petite Lune (1878-1879), Le Réveil illustré (1880), La Revue comique (1871-1881), Le sans-culotte (1878-1879), Le Sifflet (1872-1878), Le Titi (1878-1880), Le Trombinoscope (1871-1876 and 1881-1882), and Le Voltaire illustré (1880). The four artists that serve as the subjects of study of my scholarly project – Gill, Le Petit, Daumier, and Manet – worked within this thriving environment of image production.

Prints could be reproduced as multiples in mass numbers, and, in many cases, several thousand impressions exist of individual lithographs dating from the late Second Empire and early Third Republic. These images reached a far greater percentage of the population than artworks in other media did, and they had the force to unite people together. Simply put, prints, and caricatures more specifically, spoke to a public that was conscious of contemporary debates. As Jules Champfleury noted in his Histoire de la caricature moderne, caricature is the art of the people: “la caricature…consiste à mettre en lumière les sentiments intimes du peuple…Elle représente la foule.”

Caricatures became objects that the newer social classes used to designate themselves as modern, and they carried meaning in a manner that destabilized traditional codes and symbols. Hence, prints functioned as valuable sources of information and they offered insight into the daily occurrences of French society.

To its advantage, the printed image could be consumed both in public and private spheres alike. As Bertrand Tillier explains, caricatures first appeared on the public market as visual vehicles intended for broad dissemination, and they could quickly penetrate the private realm as

---

8 “Caricature…consists of shedding light on the inner sentiments of the people…it represents the crowd.” Jules Champfleury, Histoire de la caricature moderne (Paris: E. Dentu, 1865), vi.
well: “l’imagerie caricaturale est regardée, convoitée, achetée, parfois lue et débattue dans la rue, avant d’être introduite dans la sphère domestique où elle est relue, discutée, peut-être conservée et amassée, collectionnée même.”9 For those who had the means to acquire prints or illustrated journals, there was a level of intimacy of looking at such artworks, because one could hold them in their hands or even look at them framed on walls, likely in the comfort of their own homes, and they had the possibility to return to the images on several occasions. Thus, the consumption of such images was quite different than looking at a painting displayed at the Salon temporarily, where artworks were often hung at a height that was unfavorable to the average viewer – a frustration various Salon artists experienced over the years as conveyed by Daumier (fig. 9). In essence, the nuances of details and the exaggerations available to artists working with prints often could not be reproduced in large-scale paintings. Not surprisingly, many artists, including Daumier, Manet, Gill, and Le Petit, contributed to the growing popularity of the printed image.

At a time when more people understood visual imagery than the printed word (approximately 21% of the population remained illiterate in 1872), prints were instrumental in molding the beliefs of French society.10 Images could seduce viewers by example and were a form of propaganda, because they could provide opinions on certain topics to individuals who had not necessarily formulated their own thoughts beforehand. Plantu (1951–), a contributor to the French illustrated press for nearly fifty years, called attention to this exact notion in a recent article: “j’aimerais qu’ils sachent que l’on peut tout dire avec un dessin, que l’on peut liberer par

---

9 “Caricatural imagery is looked at, coveted, bought, sometimes read and debated on the streets, before being introduced into the domestic sphere, where it is reread, discussed, perhaps preserved and gathered, or even collected.” Bertrand Tillier, À la charge! La caricature politique en France de 1789 à 2000 (Saint-Denis: Musée d’art et d’Histoire, 2005), 110.
le dessin quelque chose que l’on a en soi et qui s’appelle une opinion.”

Not surprisingly, leaders feared the content of illustrated journals, especially as it related to political affairs, for much of the nineteenth century. Laughter and mockery, without any overstatement, caused angst to those in positions of power. As Edmond Texier (1815-1887), a journalist who experienced French caricature’s golden age firsthand, stated, “la caricature, cette arme du ridicule, est une véritable puissance à Paris.” Under these circumstances, caricatures faced censorship on a rigorous basis. The fight for the liberty of the press had been an ongoing struggle in France since the French Revolution in 1789 and it remained a factor until July 1881, when liberal press laws were enacted by the Republican officials in charge of governing the country at the time. As late as 1878, La Lune rousse, an illustrated journal edited by André Gill, declared that “le ciel et la terre changeront, mais ce qui ne changera jamais, c’est la Censure.” The constant threat of facing censorship meant that artists needed to hone the skills of their craft in order to mask the meaning of their images, while still conveying their point to their readership, and to subvert the authorities in the process.

Caricature was a key component in the ongoing ideological warfare that marked the French political arena during the nineteenth century, and since it is an art form that emerged as a

---

11 “I would like them to know that we can express everything through a drawing, that we can liberate something in ourselves known as an opinion through a drawing.” Plantu, “Laisse penser ton crayon,” Chroniques de la BnF 81 (2018), 11.

12 According to Pierre Larousse, mockery was the greatest weapon that Republicans had at their disposal in the nineteenth century. Jean-Michel Renault, Censure et caricatures: Les images interdites et de combat de l’histoire de la Presse en France et dans le monde (Paris: Pat à Pan, 2006), 52.

13 “Caricature, that arm of ridicule, is a genuine force in Paris.” Edmond Texier, quoted in Tillier, Caricaturesque: La caricature en France, toute une histoire...de 1789 à nos jours (Paris: Éditions de la Martinière, 2016), 188.

14 “The sky and the earth will change, but censorship is one thing that will never change.” The editors of La Lune rousse, “1784-1878,” La Lune rousse (January 27, 1878), 1.
republican tradition, it is fitting to analyze the works of artists who used their prints to sustain the Republic at a crucial moment in French history. Between 1867 and 1881, the direction of the French regime hung in the balance, and over the course of this paper, I aim to argue that the political prints of artists, such as Gill, Le Petit, Daumier, and Manet, helped shape the decisions of French citizens in coming to terms with the benefits that a republican governing body had to offer to the nation. Policies of a country that would witness its longest tenured regime since the outbreak of the French Revolution (the Third Republic lasted from 1870 to 1940) were being forged during this period, and in visual terms, the images produced by the above-mentioned artists played a role in impacting some of the governing laws that France would adopt moving forward. In short, assessing the political value of caricatures and other prints in the late Second Empire and early Third Republic is a core constituent of my dissertation.

Caricature, more often than not, upends accepted standards and morals, and accordingly, it is a form of visual representation that denounces a particular subject. Lampooning others is the essence of caricature; hence, the laughter generated by such works is often pungent in nature. As Charles Baudelaire (1821-1867) wrote in his essay on the essence of laughter, it is harder to convey positive messages (other than by negation) through caricatural works, because “le comique est un élément damnable et d’origine diabolique.”¹⁵ Laughter stems from a notion of superiority and “la puissance du rire est dans le rieur et nullement dans l’objet du rire.”¹⁶ The majority of caricatures addressed in this dissertation exemplify these characteristics: they are not lighthearted or simply meant to entertain. Caricature is an art form that uses ridicule by way of

---


¹⁶ “The power of laughter is in the laugher and in no way in the object of laughter.” Ibid., 289.
deformation and defamation, the manner in which figures are staged in scenarios, the reversal of expectations, or by accentuating certain characteristics of an image in order to affirm or criticize political or social opinions. Moreover, unlike a humorous drawing, a caricature has no comical obligations. It is a form of visual representation that makes use of stereotypes allowing a great number of people to make associations with specific issues. Yet, the viewing of caricature can benefit from the notion that one interpretation can easily evolve into another, leading viewers to reflect about a certain topic in depth, and to seek out answers to their queries. The titles and captions that accompany caricatures also contribute to the viewer’s way of understanding such images. In nineteenth-century France, *jeu de mots* or plays on words were especially prevalent, and this could easily give an image a multitude of meanings – most notably both a literal and figurative meaning (e.g. fig. 146), as shall be seen over the course of this dissertation.

Common strategies employed by nineteenth-century French caricaturists include the use of allegories, *portraits-charges*, and zoomorphism. Artists used allegories on a frequent basis because they facilitated commentary on topical themes. At a time when regimes replaced one another regularly, there was a constant need to introduce new symbols in relation to the regime currently in charge of the nation, and visually, allegories represented some of the ideals that those symbols typified. Allegorical personifications enabled artists to defend ideals and to embody entire groups of people or political bodies through the depiction of single figures (i.e. figs. 66 and 76). For instance, in nineteenth-century France, an allegory of the Republic crystallized the ambitions of many members of the political Left. The same allegory could signify different things at different moments. However, the context in which an allegory was created, such as the specifics of the scenario in which the personification(s) appeared, who the creator was and what venue he or she used to disseminate the image, and who the targeted
audience of the work was, all contributed to give an allegory its meaning for a particular audience. Simply put, allegories provided artists with the ability to illustrate concepts that otherwise could not easily be visually concretized.

Unlike allegories, portraits-charges dealt with the representation of historical figures. It is not an easy strand of caricature to master because a portrait-charge requires a resemblance to at least some features of the person depicted, while containing elements that render the final work satirical or humorous in nature. The two words that make up the term portrait-charge define this mode of representation. ‘Portrait’ is for likeness, while ‘charge’ is a way of ridiculing someone through the deformation of physical attributes. It is most common to see portraits-charges where figures are given disproportionately large heads in comparison to the rest of their bodies (i.e. figs. 46 and 155), relating to old ideas of physiognomy and the notion that character resides mostly in the head. The publication of an abundance of physiognomic literature in the nineteenth century accustomed the French to draw moral conclusions from physical appearances. Since caricatures were often displayed in window shops, the idea of composing figures with large heads and small bodies gave images greater visual presence from a further distance, and ultimately, accentuated their comic appeal. The appearance of portraits-charges also had parallels to puppets – puppet shows were a form of entertainment widely popular in nineteenth-century France. The alliance between portraits-charges and the theatre gave such caricatures additional verve and helped fashion a language of opposition. Specific associations could be made between a caricatured figure and theatre characters, giving portraits-charges a rich currency. Portraits-charges could also be made in ways that were meant to please a particular individual. In such instances, the recognizability of the portrayal was heightened, and
accordingly, on the whole, portraits-charges can be viewed as a less politically critical form of caricature.

The zoomorphism or metamorphosis of human figures was another strategy to which caricaturists had access. Zoomorphism, like allegorical personifications, gave caricatural works a universality, making them accessible to the general public. Jean La Fontaine’s fables in which animals acted as the protagonists of short stories were widely adopted by the French education system in the nineteenth century, meaning that there was a range of links to be made between the behavior of human beings and that of animals. The dominant traits that characterized animals in the fables could often be transferred to the way humans were depicted in animal form in caricature. Accordingly, a lot was to be gained by such modes of representation, because viewers were familiar with the tales and the stereotypes. Zoomorphism also served to eliminate any form of superiority that an individual held in society (whether it be a class distinction or a political position), providing caricaturists with the opportunity to level the playing field in the process. Furthermore, animal metamorphosis enabled artists to attack in sharp and ingenious ways the so-called “beasts,” whom, they often felt, wrongfully governed the people (i.e. figs. 39 and 147). Undeniably, caricaturists viewed this form of visual rhetoric as useful in capturing the complexities of a wide range of scenarios.

Honoré Daumier, André Gill, and Alfred Le Petit were some of the key artists to have contributed to the illustrated satirical press in the second half of the nineteenth century. Another artist, Édouard Manet, best known for his paintings and as a man who strove to show his
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17 Many practical lessons were to be learned from the fables. For more on their representation in nineteenth-century French art, see Kirsten Powell, Fables in Frames: La Fontaine and Visual Culture in Nineteenth-Century France (New York: Peter Lang, 1997), especially chapters 1, 2, 6, and 7.
artworks at the Salon, also took up printmaking at critical moments in his career to address particular political events. Manet knew that prints allowed artists to communicate messages that were more urgent and subversive than those accepted in officially sponsored art, and while it meant facing the risk of censorship, he turned to the production of prints to seek an avenue of artistic and political liberty. Thus, many consistencies can be drawn between Manet and the above-mentioned caricaturists, even though the venues they primarily utilized to disseminate their works appear to be divergent. The prints that Manet, Daumier, Gill, and Le Petit created in the late Second Empire and early Third Republic were deeply rooted in contemporary political debates, and in this dissertation, I will investigate the republican sentiment that these artists expressed in works they produced between 1867 and 1881. My goal is to show how prints worked in society and how they advanced a political agenda during a turbulent fifteen-year period in France. Examining this relationship will generate a network of related artistic efforts by a diverse group of artists within the visual language of satire in a manner that has not been explored before in a scholarly project.

Each of these four individuals were engaged artists. They shared a republican ideology at this moment in history, and they all revealed an overt political conscience in their printed works. Even though they had different stylistic approaches, their prints were inspired by ardent passion, and this led them to execute works that were dynamic in getting their message across to the public.

Honoré Daumier, the oldest member of this group, had been involved in the fight against political oppression since the 1830s. His contributions to La Caricature (1830-1835) were unparalleled and revolutionary in nature, and his prints appeared in Le Charivari, one of the leading satirical journals of the nineteenth century, on a weekly basis for nearly forty years. He
was the most eminent French caricaturist of the mid-nineteenth century, because as Arsène Alexandre, Daumier’s first biographer, noted, rarely has an artist conveyed such satirical verve with such an economy of means. Daumier’s drawing style was the loosest amongst all these artists. In addition, his style suggested movement the most – a key element in many of his compositions. In the late Second Empire and early Third Republic, Daumier primarily relied on allegorical personifications to convey his opinions. He fervently defended republican principles throughout his artistic career, and he remained an important republican figure even after his death. This aspect of his legacy will be addressed in greater depth in the fourth chapter of this dissertation.

Édouard Manet was the preeminent modernist painter of the Second Empire; however, it is his political production in both paintings and prints that will come to the fore in this paper. Édouard’s father, Auguste Manet (1797-1862), was a lawyer by profession, but he also served as a political deputy, and he exposed his son to republican views at an early age. Though only aged sixteen in 1849, Manet was firmly against the idea of allowing Louis-Napoléon (1808-1873) to participate in the political affairs of the Second Republic. Although his political output was not as extensive as Daumier’s, Manet demonstrated a clear interest for political issues at various stages of his career. As a printmaker, Manet primarily produced etchings, but he specifically turned to lithography as a printmaking technique (between 1860 and 1875) with the purpose of addressing political matters. As a painter-printmaker he placed emphasis on tonal values, and his

---

use of greys and blacks on the lithographic stone command a presence. Several of his political lithographs are quite large, underlining the significance Manet bestowed upon the subjects of those works. In short, when the occasion called for it, Manet was not afraid of placing art in the service of his political beliefs.

André Gill was the most renowned caricaturist of the 1870s. Gill’s career was cut short by illness and his premature death in 1885, but for a period of approximately twelve years (1867-1879) he reigned as France’s greatest satirical commentator on current events. Gill was one of the few who turned caricatures, generally viewed as ephemeral visual objects, into historical documents. Bertrand Tillier, one of the leading Gill scholars, suggests that the artist’s success during this period hampered the development and recognition of other caricaturists, such as J. Blass (1847-1892), Henri Demare (1846-1888), and Charles Gilbert-Martin (1839-1905), because they worked in Gill’s shadow. Gill’s specialty was creating portraits-charges of his contemporaries. In rendering primarily figures with oversized heads, he placed a good deal of emphasis on their facial features. In 1880, Le Voltaire illustré, a journal Gill briefly joined that year, praised the caricaturist’s oeuvre: “c’est un vrai musée, c’est l’histoire satirique de tous les événements personnifiés dans la caricature.” Thus, Gill’s prints literally embodied the first decade of the Third Republic’s existence.

Alfred Le Petit, the youngest of the four artists, demonstrated over the course of his career that he was well versed in earlier traditions of French caricature. Le Petit was certainly mentored

---

20 For instance, Manet’s The Execution of the Emperor Maximilian (fig. 28) measures 44.5 x 60.3 cm, while his Guerre civile (fig. 69) measures 48.6 x 62.9 cm.
21 Bertrand Tillier, André Gill: Correspondance et mémoires d’un caricaturiste (Seyssel: Champ Vallon, 2006), 32.
22 “It is a true museum; it is the satirical history of all the events personified in caricature.” The editors of Le Voltaire illustré, “Prime du Voltaire illustré,” in Le Voltaire illustré (February 1, 1880), 2.
by Gill, a man who helped spark his career, but in a series such as *Fleurs, fruits & légumes* dating from 1871 and some of his prints in which viewers are exposed to the animalization of human figures, Le Petit was undeniably drawing inspiration from the works of Jean-Jacques Grandville (1803-1847). Grandville was celebrated for his ingenuity, and Le Petit followed in the former’s footsteps – although the major difference between the two artists is that Grandville made humans out of animals, while Le Petit made animals out of humans. Le Petit was merciless in his victimization of those of whom he disapproved, such as Napoléon III, and though not during the fifteen-year period that will serve as the focal point of this dissertation, Le Petit was imprisoned at the Sainte-Pélagie prison in 1888 in Paris due to the content of one of his prints.23 His aggressive style and determination to fight for the freedom of expression earned him a multitude of fines, but it also serves as evidence that his images were forceful and commanded the attention of state officials. As Manet attested to in a letter from 1876, he regarded Le Petit, like Gill, as specialists in their own right: “are you asking me to do a caricature…when there are specialists like Gill and Le Petit.”24

Bringing together Daumier, Manet, Gill, and Le Petit in a comparative analysis is a worthwhile endeavor, in part, because it has never been done before, but primarily because the purpose of their printed works between 1867 and 1881 shared the same goal: to sustain a republican regime. Although they did not operate as a team, they clearly were not fully isolated
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23 Le Petit’s imprisonment at Sainte-Pélagie is a fact of life he shares with Daumier – a man who served time in the same prison in the early 1830s after producing a print (fig. 80) that attacked King Louis-Philippe (r. 1830-1848).

from one another.\textsuperscript{25} Each of these artists believed that freedom of expression was associated with progress, and they wholeheartedly felt that a republic best offered French citizens essential liberty. Accordingly, the works they produced in the aforementioned period display their republican ideologies, whether it is by supporting republican principles and politicians who share their viewpoints, or by attacking oppositional regimes and their oppressive representatives. It is my contention that on the whole, the prints these four artists created not only reflected historical trajectories, they impacted society by pushing individuals to reflect about the issues that mattered to them as they pertained to shaping the outlook of the nation and its public institutions.

Other artists were not devoid of participating in this larger ideological warfare that preoccupied France for greater parts of the nineteenth century. However, the height of their productivity either falls outside the perimeters of this project chronologically, or they did not sustain republican virtues beyond a particular event, or two, within the timeframe of 1867-1881. For instance, Faustin Betbeder (1847-1914), Paul Klenck (1844-?), and George Pilotell (1845-1918), actively created caricatures around the time of the Franco-Prussian War (1870-1871) and its immediate aftermath, and they defended republican ideologies. Faustin was one of the most successful caricaturists to attack Napoléon III after the fall of the Second Empire, as noticeable in a print where the emperor’s body and reflection take on the shape of a monkey (fig. 10). In 1870, Napoléon III’s diplomatic relations failed and Faustin was eager to denounce him as a victim of his own deception. Pilotell, for his part, established \textit{La Caricature Politique} on the cusp of the Paris Commune, publishing prints that were highly critical of the Gouvernement de la Défense nationale, such as \textit{L’exécutif} (fig. 11). In this lithograph, Jules Favre (1808-1880) and

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{25} While there is no archival source indicating that these four artists knew each other personally, they each participated in a shared visual network by circulating prints on political topics in an ongoing fashion.
\end{footnotesize}
Adolphe Thiers (1797-1877) are characterized as turncoats for cutting off the territories of Alsace and Lorraine from the Republic and ceding them to the Prussian enemy. However, both Faustin and Pilotell moved to England in the wake of the Paris Commune, and accordingly, their productivity from a political standpoint, practically began and ended around 1870-1871. Unlike Daumier, Manet, Gill, and Le Petit, they did not sustain the republic through visual creations beyond a short period of time.

Meanwhile, artists such as Charles Gilbert-Martin and Hector Moloch (1849-1909) published caricatures on a weekly basis in a variety of republican illustrated journals, including at times during the 1870s. But, the majority of their works were produced during the 1880s and the 1890s when Daumier, Manet, and Gill had passed away, and Alfred Le Petit had, in part, shifted his energy towards painting and photography. Therefore, when tracing the republican sentiment expressed in prints between 1867 and 1881, it is paramount to consider the works of these four key artists – Le Petit, Gill, Manet, and Daumier.

While the scholarship on Daumier, Manet, and Gill is considerable, few sources have dealt with the works of Le Petit, and there are no studies that specifically group these four artists together under the rubric of their shared commitment to republican ideology and its visual expression in their work. Nevertheless, the number of sources that address the visual expression of republican sentiments in the satirical press, its censorship, and its circulation, indicate that such a study would contribute to our understanding of the political functions and meanings of nineteenth-century French print culture.

---

26 Daumier passed away in 1879, Manet lived until 1883, and Gill battled illness from 1880 until he died in 1885 – only producing a limited number of works in the last years of his life. Le Petit continued to produce caricatures in the 1880s and 1890s; however, he was no longer one of the dominant forces of the illustrated satirical press as he had been at the beginning of the Third Republic.
Since the late 1980s, Robert Goldstein has been the predominant scholar on the censorship of nineteenth-century French caricatures.\textsuperscript{27} His publications on the fight of French artists against censorship provide a thorough overview on this matter, and the recent publication he edited, \textit{Out of Sight: Political Censorship of the Visual Arts in Nineteenth-Century France}, continues to highlight the importance of investigating the political aspects of visual works.\textsuperscript{28} Elizabeth C. Childs has also explored the impact of censorship, especially as it pertains to Honoré Daumier’s career.\textsuperscript{29} With regards to Édouard Manet’s politics and his challenges with censorship, it is Juliet Wilson-Bareau, the late John House, and Philip Nord who have made the greatest contributions. \textit{Manet: The Execution of Maximilian: Painting, Politics and Censorship} (1992), remains a vital source for understanding Manet’s struggles with the state in the late Second Empire and early Third Republic.\textsuperscript{30} Philip Nord has addressed Manet’s political artworks, in a highly informative

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{goldstein1989}

\bibitem{goldstein2012}

\bibitem{childsc2017}

\bibitem{wilson-bareau2003}
Wilson-Bareau has published extensively on Manet’s career, and her works have proven invaluable to the study of the French artist. See especially, Juliet Wilson-Bareau, ed., \textit{Manet by Himself} (Boston: Bulfinch Press, 1991) and Juliet Wilson-Bareau and David Degener, eds., \textit{Manet and the Sea} (Chicago: Art Institute of Chicago, 2003). John House was a key contributor to the \textit{Manet: The Execution of Maximilian: Painting, Politics and Censorship} catalogue (a volume that Wilson-Bareau was instrumental in bringing about), and he has also published on how Manet produced works which unnerved French officials elsewhere. See John House,
article titled “Manet and Radical Politics.” Additionally, Nord has provided scholars of the Impressionist movement with some political context to the 1860s-1880s period, in Impressionists and Politics: Art and Democracy in the Nineteenth Century (2000). While both these sources have their merits, the former is written from a monographic standpoint, and the latter is an introduction to the wider social and economic trends that impacted the political and aesthetic characteristics that defined the Impressionists. In essence, a comprehensive overview of the political nature of artistic creation in the late Second Empire and early Third Republic, especially as it pertains to everyday political issues and prints which targeted a national audience, is overdue.

Several French scholars have played a part in expanding the literature on nineteenth-century caricatures and republicanism in recent years. In my opinion, it is the research of individuals such as Guillaume Doizy and Bertrand Tillier that has proven to be the most beneficial to the field of study. Doizy’s efforts to promote the study of graphic works have been substantial. Marianne dans tous ses états: La République en caricature de Daumier à Plantu (2008), a book Doizy co-authored with Jacky Houdré, looks at the visual destiny of Marianne from the perspective of caricatures. It is not concerned with the trajectory of the allegorical personification in high art, and as such, it sets a precedent for the type of visual analysis I will address in this dissertation. Moreover, in 2007, Doizy founded an online portal devoted, in its entirety, to the

---


31 See note 19.

32 These two authors also collaborated on a similar project as it pertains to the zoomorphism of human beings in European print culture. See, Guillaume Doizy and Jacky Houdré, Bêtes de pouvoir: Caricatures du XVIe siècle à nos jours (Paris: Nouveau Monde éditions, 2010). This volume serves as a vital reference guide for understanding the role and attributes of zoomorphic figures in satirical prints.
research of caricatures.\textsuperscript{33} A plethora of online exhibitions are available on Doizy’s website (e.g. “Droit de vote et élections de 1789 à nos jours,” “Léon Gambetta, la République,” and “Le dessin de presse entre liberté d’expression et censure”), proving just how relevant tracing the trajectory of graphic works during a particular time period is to contemporary viewers, especially the French, who, to this day, have committed themselves, as a nation, to providing caricature a voice in national affairs.

Meanwhile, Bertrand Tillier is a specialist on French caricature of the long nineteenth century (1789-1914). His contributions to the field include larger surveys of the history of political caricatures in France since the French Revolution, as well as detailed analyses of a variety of themes relating to prints produced during the first half of the Third Republic.\textsuperscript{34} Tillier’s scholarly work on André Gill, most notably André Gill: Correspondance et mémoires d’un caricaturiste (2006), has also marked him as one of the leading experts on Gill.\textsuperscript{35} My dissertation aims to build upon the contributions made by Doizy and Tillier to the study of satirical prints in the second half of the nineteenth century by carrying out a comparative analysis of the works of four artists who were deeply engaged in the political debates that occupied France at a critical juncture of its history. In my opinion, prints, and especially caricatures, are a visual force that can help breakdown the complexity and investments or positions in the political stakes of a

\textsuperscript{33} To access the portal, see www.caricaturesetcaricature.com.


nation at any moment in time to make them legible to a broad array of the viewing public, heightening the art historical value of a study such as the present one.

It is also necessary to highlight that accounts written from a historical perspective have helped shape our understanding of the political landscape, and to an extent the artistic one, in the late Second Empire and early Third Republic. The sources that delve deep into the lives of politicians who have marked the period are of particular interest. For instance, J. P. T. Bury’s volumes on Léon Gambetta (1838-1882) and Alan Grubb’s account of Albert de Broglie (1821-1901) offer a wealth of information on the day to day matters that concerned French political parties as they sought to gain control of the government and establish a regime according to their respective principles.36 Similarly, Heather Marlene Bennett’s dissertation, “Long Live the Revolutions: Fighting for France’s Political Future in the Long Wake of the Commune, 1871-1880” (2013), is a close antecedent to the type of analysis I am carrying out in my own study – though her investigation is almost entirely conducted from a historical vantage point (with little attention given to visual imagery).37 My goal is to meld the historical narrative with visual description by analyzing works by Daumier, Manet, Gill, and Le Petit in the different chapters of my dissertation. It is by underlining the meaning of the individual works created by these four artists, and by demonstrating their relation to a common political ground, that I seek to give prints more value as artistic creations and as significant carriers of opinion and visual argumentation.

Finally, it is worth praising the work of Pierre Nora, a French historian, who is best known for having directed *Les lieux de mémoire* (1984-1992), a series of volumes dealing with figures, places, objects, and discourses which incarnate the national memory of French citizens. The historical and symbolic meaning of some of the different topics addressed in *Les lieux de mémoire*, such as the tricolor flag, the personification of Marianne, or Bastille Day, generates an indispensable dialogue around themes which were crucial in determining the fate of the Second Empire and the Third Republic. The best possible way of complementing Nora’s notion of collective memories is by stating that political prints, especially when grouped under a specific rubric, function as a new repository of public memory. The prints discussed in the following pages achieve just that: they form a site of visual memory that is vital for understanding the fifteen-year period from 1867 to 1881, a period which oversaw the birth of the Third Republic and the proliferation of republican principles throughout the nation – many of which have remained intact to this day.

The period between 1867 and 1881 can be roughly broken down into four phases, and those distinct moments will act as markers for chapters. The years 1867 to 1870 were considered to form part of the liberal phase of the Second Empire. Yet, Napoléon III was still viewed by many as an oppressor who barred the re-establishment of a republic. After the collapse of the Second Empire, the Franco-Prussian War and the Paris Commune overshadowed the early Third Republic in 1870-1871. The Republic was at its most fragile during this time, since it lacked a sense of direction and was marred by violence and turmoil. As a consequence of this disorder, a monarchical government headed the Third Republic from 1871 to 1877. From a political standpoint, this period was highly conservative, and unsettling to republicans. 1877 marked the first year republicans gained majority vote in national elections. From 1877 to 1881, though not
without its controversies, the roots of a strong republican system started to take hold, effectively bringing to an end the “era of revolutions” in France.38

My decision to choose 1867 as the starting point for my study rests on several factors. The liberal press laws that were passed under the Second Empire in 1868 had initially been intended to take effect in 1867. This was a phenomenon that artists were aware of – most shrewdly dealt with in Gill’s Portrait Authentique de Rocambole (fig. 13) – and their willingness to challenge the governmental system became apparent at this juncture.39 1867 also marked the year of Napoléon III’s foreign policy disaster in Mexico, adding a layer of international corruption to a regime that was already unsteady. 1881 is the end point of my dissertation for multiple reasons. First and foremost, the law on the freedom of the press was enacted on July 29, 1881. The greatest change that occurred after the implementation of this law was that the French government stopped censoring images in advance of publication (the written word had not been subjected to prior censorship since 1822). This impacted the production and distribution of prints moving forward. Posters became the dominant form of prints available in the last years of nineteenth century. And while republican sentiment still manifested itself in visual works after 1881, a new of set of dilemmas preoccupied opposing political parties and artists in France at the time. Therefore, these historical events bookend a tumultuous period of fifteen years during which the meaning of the regime and the definition of a republic in France were scrutinized by a variety of artists seeking to manifest their own republican beliefs.

38 The “era of revolutions” refers to the years between the French Revolution in 1789 and the establishment of the “republican” Republic in the late 1870s. Prior to the founding of the Third Republic, which lasted until 1940, France had undergone multiple regime and leadership changes, resulting in several revolutions.
39 Gill’s Portrait Authentique de Rocambole will be discussed at length in Chapter 1.
The structure of my chapters is chronological and aims to trace commonalities between the four artists I have selected. Each chapter will examine works by each artist, some of which have never been published, or consider a particular event that has marked the individual’s career as a republican artist, to trace a large arc of republican sentiment over a transformative period in French history.

The opening chapter of my dissertation will investigate works produced during the timeframe of 1867-1870, and the way they asserted freedom of political and artistic expression. During this period all four artists were active and each of them was willing to test the limits of the law. After Napoléon III had ruthlessly suppressed and extinguished the Second Republic (1848-1852), the Second Empire (1852-1870), for the most part, exerted its control over the French population in a strict manner. French caricaturists were not able to express themselves freely, since the emperor not only reestablished the press laws that were in effect throughout the majority of the first half of the nineteenth century, he added another component which forced artists to obtain the written permission of the person whom they desired to caricature before that image could be published.40 These oppressive measures remained intact until 1867, a time at which Napoléon III adopted more tolerable governing methods. Accordingly, this moment presented a window of opportunity that was critical for the spread of republican hope, and artists, such as Daumier, Manet, Gill, and Le Petit, wasted no time in expressing their opinions visually. Whether it was on the grand stage of the Salon, as was the case with Manet’s confrontation with the government over *The Execution of Maximilian* (figs. 27-28), or in the pages of satirical journals to which

Daumier, Gill, and Le Petit contributed on a regular basis, these republican artists fought hard for, and successfully asserted, freedom of expression – a longstanding republican ideal – at the end of the Second Empire.

Chapter 2 focuses on the instant fallout of Napoléon III after the Second Empire crumbled in September 1870 and will assess the precarious state of the early Third Republic. The short span of time from September 1870 to May 1871, a period that covers the Franco-Prussian War and the Paris Commune, was extremely charged, and it witnessed the emergence of different shades of republicanism. The nation was in a state of calamity, and accordingly, it is often referred to as *l’année terrible*. During this interval, freedom of the press reigned, and caricaturists aggressively ridiculed Napoléon III’s defeat in prints such as Daumier’s *L’Empire c’est la paix* (fig. 49).

Daumier, a stalwart of *la petite presse* for several decades, increasingly resorted to allegorical representations at the end of his career. He felt that allegorical personifications could convey his messages in a more universal manner, and it magnified the political potency of his images. Artists also turned their attention to the consequences of the Franco-Prussian War and of the Paris Commune. Manet’s lithographs *La Barricade* (fig. 67) and *Guerre civile* (fig. 69) were some of the most striking images produced at this moment. In these prints, Manet questioned why French citizens (conservatives) raised arms and hired guards to use against their fellow countrymen (radical republicans) to settle their divergent political ideologies. It is a moment in time when the escalated ideological divisions between Paris and Versailles (the location where conservatives and the Assemblée nationale, France’s governing body at the time, took up residence) were staggering, and I will address the tense nature of this relationship as expressed by imagery. To tackle these different issues, it will be imperative to consider what causes
Daumier, Manet, Gill, and Le Petit supported and how their commitments manifested themselves in their works.

The following chapter covers a period of approximately half a dozen years starting in late 1871 and ending in 1877, and addresses works that were made when the monarchical government was at its strongest during the early Third Republic. Because of the uncertainties of the regime in the 1870s, the battle that caricaturists aimed to overcome was essentially the same as the one they partook in during the late Second Empire. Knowing how far the gouvernement de l’Ordre moral was from their expectations of what a republic should stand for, artists of the political Left foregrounded the polarity of France’s republican tendencies in visual works. It was a time when illustrated journals, such as L’Éclipse, Le Grelot, and La Lune rousse – journals to which André Gill and Alfred Le Petit contributed on a weekly basis – dominated the satirical press. These newspapers paid the mandatory fee that was necessary to address political matters; however, that did not stop state officials under the leadership of President Patrice de MacMahon (1808-1893) from censoring some of their images prior to publication. This was a huge ideological problem for republicans, who felt that the Republic should be synonymous with liberty. In trying to come to terms with what the Third Republic should embody, the opposition between the “old, backward thinking” of monarchists and the “new, youthful attitude” of leftists came to the fore. As part of the outcry, Manet attacked the ultraconservative MacMahon in a color lithograph titled Polichinelle (fig. 73), an image which undermined the president’s authority in a similar fashion as when Gill had ridiculed Napoléon III, a few years earlier, in Portrait Authentique de Rocambole (fig. 13).

In addition, the 1870s proved to be a time when artists rallied behind intellectual leaders, such as Victor Hugo (1802-1885) and Henri Rochefort (1831-1913). Both of these men were
celebrated for their fervent republicanism, and depicting them in prints became a symbol of one’s political allegiance and resistance to conservative forces. Hugo authored several publications denouncing despotic rulership, including *Histoire d’un crime*, an essay published in two volumes (1877-1878) about Napoléon III’s repressive rise to the throne in France. Gill and Le Petit directly paid homage to this release by publishing *Le nouveau livre de Victor Hugo* (fig. 107) and *Le Justicier* (fig. 108) respectively. Although both these images are caricatures, they champion Hugo and deride Napoléon III. It is by showing the defeat of despotism at the hands of a republican giant, such as the symbolic Hugo, that belief in such a fate for republicanism began to spread and gain momentum, and ultimately reached new heights in the years that followed.

Lastly, Chapter 4 addresses works and episodes from 1878 to 1881. The Chamber of Deputies elections held in October 1877 witnessed a shift in voting in favor of republicans on a national level. From then on, a series of symbolic acts took place in fairly quick succession – the seat of the government returned from Versailles to Paris, “La Marseillaise” was declared France’s national anthem, Jules Grévy (1807-1891) replaced MacMahon as President of the Republic, and the 14 juillet was officially proclaimed as a national holiday – all of which helped consolidate republican ideologies and the Third Republic en route to its legacy as the longest lasting regime since the French Revolution. Gill, Le Petit, Manet, and Daumier (for the most part) witnessed these significant changes, which greatly impacted their careers.

Daumier had ceased artistic production by the late 1870s; however, it is exactly around the time of his death in 1879 that the art world and political leaders began to recuperate Daumier as

---

41 The timing of Hugo’s publication, as well as Gill’s and Le Petit’s prints served as indirect attacks on MacMahon’s presidency. The different elements that form part of these two images will be discussed, in detail, in Chapter 3.
the arch-republican. A retrospective show highlighting Daumier’s career was organized in 1878, and the republican regime paid tribute to one of its forefathers by transferring Daumier’s body to the Père-Lachaise cemetery in Paris in 1880 after he had already been buried in Valmondois the previous year. Daumier was publicly revered by his compatriots – a feat that was made possible by the orientation of the French government as the 1870s came to an end.

Gill and Le Petit continued to create caricatures into the 1880s, but their production rate decreased at that point because as each day went by, republican principles were more widespread, and opposition to the regime had diminished. Some of the stock figures, such as the orléaniste, légitimiste, and bonapartiste, that had served as antagonists to republican ideals for many years started to be replaced by new targets in printed images. Le Petit, for instance, began directing his visual attacks towards the Catholic Church, and many of the prints he published in *Le Sans-culotte* (1878-1879) made him one of the lead campaigners of anticlericalism in the satirical press. The political climate in France had clearly changed, and the production of printmaking was further impacted once the July 1881 press laws were introduced. 1881 also saw Manet and Gill respectively send portraits of Henri Rochefort and Jules Vallès (1832-1885) to the Salon (figs. 128 and 162). Both Rochefort and Vallès were controversial figures who assaulted monarchists and lived in exile for the majority of the first decade of the Third Republic’s existence, yet not only were both works received by the Salon, Manet was even awarded a medal for his painting. This signaled that republican principles were being upheld in public spheres, and that the art world was ushering in a new era. Accordingly, Manet, and Gill more significantly, confidently shifted media for political expression. It was time for these artists

---

to take advantage of the favorable political climate that presented itself at that moment. And symbolically, it brought an end to a period of their artistic lives that had proven to be combative on the political front.

In short, this is a study of ways in which visual culture interrelated with historical events and political debates during the late Second Empire and early Third Republic. Collectively, the caricatures and political prints produced by Daumier, Gill, Le Petit, and Manet that form part of this study sustained the ideologies of the Republic. By commenting on issues that were of vital importance to French culture in the latter half of the nineteenth century, these artists took personal risks with their artistic production, but ultimately were successful in creating a visual discourse of opposition prior to the passage of the liberal press laws in 1881. By then, their viewpoints were more in line with, rather than opposed to, the policies of the French governing body. Thus, I will demonstrate how the political prints produced by Daumier, Manet, Gill, and Le Petit between 1867 and 1881 had served their purpose at a critical juncture of both political and art history.
Chapter 1: The Late Second Empire, 1867-1870: The Liberal Press Fights for a Republican Cause

Honoré Daumier, Édouard Manet, André Gill, and Alfred Le Petit were artists dedicated to republican ideals. These were artists who placed emphasis on the moral values of the French Revolution, especially the symbolic gravity of the motto Liberté, égalité, fraternité. Through their artistic production, these artists engaged in political and cultural matters that were of vital importance to French history in the second half of the nineteenth century. The involvement of Daumier, Manet, Gill, and Le Petit in political affairs at different moments of their lives, and particularly at the end of the Second Empire and early Third Republic, made them representatives of their age. All four of these artists were men who sought to align themselves ideologically with other individuals who supported republican principles at the time, and who were also actively engaged in the realm of politics. A short list of these key figures includes: Victor Hugo, Henri Rochefort, and Léon Gambetta. Whether the artists knew them personally (Manet developed a friendship with Gambetta) or associated with these men by representing them in their images (Daumier, Gill, and Le Petit all depicted Hugo and Rochefort in a variety of prints), a symbolic alliance was being forged through their art. While illustrating these individuals in prints was not illegal, in and of itself, it clearly situated the artists on one side of the political spectrum. In the Second Empire, especially the late 1860s, it positioned them in opposition to Napoléon III and his regime. Having one individual in control of so much power and holding exclusive rights over the decisions of an entire country went against these artists’ views about government. By and large, Daumier, Manet, Gill, and Le Petit shared a belief in
what a republic should stand for. In their opinion, a republic, unlike any other form of
government, embodied liberty; it signified forward movement and progress toward a society
built on equality, and one that was free of strict rules and codes.\footnote{It also represented an ideal and a recuperation of the first two republics.}

The political climate during the late Second Empire (1867-1870) was fraught with
ambiguity. The emperor had proposed certain forms of liberalization in an attempt to appease
French citizens and to earn their vote when the time would come. However, in most cases,
changes were gradual and were rarely definitive. This state of uncertainty, and the lack of a
decisive form of liberalization in the eyes of republicans, culminated in an ever-increasing sense
of mistrust. Republicans had witnessed too many hardships and forms of oppression over the
course of the Second Empire to put faith in Napoléon III and his regime. The growing desire for
change invigorated members of the political Left with a spirit of resistance. It led to the
proliferation of artistic protests, many of which surfaced in public spheres in the shape of
political prints. André Gill, Alfred Le Petit, Édouard Manet, and Honoré Daumier are amongst
those artists who reacted most negatively to Napoléon III’s deceptive intentions, and what they
considered to be his lackluster commitment to bringing about “true” republican reforms. To
republicans of their ilk, nothing infuriated them more than having their rights to freedom of
expression repeatedly threatened during this time period – as it had been for greater parts of their
lives. Not surprisingly, the artist’s liberty became a major point of contention for several years,
as the country transitioned from an empire to a republic.

Freedom of expression was regarded as a fundamental humanist value, and was proclaimed as
one of the most precious rights of man, as constituted during the French Revolution in the
Déclaration des Droits de l’Homme et du Citoyen in August 1789. Article XI of the Déclaration
specifically referred to every citizen’s right to speak, write, and print freely their opinions, and it remains one of the most controversial topics in French society today.\(^2\) As contemporary French historians and authors attest, liberty of expression, more than a right, is a form of religion.\(^3\) It is a principle deeply rooted in French notions of citizenship and identity, especially republicans; hence, in the nineteenth century, members of the political Left wanted to use the press – a channel of free expression – as a source to enlighten people. Liberty of expression, more than any other right, granted liberties.\(^4\) Since those in power could easily sway the masses, members of the press took it upon themselves to educate the people about political affairs by deliberating over current events. The commercialization of the press not only made prints more accessible, it turned prints into significant carriers of political opinions. Their primary role was to circulate ideas, rather than to place emphasis on aesthetic qualities (though certainly artists maintained their own distinct styles). These types of prints were used by the *nouvelles couches sociales* to demarcate their modernity, and functioned as visual objects that destabilized traditional codes and symbols. In addition, the above-mentioned artists hoped that such images would persuade the public to bring about societal changes. Due to the fiery nature of these works, the government

\(^2\) A copy of Article XI as originally drafted by the Assemblée nationale can be found in the appendix.

\(^3\) In 2006, Jean-Michel Renault, a decorated caricaturist and journalist in his own right, wrote: “Exigeons en France le respect de notre religion fondamentale: la liberté, la liberté d’opinion et d’expression inscrite dans les droits internationaux de l’homme” (Let us insist in France on the respect of our fundamental religion: liberty, the liberty of opinion and expression that is written in the international rights of Man). Jean-Michel Renault, *Censure et caricatures: Les images interdites et de combat de l’histoire de la Presse en France et dans le monde* (Paris: Pat à Pan, 2006), back cover.

\(^4\) As noted by Sylvie Gonzalez: “porte-parole des opinions, la presse symbolise et conditionne les autres “libertés fondamentales” (the organ of opinions, the press symbolizes and shapes the other “fundamental liberties”). Gonzalez, “Anastasie ou la censure impériale,” in *Honoré Daumier: Du rire aux armes*, Dominique Lobstein et al. (Saint-Denis: Musée Municipal d’art et d’Histoire, 2008), 39.
routinely enforced censorship laws that undermined the very freedom of expression that those who championed the press cherished so highly.

1.1 Napoléon III Makes His Presence Felt

The press was the heart and soul of political life in nineteenth-century France, especially in the capital. Over the course of the Second Empire, the population of Paris rose from 1,053,000 inhabitants in 1851 to 1,825,000 in 1866. It was also at this moment that the accessibility to newspapers increased due to technological developments. Several factors allowed the press to diversify in the later stages of the Second Empire and into the Third Republic. The industrial revolution had enabled the improvement of different techniques and mechanized certain aspects of the printing process leading to the growth and greater dissemination of the press. Paper

---

5 The historians who have most significantly influenced this chapter as it relates to the press in the second half of the nineteenth century are Roger Bellet and Robert Justin Goldstein. Roger Bellet’s *Presse et journalisme sous le Second Empire* (Paris: Arman Colin, 1967) focuses entirely on the events that have marked the French press during Napoléon III’s reign. Few other sources cover the press during the Second Empire as extensively as Bellet. Meanwhile, Robert Justin Goldstein’s *Censorship of Political Caricature in Nineteenth-Century France* (Kent: Kent State University Press, 1989), considers the censorship of the press in France as it pertains to the entire nineteenth century; however, Goldstein’s emphasis on caricatures makes this work particularly relevant to my dissertation.

6 Jean Tulard, ed., *Dictionnaire du Second Empire* (Paris: Fayard, 1995), 970. This edited volume contains entries on all the key figures, institutions, sites, and moments that have come to characterize the Second Empire. The individual entries vary in length; however, they provide a sound foundation to understanding the historical and political context of the time period. This source has guided my research throughout this chapter.

7 Although steam-powered presses were invented in the early stages of the nineteenth century in Europe, it was not until the middle of the century that they were produced in substantial quantities and became commercially viable. In France, the invention of the gillotage technique by Firmin Gillot in the 1850s, and put into practice by his son Charles Gillot in the 1860s, allowed lithographic images to be printed simultaneously with texts. This reduced the length of time of the printing process, and gillotage became a technique commonly used by illustrated newspapers such as *Le Charivari* starting in the 1860s. For more information, see Michael Twyman, *The British Library Guide to Printing: History and Techniques* (London: The British Library, 1998), 53-54.
became a cheaper commodity, allowing printing houses to distribute issues in larger quantities and to lower prices. This also heightened the circulation of the penny press, making it easier for members of the popular classes to obtain daily papers on a regular basis. The boom of the railroad industry also contributed to the spurt of the press, as journals could reach further distances at higher speeds than previously possible. People became invested in political debates and wanted to stay on top of the latest current events. Countless new journals were being established on a yearly basis. Editors were aware that the press was a key media outlet to spread information and propagandistic ideas as a political strategy. One strand of the larger press enterprise was the illustrated satirical press. The illustrated satirical press served less to inform people about current events than to comment on them, and accordingly, it functioned as a public vehicle for comedy and social satire. A culture around satirical journals also existed in other areas outside of Paris (i.e. Marseille, Bordeaux, Rouen, Lyon, and Grenoble); however, no major center matched the production in the French capital. By the late 1860s, illustrated satirical journals had their own hub in the heart of Paris, as the rue de Croissant, in the 2e arrondissement, became the home of approximately twenty-five separate satirical journals. All of these factors were instrumental in turning the second half of the nineteenth century into the heyday of the illustrated French press.

However, on January 14, 1852, at the outset of the Second Empire, Napoléon III introduced an authoritarian constitution that set the tone for his tenure as the French emperor. The constitution granted Napoléon tremendous executive and legislative powers. He decided to reestablish strict press laws that had first been introduced during the Bourbon Restoration period, and that had recently been nullified by the Second Republic. Article 22 of the decree

---

8 This number is taken from Bellet, *Presse et journalisme*, 87-89.
passed on February 17, 1852 clearly stated that all forms of published visual images (with emphasis on drawings and prints) required prior authorization from government officials.\textsuperscript{9}

Images caused angst because they brought to life sentiments that were otherwise only expressed verbally or in written form. They seduced viewers by example and could affect the minds of those who were illiterate. Individual images may have had an intended audience, but once distributed publicly, could reach any consumer remotely interested in the matter. Simply put, images address themselves to all ages, all classes, and both sexes. For these reasons, the law asserted that the ministère de l’intérieur and the préfecture de police could both serve as licensed censors. Indeed, the surveillance of journals and publications, especially those of the illustrated satirical press, emerged as one of the primary tasks of the police during the Second Empire.\textsuperscript{10}

Beyond restoring a draconian form of censorship as outlined by Article 22, Napoléon III instituted a new condition that further restrained the liberty of certain members of the press. The law, as evidenced by Article 22, also specified that any person desiring to make a portrait-charge of another individual needed to obtain the prior authorization of the person in question.\textsuperscript{11}

This prerequisite was directly established in order to remove the possibility of rendering the emperor’s image in any visual form. Napoléon III wanted to eliminate what was, in his opinion, an oppositional force to his regime, and hence, he enforced this rule until the end of the Second

\textsuperscript{9} See the appendix for a full description of Article 22.
\textsuperscript{10} Gonzalez, 41. Moreover, the author notes that the authorities also closely monitored theatres and opera houses, as songs and stage performances were effective tools through which to influence the masses.
\textsuperscript{11} A portrait-charge, or loaded likeness, places emphasis on an individual’s head, rather than his or her body. This form of representation flourished in the mid-nineteenth century. For more, see Bertrand Tillier, “Charger” in Caricaturesque: La caricature en France, toute une histoire... de 1789 à nos jours (Paris: Éditions de La Martinière, 2016), 15-21.
Napoléon III feared the power of caricature as a vehicle that could ridicule him. His fear of caricatures had developed earlier in his career, when a large number of caricaturists had attacked him while he held the position of President of the Second Republic. The most infamous case was that of Charles Vernier (1831-1892), who was sentenced to two months in jail and fined one hundred francs for designing *Le prix de l’adresse aux Champs Élysées* (fig. 12), a lithograph published in *Le Charivari* on April 17, 1851. This was the most severe punishment handed out against a caricaturist during the “liberal” Second Republic. The success of a caricature is measured by the shock it creates, and Vernier’s image clearly disturbed Louis Napoléon. In an age when the press was the greatest means of communication, it cannot be underestimated how much satire was a threat to power. The life of a journalist, as *Le Charivari* noted in one of its issues dating from November 1867, could be summarized in the following terms: it consisted of many fines, prison sentences, duels, and adversaries. From the perspective of republicans, censorship presented itself as an enemy to overcome, rather than as a phenomenon with which to come to terms.

Many were forced to find refuge in other countries where conditions were more tolerable in order to maintain their profession. A popular destination for several key figures, such as Victor Hugo and Henri Rochefort, was Belgium. Under the Belgian constitution inaugurated in 1830, recognizing Belgium’s independence from the Dutch, liberty of the press was granted. Due to

---

12 This law was also upheld for lengthy periods in the early stages of the Third Republic, and is a topic I will revisit later in this paper.
13 Leopold Pannier, the editor who oversaw the publication of this print was also given a jail sentence and fined for his involvement in this fiasco. The details of this episode are recounted by Goldstein in *Censorship of Political Caricature*, 176-178.
14 Adrien Huart, “Ah! Quel plaisir d’être journaliste,” *Le Charivari* (November 30, 1867), 2. Huart goes on to breakdown the average number for each category based on a journalist who lived until the age of 50.
these favorable circumstances, Belgium, and more specifically Brussels, became a vibrant printing center for the French press during the Second Empire.\textsuperscript{15} Aware of this situation, Napoléon III’s response was to try to prevent as many publications as possible from entering France from outside of the country. In addition, the emperor ensured that bordering cities between the two countries would abide by his regulations, and he administered the governmental press in a way that it exercised control over the provinces of France, leaving limited space for the oppositional press to grow outside of Paris. During this time, the imperial order even allowed caricaturists to take up international current events as subjects for their images, with the hope that they would find pleasure in attacking officials and people from other countries, and to divert their attention from the Empire’s weaknesses. This tactic was effective for a while, yet it did not take long before quick-witted caricaturists turned this approach on its head, by hiding derogatory messages in their so-called internationally inclined images to criticize the French emperor and his regime.\textsuperscript{16} And eventually, as the popularity of the emperor’s rule declined towards the end of the 1860s, caricaturists felt emboldened to take greater risks in the content they included in their imagery.

1.2 The “Promises” of 1867

What really frustrated journalists and caricaturists alike for much of the 1860s was that there was no leniency in the adjudication of press laws. Liberal-minded changes were slow to come by

\textsuperscript{15} Bellet, \textit{Presse et journalisme}, 7.

\textsuperscript{16} In one of the more notable examples of such occurrences in the 1850s, see Honoré Daumier’s various images representing Faustin Soulouque (1782-1867), the emperor of Haiti from 1849 to 1859. Images such as \textit{Dernière élévation de Soulouque} (Delteil 3144) and \textit{Visitant l’intérieur des principaux monuments de Paris} (Delteil 3150) were indirect ways through which Daumier could comment on Napoléon III’s despotism. For more on this topic, refer to Elizabeth C. Childs, \textit{Daumier and Exoticism: Satirizing the French and the Foreign} (New York: Peter Lang, 2004), 111-120.
during the imperial regime, and even when they did, the changes had little to no effect on the press. For instance, when the first Salon des refusés was held in 1863, as an event to supplement the conventional Salon, it was seen as a gesture to democratize the arts, yet this courtesy was not extended to artworks published in the realm of the press, where censorship remained steadfast. Similarly, in July 1864, when a decree was passed modifying certain theatre practices – most notably granting individuals the permission to open a theatre staging performances in all genres (not simply a single specific genre) – no analogous amendments were forthcoming for the press at that time. Napoléon III, mostly upon the insistence of Émile Ollivier (1825-1913), a statesman zealously calling for a liberal empire, finally proposed revisions that would change the outlook of press laws by devising a manifesto encouraging individual liberties in January 1867. However, it was not until May 11, 1868 before a liberalization of the press actually took place.

The time that elapsed between the promise to repeal censorship laws and its realization was a factor that irritated members of the press. For some journalists, until it became a reality, it appeared to be only a distant fantasy. In a scenario presented by Gustave Naquet (1819-1889) in an article for Le Charivari, a governing council gives a man the opportunity to formulate his own press laws, which he fervently accepts. Satisfied with the changes he sets forth, the man leaves the meeting only to realize he never left the premises of his own home, as it was all a dream.

---

17 An overview of these modifications is discussed in Laurence Goux, “Honoré Daumier et la représentation de l’architecture: De l’architecture de spectacle et des bouleversements de Paris,” in Honoré Daumier: Du rire aux armes, Dominique Lobstein et al., 23-26. It should be noted that full abolition of theatre censorship only occurred in 1906.

18 The manifesto originally appeared on January 19 in Le Moniteur universel (1789-1901).

19 Naquet’s article, “Une loi sur la presse” appears in the February 2, 1867 issue of Le Charivari. Adding to the irony of this tale, is that when asked by the president of the council how much time the man needs to conceive the new press laws, instead of accepting the one month offer, he replies that five minutes will do! Press laws riled up many individuals, and it did not take long for republican journalists to pinpoint the different problems of the laws set in place during the Second Empire.
Newspaper articles repeatedly complained about how the liberalization of the press took a back seat to all other political matters over the course of the entire 1867-year. Whether it was the Luxembourg question, the German question, the Roman question, or some other affair, it always gained priority over what was needed in the view of the Left to be done with the press.\textsuperscript{20} There also was not much confidence amongst republican supporters that the Corps législatif was resolved to settle the matter. Since changes had only been suggested and not officially decreed by the emperor, and several months had gone by, who was to say that this unnerving situation would not continue endlessly. In yet another piece of satirical writing by A. Brémond, the ministère de l’intérieur, the Corps législatif, and other government bodies keep pondering amendments and modifications to the press laws without taking action. Members of the press were constantly told to remain patient as change will “come soon,” yet as Brémond scornfully looks to the future, new laws are still not being adopted by 1870, 1880, or even by the turn of the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{21} It had almost been fifteen years to the day that rigorous censorship laws were established at the outset of the Second Empire, and for those who believed in democratic rights, any day (let alone weeks) that went by without a formal announcement about redrafting the press laws was an infringement on their freedom.

\textsuperscript{20} In the December 17, 1867 issue of \textit{Le Charivari}, Liberty of the Press is personified as a woman wanting to speak to the Corps législatif, but the usher guarding the entrance repeatedly tells Liberty of the Press to wait for her turn, as the legislature body is continuously attending to other affairs. By the time Liberty of the Press gets her turn, all the committee members have left to get some rest after their “strenuous” deliberations. This scenario recurs time after time, and Liberty of the Press never gets a chance to speak to the Corps législatif. Arthur Arnould, “À la porte,” \textit{Le Charivari} (December 17, 1867), 1-2. 1867 also marked a time when Freedom of Assembly was commonly personified in the press as a fragile figure due to all the exceptions to the rule enforced by the state. While larger gatherings were permitted by this time, groups were still required to receive authorization in the case of political assemblies.

\textsuperscript{21} A. Brémond, “Petites prédictions s.g.d.g.,” \textit{Le Charivari} (June 8, 1867), 1-2.
The censorship laws had taken their toll on the press. It was not uncommon for illustrated papers to wait for an entire week before receiving permission to publish individual images. The authorization process could take several days, as the officials in charge of providing their stamp of approval never guaranteed a return date on any of the material. This meant that on many occasions, the print(s) included in journals on a daily basis did not reflect the topics discussed in the articles of that same day’s issues. For some newspapers, the notion of connecting information over a longer period of time (i.e. issuing images as part of larger series), was a regular practice that went hand in hand with how certain short stories (roman-feuilleton) were distributed to the public, and accordingly, timing was not necessarily a priority. But for other journals, not knowing when the authorities would return an image to them caused undesirable delays. Though not the most irritating of problems that illustrated journals had to deal with, it still hindered their objectives in a number of instances. Furthermore, regardless of the content of the images and articles, the press was constantly accused of wrongdoing. Those governing the country deemed the press a dangerous agent of information. On the other hand, members of the press felt that censors deliberately distorted the words and thoughts of journal writers. As maligned in Le Charivari, “la censure est l’art de découvrir dans les oeuvres dramatiques de ses contemporains des allusions perfides auxquelles l’auteur n’a jamais songé.” Beyond dealing with official censorship, the need to receive written permission to depict someone’s likeness in the press further acted as a form of censorship. This directly put at least a delay, or even a strain,

---

22 The delay in the publication of prints becomes evident when one consults all of the issues that a journal published over a specific time period. The images related to a particular political event regularly appear a few days after columnists working for the same journal (i.e. Le Charivari) have addressed the matter.

23 “Censorship is the art of discovering deceitful illusions in the dramatic pieces of his contemporaries, about which the author has never dreamed.” L. Bienvenu, “Petit cours élémentaire de censure,” Le Charivari (October 12, 1867), 2.
on the repertoire of tactics that artists could freely use to carry out their intended designs. If that was not enough, the cost of stamp duty applied to each individual issue forced all parties involved in the publication of a newspaper to be prudent about the content that went into it.\textsuperscript{24} Any newspaper issue that was seized by the authorities caused financial loss for the journal responsible for the publication due to production costs, and a number of staff members were liable to receive further fines. In short, no press personnel were immune from sanctions, and this forced them to be cautious in their actions.

1.3 The Illustrated Press Has a New Hero: André Gill\textsuperscript{25}

How exactly did artists deal with all this commotion and policing? One of the key artists to consider is Louis-Alexandre Gosset (better known as André Gill): a caricaturist who was starting to make a name for himself around 1867. At the age of eighteen, Gosset had become acquainted with Nadar, pseudonym of Gaspard-Félix Tournachon, and it was the famous photographer who encouraged Gosset to take on a pen name, and so “André Gill” was born in 1858.\textsuperscript{26} Although Gill had yet to publish a single image in a journal at this stage, Nadar introduced the young artist to Charles Philipon, the illustrated press mogul who had established \textit{La Caricature} and \textit{Le Charivari} earlier in his career, and who was at this time in charge of \textit{Le Journal amusant}.

\textsuperscript{24} The cost of stamp duty was 6 centimes per issue at this time, which when added up on a yearly basis, was a large percentage of the overall cost of maintaining the production of a journal. Tulard, ed., \textit{Dictionnaire}, 1057-1058.

\textsuperscript{25} There are several biographical works on André Gill, the latest of which is Pierre-Robert Leclercq’s \textit{André Gill: Les dessins de presse et la censure} (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2015). This biography has the benefit of integrating more recent scholarship on the French press and caricatures into its account of the artist. Nevertheless, the other biographies on Gill are useful and widely referenced by historians in the field. See, Charles Fontane, \textit{Un maître de la caricature: André Gill} (Paris: Éditions de l’Ibis, 1927), Armand Lods and Véga, \textit{André Gill, sa vie: bibliographie de ses œuvres} (Paris: L. Vanier, 1887), and Jean Valmy-Baysse, \textit{André Gill: L’impertinent}, edited by Jean Frapat (Paris: Éditions du Félin, 1991).

\textsuperscript{26} For more on Gill’s younger years and acquaintance with Nadar, consult Leclercq, \textit{André Gill}, 17-22.
Enthralled by the potential of the young artist, Philipon offered Gill a position at the journal, and on March 12, 1859 Gill signed his first print as a caricaturist for *Le Journal amusant*. In the following years, Gill’s reputation as a singular caricaturist gained momentum as various journal editors recognized his talents, and asked for his services. Gill contributed images to different papers on the Left, and eventually earned an appointment at *La Lune*, where he developed a strong business relationship with the editor François Polo (1838-1874).

*La Lune* was an illustrated journal that first appeared in October 1865, under the direction of Polo. Until mid-April 1866, *La Lune* appeared as a monthly journal, but from April 22 on, it became a satiric weekly, which coincided with Gill’s arrival at the journal. *La Lune* generated a total of 98 separate numbers before being forced to cease production in January 1868 by censorship. Gill’s presence at *La Lune* was clearly felt, as his artistic designs often appear on the front page of the journal, and as Pierre-Robert Leclercq suggests, his caricatures could well be the reason why the production rate of single copies increased over time, jumping from 30,000 copies at the time of the journal’s inception, to approximately 40,000 copies by 1867. By setting the yearly membership fee at five francs, *La Lune* could also openly claim that it was readily available to people of all social classes.

En route to becoming one of the most controversial caricaturists in France between 1867 and 1881, Gill produced many *portraits-charges*, a form of caricature in which he proved to be a specialist. Following the convention, Gill placed large heads on small bodies as his primary

---

27 Gill created designs for *Le Charivari* and *Le Hanneton* (1862-1868), where he also worked in collaboration with François Polo.
29 In comparison, the yearly subscription to a non-illustrated journal, such as *Le Constitutionnel* (1815-1914), cost 52 francs, while the price for a year membership at *Le Charivari* was 72 francs. Both of these journals were dailies.
caricatural technique for his portraits-charges, an approach first invented by Benjamin Roubaud (1811-1847) in the late 1830s.\textsuperscript{30} In his early days at La Lune, and while working at other journals before that, Gill mainly featured cultural icons in his caricatures, such as playwrights, theater actresses, and musicians. However, as the Second Empire grew more tolerant of a free press, Gill increasingly turned towards the representation of budding political journalists. Through these images, Gill was publicizing the work of columnists even if he did not know them. His goal was to bring to light, as brothers-in-arms, individuals who shared his professional field. Gill wanted to prove that he and fellow members of the press were a force for political change. As a firm believer in the liberty of the press and a man who railed against authoritarianism, it would not be long before Gill experienced harsher problems with the law and censorship officials than the infamous Charles Philipon.\textsuperscript{31}

The first brazenly controversial caricature that Gill created appeared in La Lune on November 17, 1867. Portrait Authentique de Rocambole (fig. 13) was one of Gill’s conceptual masterpieces. Rocambole was a fictional character born out of a roman-feuilleton written by Pierre Alexis Ponson du Terrail (1829-1871). As a feuilletoniste, Ponson du Terrail understood that the best way to maintain popularity was to have his most successful character, in his case Rocambole, undergo as many adventures as possible. Accordingly, Rocambole was the protagonist of Les exploits de Rocambole, a serial publication that Ponson du Terrail wrote for La Patrie (1841-1937) in over 100 installments from 1858 to 1859, as well as in La résurrection de Rocambole, a more than 200-part serial he published in Le Petit Journal (1863-1944)

\textsuperscript{30} For a key study on Roubaud, see Valérie Guillaume and Ségolène Le Men, Benjamin Roubaud et le Panthéon charivarique (Paris: Maison de Balzac, 1988).
\textsuperscript{31} Philipon is well-known for his prolonged battle with press censors in the first half of the nineteenth century.
between 1865 and 1866. On August 26, 1866 *La Lune* gladly announced the continuation of Rocambole’s adventures by launching *La dernière mort de Rocambole* – a parody of the roman-feuilleton genre authored by André Gill. Gill’s image (fig. 14) on the front page of the issue (and the opening article on the next page) further highlighted his role as the illustrator for Rocambole’s forthcoming episodes. The first installment of *La dernière mort de Rocambole* came out the following week on September 2, and remained a central component of *La Lune* until February 3, 1867. All welcomed this news, as Parisians enjoyed the distraction provided by Rocambole amidst the ongoing international conflicts. The notion that Rocambole would once again grace the pages of a journal at newspaper stands brought forth these words from *Le Charivari*: “Ah! merci, mon dieu, il y a encore de beaux jours pour la France!” Without a doubt, readers eagerly awaited the latest journal carrying Rocambole’s adventures, to see “la suite au prochain numéro,” Ponson du Terrail’s famous catchphrase included at the end of each episode to pique the reader’s interest.

Poking fun at the law requiring the prior written authorization of an individual before that person’s likeness could appear in a journal, Rocambole, in the last installment of *La dernière mort de Rocambole*, agreed to let *La Lune* publish his portrait-charge. Before dying, “Rocambole était maigre comme un clou; mais, d’une main défaillante, il envoyait à la *Lune* l’autorisation de publier sa charge.” Even though Rocambole was a fictional character, this action was significant. It was a strong sign in support of the liberty of expression broadcast

---

33 “Oh! Thank God, there are still nice days to be had for France!” A. Brémond, “La suite de Rocambole,” *Le Charivari* (August 26, 1866), 2.
34 “Rocambole was thin as a rake; but, with a faint hand, he authorized *La Lune* to publish his likeness.” André Gill, “La dernière mort de Rocambole,” *La Lune* (February 3, 1867), 3.
through a popular figure. The message was propagandistic in nature, especially as it came on the heels of Napoléon III’s January 17 manifesto about the upcoming changes to press laws. Perhaps the intention was to have a greater number of people protest against the irrationality of sustaining such a regulation. Moreover, it also enabled Gill, who had made many vignettes of Rocambole’s adventures in the previous six months, to conceive an image of the protagonist in the form of a portrait-charge, his preferred mode of representation. Soon after, on February 17, 1867, La Lune advertised that the genuine portrait of Rocambole would be published in its pages. Although the Portrait Authentique de Rocambole only surfaced in the journal on November 17, 1867, it heightened the anticipation, and Gill eventually did deliver a tour de force.

1.4 Napoléon III as Rocambole

Portrait Authentique de Rocambole (fig. 13) was a large-scale print that occupied the second and third page of La Lune, rather than two-thirds of the front page, as was convention for the other portraits-charges Gill produced for the journal. This was the only time in the run of La Lune, that a single image was spread over two full pages – adding to its shock value. The facial expression of Rocambole also contributed to this experience. When readers first heard about Rocambole in La dernière mort de Rocambole, the protagonist was practically a cadaver. Over the course of his journeys Rocambole regains his forces, but he is confronted by many challenges, which often leave him in a frenzied state of affairs. He is best described as an extravagant, chaotic figure, which led Gill to portray him as a lunatic in several of the vignettes, an aspect of Rocambole’s character that the artist retained in Portrait Authentique de

---

35 “LA LUNE publiera le VÉRITABLE portrait de ROCAMBOLE par André Gill” (LA LUNE will publish the GENUINE portrait of ROCAMBOLE by André Gill). Daniel Lévy, La Lune (February 17, 1867), 4.
Rocambole. Therefore, it was natural to claim a legitimate connection between Gill’s print and the serial hero, but of course, more hid behind the Portrait Authentique de Rocambole.

While the caption under the title claims that the print was created based on “deux photographies et un grand nombre de documents fournis par M. le vicomte PONSON DU TERRAIL, son illustre ami,” the associations with Napoléon III were unmistakable. The figure’s facial features, especially his characteristic beard and moustache, drew direct references to the emperor. Napoléon III sported such facial hair for several years, as a photograph (fig. 15) by André-Adolphe-Eugène Disdéri (1819-1889) and a painting (fig. 16) by Alexandre Cabanel (1823-1889) demonstrate. The column that accompanied Gill’s image mostly dealt with the fictional character from the roman-feuilleton, and how Rocambole found new life once more through the portrait. It was only towards the end of the article that a clear connection between the written description and Gill’s image could be made.

Part bandit, part fop, the figure is deceitful. When these characteristics are transferred onto Napoléon III, we are left with an image in which the emperor is partly shown as a dandy wearing a black hat and holding a rose in his left hand, and conversely, as a hideous creature with a piercing gaze and the caudal appendix of a sea monster. Simply put, this is a freakish two-faced being whom the caricaturist debases. It was the hypocrisy of Napoléon III that the Portrait Authentique de Rocambole intended to mock. Some details in Gill’s image can be viewed as referring to the disgraceful character that Louis-Napoléon had already displayed in 1852. The rose (a symbol of love and peace) could be seen as a peaceful token that Louis-Napoléon offered to the people en route to declaring himself the emperor of France. On October 9, 1852 Louis-

36 “Two photographs and a large number of documents supplied by his illustrious friend, Mr. the viscount, PONSON DU TERRAIL.” See La Lune (November 17, 1867), 2-3, and Figure 13.
Napoléon proclaimed in a speech that he gave at Bordeaux: “Moi, je dis: L’Empire, c’est la paix; c’est la paix, car la France le désire, et lorsque la France est satisfaite, le monde est tranquille.” Yet, it is well known that prior to this affair, he had already established oppressive laws, meaning that he was well capable of inflicting hardship and pain on those same people. That capacity is embodied by the presence of the sword in the figure’s right hand. This was a man who took advantage of others and ultimately stabbed them in the back by feigning a compassionate personality over the course of many years. In reference more specifically to press censorship, the beam of light that emanates from the monster’s eye is a comment on how Napoléon III constantly scrutinized the acts and works of members of the press. By means of censorship, he menacingly pierced the illustrated creations of the opposition. His ferocious appearance emphasizes his appetite for destruction and his readiness to pounce on the defenseless. The “la suite au prochain numéro” catchphrase on the figure’s tail, in this case, refers not to the notion that another portrait will soon follow in the pages of La Lune, but rather, that this assailant will lash out against another victim at any moment. His suppression of others will continue in the next installment. Overall, although the respectable and grotesque characteristics of Napoléon III share equal space in Gill’s print, the monstrous side of the figure carries more visual weight.

The publication of the Portrait Authentique de Rocambole was a calculated risk by the staff of La Lune; the image was not censored prior to publication, but it was not long before repercussions would be felt in relation to the content and dissemination of this work. While the image was “hidden” inside the pages of that day’s edition of La Lune, the authorities did track it...

37 “I say: The Empire means peace. It is peace, because France desires it, and when France is content, the world is peaceful.” Napoléon III, Discours de Sa Majesté Napoléon III, prononcé à Bordeaux le 9 Octobre 1852 (Bordeaux: Crugy, 1852).
down and confiscated all of the single issues they could locate. *La Lune* had gained some notoriety, especially since the journal had also recently published Gill’s *Les Lutteurs masqués* (fig. 17), for which François Polo faced charges and *La Lune* could already report the charges in its November 24, 1867 issue. This print was problematic, because it represented Giuseppe Garibaldi (1807-1882) overthrowing Pope Pius IX (1792-1878), a ruler whom Napoléon III had supported, in a wrestling match. The publication of these two images in such a short span led to fines and prison sentences for Polo, and consequently, to the termination of *La Lune*.\(^{38}\) Henceforth, censors avowed that they would be more vigilant about letting another image of a personage that shared some resemblance to Napoléon III slip through their hands. To err on the side of caution, they would even censor works whose content they were unable to grasp, assuming those images must contain some veiled meaning. The authorities did not take matters lightly, as twenty-five of Gill’s prints alone were censored between January 1868 and the end of the Second Empire in September 1870.\(^{39}\) Nevertheless, the *Portrait Authentique de Rocambole* had earned Gill public favor, because he boldly made a mockery of the emperor, and he became someone behind whom republicans rallied. By not asking for the emperor’s written permission, and by depicting him through such a clever disguise, in a single print, Gill had publicly undermined Napoléon III’s power and authority, and had used a biting satire to accomplish it.

---

\(^{38}\) Facing judgment in front of the correctional police tribunal, the judge decreed that: “Faisant application de ces articles, Condamne Polo à un mois de prison, 100 francs d’amende pour la première contravention, à un mois de prison, 500 francs d’amende pour la seconde contravention” (By applying these articles, Polo is sentenced to one month in prison, and a 100 francs fine for the first violation, and to one month in prison, and a 500 francs fine for the second violation). *La Lune* (December 8, 1867), 2.

\(^{39}\) This number is borrowed from Tulard, ed., *Dictionnaire*, 254.
1.5 *Portraits-Charges* and Written Authorizations

It was only a few months before that André Gill had sharply ridiculed the entire written authorization process by caricaturing himself in a front-page print (fig. 18) of *La Lune*. Gill’s large head occupies the center stage of the September 15, 1867 issue. The title of the image is *And. Gill, par X...* as though some anonymous person who did not ask Gill for his permission to depict his likeness made the *portrait-charge*; yet, Gill was unquestionably the one who drew this work. Gill’s head is served on a platter that carries some coins and a long crayon and a feather pen. He mockingly smiles at the viewer as his head slightly tilts to the right. His thick mustache and wavy hair add an element of humor to the print. A short note written on a piece of paper rests diagonally on the crayon at the front of the image. The inscription says: “Mon cher Polo, je n’aime pas la liberté; vous me demandez celle de publier mon portrait: je refuse net!” and is signed by Gill. Polo, the addressee, refers of course to François Polo, the editor of *La Lune* and close business partner of Gill. The message is laughable, since it full-heartedly contains an ironic undertone, as Gill had done the exact opposite of what he inscribed on the piece of paper. He fully supports liberty of the press, and he has no shame in having his likeness reproduced in a journal, to the extent that he is the one who drew the image. Gill’s signature on the note also cleverly serves as the artist’s signature for the entire image, and thus he openly publicizes his identity. Since the facial features of an individual are always the most important aspects of a *portrait-charge*, it is telling that Gill deliberately featured only his head and neck to enable viewers to focus solely on his face. Moreover, by placing his head on a platter, he urged people to do whatever they wanted to do to it. Gill’s point was that this was simply an image, and

40 “My dear Polo, I do not like liberty; you ask me the liberty to publish my portrait: I flat out refuse!” See *La Lune* (September 15, 1867), 1, and Figure 18.
nothing could harm him. He would not even shy away from the possible threat of a fine – represented by the coins scattered around his head.\footnote{Gill’s print also invokes the image of the head of St. John the Baptist as martyr.} Gill’s mission was to criticize as best as he could the requirement of the written permission of the subject in the press law set in place by Napoléon III, and in September 1867, he achieved this by caricaturing himself.

This particular image (fig. 18) formed part of a larger group of works that aimed to belittle the regime’s requirement for written authorizations to make portraits-charges. In the 1860s, it became customary for caricaturists to publish the notes of authorization that individuals had provided to go along with the portraits-charges in newspapers. More than just notices of approval, these written authorizations could be viewed on the one hand as sincere endorsements in favor of the freedom of the press, or alternatively, in the hands of some, as attacks against the government system.

One of the most significant examples is presented through the case of Émile de Girardin (1806-1881). In the early days of the Second Republic, Girardin, who many consider as the founder of the modern press in France, supported the candidature of Louis-Napoléon to be elected as president of the Republic. Girardin used the press as a means to communicate his viewpoint. Since Louis-Napoléon was appointed to this position, and Girardin believed that he had played a role in helping to bring about this decision, given that he was the editor in charge of La Presse, a journal that had a large circulation since it sold for a price well below the average at the time, the journalist was hopeful that the president would accept some of his recommendations for administering the Republic. However, not only were Girardin’s ideas declined by Napoléon III, but it was also only a matter of a few years before strict rules were imposed on the press. Starting in 1851, Girardin disapproved of the French government’s
operations, and he became one of the leading opponents of press censorship. Thus, several years later, when Gill and La Lune came calling to represent the journalist in an image (fig. 19) for publication, Girardin presented the newspaper with the following note: “si je refusais à la Lune l’autorisation que la loi l’oblige de me demander, je contredirais tout mon passé, car ce serait admettre la censure et reconnaître ce que je ne reconnais pas: l’inégalité entre la plume et le crayon.” The element most worth calling attention to here is the last part of Girardin’s message. Prior censorship of the printed word in France had already been abolished in 1822, and even though Girardin was a writer and not a visual artist, as a man who promoted freedom of expression in all its forms, he was petitioning for the illustrated press to be granted this same opportunity. If journalists had earned the right to articulate their opinions freely, why were artists and caricaturists, equally deserving members of society, treated in certain cases as greater threats to the nation? The purity of a republican principle was expressed in this thought, as Girardin was not looking to improve his own situation, but rather that of an entire profession. Girardin knew that a free press was best served if it could please diverse communities, and for this to happen, it needed to be as democratic as possible.

Some written authorizations were shorter, but they still communicated strong messages. Take for instance Victor Hugo’s note for the May 19, 1867 edition of La Lune (fig.20). Hugo proclaimed his desire for freedom by saying: “je veux toute la liberté comme je veux toute la

---

42 For a description of Émile de Girardin’s involvement in the press industry, see Joanna Richardson, La Vie Parisienne 1852-1870 (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1971), 177-179.
43 “If I refused to La Lune the authorization which it requires of me, I would contradict all my past, because I would be agreeing to censorship and would recognize that which I don’t: the unequal treatment of the pen and the crayon” (translation Robert Justin Goldstein). See La Lune (November 11, 1866), 1, and Figure 19.
Hugo’s statement alluded to the press law indirectly, as he yearned for all forms of liberties, and of course this included an artist’s wish to make a portrait-charge of him, since that was the artist’s way of expressing himself freely. Hugo never wanted to impose himself on another person’s right of free expression and freedom. For all members of society to share this point of view, “toute la liberté” was a necessity. Lumière in French, beyond referring to light, signifies the Enlightenment period when pluralized (i.e. Le Siècle des Lumières). An intellectual genius in his own right, Hugo’s call for light in this inscription, revealed a longing for the ideals of the Enlightenment. Just as philosophers during the Enlightenment aspired to separate society from the abuses of the state and its establishments, Hugo wanted the French to be freed from the perils of the Second Empire. Not surprisingly, for the remainder of his life, Hugo was often associated with a source of light, as is apparent in Gill’s image. Rising above sea level, Hugo’s head disperses rays of light as his forehead embodies the shape of a vibrant, rising sun. Emphasis is placed on Hugo’s forehead, meaning his intellectual capacities and the ideas he stood for. Although Hugo already had an outstanding reputation for his previous achievements, from this moment on, he occupied an even more vital role in French history. Over the course of the next decade, Hugo’s leadership, as a figure of reason, was regularly called into action in an attempt to overcome despotism.

An even shorter notice was the one Jules Vallès gave to La Lune on July 14, 1867. Gill’s caricature (fig. 21) that day was accompanied by the following one-word message of approval by Vallès: “chargez!” A radical republican journalist, Vallès, at the time, was the chief editor of La Rue (1867-1868). From the early stages of his life, Vallès supported the freedom of the press,

---

44 “I want all the liberty, just like I want all the light.” See La Lune (May 19, 1867), 1, and Figure 20.
45 Gill, a true admirer of the literary master, portrayed Hugo in a multitude of images.
an ideology for which he faced challenges at different times of his career. Yet, it also earned him respect amongst many of his peers. Accordingly, in 1867, *La Lune* willingly wanted to offer its help to promote Vallès’s new journal. Leading up to and during the first months of *La Rue*’s existence, *La Lune* advertised a deal to its readers and prospective subscribers that would give them a year of *La Lune* for free if they purchased a subscription of *La Rue*. Given this collaboration between the two journals, Vallès’s consent to have his likeness depicted in a *portrait-charge* by *La Lune* came as no surprise; however, it was the means by which he would express himself that carried greater weight. Vallès did not disappoint; his message was poignant and to the point. By being succinct, the journalist gave the impression that the authorization law was such a petty matter, that he could dismiss the issue with a single word. Furthermore, while Gill’s caricature of Vallès was published in *La Lune*, the word “chargez” implied that the journalist would not be bothered if Gill, or any other caricaturist for that matter, made scores of *portraits-charges* of him. Vallès’s use of the term entailed that artists should have the right to produce *portraits-charges* and certainly should “go ahead and draw him.” Much like Gill’s libertarian attitude in *And. Gill, par X...* (fig. 18), Vallès set the tone with his message by indicating that defamation was part of the exercise of liberty of the freedom of expression. The exclamation mark after the word “chargez” also carries a rather violent undertone. It seems as though Vallès was encouraging the production of visual satires to go beyond those people who provided written permissions for such representations, and instead to attack all. The purpose of such a campaign of satire would be to target those individuals, such as Napoléon III and his

---

46 The original advertisement for this offer appeared in the May 26, 1867 edition of *La Lune*.  
officials, who always refused to give consent to caricaturists. Vallès’s steady criticism of the empire and his accumulation of press offenses supports such an interpretation.

There are many other published examples of written authorizations for portraits-charges. Without going into details about the messages they extended to newspaper staff, here are but a few of the well-known figures who agreed to have their likeness portrayed in caricatures between 1866 and 1874: Gustave Courbet (1819-1877), Alexandre Dumas (1802-1870), Victorien Sardou (1831-1908), Ferdinand de Lesseps (1805-1894), and Léon Gambetta. As these names suggest, the list included people working in a broad range of professions, from artists, to novelists, to dramatists, to diplomats, and statesmen. Whether they were arch-republicans who championed all forms of liberties, or conservatives who were indifferent to the notion of freedom of the press, the illustrated satirical press saw these short mandates as potential weapons to use against the regime. In a caricature for Le Charivari (fig. 22) by Louis Pierre Gabriel Bernard Morel-Retz (1825-1899), better known as Stop, this phenomenon allegedly invades even the domestic world, as young women shied away from sending letters to acquaintances until someone – in this case the father – granted prior authorization. This was a more playful way of mocking the law set in place since the beginning of the Second Empire, but the idea of ridiculing the regime remained the same. Unfortunately for caricaturists, the law requiring written authorization was not rescinded when Napoléon III brought changes to the press in 1868, and as a result, it continued to be a point of contention throughout much of the 1870s.

48 The notes of approval written by Sardou, Dumas, Courbet, and de Lesseps were published in La Lune on October 14, 1866, December 2, 1866, June 9, 1867, and September 29, 1867 respectively. Gambetta gave authorization to L’Éclipse on September 11, 1874 for an image that would be published by the paper on September 20, 1874.
1.6 Cautious Liberalization

When the liberalization of the press laws occurred on May 11, 1868, what were the key changes that transpired? The biggest revision that took place was the elimination of prior authorization for the publication of journals. As long as government officials were informed about the different people involved in the formation of a new journal and where its headquarters would be located, members of society were able to establish a paper to their liking. Individuals were not forced to capitulate their ideas for the creation of journals before their inception, as censors no longer had the entitlement to reject them. This led to a growth in the number of newspaper publications available in the final years of the Second Empire. Additionally, the price of stamp duty exercised on newspapers in Paris was reduced from 6 centimes to 5 centimes per issue. This saved publishers some money; however, they were still in charge of supplying over eighty percent of the cost required by the government in previous years, and it did not enable them to substantially reduce the price of their own journals in order to attract more subscribers. Another modification was to grant printing houses the right to solely distribute the issues of a single journal.49 Since printers were also responsible for the materials that came out of their presses, and accordingly, liable to fines (journalists and caricaturists were not the only ones who could be sanctioned for their actions), they welcomed the opportunity to minimize the different working bodies for which they were responsible. Some members of the press even wanted to stop the regime from punishing printers altogether since they only facilitated the distribution of materials; they were not the creators or the collaborators when it came to the content chronicled

49 For a practical summary of the 1868 law changes, see Bellet, *Presse et journalisme*, 18-23.
in the papers.\textsuperscript{50} \textit{Le Charivari}, a journal invested in political affairs and known to include subversive matter in its papers, willingly promoted this idea, as shown in one of its articles from 1867: “l’imprimeur doit aussi rentrer dans le droit commun. Il ne doit plus être responsable d’aucun écrit dont l’auteur accepte la responsabilité en y apposant son nom.”\textsuperscript{51} This however was not one of the rule changes that the regime agreed to. Evidently, the revisions outlined above were cautious measures of liberalization, and they did little in terms of loosening or supporting the production of caricatures.

To make matters worse, there were many issues that caricaturists and other press staff had to accommodate in the wake of changes to the press laws. Journals were still required to submit a security deposit to the authorities, a strain on newspapers of all sizes. Moreover, fines could be imposed for the publication of private matters in any print or visual format. While such fines were only handed out if those who were victimized officially filed complaints, it forced journalists and caricaturists to sign their works, so that they could not hide in anonymity. This regulation made it harder for members of the oppositional press to comment on the lives of individuals they did not know well. And, if a member of the press was convicted of disseminating private information, mostly for use in political arenas, that person was no longer able to contribute any form of work to journals for publication until the designated administrators discharged him. The same went for those who were politically exiled from the

\textsuperscript{50} The debate over whether to punish the artist only, or all individuals involved in the publication process of an image, goes back to the early stages of the July Monarchy. For a thorough analysis of such a case (i.e. Daumier’s \textit{Gargantua} (Delteil 34) and those implicated in its public distribution), see Elizabeth C. Childs, “Big Trouble: Daumier, \textit{Gargantua}, and the Censorship of Political Caricature,” \textit{Art Journal} 51, n. 1 (Spring, 1992), 27.

\textsuperscript{51} “The printer must also form part of common right. He must no longer be responsible for any piece of writing for which the author accepts full responsibility by affixing it to his name.” Arnould, “Le sacerdoce des imprimeurs,” \textit{Le Charivari} (February 10, 1867), 1.
country, although the boldest, such as Henri Rochefort, notoriously made use of pseudonyms to counter this initiative.\footnote{A detailed account of Rochefort’s operations while in exile can be found in Eric Vatré, Henri Rochefort ou la comédie politique au XIXe siècle (Paris: Jean Claude Lattès, 1984).} All these discrepancies reminded artists and readers alike that orders were imposed by a system that was founded on despotic practices.

Meaningful changes were hard to come by during the Empire. Some conservative journalists, such as Bernard-Adolphe Granier de Cassagnac (1806-1880), did not even want to consent to the liberalization of the press in 1868.\footnote{For more on de Cassagnac’s authoritarian attitude and his career in journalism and politics, see Tulard, ed., Dictionnaire, 589-590.} It really took until after the fall of the Empire, in the early days of September 1870, for there to be a more concrete cancellation of laws that had hitherto hindered the freedom of the press.\footnote{Some of the more notable changes included: the elimination of stamp duty (starting September 5); rescinding the need to receive a censor’s pre-authorization for the publication of a caricature (beginning September 10); and abolishing the requirement of paying caution money for journals (introduced a month later on October 10). Full documentation on this matter is available at the Archives nationales, F 18.} But in the meantime, caricaturists still questioned whether any sense of improvement could be felt in the way press staff went about business on a daily basis. This sentiment was perhaps best conveyed in a lithograph (fig. 23) produced by Honoré Daumier and published by Le Charivari on June 17, 1870.

In Va t-elle être assez soulagée!... Daumier presents viewers with a scene composed of three figures. The central figure, an allegorical personification of the Press, is situated between two men who each carry large, heavy sacks. One of the bags signifies stamp duty, while the other stands for tax money for advertisements. Daumier suggests that while the Press might be freed from one burden, she cannot escape the other. Viewers are meant to suppose that the stamp duty sack was lifted off the Press’s back moments before the colossal weight of the tax money for advertisements bag was being loaded again onto her back. These ongoing challenges have taken...
their toll on the Press. Her hunched back, bent knees, and her aging appearance all reflect the poor condition in which she finds herself. Her facial expression and open arms reveal her outrage. Upon seeing the massive sack of tax money for advertisements loom over her shoulders, she is left gasping for breath, and the agonized look in her eye implies she is thinking: are you kidding me? One can barely make out the expressions of the two men, signaling that they are merely fulfilling a task. Daumier’s point is that under Napoléon III’s regime there was always something to worry about. The people working for the oppositional press simply were not satisfied with the modifications proposed in 1868, because other potential amendments with negative outcomes were a constant threat. Thus, to solve the question set forth by the caption to Daumier’s print, the answer is no – the press will not be alleviated of her problems until complete freedom of the press reigns.

There is a reason why Daumier’s lithograph, *Va t-elle être assez soulagée!...*, is allegorical in nature: by approaching this sensitive topic through allegory, the artist reduced the risk of being disciplined for criticizing the regime. Allegories were still one of the primary modes of representation amongst caricatures at the time, because it allowed them to target individuals and principles in an indirect way. For those who were not willing to purely reduce themselves to the creation of social mores, allegories enabled them to maintain a foothold in the political realm. Yet, on the other hand, the high number of allegorical satires at the time indicates that the majority of artists still lived in fear of the law. An allegory, no matter how powerful, was more of a veiled attack against the target, than a specific portrayal of the prey. Evidence bears out the basis as to why individuals did not have faith in the system of liberalization; in the two years after the 1868 press laws were put into practice more than double the number of prosecutions were doled out against press employees than in the fifteen years prior to that (leading back to the
This begs the question – exactly how tolerant was the later Second Empire? And under these fragile conditions, how could one establish trust in Napoléon III’s administration?

1.7 Édouard Manet’s Political Stance

Édouard Manet, an accomplished artist and the preeminent modernist painter of the Second Empire, received his fair share of criticism throughout the 1860s. Many objected to his style and were repulsed by the provocative choice of his subjects. Whether it was in his large-scale paintings or in his more modest-sized prints, many of the controversial elements in his works could be traced back to his republican politics. Although Manet was born in Paris to a long-standing family of the haute-bourgeoisie, the artist expressed a republican viewpoint from an early age. Manet, the son of Auguste Manet, a revered official in the ministère de la justice, acquired a fair amount of knowledge about politics and republican ideologies through his father’s métier. In the late 1840s, while traveling to Rio de Janeiro as a naval apprentice and during his stay in Brazil, Manet exchanged letters with his family and a few of his close friends back in France. His political beliefs were most fully revealed in a letter to his father from March 22, 1849. In it, Manet hoped that the French would remain loyal to the Republic by restraining

---

55 There were 327 press sanctions between 1868 and 1870, whereas the previous fifteen years witnessed approximately 150 such charges. Claude Bellanger et al., *Histoire générale de la presse française*, vol. 2 (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1969), 316.

themselves from falling under the influence of Louis-Napoléon – a man who the former felt did not embody the genuine principles of a republican. Even as a teenager, Manet felt that Louis-Napoléon was not a trustworthy figure, and he opposed the latter’s candidacy for the title of President of the Second Republic.\(^{57}\) It is from these beginnings, his initial suspicion of the values of the man who would become emperor, that Manet eventually became a profound republican.\(^{58}\)

It was not long into his artistic career that Manet began making prints. Manet’s first graphic work was a caricature of Émile Ollivier (fig. 24). This image was published in *Le Diogène* (1860-1862), an anti-clerical periodical, on April 14, 1860. Manet had made some caricatural sketches of his shipmates while traveling to Brazil, and it was only a matter of time before he explored this art form again with purview of a larger audience. Although Ollivier was not yet the grand promoter of the liberal empire in 1860 (as he would be a few years later), he began to turn towards the political Right (from the viewer’s perspective Ollivier faces the right in Manet’s lithograph) upon returning to France from exile.\(^{59}\) Hence, while Ollivier became a popular target for caricaturists from the mid-1860s through the early 1870s, it was Manet who had first lampooned the statesman.

In 1862, Manet produced another contentious print, and this time, it was directed at Napoléon III and his regime. The lithograph *Le Ballon* (fig. 25) alludes to the yearly *fête de l’Empereur*.

---


\(^{58}\) For a thorough overview of Manet’s political stance, see Philip Nord, “Manet and Radical Politics,” *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 19, n. 3 (Winter, 1989), 447-480. Nord was one of the first scholars to label Manet as a radical republican; it is an assessment with which I agree.

That year, Manet had exhibited his graphic works at Alfred Cadart’s (1828-1875) printing shop located on the rue de Richelieu. The prints shown at Cadart’s were mostly etchings, and they were made during a phase of Manet’s career when his works drew inspiration from the oeuvre of Velazquez and Titian. Accordingly, Manet’s name started to surface in artistic circles. Yet, none of those etchings would match _Le Ballon_ in terms of carrying a political message. The _fête de l’Empereur_, celebrated on August 15, the day of Louis-Napoléon’s birth, was designed to glorify the Empire and symbolize Napoléon III’s ascendancy to power. Republicans and those on the Left did not think highly of the holiday, and once the Empire fell, this celebration was no longer observed. Not surprisingly, Manet views the _fête_ in a negative light in _Le Ballon_.

Although a large crowd is assembled on the occasion of the holiday, the artist opted to depict the air balloon while still grounded, instead of showing its ascendancy. Much like the cripple in the immediate foreground, Manet suggests the balloon is unfit to take flight. Manet was skeptical about the Empire, especially since it was fixated on opulence, which did not contribute much to what he considered as social progress. This situation even led Rose-Joseph Lemercier (1803-1887), the famous print publisher who owned one of the best printing presses in all of Paris, to be wary of Manet’s lithograph. Lemercier did not want to be associated with the content of Manet’s print, and refused to publish the image. While authorities did not censor the lithograph, Manet demonstrated pro-republican sentiments by belittling the emperor and his regime at a moment when the Empire was being publicly celebrated.
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60 Manet’s _Le Ballon_ is closely investigated in Douglas W. Druick and Peter Zegers, “Manet’s “Balloon”: French Diversion, the Fête de l’Empereur 1862,” _Print Collector’s Newsletter_ 14, n. 2 (May-June, 1983), 37-46.

61 Michel Melot, _Daumier: L’art et la République_ (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2008), 103. Later that decade, Lemercier would also refuse to publish Manet’s _The Execution of Emperor Maximilian_.
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Manet’s next political strike came in 1864. *Battle of the Kearsarge and Alabama* (fig. 26) conveys an event that took place off the coast of France during the American Civil War. Manet did not witness the battle firsthand, but when he heard the news that the *Kearsarge*, a Union naval vessel, had sunk the *Alabama*, a Confederate ship, nearby the port of Cherbourg, he rushed at the opportunity of generating a visual account of the event.62 In the American war effort, Napoléon III identified with the South, whereas French republicans, to stand in opposition to the emperor and in favor of the politics of the Union, supported the North. But, rather than merely reveling in the Union victory, Manet painted this subject with the intention of deriding Napoléon III’s foreign policies. The Confederate loss and the emperor’s ties to the South reflected poorly on France’s own campaign in the Americas, which had begun when Napoléon III sent troops on a military expedition to Mexico in 1862. While the Mexican venture was not yet over in 1864, it had already proven to be a financial burden on the French and no return on its investment was forthcoming. Later in the decade, when in a series of works Manet dedicated himself to the Mexican campaign by depicting the execution of Maximilian, the Austrian prince who was seated on the throne of the short-lived French empire in Mexico, the political connection between Manet’s *Battle of the Kearsarge and Alabama* and his new set of works grew even stronger.

In the meantime Manet grew closer to other liberal-minded figures, several of whom would have a major impact on the rest of the artist’s career. Perhaps the most important of them all was

Léon Gambetta. Manet likely got to know Gambetta through one of his own brothers, Gustave Manet (1835-1884), who was a lawyer by profession and an advocate of Gambetta’s.

Gambetta’s initial claim to fame rested on his defense in court of Charles Delescluze (1809-1871), a man indicted for writing polemical articles in Le Réveil (1868-1871) and for promoting the erection of a statue in honor of Aphonse Baudin (1811-1851). Although Delescluze was fined and imprisoned for his acts, Gambetta was viewed as a man who protected the rights of the press, and people championed him for demonstrating republican loyalty. Manet certainly took note of Gambetta’s anti-imperial standards, and the two started frequenting cafés together shortly after Gambetta had pleaded for the journalist in 1868. These meetings occurred most regularly at the Café de Londres. More than a mere relationship, the two men developed a friendship that would last until their final days in the early 1880s. Whether the two men shared political views, or Gambetta was helping Manet to find suitors to purchase his art, their support for each other clearly demoted Manet’s status amongst members of the Salon jury and the bureaucrats who administered the event annually.

Since Manet faced constant rejection of his artistic endeavors and his political inclinations in the 1860s, he developed important ties during this time with art critics who were politically liberal and who wrote positive reviews in journals about Manet’s art. The key figures who formed part of this group include Théodore Duret (1838-1927), Émile Zola (1840-1902), Théophile Thoré-Bürger (1807-1869), and Jules-Antoine Castagnary (1830-1888). Théodore

---

63 Baudin fervently opposed the 1851 coup d’état, and he was turned into a republican martyr after being killed on the barricades of the streets of Paris that December.

Duret authored many significant works related to the art world in the final third of the nineteenth century, and he was a pioneer when it came to documenting the maturation of the Impressionists. Duret encountered Manet while the two men were separately traveling through Spain in 1865, and from then on, Duret closely followed Manet’s artistic progress. While in charge of *La Tribune Française*, a pro-republican newspaper Duret ran from 1868 to 1870, the art critic was indicted by the French government in 1869 for launching an unauthorized public subscription to commemorate Alphonse Baudin’s oppositional role to Louis-Napoléon at the time of the coup d’état (a charge similar to that which Delescluze was found guilty of a year earlier). Just as Manet had advocated for Gambetta’s role in the affair previously, the artist stood behind Duret once the latter was prosecuted, and this led to a lifelong friendship. It was also under the wing of Duret, while working at *La Tribune Française*, that Émile Zola began honing his skills as an art critic. Both Duret and Zola excelled at fueling the disparity between those artists who cherished liberal ideas (whether political or artistic), and those who endorsed conservative standards. Both critics were supporters of the new modern art that focused on the world around them, rather than on mythological scenes or ones clad in religious symbolism.

### 1.8 The Execution of Maximilian

In 1869, Manet turned to Zola for support when his *The Execution of Emperor Maximilian* painting (fig. 27) was denied access to the Salon because of its subject, and his lithograph (fig. 28), centered on the same incident, was banned from publication. The suppression of Manet’s works related to Maximilian led to Zola’s outburst in the papers. Zola’s protest in *La Tribune Française* noted that it was the verisimilitude with which Manet captured the affair that triggered a reaction from the authorities. In an ironic tone, Zola indicated that the specificity of
the uniforms worn by the men killing Maximilian in Manet’s images were too close to the appearance of those of contemporary French troops:

The soldiers shooting Maximilian were wearing a uniform almost identical to that of our own troops. Fanciful artists give the Mexicans costumes from comic opera. M Manet, who truly loves truth, has drawn their real costumes, which closely resemble those of the Vincennes infantrymen.65

The duplicity of the manner in which the regime dealt with the whole affair is such that Jean-Adolphe Beaucé’s (1818-1875) paintings of the Mexican campaign were accepted for various Salons of the second half of the 1860s as exemplary military successes. Beaucé represented French soldiers in favorable situations fighting on behalf of the French flag in Mexico (i.e. his Battle of Yerbabuena, 8 June 1865, between the Red Squadron of the French Counter-Guerrillas and the 1st Regiment of Mexican Lancers (fig. 29)); accordingly, his art was approved by the regime for public display.66 On the other hand, for censors to deem Manet’s work acceptable, he would have had to create a completely artificial rendering of the circumstances.

Referring specifically to the print version, Zola said:

I know exactly what kind of lithograph these gentlemen would be delighted to authorize, and if M Manet wants to have a real success in their eyes, I advise him to depict Maximilian alive and well, with his happy, smiling wife at his side. Moreover, the artist would have to make it clear Mexico has never suffered a bloodbath and that it is living and will long continue to live under the blessed rule of Napoléon III’s protégé. Historic truth, thus interpreted, will bring tears of joy to the censor’s eyes.67

At a time when there was a heightened sense of vigilance over visual imagery and its potential for public humility, Manet’s Maximilian lithograph was provocative.

---

66 This particular work was exhibited at the 1868 Salon. To learn more on Beaucé’s paintings with regards to the Mexican venture, see Juliet Wilson-Bareau, “Manet and the Execution of Maximilian,” in The Execution of Maximilian: Painting, Politics and Censorship, Juliet Wilson-Bareau et al. (London: National Gallery, 1992), 38-40.
While Manet’s lithograph contained no text or caption, it could still act as an important vehicle of visual information if publicly distributed. The lithograph measured nowhere near the size of the painting, yet it was a substantial work of art given the medium (measuring at 44.5 x 60.3 cm). Therefore, censors wanted to ban the work from being printed, let alone from being published. As Manet wrote in a letter to Zola, this troubled the artist: “It seems to me that the authorities are bent on making me take action over my lithograph, which had been causing me considerable worry. I thought they could stop the publication but not the printing.”

The government stepping in to stop the printing of an image was a rare occurrence outside the realm of caricature. Refusing Manet’s *The Execution of Emperor Maximilian* from appearing in the annual Salon could be repudiated as the painting not meeting the judges’ criteria on any of a variety of accounts, such as its aesthetic merit. However, forbidding the lithographic version of *The Execution of Emperor Maximilian* to be printed at all (presumably for the artist’s private use), had to do above all with the medium in which it was designed. Prints were a calculated form of communication, because they could reach broader audiences than did paintings. The greatest function of a print is its capacity for dissemination. If Manet’s lithograph were allowed to circulate in the public market, it would have undermined the government’s rejection of the painting of the same subject from public display at the Salon. Since Manet had made prints after his paintings on other occasions, he already knew the best way to attract alternate, broad audiences. Furthermore, Manet had made a few other paintings portraying the death of Maximilian in the months leading up to the creation of the canvas he intended for the Salon, and thus, there is no denying that the artist wanted to make Napoléon III’s regime the object of scorn.

---

Manet’s intention was to lay the blame for the death of Maximilian squarely on Napoléon III.

Manet had already unnerved the French government in 1867 when he decided to construct a pavilion near the grounds of the Exposition Universelle to hold his own one-man show. Much like Gustave Courbet had done in 1855 (and again in 1867), one of the primary purposes of Manet’s solo exhibition was to take a stance against the most conservative art institution of his time and its administrative system. Accordingly, governing officials anxiously monitored his artistic output.

It also did not help that Manet’s Maximilian series brought the entire Mexican venture under scrutiny. The Mexican campaign was one of Napoléon III’s biggest blemishes. The majority of the French were unaware of the undertaking when planning first began, and once the expedition became official, they were hostile to it. Financially, the campaign was burdensome, and as the years went by, there was a growing despair amongst the French about not receiving any official news from Mexico. A state of unrest loomed over France for the extent of the Mexican venture, as nobody knew what exactly was being gained from placing Maximilian on the throne in Mexico. Maximilian was nothing more than Napoléon III’s puppet emperor overseas, and once the French troops retreated from Mexico, the former was left exposed and eventually came under fire from Benito Juárez (1806-1872) and his republican forces, leading to the execution of Maximilian in June 1867. The whole affair weakened France’s status, as other European

---

69 All four of the paintings in this series share similarities, most notably the angle from which the action is depicted, but they do demonstrate different levels of finish. To learn more about each painting, refer to Juliet Wilson-Bareau et al., The Execution of Maximilian: Painting, Politics and Censorship, especially John House’s essay “Manet’s Maximilian: History Painting, Censorship and Ambiguity,” 87-111.

70 For a scholarly overview of the Mexican venture and its ramifications, consult Michele Cunningham, Mexico and the Foreign Policy of Napoléon III (New York: Palgrave, 2001).
powers saw the Mexican expedition as the undoing of the French Empire, while to the French it underlined the blatant decadence and irresponsibility of the Second Empire. The country had suffered at the hands of Napoléon III, as none of the diplomatic or economic advantages envisioned by the emperor had been obtained. On the level of Manet’s art, Napoléon III knew that there was a certain political truth (i.e. the role he played in the events that led to the death of Maximilian) displayed in *The Execution of Emperor Maximilian*. By blocking the lithograph from attaining widespread dissemination (which ultimately resulted in the lithographic stone remaining unprinted in Manet’s studio until after his death), the emperor temporarily alleviated the damage.

1.9 Decries Against the Légion d’Honneur

In the late Second Empire, Manet, although not in the form of an artwork, also lashed out against a long-standing bureaucratic distinction awarded to artists in France. When Jean-François Millet (1814-1875) made the news for being presented with the Légion d’honneur for his artistic accomplishments, Manet was quick to denounce the award’s value. Manet’s disdain had nothing to do with Millet as a person, or his merit as an artist. His contempt was aimed at the Légion d’honneur itself and its patrons. Accordingly, in a letter Manet wrote to his close friend Henri Fantin-Latour (1836-1904) in August 1868, Manet was of the opinion that Millet should refuse the award: “Millet was well advised not to go fishing for that tarnished bauble [the cross of the Legion of Honor] that’s only fit for children or the Cassagnacs of this world, and I shan’t think well of him if he wears it.”

Manet viewed the Légion d’honneur as a “tarnished” award because it was anti-egalitarian in its conception. It was Napoléon Bonaparte (1769-1821)

---

who first established the Légion d’honneur during the First Empire as the highest order of
decoration given for military excellence and civil merit. The artists who first began receiving the
award were primarily members of the Académie française; hence, they were beneficiaries of a
system, rather than deserving candidates according to most independent artists who increasingly
focused on modern subjects instead of traditional ones. By taking a shot at de Cassagnac, Manet
was implying that the award was only good for those who were proponents of the imperial
regime. De Cassagnac, an advocate of absolutist policies, had opposed the liberalization of the
press in 1868. Manet was infuriated that those ruling the country, to the detriment of enlightened
values, rewarded this type of behavior.

The Légion d’honneur would prove to be a point of contention for other republican artists as
well. In July 1870, prior to the fall of the Second Empire, Daumier was offered the award by
Émile Ollivier. However, Daumier refused to accept the honor for a number of reasons. Even
though the function of the Légion d’honneur evolved over time, its original purpose as a military
award went against Daumier’s values as a pacifist. Additionally, having set himself against
Napoléon III’s imperial regime from its very beginning, Daumier could not suddenly change his
position towards the Empire. It is noteworthy that Gustave Courbet was awarded the Légion
d’honneur on that same occasion, and he also declined the decoration. As staunch republicans,
beyond simply denying the Légion d’honneur, Daumier and Courbet were emphatically rejecting
the principles of the regime through this gesture. Neither wanted his name to be associated with
the Empire.72 The timing of when the award was to be bestowed was also problematic.

Republicans, such as Camille Pelletan (1846-1915), who recognized Daumier’s artistic talents,

72 It was not long after, during the Paris Commune, that artistic honors were done away with
temporarily, and Communards set fire to several buildings linked to the regime, including the
Palais de la Légion d’honneur.
felt that if the artist was truly being rewarded for his artistic merits, the honor should have been granted to him at an earlier stage of his career. Yet, Pelletan was suspicious that this act was only a measure by which the liberal Empire tried to gain popularity—especially since Ollivier was the intermediary serving as the sponsor for the event. Daumier had caricatured Ollivier in several prints leading up to this moment, and he was not about to accept any form of favor from a man viewed by devoted republicans as a false pretender. Unlike Ollivier, who began accepting some of the Empire’s terms after being granted amnesty, Daumier was not a turncoat who would sell his allegiance for the purpose of an individual award.

When Émile Ollivier returned to France from exile in 1860, after having opposed Louis-Napoléon’s procedures in 1851, his stock amongst republicans began to falter. For someone to embrace the Empire after being politically exiled from the country was a true form of betrayal—such a gesture was equated to joining the enemy. This takes us back to Manet’s portrait-charge of Ollivier (fig. 24) from Le Diogène, which critiqued the statesman for his political tendencies. Although not as vicious in spirit as Daumier’s later caricatures of Ollivier, Manet’s image suggested that it did not matter how good of an orator Ollivier was (underlined by the presence of Demosthenes in the background, as noted by Therese Dolan in her article on Manet’s caricature), if he were to use them as a representative of the opposing political faction. At the top of his head, Ollivier’s hair is combed from left to right indicating his new constitutional alliance. While Manet could not have predicted that Ollivier would be the one in charge of
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73 For Pelletan’s thoughts about the affair, see Le Rappel (February 14, 1879).
74 See, for instance, A droite ou à gauche?... (Delteil 3484), Et ces deux grands débris se consolaient entre eux (Delteil 3500), J’ai beau laver, l’ancienne couleur ne revient pas (Delteil 3696), and Je suis oiseau, voyez mes ailes. Je suis souris, vivent les rats. (Delteil 3700).
75 Dolan, “Manet’s Portrait-Charge of Emile Ollivier,” 23.
offering Daumier the Légion d’honneur, it is fitting that Manet’s visual attack against Ollivier was meant to express the latter’s untrustworthiness.

From that moment on, Ollivier became the constant target of satirical articles and was ridiculed in scores of caricatures.76 Le Charivari led the battle by turning Ollivier, on the one hand, into an individual who repeatedly displayed a false liberalism, “j’ai simplement voulu démontrer que M. Émile Ollivier, cette fois comme les autres, n’avait professé qu’un libéralisme faux, étroit et mesquin,”77 and on the other, into an antagonist whom neither political party could fully decipher or rely on. As stated in the words of Pierre Véron, the chief editor of Le Charivari:

M. Émile Ollivier, croyons-nous, s’il arrivait au ministère, n’apporterait pas avec lui un contingent bien nombreux d’approbations. Pour les défenseurs fanatiques du statu quo, il représenterait le trop; pour les libéraux il représenterait le trop peu. On connaît la fable de la Fontaine, mille fois citée: Je suis oiseau, voyez mes ailes, Je suis souris, vivent les rats. La proposition se retourne aisément. Jamais les rats ne reconnaîtront pour un des leurs quiconque aspire à prendre son vol, si prudent et si terre-à-terre que ce vol soit; jamais non plus les oiseaux n’adopteront celui qui n’est leur qu’à demi.78

The gist of the story is that the opposing political parties resent Ollivier, because at the heart of the matter, he belongs to neither. To make use of La Fontaine’s fable, by desiring to make the Empire liberal, Ollivier is a rat that aspires to take flight, and since he no longer defends a

76 Rendering Manet’s portrait-charge of Émile Ollivier less innocent than it may first seem.
77 “I simply wanted to show how Mr. Émile Ollivier, time and again, only professed a fake, narrow, and base form of liberalism.” Pierre Véron, “Bulletin Politique,” Le Charivari (April 26, 1867), 1.
78 “We believe that if Mr. Émile Ollivier went to the ministry, he would not have a large contingent of endorsements. For fanatical defenders of the status quo, he would represent too much; as for liberals, he would represent not enough. We all know La Fontaine’s fable that has been quoted thousands of times: I am a bird, behold my wings. I am a mouse; long live the rats. The proposition can easily be reversed. Never would the rats recognize as one of theirs whoever aspires to take flight, no matter how safe and how close to earth the flight may be; and never would the birds embrace the one who only belongs to them in part.” Pierre Véron, “Bulletin Politique,” Le Charivari (February 3, 1867), 1. The fable referred to in this passage is “The Bat and the Two Weasels.”
republic as the governing system of France, he is only partially a bird. Two years after these comments surfaced in the press, Daumier took the farce a step further, by turning La Fontaine’s fable into a witty visual representation of Ollivier. Daumier’s *Je suis oiseau, voyez mes ailes. Je suis souris, vivent les rats.* (fig. 30) showcases Ollivier with gigantic bat wings (often associated with evil and diabolical creatures in print culture) instead of arms as he stands behind an electoral urn. He is a hybrid creature – he is neither rat nor bird, but instead a bat. While the print was published in March 1869, it was designed with the May 1869 elections in mind. This legislative affair preoccupied Daumier because he was hopeful that Republicans would get the majority vote, and thus, set in place the foundation to overturn the Empire. By showing Ollivier in this state, Daumier was reproaching the former for changing political alliances so fleetingly, and he was also prompting viewers to make connections to the emperor as well. Those who lived through the transition from the Second Republic to the Second Empire could recall that Louis-Napoléon had altered the political climate at the time very quickly. Therefore, like Ollivier, Louis-Napoléon was one to communicate an idea with his words, but did something completely different in his actions. Both of these men were sly figures, and whether it was in the shape of a vote, or in the form of an award (Légion d’honneur), Daumier would never support the endeavors of Ollivier or Louis-Napoléon.

1.10 Henri Rochefort: The Polemicist

The principles of the Second Empire and its lackluster attempts to bring about changes also sustained an ample amount of backlash from polemical journalists in the late 1860s. Leading the
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79 The nineteenth-century French public was well acquainted with La Fontaine’s fables. As Kirsten Powell notes, there were over 1,200 different editions of La Fontaine’s fables published in the nineteenth century. For more on the fables and their representation in French art, see Kirsten Powell, *Fables in Frames: La Fontaine and Visual Culture in Nineteenth-Century France* (New York: Peter Lang, 1997).
pack amongst radical republicans was Henri Rochefort. Rochefort had authored several hundreds of articles as a critic of the arts for *Le Charivari* between 1859 and 1864, and he even wrote some of the captions for Daumier’s prints during those years, before devoting himself more sternly to political matters. His flair for the dramatic began shortly after he joined *Le Figaro* (1826-present) in 1864, and his relentless vilification of authoritarian jurisdiction continued well after the fall of the Empire. In 1866, *Le Figaro* transitioned from a weekly to a daily newspaper, and it is around this time that Rochefort’s public outbursts were first disseminated in the issues of the journal. The following year, after Rochefort wrote a series of rash articles that did not go over well with the French government, Hippolyte de Vilméressant (1810-1879), the editor-in-chief of *Le Figaro* at the time, was forced to dismiss Rochefort from its staff. Gill made a visual record of this event in what was one of the last images he designed for *La Lune* in 1868 (fig. 31). In *Figaro en voyage*, Vilméressant, no longer able to deal with the polemic writing of Rochefort and Albert Wolff (1835-1891), another journalist who regularly contributed work to *Le Charivari* and *Le Figaro* in the 1860s, banishes the two men as a few figures wave from the windows of *Le Figaro*’s headquarters. Larger in size, Vilméressant appears to be a nursemaid punishing two misbehaving children. Vilméressant drags Rochefort by the ear, while Wolff walks beside the editor on his own volition, implying that Rochefort was guilty of greater ill will. Gill, a polemical figure in his own right, demotes Vilméressant to an inept working class female who is unable to deal with the political affairs of the male sphere. His
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81 In most color representations of this image Rochefort also wears a red shirt, while the two other men are wearing blue clothes, aligning Rochefort with the political Left.
blue dress, which also offers a fair display of bosom, his white hat, and the purse he carries in his right hand all highlight the editor’s effeminate role.

Not fazed by his dismissal, Rochefort decided to create his own journal, which he named *La Lanterne* (1868-1876). The title of the journal in itself was controversial, as it invoked the lyrics of the song *Ça Ira*, a song made popular by revolutionaries of the French Revolution. Men in the streets sang different versions; the most fanatical one was composed by the sans-culottes. The opening stanzas of the vulgar version alluded to the lynching of aristocrats at lampposts: “Ah! ça ira, ça ira, ça ira les aristocrates à la lanterne! Ah! ça ira, ça ira, ça ira les aristocrates on les prendra!” James Gillray (1756-1815), a British caricaturist, highlighted the essence of the *sans-culotte* adaptation of *Ça Ira*, in one of his most famous caricatures: *The Zenith of French Glory; – The Pinnacle of Liberty* (fig. 32). The connection between Rochefort’s journal and Gillray’s violent image was not lost on many individuals in the late Second Empire, especially since the front page of each issue of *La Lanterne* was published on red paper and a piece of rope dangled from the “N” of the word Lanterne (N was also used as the imperial symbol for the Napoléon dynasty), evoking the act of hanging and blood in the process (fig. 33). Due to their controversial character, single issues of the journal were rather small in scale, enabling readers to carry them in their pockets and hide them from the watchful eyes of the police. The oppositional nature of *La Lanterne* made the journal more popular than Rochefort first imagined. 15, 000 issues of the inaugural number of *La Lanterne* were printed even though Rochefort
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82 *La Lanterne* is made up of two separate series. The first series was produced between May 1868 and July 1869, while the second one appeared between July 1874 and February 1876.

83 “Ah! It’ll be fine, it’ll be fine, it’ll be fine the aristocrats to the lamppost! Ah! It’ll be fine, it’ll be fine, it’ll be fine, the aristocrats we’ll hang them!” The original song can be dated to May or June 1790, while the *sans-culottes* version likely dates from July 1791. For more on the origins of *Ça Ira*, see Jacques Cellard, *Ah! ça ira, ça ira…: Ces mots que nous devons à la Révolution* (Paris: Balland, 1989), 45-48.
doubted they would all sell; yet, to his delight over 100,000 more copies were published for distribution due to the high demand.84 Within La Lanterne’s first year of existence, Rochefort was condemned to multiple fines and prison terms for arousing hatred of the government. As a provocative figure, Rochefort was challenged to many duels, several of which had already taken place by this stage of his career. One of these confrontations happened to be with Paul Granier de Cassagnac (1843-1904), Bernard-Adolphe’s son, further underlining how much members of the Left disliked the Cassagnac family.85 To escape from the French authorities, Rochefort went to Belgium. After producing a dozen issues in France, he continued to publish the journal in Brussels and he kept attacking the emperor’s regime. He even had La Lanterne smuggled back into his native country in a variety of ways – most famously by putting issues of the paper in the hollow parts of busts destined for France, which represented – none other than – Napoléon III.86 Due to this clever feat, Rochefort is to have said that, for once, Napoléon III had something in his head. Eventually, issues of La Lanterne were seized upon arriving in France, but it would not be Rochefort’s last stint as a virtuoso polemicist of the press.

Rochefort further jostled the political scene by founding a new journal in 1869, called La Marseillaise (1869-1870). Like La Lanterne, Rochefort’s newest journal referred to a revolutionary song, which happened to be the national anthem that France adopted during the Revolution. Over the course of the nineteenth century, the singing of “La Marseillaise” was
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85 Bellet notes that Rochefort took part in over 20 duels during his career. Some of these duels were personal (i.e. over exchanged words in the press), while others were based on political viewpoints. Rochefort often dueled against men who supported the Empire, such as Ernest Baroche (1829-1870). The author also describes the cause for Rochefort’s duel with de Cassagnac, which took place in 1867, op. cit., 172-174.
86 Rochefort, Les aventures, 184.
prohibited at times, and there is no denying that Rochefort fully desired to signal the tone of political resistance of his publication by labeling it *La Marseillaise*. It is rather ironic that while the journal was short-lived, it was in circulation exactly during the time that the Second Empire was waning, and thus, similar to the song it was named after, *La Marseillaise* functioned as a rallying cry for liberty and for the end of an authoritarian reign. Not surprisingly, Rochefort received multiple fines for a variety of infractions related to the journal, and its publication was even suspended for two months between May and July 1870. However, it is in connection with an incident that occurred in January 1870 that *La Marseillaise* is best remembered. Rochefort had several collaborators at *La Marseillaise*, most of whom had been devoted Communards during the Paris Commune, such as Gustave Flourens (1838-1871), Prosper-Olivier Lissagaray (1838-1901), Paschal Grousset (1844-1909), and Eugène Vermesch (1845-1878). And in January 1870, they all mourned the death of Victor Noir (1848-1870), a coworker, who was shot on January 10 by Pierre-Napoléon Bonaparte (1815-1881), Napoléon III’s cousin. Public outrage ensued.

1.11 The Assassination of Victor Noir

Opinions as to what exactly happened the night Noir was killed vary, but one thing that remains certain, is that Pierre-Napoléon Bonaparte shot Noir with a pistol. In December 1869, fed up by the ongoing slurs oppositional papers directed at the Empire, Pierre-Napoléon Bonaparte responded by insulting republicans in *L’Avenir de la Corse* (1861-1870), a pro-Bonaparte journal. This enraged members of *La Marseillaise*, especially Paschal Grousset, who felt that a duel would be necessary to solve the issue. Accordingly, as Grousset’s witnesses,

87 A detailed account of Victor Noir’s assassination can be found in an early biography on Henri Rochefort: Olivier Pain, *Henri Rochefort* (Paris: Périnet, 1879), 281-333. For a more recent summary of the affair, see Vatré, *Henri Rochefort*, 121-134.
Victor Noir and Ulrich de Fonvielle (1833-1911) made their way over to Pierre-Napoléon’s residence at 59 rue d’Auteuil on January 10, 1870 to inform the latter that Grousset sought to duel Pierre-Napoléon. However, Pierre-Napoléon had scripted a letter addressed to Rochefort the day before, because on Grousset’s orders La Marseillaise had published an article by Ernest Lavigne directly attacking the imperial family. Pierre-Napoléon believed Rochefort, known as a polemical writer, had drafted the offending article as the chief editor of La Marseillaise.88 Pierre-Napoléon Bonaparte’s letter expressed his willingness to duel with Rochefort, and it also indicated his home address, letting his adversary know where to find him. Eager to fight the journalist, Pierre-Napoléon expected Rochefort to be present at his home on January 10. Hence, while Noir and Fonvielle announced the reason for their visit to Pierre-Napoléon Bonaparte’s home, the latter was startled by their presence, thinking Rochefort may have been plotting to attack Pierre-Napoléon, even though Rochefort was nowhere near the vicinity that night. Overcome by uneasiness and aggravation, Pierre-Napoléon shot Victor Noir, and then fired twice more at Fonvielle, who barely escaped the premises as he ran for his life.

Given the outcome, it is undeniable that Pierre-Napoléon Bonaparte was the aggressor. Moreover, even if Pierre-Napoléon feared being the victim of a trap in being challenged by Noir and Fonvielle, he was the one who had suggested by letter that Rochefort should pay him a visit at home. The domestic location, under any circumstances, was an odd location for a duel.89

---

88 Lavigne’s article and Bonaparte’s letter are reproduced in the January 10 and January 12 issues of La Marseillaise respectively.
89 Reflecting on the perplexing nature of the scenario, Arthur Arnould (1833-1895), another contributor to La Marseillaise, wrote: “Quand on se croit insulté par un homme, quand on le provoque, on ne lui écrit pas: – on lui envoie deux témoins qui demandent à être mis en face de deux autres témoins” (When one is insulted by another man, and you provoke him, you do not write to him: you send him two witnesses who will take a stand against two other witnesses). Arnould, La Marseillaise (January 12, 1870), 2.
Pierre-Napoléon Bonaparte was likely aiming to draw an advantage by proposing a meeting at his own home, and if anyone was hiding a trick up his sleeve, it was Pierre-Napoléon. Perhaps Pierre-Napoléon intended to frame Rochefort, as an assailant disturbing another man’s privacy, if the latter had shown up at his home. Instead, it was Pierre-Napoléon who shot an innocent man. The assassination of Noir infuriated Rochefort, because it was not simply the murder of one man by another; it was a case of a Bonaparte – of all people – killing a republican.

Rochefort immediately expressed his indignation in the January 12, 1870 issue of *La Marseillaise*. After announcing the assassination of Noir on the front page of the journal, the following words in bold, large font could be read in Rochefort’s angry tone.

> J’ai eu la faiblesse de croire qu’un Bonaparte pouvait être autre chose qu’un assassin! J’ai osé m’imaginer qu’un duel loyal était possible dans cette famille où le meurtre et le guet-apens sont de tradition et d’usage … Voilà dix-huit ans que la France est entre les mains de ces coupe-jarrets qui, non contents de mitrailler les républicains dans les rues, les attirent dans les pièges immondes pour les égorger à domicile.\(^{90}\)

Rochefort’s conclusion was that the Bonapartes as a whole could not be trusted. They were murderers. It had been eighteen long years since the start of the Second Empire, a span during which republicans were continuously mistreated, and this latest episode confirmed the extent to which the times demanded political change in France.

Even though information did not travel as fast as it does in the digital age, everyone got to know about the Victor Noir incident almost instantaneously. Oppositional papers certainly took note of the encounter and its aftermath. As a weekly, *L’Éclipse* had its first chance to comment

---

\(^{90}\) “I have been so weak as to believe that a Bonaparte could be other than an assassin! I dared suppose that a straightforward duel was possible in this family where murder and snares are tradition and custom … For eighteen years now France has been held in the bloodied hands of these cut-throats, who, not content to shoot down republicans in the streets, draw them into dirty traps in order to slit their throats in private” (translation Roger L. Williams). Henri Rochefort, *La Marseillaise* (January 12, 1870), 1.
about the disturbing affair only on January 16. On the front cover of the journal was an image (fig. 34) by Gill depicting Victor Noir on his deathbed, while the opening column on the next page related how Paris greatly mourned the loss of Noir. Rochefort had actually called on Gill to make a portrait of the deceased figure, which the former intended to publish in *La Marseillaise*. Although Gill was not a contributor to Rochefort’s journal, his artistic services were in demand, and the two men shared a similar political outlook. As a result, Gill’s image also appeared in the January 13, 1870 edition of *La Marseillaise*. Meanwhile in the days leading up to the publication of *L’Éclipse*’s January 16 issue, censors prohibited the journal from disseminating Gill’s image, yet the staff of *L’Éclipse* still opted to print Gill’s work given its implications for the greater republican cause. As the man in charge of *L’Éclipse*, François Polo would be convicted for overseeing the image’s publication, but the significance of the act lay in the act of resistance to the imperial regime and its abusive means of operation (Polo readily accepted the fact that he would face charges).

Gill’s print shows Noir from his waist up. Noir wears a white shirt that is marked by blood in the area covering his abdomen. His unbuttoned shirt allows viewers to see part of Noir’s chest. Although Noir was not actually wounded in the heart, this detail implies that Noir’s death hit republicans where it hurts the most. Gill commented on the semblance of Noir’s youthfulness

---

91 *L’Éclipse* basically served as the sequel to *La Lune*. François Polo was the chief editor of *L’Éclipse* at the outset, and the journal retained many of *La Lune*’s staff members – including Gill as its lead caricaturist. The format and content of the two journals were also similar.

92 The story about how Gill was informed about the incident and how he came to sketch the image of Noir on his deathbed can be traced to an article that appeared in *Le Chat noir* on May 13, 1882. See, André Gill, “Souvenirs historiques – Victor Noir,” reproduced in André Gill: *Correspondance et mémoires d’un caricaturiste*, edited by Bertrand Tillier (Seyssel: Champ Vallon, 2006), 349-351.

93 Upon publication of the image, Polo was fined and sent to the Sainte-Pélagie prison. The length of his jail term remains undisclosed. Renault, *Censure et caricatures*, 70-71.
and that of other Frenchmen who died at an early age, while displaying a profound allegiance to the Republic. Upon seeing Noir recumbent, Gill noted: “La face de gamin de Victor avait revêtu l’indicible majesté du néant. Il semblait bien véritablement un jeune général de la République, Hoche ou Marceau.” Members of the Left had lost one of their brethren, and to add to their fury, it came during the so-called liberal years of the Empire. To underline the severity of the loss, and to further vilify Pierre-Napoléon Bonaparte and his act of violence, the words “dessin d’après nature” were added to the description of Gill’s image published by L’Éclipse. The message connotes that there is no element of satire in this print, and viewers are made to be witnesses of the fatal consequences of the crime committed by Pierre-Napoléon.

In the very next issue of L’Éclipse, the journal published on its front page (fig. 35) the severed head of Jean-Baptiste Troppmann (1848-1870), a man who had been guillotined a few days before for pleading guilty to the murder of eight members of the Kinck family in September 1869. Following a trial in December 1869, Troppmann was executed in front of large crowd of people at the Place de la Roquette in Paris on January 19, 1870. Troppmann’s name circulated in the papers on a regular basis once officials detected his murderous acts. However, issuing the image of Troppmann’s head in L’Éclipse on January 23 carried a deeper meaning than simply alluding to the recent execution of a criminal. Without surprise, Gill was the one who drew Troppmann for the satirical journal. Published on the heels of the Victor Noir incident, Gill intended to draw connections between the two murderers – Pierre-Napoléon

---

94 “The youthful face of Victor had covered the indescribable grandeur of the void. He really looked like a young Republican general, like Hoche or Marceau.” Both Lazare Hoche (1768-1797) and François-Séverin Marceau (1769-1796) had died prior to the age of thirty on behalf of the French Republic during the revolutionary wars. Gill, “Souvenirs historiques – Victor Noir,” 350-351.
95 Leclercq, André Gill, 91-93.
Bonaparte and Jean-Baptiste Troppmann to suggest that both crimes merited justice. Whether or not Gill blended some of the physical traits of the two villains when he depicted the head of Troppmann, as postulated by Pierre-Robert Leclercq, remains uncertain, but there was no mystery in terms of the political undertone that the print broadcasted. In the wake of repeated inflamed assaults by way of the media, the government quickly learnt that those who favored the political Left would not forget the assassination of Victor Noir. Through a variety of channels, these individuals continued to show support for their deceased associate, and their displeasure at the regime.

1.12 Punishments and Protests

To many republicans, especially radical ones, once Noir was dead, he was a martyr in the making, and they planned to turn his funeral on January 12, 1870 into a larger form of protest against the Empire, and possibly even to start a revolution. Reacting against the potential of ensuing riots, the government was forced to act in haste, as it dispatched large numbers of police troops throughout Paris the day of the funeral to curtail the tumultuous activities of republicans making their way through the city en route to the Neuilly cemetery (the authorities had warned them not to parade to Père-Lachaise). The imperial regime had come under fire, yet it had averted a full-fledged crisis for the time being.

The government’s next step was to arrest Pierre-Napoléon in order to give the impression that it was genuinely concerned about the death of an innocent man, and accordingly, it pledged to punish the man responsible for the crime. The authorities felt that such a maneuver would appease the Parisian populace. Officials could say that Pierre-Napoléon Bonaparte was not to be

96 Ibid., 94.
excused because of his social and political status, but ultimately he avoided harsh penal consequences. It took under three months before Pierre-Napoléon was acquitted for his role in the Noir incident on March 27, 1870. In the interim, he was incarcerated at the Conciergerie, a medieval palace located on the Île de la Cité, a rather luxurious place that was known to only hold prisoners of high rank during the Second Empire. To earn his release, Pierre-Napoléon Bonaparte was asked to pay a 25,000 francs fine to the Noir family for the crime he had committed—a mere slap on the wrist for a murder. Otherwise, it was Rochefort and some of the other members of *La Marseillaise* who were pursued by the government and who received the brunt of the punishment. Once the authorities had conducted an initial inquiry into the scandal, Henri Rochefort, Paschal Grouset, and Simon Dereure (1838-1900), the manager of *La Marseillaise*, were sentenced to fines and prison terms. However, as was common with Rochefort, he did not submit himself to the authorities without putting up a fight. When the correctional bureau held a hearing on January 22, 1870 and condemned Rochefort for his involvement in the affair, the polemicist was absent. Although he remained in Paris, he forced officials to track him down and arrest him. In the meantime, he continued his disruptive ways. While sequestered, he carried on his duties as a journalist by drafting articles and letters that were hostile towards the government and sent them to the editing team of *La Marseillaise* for publication.

---

98 This number is taken from short notices that journals produced about Pierre-Napoléon’s hearing (i.e. *L’Histoire* and *Le Journal de Rouen*) and *La Marseillaise* reproduced in its own journal under a section titled “La haute cour: jugée par la presse.” *La Marseillaise* (March 30, 1870), 1-2.

99 Details about the punishments are described in the January 24 and 25, 1870 issues of *La Marseillaise* under a section titled “Tribunaux.”
In a mocking fashion, Daumier called attention to the affair and Rochefort’s mistreatment by showcasing him in a lithograph during this time of turmoil. In *Système proposé par un réactionnaire pour les mieux isoler* (fig. 36), a print that appeared in *Le Charivari* on January 14, 1870, Daumier presents viewers with a scene of a chamber meeting in which Rochefort and another man, likely Jean Bancel (1822-1871), are placed behind bars. As the caption suggests, the framing device is meant to isolate these men from their counterparts. Since they were viewed as opponents of the regime, Daumier implies that any measure would be taken to cast aside individuals who voiced their opinions against the government or injured the imperial family, as was the case with Rochefort who accused all Bonapartes of being assassins after the Noir incident. Clearly this was a “reactionary” course of action, a word often associated with conservative citizens at the time. Daumier was commenting on the repressive nature of the liberal Empire, and it was one of the few occasions in the latter stages of his career that he employed specific historical figures (rather than allegories) to convey his message, further underlining Rochefort’s significance in the political arena at the time. Daumier’s print also signaled just how afraid the government was of Rochefort’s ability to damage its reputation and the Napoléon dynasty through his actions, and if it were possible, those in power would always place the polemical writer behind bars.

Of course it was not long before Rochefort was put into prison, and policemen raided the offices of *La Marseillaise* with the purpose of carrying out further arrests. These events,

---

100 Jean Bancel was an ardent republican who led many campaigns against Émile Ollivier and the liberal Empire as a candidate in the legislative elections of the late 1860s and early 1870s. Bancel also opposed the 1870 plebiscite.

101 The police invaded the headquarters of *La Marseillaise* on February 9, 1870. Raoul Rigault, “Visite de police a La Marseillaise,” *La Marseillaise* (February 9, 1870), 2.
combined with Pierre-Napoléon’s release from prison in late March of 1870, led to the following outburst by *La Marseillaise*.

Pierre Bonaparte est acquitté
Victor Noir est dans la tombe
Ulrich de Fonvielle est en prison
Paschal Grousset est en prison
Henri Rochefort est en prison
Millière, Raoul Rigault, Bazire,
Dereure sont en prison
Pierre Bonaparte est acquitté.¹⁰²

This passage meant to highlight the double standards of the government when it came to handling legislative affairs. Not surprisingly, while Rochefort was incarcerated, he earned the support of many who called for his liberation, including high-profile individuals such as Victor Hugo. Hugo used *Le Rappel* (1869-1933), a journal he founded along with Rochefort and other republicans, to underline his friend’s merit and significance in challenging authoritarian leadership. Hugo’s pleas were not successful, yet it is quite fitting that Rochefort was released from prison on September 4, 1870, the day the Third Republic was proclaimed, even though his jail term compelled him to remain in prison for a few extra months beyond that date. It would appear that Rochefort had the last laugh. Therefore, a few years later in 1886, when a man by the name of Victor-Havard (active 1880s-1890s) decided to publish a volume assembling the first series of Rochefort’s *La Lanterne*, and the book included a preface written by Rochefort dedicated to the editor, the journalist gratifyingly noted: “il serait moral et consolant qu’après avoir tant fait pour supprimer la presse, ce fût précisément par la presse qu’il eût péri.”¹⁰³ The

---

¹⁰² “Pierre Bonaparte is acquitted. Victor Noir is in a tomb. Ulrich de Fonvielle is in prison. Paschal Grousset is in prison. Henri Rochefort is in prison. Millière, Raoul Rigault, Bazire, Dereure are in prison. Pierre Bonaparte is acquitted.” The editors of *La Marseillaise, La Marseillaise* (March 29, 1870), 1.

¹⁰³ “It will be righteous and reassuring that after having done so much to suppress the press, it was precisely due to the press that it [the Second Empire] perished.” Rochefort, “Lettre de
press was only one of many factors that led to the demise of the Second Empire, but it would not be an overstatement to say that as far as journalists were concerned, it was Rochefort who had fuelled the greatest opposition to the imperial regime.

1.13 Alfred Le Petit Embraces the Satirical Press

Alfred Le Petit is another individual who made the Empire, and especially the imperial family, his main target of satire in the final months of the Second Empire. Le Petit was born in Aumale, Seine-Maritime, one of the departments of Normandy, but he spent the bulk of his career in the French capital. Prior to his arrival to the metropolis, Le Petit spent time in Rouen developing his painting skills; however, it was with the intention of sparking his artistic career that he moved to Paris in the latter half of the 1860s. Although he dabbled in caricature as a young artist, Le Petit’s name did not surface in association with Parisian satirical journals prior to 1867, since his primary goal was to earn a living as a respectable painter. His first collaboration took place at *Le Journal amusant* in 1867, soon after which he joined the staff of *L’Éclipse*, where he worked in the shadow of André Gill – the great master caricaturist. Gill saw potential in Le Petit, even though the latter was relatively inexperienced, as he invited the younger artist to join him as a contributor for *La Parodie*, a journal Gill launched in 1869. While *La Parodie* folded in January 1870 after the publication of only 21 issues, the fact that Gill fancied Le Petit as a collaborator proved that the former thought well of Le Petit’s artistic capabilities.¹⁰⁴ Working under the tutelage of Gill at *La Parodie* while also witnessing firsthand his successes at *L’Éclipse*, enabled Le Petit to model his career after a reputable figure of the

---

¹⁰⁴ For an overview of *La Parodie* and the collaboration between Gill and Le Petit, see Leclercq, *André Gill*, 81-87.
satirical press. It inspired Le Petit to found his own illustrated journal immediately after La Parodie dissolved. He named the journal La Charge, and for the next decade, Le Petit, along with Gill, was one of the chief caricaturists in France. It was by publishing images, such as Le Pif Impérial (fig. 37), L’aigle Impérial (fig. 38), and Le Porc des Tuileries (fig. 39) in La Charge, that Le Petit earned notoriety.

La Charge began as a rather small-sized eight-page weekly in January 1870. Yet, due to the journal’s success, as Le Petit announced in the April 14, 1870 issue, La Charge expanded in scale, and from then on, it published color images rather than black and white ones. It is also at that moment, that the journal became more political in nature. More columns are devoted to current events than to an assortment of social matters, and the prints have a greater form of satirical bite. Furthermore, it is exactly at this time that signs of a forthcoming plebiscite break out in the nation. The plebiscite that would take place in May 1870 would be the third to transpire in the country since 1850. It was an affair that preoccupied Frenchmen of all political parties for the following months, and greatly marked the conscience of republican caricaturists. By considering the caricatures Le Petit produced during this period, the significance of the plebiscite’s outcome as desired by republicans is revealed. Republicans wished to witness the collapse of the Second Empire, and with it the rise of a republic. Le Petit used his journal as a means to indicate how the country needed change in political leadership. Only the termination of Napoléon III’s reign would engender greater freedom. This led Le Petit to deface in a novel manner the individual who had ruled France over the course of the previous two decades.

In a print that appeared in the May 7, 1870 issue of La Charge, which Le Petit simply titled Une Charge (fig. 40), Napoléon III is represented as a pig.105 This was one of Le Petit’s many

---

105 Le Petit reused the same image for Le Porc des Tuileries (fig. 39).
violent attacks on the imperial family, but it was the first to completely dehumanize the emperor, and this brazen act occurred still during the Second Empire. The pig leans over the railing of a balcony as it looks at a small star that is about to disappear amid the dark clouds in the sky. At the far right, the contours of the Arc de Triomphe are visible above the railing. This detail clarifies that the animal overlooks Paris from the balcony of the Palais des Tuileries, one of Napoléon III’s residential palaces. Viewers are encouraged to draw a further connection between the pig and the emperor as a pointy nose and whiskers are apparent in the black cloud that surrounds the pig’s head. This was a crude way to debase Napoléon III, since Le Petit’s intention was to highlight the former’s vileness. Perhaps more than any other animals, pigs are viewed as vulgar creatures. They are dirty animals and Le Petit wanted to draw a parallel to the emperor’s impure character.

*Une Charge* was published only two weeks after Le Petit portrayed Léon Gambetta in a valorizing manner in *L’Oeil du Maitre* (fig. 41), and accordingly, drawing a comparison between the two images is fitting. Gambetta was one of the leading figures who stood in opposition to the Empire in the 1860s and early 1870s, and he was recognized as one of the most distinguished orators in France. Gambetta is even remembered by French historians as the most popular deputy of Paris to form part of the Corps législatif in 1870. Le Petit was not the only one to praise Gambetta, yet it is significant that the artist portrayed the politician in a respectful way. In the bottom right corner of *L’Oeil du Maitre*, Le Petit reproduced a portrait of Gambetta based on a photograph by Étienne Carjat (1828-1906). The purpose of including this detail is to

---

106 These facial features relate to Napoléon III. Bertrand Tillier also identifies these characteristics in Le Petit’s image. See Bertrand Tillier, “Paul Hadol et sa menagerie! ou le cirque d’un caricaturiste antibonapartiste,” *Gavroche* 80 (Spring, 1995), 5.

107 Gambetta advocated for a governing state that ideologically placed merit on notions of profound liberalism. Tulard, ed., *Dictionnaire*, 555-556.
show the physical resemblance between Carjat’s photograph and Le Petit’s depiction of Gambetta. Gambetta’s head is placed in a large sphere at the center of the image, and while his nose is enlarged, it respects the shape of this physical attribute on his own body, and the rest of his facial features remain intact.

Le Petit presents Gambetta as the voice of reason at a larger assembly meeting, as the sphere he occupies functions, in itself, as an eye that sheds light onto others. “L’Oeil du Maître” is a fable La Fontaine wrote to reveal how nothing escapes from the master’s vision, as his acuteness is second to none. In April 1870, Gambetta was more farseeing than his counterparts, such as Adolphe Thiers, Jules Favre, and Adolphe Crémieux (1796-1880), figures who are rendered negligible by occupying a small space at the bottom of Le Petit’s print, because Gambetta felt that France needed to avoid a plebiscite at this moment in time, or if a vote was unavoidable, that citizens should by all means cast no ballots with regards to the plebiscite. In a letter written on April 19, 1870 that was edited by Léon Gambetta and Jules Ferry (1832-1893) on behalf of a larger group of Left wing individuals, these men urged their fellow citizens to vote no on the plebiscite because of the outcome of the two former plebiscites (1851 and 1852), which had practically handed over the country to Louis-Napoléon. To highlight Gambetta’s efforts to sway the country in a different direction and away from the emperor’s power, Le Petit

---

108 In La Fontaine’s fable, a deer hides among oxen in a barn, yet the all-seeing master of the farm is still able to identify the creature. The moral of the story is that nothing goes unnoticed by the shrewd eye of the master.

109 Approval of the plebiscite would basically certify that the reforms set in place by the imperial regime since 1860 were acceptable to the people, and as a result, it would extend Napoléon III’s reign as the head of the Empire. This would also facilitate Napoléon III’s son to inherit sovereignty of the country and rule the French as Napoléon IV.

110 This letter is reproduced in the April 22, 1870 issue of La Marseillaise.
even wrote a column in *La Charge* to signal the deputy’s competence in relation to the whole matter, placing emphasis throughout on Gambetta as the one and only all-seeing master.

Quel oeil! Comme il domine cette masse humaine! Comme il éblouit toute l’Assemblée de ses rayons incandescents! Comme il darde! On le voit de partout. De tous les points de la salle immense, on ne voit que lui. C’est l’œil du maître! – Oui du maître: et ce n’est pas une vaine flatterie que de le nommer ainsi. Il est passé en maître de l’art de bien dire, et son talent comme orateur ne rencontre guère de contradicteurs.111

It is noteworthy that Le Petit even provided a description to supplement his *L’Oeil du Maître* print, since the majority of his images in *La Charge* remain without commentary. Le Petit’s words complimented Gambetta and elevated his status to that of a celebrity. Therefore, this form of representation was directly opposed to the vulgarized image of Napoléon III as a repulsive, fat pig.

The defaced portrayal of the emperor in *Une Charge* was also meant as a reflection on Napoléon III’s entire regime. Pigs can allude to luxury due to their obesity. By illustrating the emperor as a pig, Le Petit implied that Napoléon III had profited from his position as ruler of the country at the expense of others. His opulent lifestyle was only shared by a small number of distinguished individuals. And to make matters worse, from the perspective of republicans, the other characteristic of the Second Empire as a period was the emperor’s despotism.112 In Le

---

111 “What an eye! How it dominates this human mass! How it dazzles all of the assembly with its incandescent rays! How it shines! One can see it from everywhere. From all corners of the huge room, one sees only it. It’s the eye of the master! Yes, the master, and it is not a vain flattery to name him as such. He has succeeded as a master in the art of rhetoric, and his talent as an orator rarely encounters any adversaries.” Alfred Le Petit, “L’œil du maître,” *La Charge* (April 21, 1870), 2.

112 This sentiment is perhaps best summarized in a column of *La Marseillaise*: “votez oui, vous tous qui voulez que l’ignorance et la misère soient le lot du plus grand nombre; l’opulence, le pouvoir et l’impunité le lot des gens que vous payez” (vote yes [on the plebiscite], all of you who desire ignorance and misery to be the faith of the majority; opulence, power, and impunity to be the faith of those you must finance). Arnould, “Courrier Politique: L’Héritage,” *La Marseillaise* (April 27, 1870), 1. The next day, Arnould also commented on how the emperor drained the financial resources of the nation in “Courrier Politique: L’empire et nos écus.”
Petit’s opinion, the list of wrongs Napoléon III had committed was vast and his crimes as a leader had outweighed those of other deplorable figures as can be seen in *Le plus lourd l'emporte* (fig. 42), a print that was published a few weeks after Napoléon III was defeated at the Battle of Sedan in September 1870. Napoléon III’s offenses were worse than those of Troppmann, Pierre-Napoléon Bonaparte, and other assassins combined; thus, in a negative way, Napoléon III is their master as noted in the inscription on the left-hand side of the print. In this image, Napoléon III is the only figure to cast a shadow, and in a satirical fashion it is the head of a pig with a long snout that is reflected. The connection to *Une Charge* was deliberate, and afterwards other caricaturists, including Faustin Betbeder, were inclined to portray Louis-Napoléon as a pig (fig. 43).\(^{113}\) The inclusion of a question mark below *Une Charge* was meant to call into question whether French citizens really wanted Napoléon III – a pig – as a leader. Since the plebiscite was scheduled for May 8, 1870, the decision about Napoléon III’s fate had yet to be determined at the time of *Une Charge*’s dissemination; however, Le Petit asserted that a man who had turned his back on the nation after swearing loyalty to the democratic practices of the Republic in 1848, had no right to govern France any longer.

To Le Petit’s great displeasure, he felt that all hopes of a republic were lost once the results of the plebiscite were finalized. While newspapers of all political factions began posting the outcome of the ballots that had been accounted for in the days following the plebiscite on May 8, it was not until the constitution on May 21, 1870 that the new proclamation was sanctioned. The same day, Alfred Le Petit’s image for *La Charge* was a grim portrayal of the Republic (i.e. Marianne attired in her symbolic Phrygian cap) reduced to her bare bones – a skeleton (fig. 44).

\(^{113}\) The widespread use of pig imagery in French political caricatures from 1870 onward, is analyzed by Guillaume Doizy in “Le porc dans la caricature politique (1870-1914): une polysémie contradictoire?” *Sociétés & Représentations* 27, n. 1 (2009), 13-37.
“Actualité,” the French word for current events, which serves as the title of the work, also stands for the actuality of the situation of France in this case, since the term is not pluralized. Only the major urban centers of the country, such as Paris, Lyon, Marseille, Toulouse, and Bordeaux, had voted no in greater numbers on the plebiscite, but since the rural population of France far outnumbered that of the urbanized centers, those against the plebiscite did not have enough leverage. Le Petit had no option but to declare that ideologically the Republic was dead.

Elle est morte, les yeux tournés vers l’avenir et sûre du lendemain. Mais à qui donc, ô justice éternelle! appartiendrait l’avenir si ce n’est à la liberté? Elle a succombé après bien des trahisons, après des supplices de toutes sorte: elle a vu des parjures, des renégats, des traitres … mais ses fils croyaient encore, quelques jours avant la dernière heure, que la victoire serait pour elle! Mais non … tout cet espoir a fui…… 114

By extending Napoléon III’s duties as emperor of France, the republicans feared that the Empire was now stronger than ever. The plebiscite was proof that people would support the emperor’s decisions. Cries of help to the Lord would be in vain. Hence, in Le Petit’s print, only a skeleton remains under the Phrygian cap of liberty. However in the coming months, the fate of the country would take yet another twist, and chaos would ensue away from polls, as the streets of Paris turned into a battlefield.

1.14 The Dark Cloud of Disparity

As these prints by André Gill, Honoré Daumier, Édouard Manet, and Alfred Le Petit demonstrate, freedom of expression and republican sentiment were of vital importance to each of them. Since Napoléon III’s government aimed to restrict the forms of liberties that French

114 “She is dead, with her eyes turned towards the future, certain of her destiny. But to whom then, ô just eternity, will the future belong to if not to liberty? She has succumbed after many betrayals, after pleas of all kinds: she has seen perjures, turncoats, traitors … but her sons still believed, even in the days leading up to the final moment, that she would be victorious! But alas … all the hope has vanished.” Alfred Le Petit, “De profundis !!,” La Charge (May 21, 1870), 2.
citizens had, even as the regime transitioned towards a liberal empire in the later 1860s, these artists designed images that asserted a political threat to the regime. Republican artists grew more daring in their attempts to test the limits of the government once the emperor had announced in January 1867 that liberal revisions would be forthcoming, and once again, in the wake of the press liberalization introduced in May 1868. In the opinion of republicans, the changes that Napoléon III ushered in were not sincere. Whether the artists were alluding to Napoléon III in a direct or indirect way, as in Gill’s *Portrait Authentique de Rocambole* (fig. 13) or Le Petit’s *Le Porc des Tuileries* (fig. 39), or to his governing policies, as Daumier and Manet had in *Va t-elle être assez soulagée!...* (fig. 23) and *The Execution of Emperor Maximilian* (fig. 28) respectively, their intention was to vilify his flawed and deceitful character. Ultimately, the emperor was viewed as an oppressor who barred the establishment of a republic, and he was thus constantly the target of criticism.

Because Napoléon III had practically abrogated the right to freedom of expression that republicans had repeatedly fought for since the early days of the French Revolution (and won on different occasions), his success pushed certain individuals (artists and politicians alike) to join the political Left.115 Napoléon III’s actions impelled artists such as Manet, Gill, Daumier, and Le Petit, to identify freedom of expression in art with political freedom. As the prints by these artists illustrate, art and politics simply could not be separated – they were intertwined. This notion was especially true of prints that could be reproduced in large quantities, and around which dialogues broke out in public. By fearing the power that prints held as propagandistic

---

115 For a thorough analysis of how artists, poets, and political activists dealt with this situation immediately after the Second Empire was established, see Manuele Delbourgo Wasserman, “Artists in Politics in Nineteenth-Century France: Lamartine, Hugo, Daumier, Baudelaire and Courbet,” Ph.D. diss. (New York: Columbia University, 1977).
tools used by the opposition, Napoléon III tried to control the dissemination of such images. Yet, even in the face of adversity, these artists did not refrain from showcasing their republican sentiments in the press. This trend would continue after the final days of the Second Empire and Napoléon III’s capitulation to the Prussians at Sedan in September 1870. Even though the Republic was proclaimed on September 4, 1870 and Napoléon III no longer stood in the way of republicans, it would not be long before other figures came between these artists and their dedication to freedom of expression. As several of the next prints will show, the country was still divided. Opposing principles continued to spur on the battle between liberals and conservatives, a battle that was visualized with ferocity in the visual culture of the early Third Republic.
Chapter 2: The Terrible Year, 1870-1871: A Balancing Act of the Early Third Republic

With the fall of the Second Empire in early September 1870, it appeared that better days lay ahead for republicans. However, the next 365 days turned into a nightmare for France, as the country became a war zone. France first had to contend with the invading Prussians who laid siege to Paris and other French cities during the Franco-Prussian War, before submitting to its own internal problems in a civil war that lasted nearly four months. The daily events of French society were completely disrupted. Artistic production, for the most part, was put on hold. The State did not commission any major projects; institutional events, such as the Salon, were not held, and many artists either were forced to participate in the warfare, or fled the country in an attempt to save their lives. The difficulties that the illustrated press faced in publishing journals on a regular basis prove that these were hectic times. The entire output of several newspapers came to a halt. This heightened the significance of journals, such as Le Charivari, which were able to maintain productivity for stretches during this troublesome period. It also meant that loose sheet images, or feuilles-volantes as they were called at the time, became a popular means of disseminating visual information. Feuilles-volantes required fewer individuals to create than did prints published in journals, and thus were produced more quickly in response to events. Although business standards had been driven to subpar levels, for those seeking to disseminate a message, printmaking still functioned as a valuable source of commentary on the latest affairs. Manet, Gill, Daumier, and Le Petit closely followed the events related to the Franco-Prussian War and the civil war that ensued between Versailles and Paris, and were even involved in some
of the conflicts. These artists protested the war that Napoléon III had initiated with Prussia, yet that is not to say that they remained disengaged once the nation was endangered. Both Manet and Gill became members of the Garde nationale during the Franco-Prussian War. It was the Siege of Paris – their beloved city – that impelled these men to take part in the conflict. Even though neither artist fought on the front, it took courage to defend the country while some other Frenchmen retreated from active duty. Many of Manet’s letters from the war survive, and they offer a firsthand account of the hardships experienced by the soldiers and civilians who stayed behind during this time.\footnote{These letters can be found in Édouard Manet, \textit{Lettres du Siège de Paris précédées des Lettres du voyage à Rio de Janeiro}, ed., Arnauld Le Brusq (Vendôme: Éditions de l’Amateur, 1996). Some of Manet’s letters from this time period are also grouped together in Juliet Wilson-Bareau, ed., \textit{Manet by Himself} (Boston: Bulfinch Press, 1991).} Manet only stopped serving as a guard once an armistice was signed between France and Prussia in January 1871. However, he certainly was not shy in expressing his political feelings once the Franco-Prussian War was over, as attested by his letters and the images he produced after the Paris Commune. Manet returned to Paris in May of 1871, at the height of the civil war, due to his emotional attachment to the city – a sentiment he shared with his good friend Berthe Morisot in a letter: “everyone is returning to Paris, and the fact is it’s impossible to live anywhere else.”\footnote{Édouard Manet, “Untitled letter to Berthe Morisot,” (June 10, 1871), quoted in \textit{Manet by Himself}, ed., Wilson-Bareau, 161.} As for Gill, he participated in the French sortie led at Bourget in October 1870 and primarily acted as an assistant pharmacist while serving the Garde nationale.\footnote{Bertrand Tillier, ed., \textit{André Gill: Correspondance et mémoires d’un caricaturiste} (Seyssel: Champ Vallon, 2006), 396.} While he was away from Paris on duty, Gill still occasionally sent images to \textit{L’Éclipse} for publication – most of which were issued as \textit{feuilles-volantes}. During the Commune, Gill was in Paris, and his love for the arts led him to join the artist federation that was
created at the time. Courbet, the self-proclaimed leader of this federation, placed Gill in charge of safeguarding the works in the Luxembourg collection. Once the Commune was over Le Figaro erroneously reported that Gill had been arrested, because as a member of the artist federation he was allegedly connected to the Commune. Later that summer, once the civil war was over, Gill gladly resumed his accustomed post as the chief caricaturist at L’Éclipse.

Daumier, for his part, was too old to participate in either of the wars, yet he was one of the few artists who remained in Paris throughout the length of this disastrous period. Daumier denounced the Franco-Prussian War in the images he created in the latter part of 1870, and he continuously aimed to reject the notion that initiators of warfare displayed patriotic qualities. For Daumier the obligations of patriotism ended when they impeded the peaceful existence of any individual. Several of his lithographs were even published in a special album issued by Le Charivari that was wholly dedicated to the Siege of Paris and its aftermath. Although there was no equivalent album for the events of the Commune, Daumier still continued to be Le Charivari’s leading political cartoonist in 1871. As the youngest of the four artists, Le Petit was still trying to make a name for himself in the early 1870s. He kept producing images for La Charge – most of which criticized Napoléon III’s ineffective military strategies. Then he targeted members of the provisional government in a series titled Fleurs, fruits & légumes du jour. Shortly after the Paris Commune was declared in late March 1871, Le Petit provided a few drawings to La Montagne (1871), a Communard newspaper; however, it was not long before he

---

4 The statement reporting Gill’s arrest is published in the June 7, 1871 edition of Le Figaro. Gill made sure to clear his name by noting that he was not involved in any political decisions that the Commune was making; he was simply carrying out his duty by protecting the artworks at the Musée du Luxembourg.

5 This set of works, known as the Album du Siège, contains a selection of prints by Daumier and Cham that had previously appeared in individual issues of Le Charivari. For a facsimile of the album, see Album du Siège (Ivry-sur-Seine: Éditions Alexandra, 1979).
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distanced himself from this publication. His rich output of caricatural works during this critical time eventually led him to sign an exclusive contract with *Le Grelot*, a republican journal that was founded in April 1871. Hence, the year in which the country found itself in crisis undeniably acted as a turning point in Le Petit’s career. With this in mind, the aim of this chapter is to observe how Manet, Gill, Daumier, and Le Petit responded to the fall of the Second Empire, the Franco-Prussian War, the founding of provisional governments, as well as the Paris Commune, its repression, and its aftermath.

### 2.1 Napoléon III’s Fallout

By proclaiming a new constitution in France on May 21, 1870, sanctioned as a result of the plebiscite held earlier that month, Napoléon III’s tenure as emperor of the French, to the great dismay of republicans, was extended. With the backing of votes, Napoléon III felt that the time was opportune to fight Prussia in order to avoid the possibility of German unification. Accordingly, one of his first actions was to declare war to Prussia on July 19, 1870. However, throughout the 1860s Napoléon III had underestimated Otto von Bismarck’s (1815-1898) capacities of transforming Prussia into a major European power. Briefly put, it only took over a month of warfare before Napoléon III capitulated to Prussia at Sedan on September 2, 1870. The defeat was embarrassing, and it brought to the fore the emperor’s weak military strategy. It

---


7 Le Petit initially signed a four-year contract on November 9, 1871, which was renewed partway through for another three years on November 1, 1874. Ibid., 178.

8 As Minister President of Prussia, Bismarck had engineered key victories over Austria in 1866 and Denmark before that, making Prussia a serious threat to France’s commanding position in Western Europe.

also underlined Napoléon III’s vainglorious ambition, and how his self-interest led to the demise of France and the Second Empire. Over the course of the Empire, great portions of the population’s financial resources had been used up to support the grandeur and decadence of the few, and by September 1870 (and for the remainder of the Franco-Prussian War), the state of France balanced in the hands of the enemy.\textsuperscript{10} Since the Prussians had defeated the French emperor with relative ease, German caricatures in the final months of 1870 took aim at Napoléon III. Rather than attacking the French people, German caricatures scoffed at the emperor’s impotence amidst his warmongering.\textsuperscript{11} In the opinion of Germans, the French had succumbed to a lowly position by taking orders from a despot, but it was the malevolence of Napoléon III that led the country to a disastrous fate.

The French did not waste any time in declaring a republic after the catastrophic results of Napoléon III’s campaign. On September 4, 1870 the Third Republic was declared on the balcony of the Hôtel de Ville in Paris – a symbolic site since Napoléon III had used this location to proclaim the Second Empire. September 4 became a day of celebration in France, not because it marked the defeat to the Prussians, but rather because it signified the end of the Empire. Amidst the revelry, people destroyed many of the imperial symbols that were spread throughout the city

\textsuperscript{10} Shortly before the emperor’s term was renewed, members of the political Left voiced their displeasure at the amounts of money that had been poured into the coffers of the government: “si la prospérité d’un pays se mesure à la quantité d’écus qui sortent de la poche des contribuables pour entrer dans la caisse du gouvernement, jamais le peuple français n’a été aussi prospère, car jamais, depuis qu’il y a un gouvernement en France, le peuple n’a autant payé à ses maîtres” (If the prosperity of a country is measured by the number of coins taken out of the pockets of contributors in order to be placed in to the government’s coffer, then never have the French been so prosperous, because they have never paid so much money to their masters since a government has existed in France). Arthur Arnould, “Courrier Politique: L’empire et nos écus,” \textit{La Marseillaise} (April 28, 1870), 1.

\textsuperscript{11} To learn more about German caricatures mocking Napoléon III, refer to Jean-Claude Gardes, “Napoléon III et la caricature allemande: La déchéance d’un tyran ridicule,” \textit{Ridiculosa} 4 (1997), 46-58.
in an attempt to disassociate themselves from their former leader. With the advent of the Third Republic all forms of press censorship were repealed, and Louis-Napoléon became the primary target of countless French caricatures.\textsuperscript{12} It was no surprise to find caricaturists unleashing their frustration at the former emperor, especially since it had not been possible to legally depict his likeness during the Second Empire. Louis-Napoléon was depicted in a myriad of forms, including as a flesh eating vulture (fig. 45), and until the declaration of the Paris Commune in March of 1871, he remained the single most targeted prey of caricatural representations.\textsuperscript{13} Although these images took aim at Louis-Napoléon in a multitude of ways, some of the more clever ones showcased him as a pawn used by France’s adversaries to achieve their desired goals.

During the majority of the Franco-Prussian War, \textit{L’Éclipse} voluntarily suspended the publication of its journal; however, it occasionally distributed loose sheet images to comment on political affairs.\textsuperscript{14} This was the case with André Gill’s \textit{Les deux compères} (fig. 46), a print that appeared as a supplement to the satirical journal in late September or early October 1870. The two figures in Gill’s lithograph are Napoléon III, and Wilhelm I (1797-1888), the King of Prussia and future emperor of Germany. Gill exaggerated some of their facial features, such as their noses, and he gave the impression that Wilhelm I had breasts because of the way the two pistols rest against his body; however, the print’s satirical bite comes from the figures Gill chose

\textsuperscript{12} Caricaturists experienced an unlimited form of freedom of expression until March 11, 1871 when officials, led by General Vinoy (1803-1880), began suppressing journals and their visual content again. For more on works produced during this timeframe, see Bertrand Tillier, “Napoléon III et la caricature en 1870: Histoire d’une dissolution,” \textit{Ridiculosa} 4 (1997), 30-45.

\textsuperscript{13} It remained more popular to attack Louis-Napoléon than any other individual, such as Adolphe Thiers and Louis-Jules Trochu (1815-1896), or than personifications, such as Marianne and France. Gardes, “Napoléon III et la caricature allemande,” 55.

\textsuperscript{14} The interruption at \textit{L’Éclipse} took place between September 19, 1870 and June 1871 (one issue was published for the entire month of June).
to depict and the situation in which they find themselves. Napoléon III is the shorter of the two figures, he has a clyster syringe at his side for a weapon (instead of pistols), and he is embarrassingly shown holding up the right hand of the King of Prussia in order to kiss it.\textsuperscript{15} This shameful act suggests that Napoléon III is willing to please his counterpart and is weaker than him. Faustin had juxtaposed the same two figures in a lithograph dating from around the same period (fig. 47), in which Wilhelm I provides Napoléon III an enema by applying a syringe to the latter’s posterior. In Faustin’s work, Napoléon III’s infirmity is brought to the fore, especially since his sword, depicted in the shape of a phallus, curves backwards towards the stronger, commanding figure.

In \textit{Les deux compères}, Gill portrayed Napoléon III as the Prussian emperor’s partner in crime. The two men are represented as Robert Macaire and Bertrand, the duo of thieves immortalized by Honoré Daumier and others in prints dating back to the 1830s.\textsuperscript{16} In Daumier’s prints the deceitful Robert Macaire is always trying to cheat the system, while Bertrand acts as his slender sidekick. Here, by obeying Macaire (Wilhelm I), Bertrand (Napoléon III) is on the verge of handing over Paris, the heart and soul of France, to his accomplice.\textsuperscript{17} To caricature Napoléon III was one thing, but to characterize him as Bertrand was making a complete fool out of the former emperor. While Napoléon III did not actually concede Paris to the Prussians upon folding to the enemy at the beginning of the month of September, he was figuratively selling off the country to

\textsuperscript{15} The clyster syringe – used to provide an enema – was commonly depicted in the oppositional caricatures of the July Monarchy.

\textsuperscript{16} \textit{Caricaturana} (Les Robert Macaire) is a famous set of one hundred prints by Daumier published in \textit{Le Charivari} between August 20, 1836 and November 25, 1838.

\textsuperscript{17} This scenario likely inspired Faustin to create a similar image in which Adolphe Thiers, Jules Favre, Jules Ferry, Louis-Jules Trochu, and Louis-Antoine Garnier-Pagès (1803-1878) are shown lowering a key over the wall of a fortress in order to give Bismarck the opportunity to unlock the gate to Paris. Faustin’s \textit{La clef de la situation} (fig. 48) was published on January 29, 1871, a day after France signed an armistice with Prussia.
Prussia. Moreover, the caricature implied just how ignorant it was for him to declare war against a stronger opponent. Gill further belittled Napoléon III in this work, as the emperor grounds the imperial eagle by a leash, an emblem of supremacy during Napoléon I’s reign and a symbol maintained under Napoléon III’s tenure as the French emperor. By being grounded, the eagle and its owner lack any force. For Gill, there simply was no way of dignifying an individual whose decisions ultimately had led to violence and to the death of French civilians.

2.2 The Empire Means Peace

In October 1870 Daumier also commented on Napoléon III’s incumbency as emperor of France in a memorable fashion. Although Louis-Napoléon is not physically shown in *L’Empire c’est la paix* (fig. 49), Daumier addresses how difficult it will be for France to recuperate from the physical and moral destruction that took place under the Second Empire. This work depicts the remnants of a town that has suffered from the effects of war. Some of the ruined buildings still belch smoke, while a few crows fly around the devastated scene. Two corpses can be seen on the ground; the figure in the foreground is likely a personification of France or Peace. The peaceful complexion of this image comes from the somber mood that the cruelties of war leave behind. “The empire means peace” came at an extremely high price and was a far cry from the self-promoting statement Louis-Napoléon had made on October 9, 1852 in Bordeaux as the President of the Second Republic.18 Preceding his famous words “the empire means peace,” he had said in 1852: “par esprit de défiance, certaines personnes se dissent: *L’Empire c’est la guerre.*”19 To appease the crowds, Louis-Napoléon had openly declared: “the empire means

---

18 An anonymous German artist also used Louis-Napoléon’s infamous words for the title of a political print produced in an issue of the *Fliegende Blätter* in 1859.
19 “By a spirit of defiance, some say that the Empire means war.” Napoléon III, *Discours de Sa Majesté Napoléon III, prononcé à Bordeaux le 9 Octobre 1852* (Bordeaux: Crugy, 1852. The
peace…because France desires it.” Yet, Louis-Napoléon’s original statement held no currency as France had taken part in the Crimean War in the 1850s and the Franco-Mexican War in the 1860s – two costly and bloody affairs. In addition, the extension of Napoléon III’s reign in 1870 directly led to the Franco-Prussian War and to France’s defeat. As a result, Daumier’s image painted a drastically different scenario than the lithograph Bénédict Masson (1819-1893) made to accompany a musical piece that Arsène Houssaye (1815-1896) and Céline Domény (?) collaborated on in 1852 to honor the new emperor. In Masson’s version of *L’Empire c’est la paix* (fig. 50), there is an abundance of peace and joy; however, this sense of jubilation was short lived. In reality, it was impossible for the Empire to stand for peace, because the emperor championed progress through warfare and sought to echo the achievements of his uncle, Napoléon I, through conquest.

It did not take long for republicans and other members of French society to question Napoléon III’s quest to engage Prussia in battle. On July 20, 1870, the day after the emperor declared war on Prussia, the journalist Arthur Arnould noted: “pourquoi cette guerre? – Quel en sera le résultat? Vainqueurs, que nous rapportera-t-elle? – Rien!” And of course the outcome would be worse if Prussia won the war, as France would be invaded. The Prussians eventually did attack parts of France, including Paris, and the devastation of Napoléon III’s choice to wage war against Prussia was still being referred to in negative ways in 1871. In *Épouvantée de l’heritage* (fig. 51), Daumier personifies the year 1871 as an allegory that is appalled by her inheritance from the previous year. The dead figures relate this image back to *L’Empire c’est la paix*

Words “L’empire c’est la paix” were also reiterated by Hugo in the first book of his *Les Châtiments.*

paix, and the lone standing figure is decked in black to highlight her mourning state. Daumier was placing the blame on Napoléon III – not the Prussians – for the dreadful circumstances in which the country found itself. The losses that France would suffer from the Franco-Prussian War (both the loss of peace, and the loss of citizens in battle, either of which could be symbolized by the figure lying in the foreground of L’Empire c’est la paix) rested on Napoléon III’s ill-advised decisions. Therefore, Daumier attacked the abusive power embodied by the former emperor, and the Second Empire as a whole, in a print that underlined the pain and brutality experienced by the French population.

2.3 The Gouvernement de la Défense Nationale and Its Tribulations

Once Napoléon III was captured at Sedan, on September 2, 1870, the war between France and Prussia did not come to a sudden halt, and those who had proclaimed the Republic in France on September 4 were called into action. A new government was erected that day, known as the Gouvernement de la Défense nationale, comprising of twelve individuals, including amongst others, Jules Favre, Léon Gambetta, Ernest Picard (1821-1877), Henri Rochefort, Jules Simon (1814-1896), and Louis-Jules Trochu, who had been appointed governor of Paris shortly after Napoléon III had commenced his war campaign against Prussia. This government claimed it was

---

21 The works that are most representative of having influenced the findings of this section, and the subsequent ones in this chapter, are Stéphane Rials, ed., Histoire de Paris: De Trochu à Thiers 1870-1873 (Paris: Hachette, 1985), and John Milner, Art, War and Revolution in France 1870-1871: Myth, Reportage and Reality (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000). Histoire de Paris: De Trochu à Thiers 1870-1873 is a large volume of over 600 pages devoted entirely to this short timeframe in France’s history. It is a highly concentrated publication with ample historical context. Milner’s book describes through images the events that occurred in France between the fall of the Empire in September 1870 and the end of the Paris Commune in the summer of 1871. Art, War and Revolution in France 1870-1871: Myth, Reportage and Reality is an insightful contribution to our understanding of French art at this critical juncture in French history, and while it covers artworks in all media, it places particular emphasis on prints and photographs.
formed with the intention of defending *la patrie*. However, while the Gouvernement de la Défense nationale was able to gather large forces in sheer numbers, the vast majority of men that the nation counted on were not well versed in military training.\(^{22}\) Contributing to this problem was the low enrollment of the Garde nationale at the time. In the late Second Empire, Napoléon III had deliberately restricted the size of the Garde nationale, fearing that if it grew too large, this group (first born as a republican body during the French Revolution) would turn against him and dethrone the emperor.\(^{23}\) In sum, it was yet another damaging act triggered by Napoléon III which played in favor of the Prussians. Notwithstanding, the Gouvernement de la Défense nationale had its fair share of problems as rumblings about its inefficiency emerged only a few days after its founding. Already on September 15, 1870 Édouard Manet had noticed: “the present provisional government is very unpopular and it looks as if the true republicans are planning its overthrow after the war.”\(^{24}\) Things would only get worse for the French once the Prussians began their siege of Paris on September 19, 1870.

It is without a doubt that the Prussians were better equipped for war than the French; however, the interim government was at fault for mishandling the situation because it lacked true leadership. As the military governor of Paris, Trochu was supposed to be the defender of the capital, but he failed to devise any genuine form of strategic planning. Prosper-Olivier

\(^{22}\) The Défense nationale army may have contained over 500,000 people, yet only 20,000 or 30,000 of these individuals displayed proper military strategies, and only another 60,000 to 80,000 could have physically come to the aid of those men. These numbers are borrowed from Rials, ed., *Histoire de Paris*, 97-101.

\(^{23}\) For more on the role of the Garde nationale in the late 1860s and during the Franco-Prussian War, see Bertrand Tillier, *La Commune de Paris, révolution sans images? Politique et représentations dans la France républicaine (1871-1914)* (Seyssel: Champ Vallon, 2004), 112-115.

Lissagaray, a republican journalist and the author of the *Histoire de la Commune de 1871*, felt that neither Trochu nor the Gouvernement de la Défense nationale was committed to defending Paris. More than anything else, Trochu’s “plan” seemed to revolve around surrendering to the opponent, as he and several of the other members of the government were willing to accept a treaty that would put an end to the fighting. Several caricaturists, including Daumier, perceived this as a weakness. It was this purportedly dishonorable act that Daumier ridiculed in *L’idéal de certains journaux* (fig. 52). A Prussian soldier, identifiable by his pointed helmet, holds the Assemblée nationale by the hand as she bows to her audience. Although her eyes are shut, her facial expression reveals a hidden smile, indicating that she is satisfied with this relationship. Meanwhile, the Prussian soldier appears delinquent. He is happy to be in this position, but knows well that it is the foolish behavior of the French that has granted him this privilege. He, like Daumier, is mocking the provisional government for practically handing France over to Prussia willfully. His long sword jumps out at the viewer as a phallic symbol, and it implies that he has the upper hand amongst the two figures. The Prussian soldier is robust, while the Assemblée nationale is an old, fragile woman. Even the draftsmanship highlights the gendering divide between the two figures. Thick, dark lines shape the Prussian soldier, while the female allegory is marked by flimsy, squiggly lines. France was in a vulnerable position, and the sentiment Daumier evoked was that the men overseeing the nation were sellouts, because they were satisfied with courting compromise.

Under this dysfunctional environment, France’s efforts to defend its territories were lackluster and disorganized. When it came to the protection of Paris, members of the provisional
government even told certain bodies of the rural population not to get involved in the conflict. Thus, while many, including Manet who enlisted in the Garde nationale at this time, were hoping that reinforcements from the provinces would come to the aid of Paris during the siege, there were none forthcoming. The Parisian civilians who wished to fight on and form a committee separate from the Gouvernement de la Défense nationale in order to place pressure on the guidance of the decision makers further precipitated the divide. Those belonging to the political Left wanted no part of any war when they had voted against the extension of Napoléon III’s rule (i.e. the plebiscite) earlier in the year, yet they did not simply submit themselves to the opposition disgracefully once the country had decided to engage Prussia in a war. In contrast, by October 1870, it was those who had originally supported the emperor’s notion of a war who found themselves backing down and who lacked a sense of loyalty towards their fellow countrymen. In only a few months, France’s stance regarding the war effort had drastically changed; certainly there was a pretext of the absence of aid that those living in the city received from their brethren residing in the countryside. Amidst the turmoil, Henri Rochefort, who had seen enough, chose to resign from the Gouvernement de la Défense nationale on October 31,

25 In his prologue to the history of the Commune, Lissagaray addresses the debacle that took place in France in the final months of 1870. See Prosper-Olivier Lissagaray, History of the Paris Commune of 1871, translated by Eleanor Marx Aveling (London: Reeves and Turner, 1886), 44-57. Lissagaray’s account of the Paris Commune is not without bias, given his political position as a republican journalist; however, as an individual who lived through the Commune, his history of the events outlines many details not reproduced elsewhere. It is an informative source that has helped to shape this chapter.

26 In two separate letters to his wife dating from September 25 and October 23, 1870, Manet mentions how the national guards are counting on the help of rural society. By November, as the situation increasingly worsened in Paris, Manet even expressed his frustration at some of his acquaintances who fled the capital instead of helping the greater cause: “A lot of cowards have left, among them, I’m afraid, our friends Zola, Fantin, etc.” Édouard Manet, “Untitled letter to Eva Gonzalés,” (November 19, 1870), quoted in Manet by Himself, ed., Wilson-Bareau, 60.
Rochefort sought to disassociate himself from this body, since it did not truly embody his principles. Not surprisingly, as Prussia gained ground, other republicans followed suit in voicing their displeasure at the Défense nationale’s maneuvers (or lack thereof), and increasingly attacked Trochu as the untrustworthy leader responsible for these deplorable conditions. People doubted the governor’s capacities and called for his resignation. In short, Parisians felt betrayed by the Gouvernement de la Défense nationale, much like republicans throughout the country had felt betrayed by the Second Empire.

2.4 Trochu Versus Gambetta

One of the major disadvantages that Paris experienced as a result of the siege was a growing level of physical isolation. Lots of people experienced food shortages and diseases spread throughout the city. Furthermore, it became very difficult for Paris to communicate with the rest of the country on a regular basis. Many journals even stopped production because of the hectic conditions. To keep some contact with the outside world, the French sent out and received (when possible) letters in hot-air balloons. This set the stage for a heroic event. In the early part of October 1870, Léon Gambetta, refusing to let Paris and the country go down without a fight, decided to embark one of the balloons, known as the Armand-Barbès, in order to organize the resistance. Nadar helped to equip and fly the Armand-Barbès, which was destined for Tours, since he had previously flown a balloon while taking bird’s-eye view shots of Paris with his camera. Gambetta safely reached his destination, which was located to the southwest of the French capital. Once in Tours, Gambetta was ready to direct the war effort to the best of his

---

27 Lissagaray, History of the Paris Commune, 41.  
28 France’s military tactics under the interim government instilled no fear in the Prussians, and the administration was clearly losing respectability.  
29 For more on the resistance led by Gambetta during the Siege of Paris and France’s use of balloons during the war, see Milner, Art, War and Revolution, 79-87.
capacity. Therefore, in the opinion of republicans, who had hoped for positive change once the Republic had been established on September 4, 1870, Gambetta’s star shone brightly while Trochu’s continued to fade.

Writers and artists alike celebrated Gambetta’s famous escape from Paris.\(^{30}\) Always quick to react to the affairs of his day, Gill depicted Gambetta’s heroic feat in an untitled print dating from October 1870 (fig. 54). In this image, Gambetta is shown leaning over a throne as he looks at vignettes of himself flying through the sky in a hot-air balloon. In each of these vignettes, Gambetta flies above the sun, which is pictured at the bottom left on the print, marking the magnitude of his accomplishment. In the top left corner, Gambetta is even able to reach a lightning bolt highlighting his courage, and making him the equivalent of Zeus. Throughout the image there are more than a dozen exclamation points that vary in size, implying the amazement and awe with which people observed this incredible moment. Gambetta’s daring venture became a symbol of his aspiration and wit, and accordingly, Gill even immortalized Gambetta as a muscular figure standing atop a column on the right (likely a representation of the colonne Vendôme because of its shape), visually equating him with the heroics of Napoléon I.\(^{31}\)

Not only was Gambetta hailed as a legendary figure because of his courageous act, he came to be viewed as a liberator, placing him in direct opposition to Trochu. When the statesman arrived

\(^{30}\) Nadar (fig. 53), as well as Jacques Guiaud (1810-1876) and Jules Didier (1831-1892), had recorded the acclaimed moment in respective paintings. Once the war was over, Manet also sought to honor Gambetta by painting his portrait; however, the statesman was unable to provide the artist sufficient sittings for the work to be completed. For more on Manet’s attempt to paint Gambetta’s portrait, see Philip Nord, “Manet and Radical Politics,” The Journal of Interdisciplinary History 19, n. 3 (Winter, 1989), 467.

\(^{31}\) The colonne Vendôme was a charged monument because it was erected to commemorate Napoléon I’s conquests in battle. Communards who did not subscribe to the symbolism of the column eventually destroyed it during the Paris Commune (the monument was toppled over on May 16, 1871).
to Tours, he was able to raise an army of 180,000 men, which almost immediately led to a Prussian defeat at Coulmiers.\textsuperscript{32} By the end of November, he was attempting to lead a sortie against the Prussian forces besieging Paris (with the goal of creating a passage that would link the reinforcements from the South with the French armies to the North in Paris). Although the sortie did not turn out successfully, it was viewed as a valiant effort, adding to Gambetta’s heroic status. Meanwhile, Trochu’s primary concern was the flocks of Parisians (mostly formed from the popular classes) that were taking up arms to join the military defense. Rather than concentrating on how to dispatch these men to the best of the nation’s advantage, Trochu instead feared that inexperienced civilians were now armed with weapons, and that they could rise as a group and riot. His priority was to protect himself. Trochu made a mockery of the situation and his position as the defender of Paris. The man who had declared: “the governor of Paris will never capitulate” had betrayed the people, and the French had taken to calling Trochu and several of the other members of the Gouvernement de la Défense nationale “the band of Judas.”\textsuperscript{33} Not surprisingly, a growing number of caricatures were aimed at Trochu, as he kept losing control over matters.

By virtue of their proximity in date, one cannot help but compare Alfred Le Petit’s \textit{L’oeillet} (fig. 55) and \textit{Le soleil} (fig. 56), works that are caricatural representations of Trochu and Gambetta respectively. Both of these prints appeared in Le Petit’s \textit{Fleurs, fruits & légumes du jour} series, a set of works that was published as a supplement to \textit{L’Éclipse} between January and June 1871. \textit{L’oeillet} was issued on January 11, 1871, while \textit{Le soleil} appeared in circulation the next day. In this series, over thirty individuals are transformed into different types of flowers,

\textsuperscript{32} Milner, \textit{Art, War and Revolution}, 83.
\textsuperscript{33} Quoted in Lissagaray, \textit{History of the Paris Commune}, 33-34.
fruits, and vegetables. Contributing to the element of humor of Le Petit’s series is that the figures are to be consumed by the public literally and figuratively, since many of them are edible in their metamorphosed form. Being further removed from humans than animals, fruits, vegetables, and plants rank low on the hierarchy of elements with a worldly existence. Moreover, by turning these public figures into lesser beings, the political permanence that they desire is unattainable since their lifespan is temporal – they are visual expressions of memento mori. The transformed figures are deliberately not defaced in order to allow viewers to decipher them. Trochu is represented as a carnation, but his status pales by comparison to Gambetta’s, whom Le Petit chose to illustrate as a sunflower.

Trochu’s head is placed at the top of a stem that emerges from a pot. His forehead, shaped like a lump, appears to be hollow, and the lone carnation that has bloomed covers the backside of his head, further calling attention to his large bald spot. The caption at the bottom of the print refers to Trochu’s infamous “plan.”

It satirically tells viewers not to question it, although by the time this print was published, it was only a matter of a few days before Trochu was relieved of his duties as governor of Paris.

Bees and butterflies with the heads of politicians, such as Jules Favre, Adolphe Crémieux, and Garnier-Pagès, hover around the scene as they seek to take over Trochu’s post. Multiple Légion d’honneur medals weigh down two stems that act as Trochu’s

---


35 Trochu was officially replaced on January 22, 1871. The caption, as Bertrand Tillier indicates, also adds “un lot d’astuces supplémentaires, qui multiplient les effets comiques par un jeu d’échos polysémiques. De la sorte s’établit une totale confusion entre le physique de l’homme, son caractère, sa pensée, son action, son œuvre et son actualité” (a complementary set of clues, which multiply the comical effects [of the work] through a polysemic play on words. This is how a complete form of confusion is created between the physical person, his character, his thought, his action, his work, and his existence). Bertrand Tillier, Le potager républicain: caricatures d’Alfred Le Petit (Montreuil: Musée de l’histoire vivante, 2002), 14.
hands. Ribbons belonging to these medals, instead of petals, have fallen to the ground. This detail suggests that such awards do not automatically render a person a suitable candidate for significant positions. Trochu was a devout Catholic, another reason which made him unpopular amongst most republicans, and accordingly, a cross appears on the front of the flowerpot. A cross also hangs from a rosary that has tangled its way around the stem that holds Trochu’s head, indicating that it could pull him down at any moment. Republicans hated this man since they were apprehensive about his plan of action, and he bore the brunt of the responsibility for failing to lead the country to victory.

Meanwhile, shown as the “sun,” Gambetta occupies a prominent position, as he is elevated beyond all the other individuals represented in this series. To reinforce his significant status, Le Petit has chosen to group together several of the figures from his series on the title page of the entire set, and Gambetta is positioned at the top center of that image (fig. 57). Even though Trochu also appears on this image he is relegated to the bottom right corner, where he stands next to a handful of pear-shaped heads, including that of Adolphe Thiers. In Le soleil Gambetta does stand on crutches, but his limbs are intact and his body has not been transformed into any kind of organic produce. Although the crutches are very skinny, they do not threaten Gambetta’s balance, and they help him rise above the sun shown to the left of the image, which humorously expresses its frustration at holding a lower position. Not only does Gambetta have access to the use of his body (unlike the majority of the figures in the Fleurs, fruits & légumes du jour series), his facial features practically mirror Le Petit’s depiction of the statesman in L’Oeil du Maître (fig. 41), which was a deliberate effort to portray him sympathetically. A shepherd and his dog are shown at the bottom of the print signaling that Gambetta is a trustworthy person, and hence one should view him in a positive light. During the Franco-Prussian War, Gambetta was one of
France’s lone sources of light, as he tried to urge his fellow countrymen to keep fighting. As the caption reveals, he was the one to reawaken the sense of pride and patriotism amongst discouraged men in the countryside. His status is elevated, much like his position in the print. Therefore, from the perspective of republicans, representing Gambetta as a sunflower was fitting. By the nineteenth century, the sun no longer had any associations of a monarchy, as it once had during the Ancien Régime. Rather, it embodied the Republic and its liberal principles, heightening the significance of its symbolism. In the following years, the career paths of Gambetta and Trochu differed greatly, as Gambetta remained a vital figure in French politics and a champion of the “republican” Republic, while Trochu removed himself from political affairs entirely, even though he outlived the former by more than a dozen years.

2.5 The Armistice and the Country’s Growing Divide

Although it was clear that Trochu was not fit for the task and that Gambetta, along with the “true” republicans, did not want to settle for an agreement with Prussia that would likely lead to the dismembering of the country, conservative politicians still felt it was time to put an end to the war because France did not stand a realistic chance at coming out victorious. Men such as Jules Favre and Adolphe Thiers, campaigned to end the combat. An armistice was declared on January 28, 1871, conceding the victory to the Prussians, and at a later date, Thiers solidified the terms of the truce under a new provisional government. Favre, who shortly after the proclamation of the

---

36 As noted by Bertrand Tillier, the sun, more than a mere source of heat, “est aussi au XIXe siècle l’emblème des Lumières dans leurs lutte contre l’injustice et l’obscurantisme” (is also, during the nineteenth century, an emblem of the enlightened and their battle against injustice and the obscure). Bertrand Tillier, “Victor Hugo caricaturé: ou la mémoire des images satiriques,” in Le Victor Hugo illustré, Pierre Gamarra et al. (Montreuil: Musée de l’histoire vivante, 2002), 19. A comparison can be drawn between Le Petit’s Le soleil and Gill’s image of Hugo from La Lune (fig. 20), in which the poet’s head rises above the sea as the sun.

37 France had been plagued by the torments of warfare, which included deaths caused by famine and by the frigid temperatures of the long winter.
Republic in September 1870 had uttered “we will cede neither an inch of our territories nor a stone of our fortresses,” ended up giving up the fight without much reserve. Parisians, including the caricaturist Charles de Frondat (1846-?), showcased their outrage at this form of renouncement (fig. 58). In de Frondat’s *La comédie politique*, Favre and Thiers stage an act where they have tears in their eyes because the nation is in a vulnerable position as a result of the Franco-Prussian War, but behind the red curtain that divides the scene into two parts, they rejoice at their decision of having conceded the war to the enemy. Even before establishing the Commune, those who felt most betrayed by their peers voiced their displeasure at the unfolding turn of events.

Le gouvernement qui, le 4 septembre, s’est chargé de la défense nationale a-t-il rempli sa mission? – Non! Nous sommes 500 000 combattants et 200 000 Prussiens nous étreignent! A qui la responsabilité, sinon à ceux qui nous gouvernent? Ils n’ont pensé qu’à négocier au lieu de fondre des canons et de fabriquer des armes. Ils se sont refusés à la levée en masse. Ils ont laissé en place les bonapartistes et mis en prison les républicains. Ils ne se sont décidés à agir enfin contre les Prussiens qu’après deux mois, au lendemain du 31 octobre. Par leur lenteur, leur indécision, leur inertie, ils nous ont conduits jusqu’au bord de l’abîme: ils n’ont su ni administrer, ni combattre, alors qu’ils avaient sous la main toutes les ressources, les denrées et les hommes.

---

38 Quoted in Lissagaray, *History of the Paris Commune*, 14. History seemed to repeat itself, as yet another man belonging to the Gouvernement de la Défense nationale who claimed to defend *la patrie* had turned his back on the country.

39 “Did the government that was put in charge of the national defense on September 4 accomplish its mission? No! We have 500, 000 fighters, yet 200, 000 Prussians overpower us. Who is to blame, but does who govern us? They have only thought of negotiating, instead of erecting cannons and producing arms. They have refused to conduct any mass uprising. They have left in place bonapartistes and have sent republicans to jail. They only chose to act against the Prussians after two months had gone by, the day after October 31. Because of their slowness, their indecision, their inertia they have led us to the border of defeat: they did not know how to administrate, nor how to fight, even though they had all the resources, the commodities, and men at their disposal.” Delegates from Paris affixed this statement to a proclamation made public on January 6, 1871. Jacques Rougerie, *Paris libre 1871* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 2004), 61-62. Rougerie’s investigation into the Paris Commune is very thorough in *Paris libre 1871*, and he has published extensively on this time period over the course of his career. He is a vital source for any study that addresses the Paris Commune.
Tension was in the air, as the decision to settle for an armistice was just the first of a list of incidents that would drive apart the country, and ultimately, both Favre and Thiers would be castigated for their roles in this ploy.

In the meantime, Prussia and Germany reaped the benefits of France’s mismanagement. Wilhelm I was crowned German emperor on January 18, 1871 in la galerie des Glaces at Versailles (fig. 59). The new emperor had gotten his revenge on France, and the location of his ceremony could not have been more humiliating to the French. Eventually, the triumphant Germans would make way for the deputies of defeated France, but not before they forced the French to agree to let them parade through Paris. While Bismarck had accepted Favre’s armistice as part of a peaceful settlement between the two nations, the former did not recognize the provisional government France had erected in September 1870 as an official political body. Thus, France was forced to organize legislative elections, which once concluded, would enable the new assembly to ratify the agreement with the conquerors. Thiers emerged as the leading figure of the newly formed government set in place on February 8, 1871, and then went on to sign the truce with Bismarck on February 26. It was at that moment, that the Germans coerced Thiers into giving them the authorization to parade through the capital. This was a very painful experience for Parisians; it added to the city’s exasperation, as Paris faced the burden of defending itself from foreign occupation on its own. Parisian republicans were demoralized when Favre agreed to the armistice, but now they were enraged because the Germans were permitted by Thiers (whether willingly or not was irrelevant) to have a procession through the

41 The victors marched along the Champs-Elysées on March 1, 1871, and departed Paris two days later. Milner, Art, War and Revolution, 133.
streets of Paris. This planted another seed in the growing divide within the country, and led to a further struggle that witnessed the opposition of Paris and Versailles on both an ideological and physical level.

2.6 Bordeaux’s Moment on the National Stage

When Bismarck pressured the French to hold elections for a new government, deputies felt it would be advantageous to retreat from Paris and to continue political proceedings from a remote location that was not under fire. Accordingly, Bordeaux became the center of attention of French politics for a few weeks. Certain trends emerged from the elections. Parisians voted highly in favor of Republicans and their desire to fight. Out of 43 deputies elected from Paris, 36 were Republican. On the other hand, in the provinces, Thiers, who distinctly opposed the war, surfaced as a clear favorite. Not only that, he became the chief executive of the acting Assemblée nationale starting on February 17.

The Republic was endangered, and this was the message conveyed by Daumier’s *L’assemblée de Bordeaux; Qui prendra le couteau*? (fig. 60). A personification of France or the Republic lies motionless on a dissecting table as if already dead and ready for autopsy. The figure has an eerie resemblance to the allegory of France that Daumier depicted in *Autres candidats* (fig. 61) just

---

42 Given the short span in which the assembly needed to be created, there was no time for campaigning. Votes were mostly cast based on a candidate’s willingness or not to keep fighting the war.


44 While appearing last on the ballots in Paris, he earned the most votes in 26 different provincial departments, securing his position in the assembly. David Shafe, “Éthériées et anonymes: les allégories féminines de la république dans la caricature française (1870-1871),” *Cahiers d’histoire* 75 (1999), 82.

45 Thiers could also count on one of his key collaborators, Jules Favre, who was the only member of the Gouvernement de la Défense nationale, outside of Gambetta, to be elected to the government created in February 1871. Overall, the assembly was made up of 675 elected deputies, of whom over 400 were monarchists. For a complete breakdown of the numbers related to the elections, see Rials, ed., *Histoire de Paris*, 223-225.
two weeks earlier, and can also be compared to the primary allegorical figure in *L’Empire c’est la paix* (fig. 49). A knife rests besides her, suggesting that the men who look at her with grimacing faces will soon carve up her body. Her right eye has already been gouged out. The aged men represent the monarchists of the newly formed government who seek an authoritative regime. The knife not only indicates the tool with which they will dissect the country, it underlines the backstabbing nature of these heartless individuals. Prussia had stopped its onslaught on France, but now another group of men was willing to lead the nation to ruin. A sense of mistrust revolved around the conduct and operations of a government that was created in haste, leaving Daumier to feel that the country, and by virtue of it the Republic, was dying.

Republicans, especially in Paris, feared that the assembly would seek to name a monarch after it reached an agreement with Bismarck – a sentiment that was not without justification. Giuseppe Garibaldi and Victor Hugo were two men who had been elected to the assembly in February, yet neither figure formed part of it halfway through the next month (these men symbolized democratic and humanitarian ideals). Even though Garibaldi showed great heroism in defending France against the Prussians during the war, a fact Hugo vigorously brought to the attention of the assembly in sessions, monarchists were quick to invalidate his candidacy. Although Garibaldi had strong ties to Italy, he had been born in Nice, making him French by birth. Yet, the conservative members of the assembly feared he was a revolutionary and a “foreigner,” which meant he shared too many hereditary similarities to Napoléon I. Moreover, Garibaldi was anticlerical, and Right-wing politicians had ostracized him in the 1860s for trying

46 The assembly was primarily orléaniste and légitimiste, as the majority of deputies belonged to the nobility and the upper-middle class.
to free Rome from the Papal States. As such, it did not matter to monarchists that he commanded nearly France’s entire eastern front during the war, and that he fought fearlessly on the country’s behalf up until the initiation of the January armistice.\textsuperscript{48} Simply put, he was not a popular figure amongst the reactionaries and was deemed ineligible to partake in any of the Assemblée nationale’s rulings. This infuriated Hugo who pled to have the decision overruled. In a meeting session held on March 8, 1871, monarchists kept interrupting Hugo’s speech as he reasoned on Garibaldi’s behalf and demanded for his reinstatement.\textsuperscript{49} The novelist’s voice was completely suppressed by the clamor. By force of not even being able to express his opinion in what was supposed to be a controlled environment, Hugo resigned from taking any further actions in the Assemblée nationale. This dealt a huge blow to republican hopes across the country. Only days after Hugo stepped down from his position, \textit{Le Charivari} commented on the void this left on the Republic and its grander cause: “nous regrettons sa décision, non pour lui, mais pour la cause de la liberté.”\textsuperscript{50} Therefore, whether imposed or not, republican competition was being eliminated from the ranks of the Assemblée nationale.\textsuperscript{51}

To say that republicans resented the monarchist character of the new government would be an understatement, but what made matters worse, is that shortly after Thiers signed the truce with Bismarck on February 26, 1871, a decision was taken to make Versailles – and not Paris or Bordeaux – its new central location. For republicans, Versailles had negative connotations

\textsuperscript{48} Garibaldi and his armies pestered the Prussians relentlessly up until the defense of Dijon, which ended on January 23, 1871.
\textsuperscript{50} “We regret his decision, not for him personally, but for the cause of liberty.” Pierre Véron, “Bulletin Politique,” \textit{Le Charivari} (March 12, 1871), 1.
\textsuperscript{51} For more on the key events that sparked the origins of the Commune, see Rougerie, \textit{Paris libre 1871}, 59-100.
because it had been the traditional seat of the French monarchy during the Ancien Régime. In addition, the Germans had recently celebrated their victory over the French at Versailles and crowned Wilhelm I as emperor at the château that Louis XIV (1638-1715) had commissioned as a luxurious palace. Associating with this site aligned the assembly more closely with the recent Prussian victors than their fellow countrymen, as made evident by Charles de Frondat’s *Les Prussiens de Versailles* (fig. 62), in which Favre and Thiers are shown firing balls out of a cannon while sporting the pointed helmets that were worn by Prussian soldiers at the time. Furthermore, the move to Versailles encapsulated the repressive nature that the absolute monarchy had once embodied in France. Paris was at a complete loss. It brought despair to the people who had sacrificed their lives in the dreadful war. Simply put, it was the worst of treasons that the assembly could commit. The tangible and emotional damage of this act is summarized by the editor-in-chief of *Le Charivari* at the time.

Ce Paris, qui a pendant cinq mois souffert intrépidement pour la France, ils ont l’impudeur de vouloir le remercier en le reniant. A toute époque c’eut été une sottise. Aujourd’hui c’est une ingratitude qui révolte. L’expédient de Versailles ne peut être qu’une transition. En persistant dans cette défiance les gens de la majorité feraient pire que les Prussiens n’ont fait. A la France les Prussiens n’ont enlevé qu’un membre, eux lui couperaient la tête.52

This reactionary maneuver could only lead to an insurrection, as many Frenchmen were disgusted by the news. A civil war was brewing in France, and Bordeaux was a site haunted by two infamous pronouncements – first, Louis-Napoléon’s “the empire means peace” statement in 1852, and secondly, the Assemblée nationale’s choice to relocate to Versailles in March of 1871.

---

52 “This Paris, which has gallantly suffered for France for five months, they have the shameless desire of thanking her by renouncing her. At all times this would have been a stupidity. Today, it is a form of ingratitude of the highest order. This ploy to move to Versailles can only be temporary. If such defiant acts persist, the men in the majority would do worse than the Prussians. The Prussians only took from France a limb, they would cut her head.” Véron, “Bulletin Politique,” *Le Charivari* (March 11, 1871), 1.
As the chief executive of the assembly, Thiers played a major role in this decision. Upon getting hold of the news, Le Petit called out the politician’s self-serving desires amidst his intentions to entice the Republic. In *La République en danger* (fig. 63), Thiers, personified as a cupid, tries to persuade the Republic that he desires her. He looms over her right shoulder, and his evil character is displayed through his facial expression. Here is a figure who aims to take advantage of the Republic by untying the single piece of clothing that covers the top part of her body. However, the female allegory protects herself with one hand as she refuses to give her body up to the cunning old man. As the caption below the image notes, she does not trust his mischievous ways. The same applies to the comte de Paris, Philippe d’Orléans (1838-1894), who is shown as a small butterfly fluttering near the rose that the Republic holds in her right hand.\(^{53}\) Due to the sexual innuendo of this print, the rose likely represents the Republic’s virginity, which she is unwilling to give up. One cannot help but draw a comparison here between this scene and the biblical story of Susanna and the Elders, in which two sly men attempt to blackmail the lovely Susanna unless she gratifies their sexual pleasure. The wickedness of the two old men is not rewarded in the Bible, but it remains unclear whether the venomous Thiers will get his way in Le Petit’s caricature. The country was governed as a republic since September 1870; however, this seemed less evident as each day went by and monarchists kept gaining momentum. The feeling of disgust amongst republicans was unanimous, and resentment at Thiers kept escalating, as exemplified by Manet’s words: “I never imagined that France could be represented by such doddering old fools, not excepting that little twit Thiers who I hope will

\(^{53}\) Philippe d’Orléans was the pretending orléaniste heir to the throne in France for most of the second half of the nineteenth century. It is no surprise that Le Petit would show him trying to sway the Republic to his side.
drop dead one day in the middle of a speech and rid us of his wizened little person.” Thiers had a trick up his sleeve, and it would merely take him a few days to unveil it. Therefore, the stability of the Republic was in jeopardy, as there was no guarantee that France would remain a republic in the short or long term.

2.7 Versailles Exerts its Authority

The assembly under Thiers’s leadership officially moved to Versailles from Bordeaux on March 12, 1871, and it did not take long before it began asserting its dominance over Paris and the rest of the country. Resuscitating the methods of earlier repressive governments in the nineteenth century, censorship of the press – chiefly caricatures – was reinstated. The effect was felt immediately by journals stationed in Paris, including La Caricature politique (1871) and Rochefort’s Le Mot d’ordre (1871), which were forced to stop production within a matter of weeks; however, the enforcement of press censorship had a lasting impact on the entire first decade of the Third Republic’s existence. Those in Paris who were on the verge of establishing a commune attempted to refute press censorship and were disinclined to comply with any of Versailles’s autocratic procedures, especially after an incident that took place on March 18, 1871.

In order to defend the city from the Prussians during the siege, Parisians had fortified the city to the best of their capacities. Approximately 200 cannons remained at the top of the Butte-Montmartre – a strategic location from which an advantage could be gained. Thiers was resolved to seize the cannons, fearing that guards would make use of this heavy artillery in the

---

55 Other cannons were dispersed in different quarters of the city. A summary of the events that occurred on March 18 can be found in Rougerie, Paris libre 1871, 100-108.
case of an armed insurrection. Accordingly, the chief executive of the assembly ordered troops to disarm the French capital on March 18, as illustrated by Pilotell in one of the final prints he made before fleeing the country (fig. 64). By the time the squads arrived at the top of the escarpment (later that day), the armed insurgents of Paris, which included men belonging to the Garde nationale, had been aware of the mission and were equal to the task. Amidst the commotion, the generals Lecomte (1817-1871) and Clément-Thomas (1809-1871) were killed by a group of men defending the artillery on the butte. Although they had suffered more serious losses, the Versaillais were the aggressors in this incident. In Paris, the Garde nationale had emerged victorious at the end of the troublesome day, but since it was not a governing body, it was at this moment that the notion of a “Republic of Paris” surfaced. Elections were about to be held in the French capital marking the beginning of the Commune.

Upon returning to Versailles, Thiers assumed an offensive position. On April 1, 1871 Thiers officially announced war and blockaded all trains with expeditions destined for Paris. He wanted to suffocate Paris by refusing to let goods and food supplies to reach the capital; it was the equivalent of placing an embargo on another country. Later that month, Thiers’s orders were delegated to the commissaries of different railway stations through a circular written by the préfecture de police.

The chief of the executive power has just decided that, dating from to-day, all victualing trains and all supplies of provisions directed to Paris shall be stopped. I beg you to take all measures you may deem needful for the execution of this decree at once. You are to

56 The operation did not yield much success, as Thiers’s men were only able to gather a few cannons from remote locations.
57 In Thiers’s view, Paris needed to be cut off from the rest of the country. To learn more about the mindset of the opposing camps in the opening days of April 1871, see Lissagaray, History of the Paris Commune, 160-170.
examine with the most vigilant attention all the railway trains, all the carriages destined for Paris, and you will send back to the purveyors all the provisions you may discover.\textsuperscript{58}

Having declared a civil war, Thiers was of the opinion that the more his opponents would starve from hunger, the less men his troops would have to face in combat. No matter how intent he was on starving Paris, all food supplies were not deterred from arriving to the capital; however, Daumier made sure Thiers’s outrageous act would not go unnoticed.

In \textit{Versailles! Versailles!...Trois semaines d’arrêt} (fig. 65), a figure personifying Versailles is about to derail a train with supplies destined for Paris by placing a large wooden log across the railway lines. Emerging from the mass of drapery that clothes this figure is the circular head of an older person wearing glasses. Daumier’s late allegories tended to portray females, but this, without a doubt, is a disguised representation of Thiers. Thiers’s physiognomy was unmistakable, and it lent itself to caricatures, especially when he played a perturbing role in the news of the day. Although Thiers was Daumier’s elder by nearly a dozen years, the careers of these two men took off at the same time, in the early 1830s, and they would cross paths many times over the years. Thiers’s despotic character increasingly revealed itself as he grew in age, and Daumier made sure to bring this aspect to light by making him the antagonist, who most of all, incarnated the evils associated with Versailles (both past and present). In the image, the figure representing Thiers seems satisfied by his vile coup, exposing his coldblooded nature in the process. He exemplifies what is wrong about a monarchical regime, since his self-centeredness has led him to adopt a wickedly cruel behavior towards his own people. Over the years, Daumier stigmatized Thiers’s political actions, and he certainly wanted to illustrate that in

\textsuperscript{58} Valentin, the acting head of the préfecture de police, sent out this message on April 25, 1871. Ibid., 471.
a clear fashion in *Versailles! Versailles!...Trois semaines d’arrêt*, which would turn out to be one of the last prints the artist made of the politician.

2.8 Vive la Commune

Radicals living in Paris judged that it was time to initiate a municipal council that would govern on its own accord. Elections were initially set for March 22, 1871 and were postponed almost daily until March 26, 1871, due to the administrative inexperience of the Communards. Nevertheless, once the elections were held, over 80 individuals were chosen to represent the Commune.

The official proclamation of the Commune occurred in Paris on March 28, 1871 at the Hôtel de Ville, and after having shown administrative hesitancy the previous week, motions were proposed and legislated in a fairly rapid succession. On March 29 conscription and the permanent army were abolished. The Paris Commune created a model of governance that did not rely on force, and it hoped that other cities in the country would follow her lead in order to

---

59 For a brief but comprehensive breakdown of different aspects of the Paris Commune, such as the social, artistic, and judicial making of this short-lived governing system, see Jean-Louis Robert, ed., *Le Paris de la Commune 1871*.

60 Initially, Paris struggled to define its political ambitions, and this uncertainty was felt amongst those who were not committed to the plans of the Paris Commune. It was mostly members of the bourgeoisie who had remained in Paris until that time who feared the outcome of a self-governed council primarily made up of revolutionary workers. This translated to a high number of abstentions in the polls, as only 229,167 people voted out of the 484,569 eligible. These numbers are borrowed from Jacques Rougerie’s extensive research on the Commune. Rougerie, *Paris libre 1871*, 145.

61 At the core, these men agreed that a Commune was necessary, but their exact political orientation was far from unanimous, insinuating that issues could arise at some point down the line. The elected were made up of socialistes, blanquistes, internationalistes, as well as men belonging to the Garde nationale. In the moment however, jubilation reigned as a sense of total liberation spread amongst those who remained in the city.

62 For an extended overview of all the changes decreed during the Commune (several of which are mentioned here), refer to Rials, ed., *Histoire de Paris*, 417-435, and Rougerie, *Paris libre 1871*, 147-193.
generate a larger ideological opposition to the governing body in Versailles.\textsuperscript{63} Anticlerical sentiment had gained momentum in the latter part of the Second Empire and became even more predominant at this time. As a result, the Commune declared the separation of the Church and the State on April 2. The popularity of scientific theories also increased as writings vilifying the Church and its role in society were disseminated to the public, whether it was through the official journal of the Commune, known as \textit{Paris Libre} (1871), or by way of other available sources. As part of this plan of action, the secularization of the educational curriculum was introduced in April 1871 and was in effect the following month. This, in the opinion of Communards, was the only means by which to offer a genuine, unbiased form of education to the population.

Furthermore, an initiative to bring change to the arts also transpired in the month of April. A group of over 400 artists met on April 13 with the objective of revamping the arts program in the city. From this meeting emerged an artist federation whose purpose was three-fold: safeguarding works from the past, giving living artists more opportunities to publicly display their works, and providing a non-elitist education to younger generations of artists.\textsuperscript{64} A committee of forty-six artists was selected to take command of the enterprise.\textsuperscript{65} Gustave Courbet was one of these artists, and he took the task to heart by proclaiming himself the leader of the committee, while other artists, including Manet and Daumier, were appointed to the committee but declined to serve. Gill formed part of the federation, and his role was to administer the conservation of the

\textsuperscript{63} Short-lived as they were, communes did emerge in pro-republican cities, such as Lyon, Marseille, Toulouse, and Narbonne.

\textsuperscript{64} The most extensive study on the artists federation and its role in the early Third Republic, is Gonzalo J. Sanchez, \textit{Organizing Independence: The Artists Federation of the Paris Commune and its Legacy, 1871-1889} (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997).

\textsuperscript{65} One did not need to be a Communard to form part of this group.
Musée du Luxembourg along with two other colleagues. The federation underlined the collective element of the group over all forms of individualism. It proposed to stop pouring money into the official institutions supported by previous regimes, such as the École des Beaux-Arts, and did away with the Prix de Rome award. In theory, the federation wanted to establish a democratic system for artists and hold a significant political role, but since it came into term under the transient Commune, its functionality was rather limited.

2.9 Civil War

Those fighting on behalf of Paris could have retaliated against the Versaillais after the cannons episode on March 18 by leading an attack on Versailles. However, the supporters of the Commune were instead focused on organizing a municipal government and overhauling the city’s program. For this reason, Communards felt that they were orchestrating a resistance, and not any form of attack in the spring of 1871. Although the worst was still to come in the final week of May, Daumier wanted to illustrate while it was still possible how the two sides were completely at odds with each other. Le Charivari understood that the situation was getting out of hand, and it notified its readers on April 21, 1871 that it would interrupt the publication of its journal until the return of more favorable conditions.

Daumier’s Le char de l’état en 1871 (fig. 66) was strategically published in the satirical journal’s issue that day. In this print, the artist did not want to resort to the use of violence, but he

---

66 The two other men were the sculptor Agénor Chapuy (1838-1903) and the painter Eugène Gluck (1820-1898).
68 By catching the enemy off guard at an unexpected moment, it would have perhaps given the Commune its best chance at defeating the opponent.
69 Their immediate instinct was to not engage in warfare, but rather to recognize the need to govern their own body of people.
70 The journal would only publish its next issue on June 12, 1871.
wished to single out the oppressor in the conflict. Versailles was erecting an army under the command of Patrice de MacMahon, a general who had acquired a lot of military experience over several decades. Initially, MacMahon could count on approximately 65,000 men, which already surpassed the total number of fighters available to the Commune (it had no more than 50,000 combatants), and as each day went by the general’s army grew in size. In Daumier’s lithograph, figures personifying Versailles and Paris are placed in a small rectangular chariot and attempt to drive this vehicle in opposite directions. Versailles, who is meant to resemble Thiers in the dress of the allegorical symbol of monarchy, is clearly the aggressor of the two parties. The whip she zealously holds up highlights the figure’s confrontational temper as she strives to spur the horse into action. Her puffy cheeks reveal the anger with which she tries to command the creature. On the other hand, Paris is marked by her calmness and dignity. She is tall and upright. Her drapery and Phrygian cap identify her as the Republic. Her arms are relaxed in comparison to those of Versailles; she does not appear irritated. Daumier suggests that the path of the Republic is the natural way to go – it is the regime that the nation should embrace.

2.10 Manet’s Response to *La Semaine Sanglante*

Both sides lost men in April and in the first half of May, and yet others were made prisoners, but the height of the battle took place during the final week of the latter month. The period between May 21 and May 28, 1871 has been labeled *la Semaine sanglante* in French history,

---

71 On May 10, 1871 Versailles received its biggest boost. That day, the traité de Francfort was signed between Thiers and the German Empire, which officially concluded the Franco-Prussian War and established the frontier between the two powers. As part of the agreement, the Germans liberated French prisoners of war and these men were now free to join the fight against the Communards. MacMahon’s army nearly doubled in size because of this entente. For more, see Jean-Louis Robert, “Une histoire politique de la Commune,” in *Le Paris de la Commune 1871*, ed., Robert, 37-39.
because of all the people who died at that time. A greater number of people died during la Semaine sanglante than were guillotined at the time of la Terreur during the French Revolution. The most common number associated with the losses suffered by the Communards during the war is 20,000. In contrast, MacMahon filed a report after the war indicating that the Versaillais had lost 877 combatants. The numbers are incredibly lopsided. While it is undeniable that the Communards did not depend on effective military strategies, the killing of 20,000 men – if the numbers are correct – proves that the Versaillais were very cruel. Why did these men retreat in front of the Prussians during the Siege of Paris, yet act so violently against Parisians the following year?

The Versaillais were relentless in their assault, which continued into June even though the war was over. On some occasions, defenseless civilians were backed up against walls and shot from point-blank range. Certain parts of the Seine were even red from all the blood that poured into the river. Such horrible scenes greatly impacted Manet. Manet was not directly involved in the Paris Commune, as he had decided to join his family in Oloron-Sainte-Marie in the southwest of France soon after the country had agreed to an armistice with Prussia in January 1871. However, he did return to Paris later in the spring of 1871 (possibly at some point during la

---

72 A party of conciliators had tried to negotiate an agreement between the Versaillais and the Communards on a couple of occasions prior to the bloodshed, but the discussions reached an impasse chiefly because Thiers was unwilling to have anybody interfere with his plans. To learn about the activities of the conciliators and how Thiers dismissed their mission, see Philip Nord, “The Party of Conciliation and the Paris Commune,” French Historical Studies 15, n. 1 (Spring, 1987), 1-35.

73 Several historians, including Jacques Rougerie, Stéphane Rials, Prosper-Olivier Lissagaray, and Jean-Louis Robert, propose this number. In comparison, it is claimed that approximately 17,000 were guillotined during la Terreur: approximately 3,000 in Paris and 14,000 in the provinces. See, Christopher Hibbert, The Days of the French Revolution (New York: Morrow, 1980), 184.

74 Rougerie, Paris libre 1871, 257.
Semaine sanglante) and witnessed the execution of Communards near Versailles on his way back to the capital. It led him to the creation of two lithographs, which captured the gruesome nature of the civil war. La Barricade (fig. 67), which Manet also conceived as a watercolor (fig. 68) was perhaps envisioned as a Salon project given its large size (46.2 x 32.5 cm). Yet since the Salon was not held in 1871 because of the political unrest in the country, and the likelihood of such a work being purchased by the State was very slim, it is telling that Manet chose to express his thoughts about the affair visually.75

Manet’s lithographic version of La Barricade is not simply a mirror image of his watercolor. Viewers are more distanced from the killing in the lithograph. There is a greater sense of foreground space, and the barricade that forms the wall between the buildings is more noticeable. The prisoners who are about to be shot also command a greater presence, because it is easier to make out their facial features, especially those of the figure closest to the shooters. Moreover, the lithograph itself is larger, putting it on par with some of the fin-de-siècle posters that were displayed on Morris columns and other public structures throughout the city. The exact date of production of Manet’s print remains unknown. Yet his sketchy application of the lithographic crayon and the action lend the work immediacy, giving the impression that he made this work while the incident took place.

75 The content of this section is guided by two key articles on Manet: Philip Nord’s “Manet and Radical Politics,” The Journal of Interdisciplinary History 19, n. 3 (Winter, 1989), and Jacquelynn Baas’s “Edouard Manet and Civil War,” Art Journal 45, n. 1 (Spring, 1985). Nord’s article examines Manet’s artistic output through a political lens. He illustrates well Manet’s republicanism. Baas’s article focuses primarily on Manet’s response to the Paris Commune by analyzing two of his lithographs: Guerre civile (fig. 69) and La Barricade (fig. 67). Her argument about the meaning of Manet’s Guerre civile is particularly compelling.
At the same time, *La Barricade* shares certain elements in common with the artist’s *The Execution of Emperor Maximilian* (fig. 28) lithograph. In both works men are shot by a larger group of officers from an extremely close range. The position of the victims and the gunmen is almost identical in the two prints. Manet blamed the Bonaparte regime for its mishandling of the Mexican affair in the earlier work, and one can assume a similar sentiment informs *La Barricade*. The firing squad acting on behalf of Thiers’s government is carrying out a form of military brutality that Manet absolutely condemned. Although Manet was not a Communard, his heart clearly lay with the civilians who were on the verge of being killed in this style of precipitous execution. For this reason, none of the shooters are drawn in a way or from an angle that allows the viewer to make out any of their facial attributes. The killers fire away in an untroubled and systematic way as if they were machines. The Versaillais took up the attitude that the entry into Paris was more of an internal police-like operation than anything else, and accordingly, laws of war did not need be observed.76 From the Versailles army’s perspective, it was not participating in a bloody repression, but actually liberating France from the anarchy and destructive behavior of the insurgents. As a result, one is left with the impression that the Versailles troops would stop at nothing to eliminate the entire Commune. The mood is more dramatic in *La Barricade* than it is in *The Execution of Emperor Maximilian*, due to the lifelike setting, but more importantly, because the annihilation of French civilians on French soil was harder for Manet to swallow than that of Maximilian, an Austrian Napoléon III had turned into a puppet in Mexico. Undoubtedly, Manet was disgusted by the drastic measures the executioners

76 As Jean-Louis Robert explains, the Communards approached the civil war from the opposite end. They obeyed the laws of war, which led them to treat many prisoners and hostages humanely. Robert, “La Commune et la justice,” in *Le Paris de la Commune 1871*, ed., Robert, 171-172.
used against civilians, and the fact that the soldiers and the victims shared the same nationality only made it more heartbreaking.

The other work Manet produced on the Paris Commune, and that was perhaps intended as a pendant to *La Barricade*, is *Guerre civile* (fig. 69). The year 1871 appears at the bottom left corner of the lithograph, and Theodore Reff has proposed that the event Manet represents took place on May 23, 1871 because of the location of the incident – this scene is situated near the Madeleine in the 8e arrondissement. It is likely that Manet created this work in 1871; however, given the controversial nature of the subject, *Guerre civile* was only published in February 1874. This was yet another work that commented on the brutality of those in charge. Knowing the embarrassment this could cause to the government, the suggestion has been made that Manet strategically titled his image “guerre civile” because it would probably bypass the censors and enable him to publish his work. Without the title, one would be accustomed to associate such an image to a war between two nations, in this case the Siege of Paris, especially since Manet had served in the Garde nationale; however, since the print illustrates the barbaric complexion of a civil war the sense of petrification is immediately heightened. Manet solely relied on the blacks, greys, and whites that lithography as a medium offers, yet the implication that a terrible crime has been committed is transparent. His scene is claustrophobic. Paintings of war while not positive, such as Étienne-Prosper Berne-Bellecour’s *The Tirailleurs de la Seine at the Battle of

77 Based on historical accounts, the Versailles troops had reached parts of the 8e arrondissement by May 23, 1871. Theodore Reff, “The Street as Battleground,” in *Manet and Modern Paris: One Hundred Paintings, Drawings, Prints, and Photographs by Manet and His Contemporaries*, ed., Reff (Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1982), 212.
78 Lemercier, who had refused to publish Manet’s *The Execution of Emperor Maximilian* lithograph a few years earlier, was the printer who agreed to circulate *Guerre civile*. 100 impressions of *Guerre civile* were published as indicated on the bottom left margin of each version of the print.
79 This claim is made by Baas in “Edouard Manet and Civil War,” 39.
Rueil-Malmaison, October 21, 1870 (fig. 70), generally strike one as more placid and almost pastoral, and accordingly, they take away from the sinister element of a conflict when compared to prints. Manet deliberately conceived Guerre civile as a lithograph, because he knew that this medium had long been associated with political criticism and protest in France.\(^{80}\)

In Manet’s image, a man, most likely a guardsman fighting on behalf of the Commune, lies dead in the middle foreground, while another body is cut off at its feet in the bottom right corner.\(^{81}\) The pants the person at the lower right wears are not indicative of a military uniform, implying that he is a Communard. The similarities to Rue Transnonain, le 15 avril 1834 (fig. 71), one of Daumier’s most famous lithographs, are striking. Both images denounce the use of violence as an acceptable solution to end civic unrest.\(^{82}\) In both works the central figure occupies a similar position; the body is closer to the right-hand side and rests on a diagonal. In Daumier’s print it is the head of an old man that is cut off at the bottom of the image, but both artists apply the use of cropping to similar ends, especially since they employ the same horizontal format to

---

80 The majority of Manet’s prints were etchings. His etchings were mostly produced in the early 1860s, and were often reproductions of his paintings. However, in the late 1860s and early 1870s, Manet increasingly turned to lithography. This form of printmaking allowed him to produce designs at a faster pace, since the creation process of lithographs is less painstaking than that of etchings, which require the constant biting and re-biting of a plate. Accordingly, in Guerre civile, as in several of his lithographs, Manet was able to imbue his print with political statements.


82 Daumier’s print relates to the republican insurrection that occurred in Paris in April 1834 after riots broke out in Lyon earlier that month; these were caused by the dreadful working conditions of factory workers. He illustrates the corpses of innocent civilians who were murdered by troops under the direction of King Louis-Philippe (1773-1850), in the Marais quarter, on the night of the attacks on April 15, 1834.
convey their message. A woman appears on the left in Daumier’s lithograph, and while there is no such figure in Manet’s print, a further connection can be drawn between the two artworks if one considers her position. Her entire body is stretched out on the floor, much like that of the main figure in Manet’s print, and her feet (more than any of her other body parts) stand nearest to the viewer linking her to the man whose physical form has been truncated in *Guerre civile*. All of the recumbent figures represent civilians, but whether they are viewed individually or collectively, they allude, in a similar vein to allegorical personifications, to a larger entity; these examples show the harmful subjugation brought on republican beliefs at different moments in French history. The dreadful bestiality of the oppressors is magnified in Daumier’s *Rue Transnonain, le 15 avril 1834* by the presence of the dead baby squashed under the weight of his father. The white light that shines from the top right corner onto these two figures highlights their innocence. In turn, in Manet’s work it is the inclusion of a white flag or handkerchief near the right hand of the central figure (almost situated in an identical location as the baby in Daumier’s print), an object signaling surrender in combat but which has been ignored by the Versaillais in this case, that renders this piece all the more chilling. The darkness of the corpse accentuates the sheer savagery symbolized by troops killing their fellow countrymen. An element of desolation marks Manet’s print, because like his predecessor, he opted to exclude the aggressors from his scene. Militarism was merely a convenient way for those in power to avoid resistance when faced with political adversity.

It is undeniable that Manet blamed Thiers’s and MacMahon’s leadership for the massacres that occurred during the Paris Commune, because a more peaceful outcome, one with less

---

83 In her article on Manet’s *Guerre civile*, Jacquelynn Baas identifies this piece of cloth as a white handkerchief to underscore the political nature of the artist’s print. Baas, “Edouard Manet and Civil War,” 41.
bloodshed, could have been reached if moderation had prevailed. Manet’s print implies that the casualties the civil war imposed on the Communards is not only measurable by the number of bodies they lost in warfare. The excruciating pain can also be seen through the stacks of stone that form the barricade in Guerre civile. Manet scratched a lot of short vertical lines onto the stones that appear above the middle part of the main figure’s body and on those to his left. These lines suggest wounds, and that the very device that was meant to provide protection has been permanently damaged due to the excessive brutality of street warfare. The somber reality is that by the end of the Commune, the Versaillais had achieved their goal, which was to wipe out a large portion of the revolutionary population in Paris. On the final day of la Semaine sanglante, when the Commune had been crushed, MacMahon made an announcement that underlined this sentiment: “Inhabitants of Paris, Paris is delivered! To-day the struggle is over. Order, labor, security are about to revive.” The Commune was discredited; its laws were negated, and Paris was left without a governing body. It is the ferocity with which the Versaillais had conducted “business” that Manet aimed to point out in his works. As a pacifist these acts of terrorism only strengthened Manet’s republican spirit and, as the decade wore on, he firmly believed that the Communards living in exile deserved to be granted amnesty.

As if the killing of 20,000 people was not enough, after the war the Versaillais held 43,522 Communards prisoners, and it took twenty-four councils (spread out over several years) to determine the fate of these individuals. Treated brutally, these individuals were killed, sentenced to prison, deported to New Caledonia (which was the furthest French colony from

---

84 Quoted in Lissagaray, History of the Paris Commune, 383.
85 Manet’s own letters attest to this position. See, Manet by Himself, ed., Wilson-Bareau.
86 Rougerie, Paris libre 1871, 257.
European soil), or if fortunate, acquitted.\textsuperscript{87} Communards were treated as enemies in war; they were relegated as outsiders, and it took several years before they were reinstated as common citizens of the country.\textsuperscript{88} It truly was one of French history’s darkest moments.

2.11 Towards the Start of a Presidency

To restore social stability in the country the Versaillais felt justified in crushing the Paris Commune, as this would put an end to all notions of a “socialist” republic in France.\textsuperscript{89} Moreover, to reduce the chances of any oppositional retaliation from occurring, the Versailles government terminated the Garde nationale’s operative role in August 1871. After all the mayhem, Thiers also tightened press laws once more to maintain a stern order on communication, and the press in particular.\textsuperscript{90} With these measures in mind, Thiers started building the conservative republic he envisioned for France. He came to terms with the idea that a republican form of government could provide the country the greatest opportunity to succeed and to recover from its deteriorated status. Such a position was not without its share of controversy.

Thiers officially became the President of the Third Republic on August 31, 1871, yet he had essentially acted as the head of the country since being named chief executive of the newest

\textsuperscript{87} A table indicating the age and gender of these people, as well as the sentences they received is provided in Rougerie, \textit{Paris libre 1871}, 258-259.
\textsuperscript{88} The first convoy set sail for New Caledonia on May 3, 1872, and due to the length of the journey (it took over 100 days to reach the colony) and the unsanitary conditions on board, many people died on the ships. As a result, not all of the 4,586 individuals deported survived to serve their sentences. Ibid., 257.
\textsuperscript{89} The workingmen of Paris were viewed as socialists, and the Commune embodied socialism’s battle against capitalism. To monarchists, the Commune represented the rise of violent insurgents who would destroy civilization because of their hatred for landowners, the clergy, and the bourgeoisie.
\textsuperscript{90} Patrice de MacMahon upheld these laws under the following presidency. Bertrand Tillier, \textit{La République. La caricature politique en France, 1870-1914} (Paris: CNRS, 1997), 15.
French government. Republicans who fought against the Second Empire, the Gouvernement de la Défense nationale, and the conservative Versailles government, objected to this arrangement because to them Thiers was an executioner, not a liberator, or a champion of the Republic. Many republicans distrusted Thiers because they believed that he would stop at nothing to achieve power, and that he would prioritize his own agenda over that of the State. A man who had been such a fervent adherent of King Louis-Philippe and the July Monarchy, and who supported the candidacy of Louis-Napoléon afterwards, simply could not be cognizant of the Republic’s best interests. On the other hand, monarchists were displeased with Thiers for even considering the notion of reorganizing the country as a proponent of the Republic. The politician lost credibility amongst the elite and the men who encouraged his resolution to vanquish the Commune. Having said that, Thiers did earn the respect of men from both sides by coming up with an effective plan to pay off the indemnities owed to Germany. He called on the French population to raise the funds by agreeing to two large bonds; the nation responded fervently to this task. Even Daumier could not help but find pride in France’s expeditious effort in accumulating the necessary resources. While not defending Thiers, Daumier did show a German soldier crushed under a mountain of coin bags in *Je t’en avais comblé, je t’en veux accabler* (fig. 72). This was

---

91 The title of president was conferred on Thiers after Jean-Charles Rivet (1800-1872), a highly ranked functionary, proposed this amendment to be voted through by the assembly. Jean Garrigues, “Les élus du centre gauche en 1871,” *Parlement[s], Revue d’histoire politique* 16 (2011-12), 27.

92 His status was similar to Émile Ollivier’s during the days of the liberal Empire.

93 Republicans believed that the foundation of a “true” republic – that incorporated all of France – provided the best opportunity of uniting the country, and could, once and for all, put an end to the long era of revolutions in France. Whether the brutal repression of the Commune by the Versaillais would permanently undermine this goal, or whether the Commune’s existence demonstrated irrevocably how opposed people were to autocratic power remained an open question after 1871.

proof that the nation could rally together on certain matters. One way or the other France was about to experience the dawn of a new era, as a terrible span of twelve months was drawing to a close and a new year was on the horizon.

2.12 The Summary of a Terrible Year

For republicans, what began as a display of hatred towards Napoléon III and his ambitions to engage in warfare for the purposes of self-aggrandizement and empire, morphed into a sense of mistrust towards those who governed the country from the inception of the Gouvernement de la Défense nationale through to the Versailles government that repressed the Paris Commune. The irritation republicans expressed towards Napoléon III completely boiled over when the emperor declared war on Prussia in the summer of 1870. Artists visually derided the emperor’s actions in a multitude of political prints that surfaced throughout the duration of the Franco-Prussian War. However, new targets also emerged as the country remained in danger, and leadership at the highest levels proved lackluster. Frustration and disbelief amongst Frenchmen mounted as individuals, such as Trochu and Favre, turned out to be incompetent authorities when it came to the defense of la patrie. Similarly, the leading caricaturists at the time rigorously attacked Thiers’s malicious maneuvers once he became the chief executive of the Assemblée nationale in February 1871. It simply was not possible to commend an individual who used force and arms, and raised money to kill the French – no matter the circumstances. As a result, the face of the

---

95 Though not known at the time when Thiers was named President of the Third Republic, France would go on to pay the money owed to Germany eighteen months before its original due date. Ibid., 214.

96 These men were keener on admitting defeat than on demonstrating that they were worthy leaders of the Gouvernement de la Défense nationale.
enemy had changed on multiple occasions, giving rise to a period that witnessed scores of spirited visual charges against French political figures.

To express their discontent with developing affairs, Daumier, Gill, Le Petit, and Manet continued to use prints as their graphic means of communication. In contrast to wood engravings from the penny press or prints from illustrated dailies, such as *Le Petit Journal, Le Monde illustré* (1857-1940), and *Le Petit Parisien* (1876-1944), the political prints made by these artists were not merely made for documentary purposes. They were produced out of the artists’ own volition, and show a rich display of satirical bite. These images of political opposition were meant to cause viewers to react against the oppression of authorities. All four of these artists, at one point or another, dealt with the most pressing issues that the nation had to grapple with over the course of the terrible year that began with the Franco-Prussian War and ended shortly after the suppression of the Paris Commune. These men did not shy away from any topic. They chose emotional subjects that had political relevancy and allowed them to propagate particular messages. Occasionally, they moved away from all the upsetting news by opting to focus on some of the republican leaders who distinguished themselves in a positive manner – as was the case with Gill’s and Le Petit’s representations of Gambetta. However, on the whole, these four artists targeted oppressive figures in their prints, because as adherents of pacifist beliefs they aimed to vilify the individuals whose actions they regarded as immoral.

As anti-imperialists, it is no surprise that these republican artists attacked Louis-Napoléon – whether it was before (as discussed in Chapter 1) or after the fall of the empire. Yet, the same rules applied to Thiers and the Versaillais once the civil war broke out in France in 1871, even though neither of these artists was considered a socialist or a Communard. While the Paris Commune may have had questionable political convictions, it was the Versaillais who acted as
barbarians attacking the Communards with force. This was deemed unacceptable. The men led by Thiers were worse than the Prussians. Daumier, Manet, Gill, and Le Petit wanted to disassociate themselves at all costs from the evils embodied by the monarchists fighting on behalf of Versailles, since they did not share their political views or their ethical standpoint. Ultimately, these artists were more focused on showing the wrongs of the Versaillais, than illustrating the virtues of the Commune, because what they feared most was that the civil war would play into the hands of the monarchists. In the opinion of monarchists, a conservative republic was not sufficient; they desired a return to a monarchy. And as the following years would demonstrate, the fate of Third Republic was still at stake.
Chapter 3: An Ongoing French Debate, 1871-1877: The Hardships of Settling the Political Order of the Regime

While the Paris Commune was defeated shortly after the Franco-Prussian War, the 1870s that followed were hardly a time of peace and stability in France. Instead, the first decade of the Third Republic was marked by hostility between the different political factions, as they all vied for constitutional power and control over the country. The authority of the government was repeatedly contested, and the outlook of the political administration oscillated like a pendulum. The period between 1871 and 1877 was particularly fraught with uncertainty because conservative figures governed the country, yet the regime in place was a republic.¹ The greater part of this seven-year period was known, politically, as the gouvernement de l’Ordre moral, as Patrice de MacMahon presided over the nation. It was only at the end of 1877, after crucial elections resulted in favor of republicans, that the tide began to turn en route to the establishment of the “republican” Republic. During these years, censorship still played a major role in dictating what forms of visual representations the government sanctioned, but by no means was this a period dominated by illustrations of social mores, as was the case for much of the Second Empire and the 1880s – once liberal press laws were passed in July 1881.² The Parisian press kept growing at this time, and political content, including imagery, was at the forefront of the

¹ In this chapter, the term conservative refers to the political factions that wanted to subvert the Republic in favor of restoring either the Bourbon or orléaniste dynasty, or a Bonapartist empire.
² These press laws will be discussed in greater detail in the following chapter.
news as the pool of eligible voters increased and citizens aligned themselves with competing political parties.\(^3\)

In this time of so many political voices, there are stock characters that come, on the part of the republican artists, to represent the different political stripes. The figures in question are the Republic, an orléaniste, a légitimiste, and a bonapartiste. The ideologies and desires of the main political parties at the time are captured in the very essence of these stock figures. Each of these figures personified a vast population of followers, and accordingly, viewers could easily identify with the character with which they aligned most strongly. Their presence in graphic works help chronicle the development of the political climate in France over these years. Amongst republican artists, images of the Republic are most common because represented as an allegorical female figure, she is heroic. Unlike the other stock figures, who would rather see the restoration of a monarchy in some capacity, she champions a republican form of government, and thus is a protagonist.

In the 1870s, allegories were still a common form of representation in visual satire, and they were practically the only way in which female figures made an appearance in the political, visual realm. A major change did take place at this time when it came to allegorical depictions of the Republic. The Third Republic marked a new era in French history, and as a result, the Republic was commonly portrayed as a young figure. She was not some distant hope, but rather a physical entity who only got stronger as republicans increasingly made their mark felt in the political arena. The Republic’s growth in prints from this period basically mirrors the success of the republican cause as it pertains to the opening decade of the Third Republic. In contrast,

\(^3\) By the early 1870s, the total of Parisian newspaper issues in circulation on a daily basis had surpassed one million, whereas in 1852 the number was closer to 150,000. Jean-Marc Léri, ed., *La presse à Paris 1851-1881* (Paris: Bibliothèque historique de la ville de Paris, 1983), 7.
allegorical representations of the Monarchy kept getting older, and she was often shown in a state of decay, because the chances of a restoration had gradually faded. However, this transition did not take place overnight. The struggle was long and wearisome for members of all political parties as we shall see in this chapter.

When considering republican imagery during this time period, it also becomes apparent that not all images were meant to be critical satires of specific individuals. Instead, several examples showcase honorific portraits of key persons who altered the course of French political history. Beneficiaries of such treatment include Victor Hugo, Adolphe Thiers, a man who had been vilified only a few years earlier, and republican members of the Chamber of Deputies who were elected to this governing body in 1877.\(^4\) This type of imagery first surfaced as a means of depicting exemplary individuals in the face of oppositional threat. Later on, it signaled republican dominance. In essence, caricature became less relevant as a form of ridicule once those in charge shared the same principles as the majority of the graphic artists who made political art. Towards the end of the decade, highlighting different notable personalities in a representational manner became a common trend. A shift had occurred, which would grow even more noticeable in the following years.

The press often foretold reality, and it acted as an integral source for the critical response to historical context. Republicans still associated liberty and free thought with progress, and artists such as Gill, Le Petit, Daumier, and Manet politicized their works in ways to reflect their principles. It is during these years that Daumier’s printmaking career came to an end, as his

\(^4\) It is intriguing that within a period of five years, Thiers went from being an enemy of the republican press to a man honored for his contributions to the early Third Republic. This underlines the unpredictable nature of French politics at the time, giving prints an added level of significance as symbolic agents of current affairs.
eyesight started failing him and he had nearly gone blind by 1873. However, he sustained his regular production of lithographs before completely losing his eyesight, and the majority of his works deal with the state of the French regime while Thiers governed the country. Although these images feature fewer details than his earlier works, they do not lack any of their political verve. Meanwhile, the 1870s can be viewed as the high point of both Gill and Le Petit’s careers, and on certain occasions their works even appeared in the same issues of an illustrated journal. André Gill was the leading French caricaturist at the time. His images were omnipresent on the front page of *L’Éclipse* until the end of June 1876, when the journal opted to adopt a smaller format for its publications. Gill was unfazed by this alteration; he simply decided to edit his own journal, which he named *La Lune rousse*, in honor of François Polo’s *La Lune*, and started its production at the end of that year. Gill not only maintained the original dimensions of *L’Éclipse* for his *La Lune rousse*, he also chose to use up the second and third pages for his image (instead of only the first one) in many issues of this journal. This format better served Gill’s talent as an artist and it heightened the importance of the visual element of his newspaper.

Alfred Le Petit found success in the 1870s by becoming the lead caricaturist at *Le Grelot*. This satirical newspaper based itself largely on the design of *L’Éclipse* and published approximately 20,000 copies of each of its installments. *Le Grelot*, along with *L’Éclipse* and *La Lune rousse*, was one of the main illustrated satirical journals at the time and remained a

---


6 See for instance the issues of *L’Éclipse* from August 23, September 3, September 10, October 1, October 15, October 29, November 5, November 12, 1871.

7 *La Lune rousse*, just like *L’Éclipse* and *La Lune* before it, was a four-page journal.

republican emblem for the entire first half of the Third Republic. For Le Petit to have signed an extended contract with the journal proves the quality of his work and his value to the satirical press in the final third of the nineteenth century. As for Manet, the 1870s were not a particularly flourishing time of his career as a printmaker; however, he did create one of the most memorable works on paper of the entire decade to address the political scene in the early years of the Third Republic. Manet’s *Polichinelle* lithograph (fig. 73), dating from 1874, is a tour de force when viewed through the lens of the *gouvernement de l’Ordre moral*, which was in charge during this time period.*Polichinelle* was a cleverly disguised attack on the ultraconservative maréchal de MacMahon. It showed beyond doubt that, time and again, Manet was willing to place his art in the service of politics. Ultimately, this controversial image heightened Manet’s status as one of the leading republican artists of the 1870s.

All four artists, although working in distinct style, used prints to advance a shared core belief in the ideals of republicanism at a time when political structures of that new entity were fragile. They gave prints – primarily caricatures – a specific agency to keep republican sentiment alive during a volatile period in the history of the French Republic. Thus, at a time when the political arena experienced constant change, the consistency with which these artists delivered their messages by way of their prints shines through, and it is to the investigation of the relation between them and the climate of liberal republicanism that we shall turn next. Republicanism nearly collapsed at various stages throughout the 1870s, and prints played a large part in helping it survive and eventually establishing notions of the republic as they pertained to the governmental, parliamentary, and institutional realms as the start of the following decade approached. Prints had a direct impact on society because they created communities of shared
belief and interest, and the works of Gill, Le Petit, Manet, and Daumier were a driving force during a phase of French history that witnessed so much change.

3.1 Thiers: The First President of the Third Republic

Thiers’s presidency was off to a rocky start. Although the war with Prussia had been over for several months, the Prussians dictated the terms of the treaty signed between the two powers, and they remained on French soil until objectives of order were met by the French. This created unease amongst French citizens, and Thiers’s role in the crushing of the Paris Commune meant that people from all political spectrums questioned his leadership. They resented that Thiers was the president of a republican government.

As had often been the case in previous years, Le Charivari now relied upon Daumier to comment on political events in a satirical fashion. Less than two weeks after Thiers became the first president of the Third Republic, Daumier represented the president’s complex position in Le président de Rhodes (fig. 74). To show just how divided the Left and Right were and how precarious Thiers’s position was, the artist referred to ancient Greek history to deliver his message. In this lithograph dating from September 12, 1871, Thiers is shown as a modern-day Colossus of Rhodes, a statue that was erected on the Greek island in the third century BCE. The colossal statue stood at the entrance of the harbor at Rhodes and commemorated the island’s

---

9 The Prussians vacated French territories in stages only after payments were made by the French. For more on the Prussian retreat from France, see Jules Simon, The Government of M. Thiers: From 8th February, 1871 to 24th May, 1873, vol. 2 (New York: C. Scribner’s Sons, 1879), 211-216.

10 Even though Thiers had clearly been voted President of the Republic on August 31, 1871, members of the political Right felt cheated by this man. Meanwhile, the Left could not understand how the Assemblée nationale, forced into place by Bismarck earlier that year, could be in charge of determining who should preside over the country. Republicans claimed that Thiers was not in tune with the core values of a republic – he merely desired a position of power.
Whether the statue straddled the harbor, or it stood firmly on the ground remains debated (as no original representation of the statue exists today), but scholars agree that the figure was posed with its legs apart. This is an element that Daumier incorporated into his own image to underline the political divide in France more effectively. The pieces of land on which Thiers stands on are inclined cliffs rather than flat surfaces. The cliffs are marked ‘droite’ and ‘gauche’ and a boat is steering its way through the opening. Portraying Thiers as a giant, a man known to be short in stature, adds to the irony of the image. He is only draped at the waist, showcasing his robust upper body; however, it also calls attention to his scrawny legs, which could give way at any moment. The pressure of sustaining the two political sides, in Thiers’s case, will inevitably overwhelm him, and in the process, he might crush those who find themselves below.

Comparing Thiers to the Colossus of Rhodes was fitting, especially since the statue toppled over in 226 BCE due to an earthquake hitting Rhodes and other nearby regions. Thiers’s downfall might not be caused by natural disaster, but his livelihood was in danger because of the onslaught of political animosity he faced from the primary political parties at the time. The morale in the country was not particularly strong after suffering through a year of warfare, and the weight of such a burden might also topple the president. For how long Thiers would be able to maintain his upright stance remained to be seen. However, Daumier clearly suggested that time was ticking, as the tip of the head mast of the boat that passes underneath him in the print

---

11 For more on the history of the Colossus of Rhodes, see Herbert Maryon, “The Colossus of Rhodes,” The Journal of Hellenic Studies 76 (1956), 68-86. Maryon provides a reconstructed sketch of the statue’s probable pose.
12 Ibid., 76.
could pierce his body in a very painful area as his legs hyperextend sideways, forcing him to potentially lose his command and his balance simultaneously.

Oddly, since the start of September 1871, Thiers’s name was attached to the republic, yet he embodied conservative values. Here was a man whose leadership role perhaps should not have extended beyond his position as chief executive of the Assemblée nationale. To which political party did he really belong? What type of regime would he endorse not only in name, but more importantly in doctrine? This cloud of uncertainty loomed over French citizens, and it led Alfred Le Petit to imply that Adolphe Thiers was a chameleon a few months into his presidency. In *Addition* (fig. 75), an image published in *Le Grelot* on November 19, 1871, Le Petit depicts Thiers as a multifaceted character. On the left, Thiers is dressed as a légitimiste and the words he utters are: “*vive le roi!*” indicating his support of a restoration of a monarchy. In the middle, Thiers takes on the body of an eagle; he wears a puny crown which also has a symbol of an eagle on it, and he claims ties to Bonapartism by saying: “*vive l’empereur!*” On the right, the president wears the clothes of a bourgeois civilian, while a large, red Phrygian cap covers the top of his head, and he declares his allegiance to the Republic by stating: “*vive la république!*” A horizontal line is drawn below the different representations of Thiers, and by adding up features of the three figures, the complete one that emerges is a chameleon.

The body of the chameleon is blue, green, and red, because it is meant to equate to the predominant color associated with each faction represented here (blue/ légitimiste, green/ bonapartiste, red/republican). One needs to be wary of the chameleonic Thiers because he changes his political behavior according to the situation. Each figure is shown from a different angle – the légitimiste is pictured from the front, the bonapartiste is shown in profile, and the republican is in a three-quarter pose – since Thiers’s political attitude appears to fluctuate on a
daily basis. The only common thread between the three portrayals of Thiers is that each version
has crab claws instead of a nose and mouth. Transforming Thiers’s face into crab claws is meant
to stigmatize him as a reactionary and deceitful figure. Over the course of his career, Thiers had
been a spokesperson for King Louis-Philippe, Napoléon III, and a republic, and his hesitancy to
demonstrate complete loyalty towards a particular party in the early 1870s raised questions as to
the true color the regime would display moving forth.

3.2 Criticizing Monarchist Ambitions

Since Thiers was seen as someone who could change his political allegiance at any given
moment, both the Left and the Right tried to sway him in their respective direction. For
republican illustrated journals, it was critical to visually express the flaws that monarchists, and
their members who aspired to be head of state, presented to the country. The goal was to
eliminate the possibility of a return to a monarchy, made all the more important, because the
young Republic was still exceedingly fragile. Republican caricaturists wasted no time in deriding
their political opponents, leading to a string of images pertaining to the deficiencies of the Right
in the immediate weeks and months that followed the beginning of Thiers’s presidency.

The Right was seen as old and reactionary as portrayed by Daumier in Je vous assure que
vous serez très bien assise (fig. 76). In this lithograph, an allegory personifying the Right holds
out a chair for the figure of France to sit on. The juxtaposition between the two figures is
manifested in their age and appearance. France is a tall, youthful looking figure that stands
upright, and has a shield at her hands as she is ready to go to battle. In this case, the
confrontation is political rather than physical. Maintaining her political stance against a

13 This motif also underlines the longevity of the statesman’s political career. See, Guillaume
Doizy and Jacky Houdré, Bêtes de pouvoir: Caricatures du XVle siècle à nos jours (Paris:
Nouveau Monde éditions, 2010), 108.
monarchy is France’s prime concern. Meanwhile, the Right is characterized as a decrepit old woman, bent over with age. The rapid, successive lines outlining her clothing and her hair call attention to her frail body and unkempt appearance. She is a deceptive figure, a detail underlined by the grin on her face, because while she claims to offer France a comfortable chair, it is in fact broken. The bottom portion of the right hind leg is missing and there is a hole in the middle of the frayed and collapsing seat. The Right is providing no stability to the country, as she desires to physically ground her counterpart. Moreover, even though the word ‘monarchie’ is inscribed on the chair it is pitiable; it has no semblance to a throne, and the age of the chair may convey the outdatedness of the idea of a monarchy. Thus, it is inadequate for a figure of France’s stature. Not surprisingly, France rejects her counterpart’s offer by dismissing it with her indifferent glance.\textsuperscript{14} Simply put, France does not trust the advances that the Right makes towards her, as the latter personifies the majority of members in the Assemblée nationale. These politicians had fought resolutely against the establishment of a republic, keeping France in a state of uncertainty and agitation in the interest of their monarchical hopes.

Specific individuals were also targeted during this campaign, and perhaps none more so than Henri, comte de Chambord (1820-1883), grandson of King Charles X (1757-1836) and the man who had the potential to restore the Bourbon dynasty. It was only two days after Daumier’s \textit{Je vous assure que vous serez très bien assise} appeared in \textit{Le Charivari}, that André Gill’s \textit{Les pretendants; Henri V} (fig. 78) was published in \textit{L’Éclipse}. In this image, the comte de Chambord

\textsuperscript{14} Daumier conveyed a similar exchange between Jacques Bonhomme, a man who personified the everyday Frenchman, and an allegorical representation of Monarchy in a print (fig. 77) published by \textit{Le Charivari} in 1872. In this lithograph, Monarchy offers her hand in marriage to Jacques Bonhomme who refuses to accept her proposal. He wants nothing to do with her (i.e. the everyday person does not want a monarchy). The facial features of the Right in Figure 76 and those of Monarchy in \textit{Jacques Bonhomme; Merci, ma vieille, trop décépite!}... (fig. 77) are almost identical.
is portrayed as a very obese man who weighs down the horse on which he is propped. It is meant to be an equestrian statue, but there is nothing regal about this representation. The weight of the comte’s stomach, which is shown as a massive, bulging sphere, suffocates the horse which is about to collapse under the exorbitant pressure. The animal’s legs are curled up instead of standing upright, its head stoops very low, and its tongue sticks out as if it were breathing its last grasp.

Gill’s image is even more condescending when one compares it to the *Equestrian Statue of King Henri IV* (fig. 79) located on the Pont-Neuf in the heart of Paris. This commemorative sculpture was created by François-Fréderic Lemot (1771-1827) in 1818 in honor of Henri IV – the first of the French Bourbon kings. The statue’s purpose is to glorify this distinguished individual. In Lemot’s work, Henri IV wears a laurel wreath and he holds a scepter decorated with fleurs-de-lis in his right hand. He has a stoic expression and his commanding pose aligns him with representations of great leaders in the ancient world. However, in Gill’s depiction these elements are nonexistent. Horses, which often exemplify military prowess, here accentuates the rider’s inadequacy. In addition, the comte de Chambord, who was sometimes referred to as Henri V in jest because of his desire to be named king, is not crowned by a laurel wreath. The absence of this feature calls attention to his balding forehead and his large cheeks which droop down over his equally large chin. Instead of wearing a breastplate to illustrate his heroism like Henri IV, the comte de Chambord sports suspenders to support his potbellied body.

---

15 A rich summary of the statue can be found in Geneviève Bresc-Bautier, “Henri IV au Pont-Neuf,” in *Art ou politique? Arcs, statues et colonnes de Paris*, Geneviève Bresc-Bautier et al. (Paris: Action artistique de la ville de Paris, 1999), 36-41. An earlier equestrian statue honoring Henri IV had been erected in the first half of the seventeenth century but was destroyed during the French Revolution. The current version was commissioned to replace the original statue.
The comte de Chambord is clearly a glutton and may consume the cock that represents France at any moment. By depicting Henri V in such a manner, Gill was likely referencing Daumier’s *Gargantua* (fig. 80), a lithograph that attacked King Louis-Philippe as the voracious giant in François Rabelais’s (1483?-1553) literary masterpiece. *Gargantua* is one of Daumier’s most recognizable prints, and it led to the artist’s imprisonment for a six-month term in the early 1830s. According to Daumier, Louis-Philippe was a monstrous figure, and Gill aimed to convey a similar message about the comte de Chambord in his *Les pretendants; Henri V*. This visual parallel added to the insulting nature of Gill’s print. The fleur-de-lis in the shape of a scepter in the comte de Chambord’s right hand (the only similarity this image shares with the *Equestrian Statue of King Henri IV*), might serve as the sharp tool with which he can carve up the fowl. The inclusion of these two details was a calculated act on Gill’s behalf, because both the fleur-de-lis and the (Gallic) rooster were political emblems. The Gallic rooster has been associated with France for many centuries, but its popularity really emerged during the French Revolution and it was over the course of the Third Republic that it truly became a national symbol. Much like the tricolor (blue, white, and red) flag, the rooster was a symbol of the nation of France as opposed to that of any one particular political party. Since the comte de Chambord was the monarchist pretender at the time, it is not surprising that he would revere the fleur-de-lis, while intending to feast on the rooster (i.e. the rest of the nation).

The fleur-de-lis also had strong attachments to the white flag, a flag that symbolized the French monarchy for many years and one that was favored by the légitimistes in the 1870s.

---

16 For an informative analysis of the significance of national emblems, such as the Gallic rooster, the tricolor flag, and the white flag (symbol of French monarchy), see Raoul Girardet, “The Three Colors: Neither White Nor Red,” and Michel Pastoureau, “The Gallic Cock,” in Pierre Nora, *Rethinking the French Past: Realms of Memory; Symbols*, vol. 3 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996), 3-26 and 405-430.
Henry V was supported by a group of hardcore légitimistes, known as the chevau-légers, who wanted to restore a monarchy in France and with it the use of the white flag throughout the country. Yet the comte de Chambord’s fixation with the white flag proved costly. He hindered the monarchists’ chances to rule the country in 1871 (and later in 1873) by refusing to fly the tricolor flag. He had stated in a letter dating from July 1871 that the only way he would rule the country was if the white flag was accepted by all: “je suis prêt à tout pour aider mon pays à se relever de ses ruines et à reprendre son rang dans le monde; le seul sacrifice que je ne puisse lui faire, c’est celui de mon honneur … FRANÇAIS, Henri V ne peut abandonner le drapeau blanc d’Henri IV.” For those who wanted to see the Republic grow, it was crucial to vilify the comte de Chambord and this ultraconservative perspective because of all of the negative connotations associated with the white flag. The white flag “stood for reverting to the Old Regime and for military defeat, for renunciation of the principles of 1789 and for the destruction of “la Grande Nation”.” Accordingly, in a lithograph dating from March 2, 1872 Daumier represented the comte de Chambord as someone who tried to do away with the tricolor flag at all costs. In Satané drapeau!... Impossible de faire passer la couleur! (fig. 81), the comte is turned into a laundryman who is unable to wash out the red and blue parts of the tricolor flag even though it is being soaked in a pool of substance labeled ‘blanc de lys’, meaning it should turn white to honor the monarchy. Instead, the flag maintains its true colors leading the comte to swear at it in

17 The meaning of the term chevau-légers as it pertains to the Third Republic is defined by Pierre Pierrard in Dictionnaire de la troisième République (Paris: Librairie Larousse, 1968), 64.
18 “I am ready to do everything to help my country recover from its downfall and to regain its status in the world; the only sacrifice I cannot do for it, is to give up my honor … Frenchmen, Henri V cannot abandon the white flag of Henri IV.” Henri V’s letter is reproduced in its full length in Fresnette Pisani-Ferry, Le coup d’état manqué du 16 mai 1877 (Paris: Robert Laffont, 1965), 54-56.
frustration. The motif of washing a flag to alter its colors was one that Daumier had already used earlier in his career for satirical purposes. In 1832, Daumier had depicted Jean-Charles Persil (1785-1870), the comte d’Argout (1782-1858), and Marshal Soult (1769-1851) attempting to remove the blue and red parts of the tricolor flag in Les Blanchisseurs; Le bleu s’en va mais ce diable de rouge tient comme du sang (fig. 82). The link between the two works is evident, and it made the disparaging acts of Henri V all the harder for republicans to swallow. The comte de Chambord was the enemy incarnate. The regime he envisioned would have caused major setbacks to an era of political repression many of those who were fighting for their political freedom in the 1870s easily recalled.

From the days of the French Revolution, the white flag had sparked controversy and symbolized civil war in the eyes of many. As the images by Gill and Daumier show, proving the unsuitability of a pretender who aspired to be head of state was part of their mission of supporting the Republic. Strong oppositional views could not coexist, and living in a republic without republican principles clearly vexed members of the Left.

3.3 The Government That Divides Us the Least

Thiers felt that the restoration of a monarchy was impossible, and thus he embraced the Republic. Now in his 70s, Thiers believed that a republic was the form of government that divided the country the least. He was an orléaniste at heart, meaning he lobbied for a

---

20 All three of these men were proclaimed enemies of the republican movement during the days of the July Monarchy. They all loathed the journals that were anti-monarchist, and Persil and d’Argout, in particular, were involved in suppressing freedom of the press in the 1830s.
21 On the history of the Third Republic, see Jules Simon, The Government of M. Thiers: From 8th February, 1871 to 24th May, 1873, and J. P. T. Bury, Gambetta and the Making of the Third Republic (London: Longman, 1973). Bury’s book is based on an array of private papers and published material related to Gambetta and his contemporaries. This source is also part of a three-volume study that the author has written about the political career of Gambetta.
conservative republic – but a republic nonetheless. Under Thiers’s leadership the Republic was at its most conservative in 1871, and his call to arms to crush the Paris Commune was dreaded by those on the Left. However, the majority of his political actions and foreign policies in 1872 earned him a level of acceptance from ardent Leftists. Thiers’s commitment to liberate the country by making his greatest priority the paying off of the war indemnity to the Germans was particularly exemplary. Before the end of 1871, one-fifth of the indemnity had to be settled, with the other portion to be paid by 1875. Yet midway through the year, Thiers carried out plans to finalize the payments by the end of 1873.

It is around this time, that Gill decided to depict the President of the Republic mounted on a gigantic cannon ready to fire a shell in the shape of a money bag at the enemy (fig. 83). In the distance on the left, one can see the outline of a Prussian helmet at which the heavy artillery is aiming. When France had paid an installment of the indemnity a year earlier, Daumier did not praise Thiers directly in his *Je t’en avais comblé, je t’en veux accabler* (fig. 72), but by August 1872, the president was gaining the respect of his peers, including some of those who had previously attacked him. At the bottom right corner of Gill’s image, a large piece of paper is rolled out and it serves as a notice to the Germans that the payment is guaranteed by order of the French Republic. Since the country was being liberated at a swift pace, Gill had no issues associating this accomplishment with Thiers’s efforts. Taxes were raised on certain commercial goods, such as alcohol, sugar, tobacco, and soap, but ultimately the tactic proved successful in raising the necessary funds: the compensation exacted by the victors was paid in its entirety by

---

22 Article 7 of the traité de Francfort outlines that the French needed to pay 5,000,000,000 francs to the victors. One billion had to be given over at the end of 1871. For more on the conditions of payment and how the French went about collecting the money, see Simon, *The Government of M. Thiers*, vol. 2, 211-242.
September 1873. Briefly put, when it came to the liberation of the country, Thiers did what was best for the entire population – an action that suited a president of a republic. It was a selfless act that deserved recognition. As intimated by Gill’s print, Thiers was not impartial to the Republic and the pivotal role he played in freeing France from enemy occupation was probably the best way he could right a wrong. The fact that the debt was paid off without completely altering the European balance was another testament to Thiers’s hard work. Dealing with Bismarck and the Germans was no easy task, and Thiers had to be a smooth operator of some sort to expedite the original entente with France’s opponent.

In 1872, Thiers’s willingness to accept the Republic also drew him further apart from monarchists. When it came to his presidency, it appeared that the Left offered Thiers a greater level of support than did the Right. There were even signs that a fusion between Thiers and Gambetta would be possible, as time and again each of the two men made headway in pleasing the principles of the other. That year, Gambetta toured greater parts of the country with the hope of turning rural people, who traditionally affiliated with the Right, into advocates of the Republic. Gambetta’s tours proved more successful in certain areas than others, but he worked tirelessly to break down the barrier between urban and rural folk, contending that members of the bourgeoisie and rural workers should not be treated differently. Gambetta’s mission was to rally people together, and some of the speeches he gave while on tour were published in print form and sold for small sums (i.e. 10 centimes per copy) as propaganda pieces. While campaigning

---

23 Ibid., 228.
24 For a detailed account of their relationship during the early years of the Third Republic, see Bury, *Gambetta and the Making of the Third Republic*, 27-35.
25 Gambetta wanted rural workers to have a clear understanding of the connection between their affairs and national politics. To learn more about the popularity of Gambetta’s tours and the content of some of his more important speeches, see Bury, *Gambetta and the Making of the Third Republic*, 94-127.
in Grenoble in September, Gambetta preached egalitarian ideals and proposed sharing power with the *nouvelles couches sociales*. Members of the Right were convinced that such beliefs and the use of such terminology would infuriate Thiers and force him back towards their own party. However, Thiers did not condemn Gambetta’s actions. From then on, the Right was truly enraged at both of these men, and the conservatives began plotting ways to overturn Thiers.

Albert de Broglie emerged as the leader of the opposition to the Republic in the Assemblée nationale after Thiers defended himself by insulting and verbally threatening the politician during a meeting on November 18, 1872 (though discussions had already been heated in sessions held on the previous days).²⁶ De Broglie was religious and fervently conservative. He strongly opposed any regime that aimed to make inroads towards democracy, and that was clearly a tipping point for him in 1872 (similarly, he found himself opposed to the liberalization of the Second Empire in the late 1860s).²⁷ For someone like de Broglie, Thiers had become too republicanized. How could it be that a man who had put an end to the Paris Commune, would not lead a party that openly campaigned against the Republic while presiding over the country?

Members of the Right continuously accused Thiers of giving the Republic fresh chances to

---

²⁶ For a detailed description of this incident, refer to Alan Grubb, *The Politics of Pessimism: Albert de Broglie and Conservative Politics in the Early Third Republic* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1996), 93-96. Tensions already began to rise on November 13, as Thiers saw the Left as the party of order and he implied that the Right was made up of agitators. The scarcity of sources analyzing the strategies of the Right in the early stages of the Third Republic make *The Politics of Pessimism: Albert de Broglie and Conservative Politics in the Early Third Republic* particularly valuable – much of the historiography of the period focuses on republican figures. Albert de Broglie was one of the key statesmen fighting on behalf of conservatives in the 1870s and his role in the political arena leading up to the May 16, 1877 incident cannot be overlooked. No biography of de Broglie exists prior to Grubb’s scholarly work.

²⁷ A thorough analysis of de Broglie’s political outlook is provided in Grubb, *The Politics of Pessimism*, 13-32.
survive. De Broglie wanted the acceptance of the Republic to be a provisional step – not a definitive one. Yet Thiers simply would not govern with de Broglie as a member of his cabinet.28

It was amidst the rising tension which played itself out in the Assemblée nationale that Alfred Le Petit made a print (fig. 84) showing Thiers about to toss a bowling ball at the feet of people whose figures resemble an assembly of bowling pins. The word ‘république’ is written across the bowling ball, and while the crowd of legs appears nondescript, a notable symbol emerges on the shoes of the individual nearest to Thiers (fig. 85). The fleur-de-lis is pictured along the tongue area of each shoe, identifying these figures as légitimistes. Thiers was clearly fed up with the attitude of légitimistes who had never seemed satisfied with the services he brought to the country from the beginning of his presidential inauguration. Most Right-wing individuals were not even willing to consider a conservative republic, as they felt that a monarchy was the sole form of salvation for France. The two sides increasingly mistrusted each other, and Thiers wanted to literally bowl them over – as implied by Le Petit’s image – just as they wanted to overthrow him. The divide only increased as the reactionary ways of the Right intensified. By claiming that the Republic was a temporary hindrance even though the regime had been declared the previous year, it was those on the Right who were acting in extreme fashion, seeking to cause an uprising by demanding change almost on a daily basis. As a result, Thiers is the protagonist in Le Petit’s Gare les quilles! It was not that members of the Left had suddenly adopted Thiers as one of their own, but they could see that he was not the main problem in their fight for the Republic’s consolidation. Thus, reassessing Thiers’s merit as President of the Republic became a priority for both sides of the political spectrum.

28 It became increasingly evident that Thiers would only tolerate affiliates of the Right Center (not the Right) to form part of his body of advisers.
3.4 Halting the Republic’s Progress

After the in-session altercations, a constitutional committee, known as the Commission des Trente, was elected later that November in order to draft a constitution for the country, seen as France had been without one since the fall of the Second Empire. The committee was made up of twenty-one men from the Right and nine from the Left – though the latter were closer to the Center: men of no real party. Albert de Broglie was one of the committee’s representatives. Although the Commission des Trente’s primary task was to formulate constitutional laws, it was outspokenly against Thiers’s presidency and tried to keep him in check as much as possible. One of the actions taken by the committee was to restrict Thiers’s freedom to intervene in the assembly’s debates.

This situation led Le Petit to cast Thiers as Gulliver trapped amongst the Lilliputians (fig. 86). This print was published by Le Grelot in mid-February 1873 and was a fitting rendition of how the Commission des Trente was treating the President of the Republic. Much like in Jonathan Swift’s (1667-1745) satirical masterpiece, *Gulliver’s Travels*, a group of tiny men are threatened by the size of the main character in Le Petit’s lithograph. Thiers, or the “New Gulliver”, is being tied down to the ground by Lilliputians who have either climbed up onto his body or surrounded him. The physical assault is carried out by twenty-two men (ten of whom have small numbers beside them), but Le Petit cleverly illustrated thirty men in total (eight are rushing off into the distance to seek help), to indicate that the Lilliputians in this case represent the Commission des Trente. Not only is Thiers turned into a prisoner by the race of tiny men, his ability to speak is violently removed. One of the figures has stitched up his mouth with a piece of string, reflecting his curtailed means to speak freely in front of the assembly. Certainly, the Commission des

---

Trente had taken this initiative, yet Le Petit’s print was prophetic, because a month later, the committee passed a law replacing Thiers’s presidential system with a parliamentary administration. This maneuver intended to give monarchists a firmer control on the country’s political proceedings. Their plan was effective, as a mere two months later (May 1873), Thiers was no longer President of the Republic. As such, the “New Gulliver” no longer addressed the Assemblée nationale at all.

While it was not definitive until May 24, 1873, the day Thiers was ousted as president, he was already losing command in the opening months of 1873. By occupying a role in the Commission des Trente, some of the most influential figures in the Assemblée nationale were eager to halt the progress of the Republic. The committee’s members were a real burden on Thiers, and he was essentially trapped because he could not fully exercise his presidential power. Whatever support he had from the Right before, had completely slipped away from him by 1873, as illustrated by Le Petit in *Le char de la République* (fig. 87). In this print, Thiers pilots a chariot in which an allegorical personification of France is being transported. Two horses act as the driving force of the chariot; however, one of the horses has been totally sidetracked. The horse in question is white, while the one striving to push ahead is red. The white horse represents the Right (i.e. monarchists), and the red horse embodies the Left (i.e. republicans). Combined with the blue dress worn by the allegorical figure, they stand for the tricolor flag. Given Thiers’s facial expression, it is evident that he is struggling to regain control of the white horse. Meanwhile, the red horse overtaxes itself and the strain it feels will leave an imprint. The posture of the red horse is very stiff; the chain that links to its collar is unbending unlike the one that has become loose around the white mammal. The former’s back is straight like an arrow, indicating just how hard

---

30 To examine the law’s significance further, see Grubb, *The Politics of Pessimism*, 101-104.
the animal is toiling in an attempt to inch ahead. The Left will undergo a similar strain in the political arena in the following months and years. In short, the fork in the road created by the poses of the horses underlines that the country is at a critical juncture, and significant change is pending.\textsuperscript{31}

Behind the leadership of the duc de Broglie, the Right concentrated its energy on bringing Thiers’s shortcomings to the fore, while simultaneously advocating for a replacement presidential candidate. When calling for Thiers’s resignation, the Right indicated that the president was not an aristocrat, and so he was not deemed fit to govern the country simply based on his social status. Since the majority of men who formed part of the Assemblée nationale were clerical, it was also noted that Thiers was not a religious man.\textsuperscript{32} And of course there was the issue that Thiers defended the Republic. Accordingly, de Broglie played a significant role in pushing for Patrice de MacMahon to be named the new president – a man he personally regarded as qualified for the task.\textsuperscript{33} Furthermore, de Broglie felt that should MacMahon succeed in overtaking the presidency, the two men could forge an alliance that would benefit the Right’s cause. The statesman’s conservative determination proved effective, as in April 1873 the Right practically forced out Jules Grévy (1807-1891) from his role as president of the Assemblée nationale – a position he had held since the government body was instituted in February 1871. This was a major loss for the Left, because Grévy was a proponent of republicanism (he

\textsuperscript{31} It is notable that a few weeks later, Gill drew a comparable image for \textit{L'Éclipse}. In \textit{Les batons dans les roues! Hue! cocotte, un dernier coup de collier...} (fig. 88), Thiers mans a horse-driven chariot with great difficulty, as several wooden sticks are caught between the spokes of one of the vehicle’s wheels. Unlike in Le Petit’s lithograph, colors do not play a significant role in Gill’s print; however, the message is similar.

\textsuperscript{32} Grubb, \textit{The Politics of Pessimism}, 116.

\textsuperscript{33} De Broglie believed that MacMahon was a candidate whom all sides of the Right coalition (légitimistes, orléanistes, and bonapartistes) could stand behind.
eventually became the President of the Republic in 1879), and it was yet another sign that the Right was gaining momentum in the political sphere.\textsuperscript{34} The grip on Thiers’s term as president kept tightening and it was only a matter of time before his opponents would force his dismissal. This frustrated the Left, as it could only mean one thing: someone even more conservative than Thiers (i.e. MacMahon) would preside over France.

3.5 The \textit{Septennat} is Introduced

Ties with Thiers were officially cut on May 24, 1873, and the very same day Patrice de MacMahon was named President. Albert de Broglie immediately occupied a pivotal role in the new president’s first ministry as the prime minister.\textsuperscript{35} The notion of a restoration was not farfetched, and even bonapartistes were thrilled by the turn of events, rekindling some of their strength for the first time since Napoléon III had passed away in January 1873. That said, the ministry that was established as a result of Thiers’s fall consisted primarily of légitimistes and orléanistes. Since these factions were still divided over certain matters (most notably the ideal candidate to designate as monarchical ruler) de Broglie did not feel as though it was the most opportune time to reestablish a monarchy.\textsuperscript{36} Instead, his efforts were expended towards

\textsuperscript{34} Thiers and Grévy were also on good terms; hence, the former lost someone he could rely on in difficult times.

\textsuperscript{35} Within the first weeks of MacMahon’s presidency, over a dozen prefects who had expressed their loyalty towards Thiers had been dismissed. For more on the growing tension between politicians of opposing parties in the wake of the new presidential term, see Heather Marlene Bennett, “Long Live the Revolutions: Fighting for France’s Political Future in the Long Wake of the Commune, 1871-1880,” Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2013, 200-208. Her work examines how the identities of France and the Republic merged over time in the 1870s in the wake of the Paris Commune and the political struggle that ensued in its aftermath. It is a very comprehensive source.

\textsuperscript{36} Although the comte de Chambord proved to be the lead candidate, his unwillingness to accept the tricolor flag, an issue that had already hindered the monarchy’s potential restoration two years earlier, continued to be a major obstacle. Orléanistes were irked by the comte’s uncompromising pride.
lengthening MacMahon’s presidency for as long as possible. Just because the Right longed for a monarchy, it did not mean that MacMahon’s reputation was tarnished. Accordingly, on November 20, 1873 the *septennat* was introduced in France.\(^{37}\) This event not only marked the Third Republic, it became a moment of great import in French history. The *septennat* was recognized as the presidential structure throughout the entire Third and Fourth Republics, and for much of the Fifth Republic – France’s current regime.\(^{38}\)

Although the restoration of a monarchy had not succeeded, many members of the Right felt that the *septennat* was the best way to have a conservative leader in place, at least for the near future.\(^{39}\) From the perspective of the Left, the silver lining in passing the presidential mandate law in November 1873 was that it formally acknowledged the Republic as France’s political regime. As suggested by Le Petit in *Les deux nourrissons; C’est pourtant le même lait!* (fig. 89), the offspring of the Republic is growing at a healthy pace. He is pudgy and in good spirits. His counterpart, a personification of the Monarchy, is visibly sick. The latter is feeble, and his facial features are emaciated. A motherly figure, accentuated by red, white, and blue clothing accessories, holds two babies in her arms, yet the one on the left is nearly twice the size of the one on the right. The one on the left represents the Republic as he is dressed in clothes that designate the tricolor flag. His appearance underlines his shared lineage with the nurse. Meanwhile, the other baby is fully clothed in white, rendering evident his identity as the

\(^{37}\) Initially, de Broglie and his colleagues pushed for a ten-year term, but the law officially recognized the duration of the presidency at seven years.  
\(^{38}\) It was only in 2002 that the *quinquennat* replaced the *septennat* – 44 years into the Fifth Republic’s existence.  
\(^{39}\) Bonapartistes were even optimistic that carrying out the first *septennat* would allow time for the Prince Imperial (1856-1879) to come of age. Napoléon III’s son was 17 when the new law was instituted, and the hope was that he could be next in line to lead the country. On the other hand, Chambord and his followers felt that the *septennat* ruined any chance of a return to a monarchy. Chambord castigated De Broglie for overseeing the *septennat*’s inception.
Monarchy. Even though the mother feeds the infants the same milk, as noted by the caption, the outcome on their bodies vastly differs. The nation will take its natural course, once the “future” has been born and nourished. In essence, the personification of the Republic will prosper, while the other figure, will presumably die. *Les deux nourrissons; C’est pourtant le même lait!* is the visual embodiment of the notion that monarchists represented the “old” and “backward” way of thinking, while republicans symbolized the “new” and “youthful attitude” of the nation’s political fortune. Since this print was published less than a month after the *septennat* was passed, Le Petit implied that something good did transpire from its inauguration. Conceptually, this was a victory for republicans, but overcoming MacMahon was not going to be an easy task, especially with de Broglie as his wingman. Both men envisioned strict orders for the regime.

### 3.6 MacMahon and the *Gouvernement de L’Ordre Moral*

MacMahon’s closest ties were to légitimistes, but he earned his reputation during the Second Empire receiving accolades for his military accomplishments. MacMahon was a distinguished man, but in the opinion of republicans, a military figure did not fit the bill of governing the country as President of the Republic. Having previously occupied the role of military general, MacMahon could not embody pacifism – an ideological problem that caused concern for the Left even before considering the Marshal’s personal political alliances. His lack of knowledge in the political arena is likely why he relied on de Broglie’s judgment to make important decisions. Many even felt that de Broglie manipulated the president, because the latter’s commanding presence was less forceful than it once was on the battlefield. It has been well documented, that even when de Broglie did not form part of the ministry, he remained MacMahon’s adviser as the

---

40 He served in the French Army and participated in many campaigns and battles throughout his illustrious career.
two maintained a close personal relationship. MacMahon’s character posed a similar threat to the Republic as when Louis-Napoléon had undermined the Second Republic, which increasingly became more conservative in 1850 and 1851. Was the second President of the Third Republic capable of a coup like the man who awarded him the distinction of Marshal of France? Time would tell, but MacMahon’s principles leaned towards its probability.

Once MacMahon became president, any form of clemency that participants in the Commune had benefited from in the previous years were revoked. MacMahon was a crucial commander in Versailles’s fight against the Paris Commune, and he viewed Communards as criminals. In an act of revenge and hatred, inquiries into the incidents that sparked the Commune were conducted under his jurisdiction. The repressive attitude towards those involved in the Commune led many, including Gustave Courbet, to take up exile in 1873. It was also at this time that Henri Rochefort was deported to New Caledonia. While Rochefort was originally sentenced to deportation for life, he had been carrying out his prison sentence in France, because Victor Hugo had successfully convinced Thiers that a man of Rochefort’s stature deserved a better fate – even in punishment. However, such pleas were reversed by MacMahon, and thus, Rochefort was removed from prison in the southwest of France and was sent to New Caledonia in August 1873, where he arrived four months later. Not surprisingly, motions for amnesty were rejected during MacMahon’s presidential term, and men were still being condemned to life sentences of hard


Bennett, “Long Live the Revolutions,” 207. The fact that Thiers had given permission to Rochefort to carry out his sentence in France proved that he was more tolerable than MacMahon.
labor in 1876 because of their ties to the Commune.\textsuperscript{44} Even though only a fraction of republicans were radical revolutionaries (i.e. associated with the Commune), no republican abided by such oppressive punitive measures.

In addition, the \textit{gouvernement de l’Ordre moral} was very clerical in orientation. Under MacMahon’s presidency, religious buildings and public monuments were erected throughout France. Most notably, the decision to construct the Basilique du Sacré-Coeur at the top of the Butte Montmartre, the site of extreme radical sentiment, was an initiative led by MacMahon. Though construction of the basilica did not commence until 1875, the project was launched by MacMahon’s \textit{gouvernement de l’Ordre moral} in summer 1873 – before the \textit{septennat} was even introduced.\textsuperscript{45} The purpose of this symbolic monument was to expiate the sins of Communards and republicans at large. The Basilique du Sacré-Coeur epitomized French Catholicism and it promoted the conservative principles of MacMahon’s regime. While it took nearly forty years to complete, the basilica is white to conform with monarchist ideologies and it is also known to some as the “white citadel.”\textsuperscript{46} MacMahon also ordered to remove certain monuments with republican imagery or symbols in various cities. Many depictions of Marianne, the female personification of the Republic, were condemned. The Phrygian cap worn by some figures representing the Republic particularly disturbed the president. For instance, Paul Cabet’s (1815-1876) statue of Marianne erected in Dijon was destroyed in 1875 because it did not conform to

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{44} Prosper-Olivier Lissagaray, \textit{History of the Paris Commune of 1871}, translated by Eleanor Marx Aveling (London: Reeves and Turner, 1886), 463.
  \item \textsuperscript{45} For more on the initial terms of agreement to construct the Basilique du Sacré-Coeur, see Bennett, “Long Live the Revolutions,” 203-305.
  \item \textsuperscript{46} Claude Langlois, “Catholics and Seculars,” in \textit{Rethinking the French Past: Realms of Memory; Conflicts and Divisions}, vol. 1, edited by Pierre Nora, 126.
\end{itemize}
standards set by MacMahon’s government. A few years later, in 1880, a replica of the statue (fig. 90) was restored by republicans after MacMahon’s dismissal. In the early stages of the Third Republic, cultural symbols and institutions were contested spaces mirroring the ongoing debates that took place in the political arena. With each of its actions, the gouvernement de l’Ordre moral introduced restrictions that aimed to silence the Left and to combat the power of republicanism. Therefore, from the moment MacMahon stepped into office to the end of his presidency, republicans – including visual artists – felt the repercussions of his conservative agenda.

3.7 Censorship Issues

Since a republic was still in place, members on the Left felt entitled to the basic rights and liberties that were associated with such a regime, such as freedom of the press and the freedom to meet in larger groups to discuss political matters. However, instead of enjoying these humanist values, republicans witnessed a major setback on this front during the gouvernement de l’Ordre moral. Out of concern for public order, the government suppressed newspapers and many associations were dissolved in the first year of MacMahon’s presidency. De Broglie had a lot to do with the folding of republican journals and the censorship of specific prints at that time, as he persistently harassed those whom he felt threatened the well-being of MacMahon’s government. Anticlerical assaults and attacks against the president were practically non-existent because such imagery was immediately suppressed. Perhaps none were more affected by these harsh measures than André Gill, who had dozens of his caricatures censored under the first

---


few years of the gouvernement de l’Ordre moral.\textsuperscript{49} Even though L’Éclipse, the main journal Gill worked for during this period, had been paying a fee to the government since the days of the Second Empire in order to have permission to discuss and represent political matters in its issues, it did not prevent the government from seizing some of Gill’s works.

Gill was highly critical of this outcome and his inability to express himself freely during a time that was considered to be a republican regime. Thus, on November 30, 1873, only a few days after MacMahon’s presidential term was extended to a seven-year period, suspecting that matters would only worsen under MacMahon’s command, the artist declared the death of caricature as an art form in L’enterrement de la caricature (fig. 91). The emphasis should probably be placed on political caricature, but nevertheless, the situation was so flagrant in Gill’s opinion that the burial of this mode of representation best summarized the state of affairs. In this print, two men and a cat follow behind a cart in a funeral cortege. A pen with a sharp edge and a brush on the other side is attached to the back of the cat to identify these men and their profession. The two individuals are André Gill, characterized by his long hair, and François Polo, who is recognizable by his facial features.\textsuperscript{50} Since Polo was the editor-in-chief of L’Éclipse and Gill its main caricaturist, the loss was greater on the latter, and accordingly, he occupies the central position in this scene. The artist depicted himself in a manner that was widely familiar to his audience: he placed a disproportionately large head on a body creating a portrait-charge in the process. Although Gill is shown alive, it is as though viewers are witnessing his burial. By proclaiming the death of caricature, a central element of his livelihood, part of Gill was dying.

\textsuperscript{49} Bertrand Tillier discusses Gill’s hardships during those years, in Tillier, “Gill, caricature et politique,” Revue de la Bibliothèque nationale de France 19 (2005), 55-56.

\textsuperscript{50} For comparative purposes, see André Gill’s portrait of Polo from 1874 (fig. 92).
While he has his back against the viewer, he is likely weeping. Polo is offering his condolences to Gill, or at the least trying to comfort his friend by holding his hand at this sad moment.  

The hardship that Gill encountered was genuine, and as a result, he depicted *L’enterrement de la caricature* from his own perspective. His presence within the lithograph heightens the actuality of the desperate circumstances that caricaturists like himself were undergoing. This is a strategy that Gill had utilized earlier in his career (November 1871), and one that Alfred Le Petit also employed in *Mon boulet* (fig. 93) in July 1873. Feeling the weight of censorship bearing down on him, Le Petit is dripping sweat as he holds a giant-sized crayon in his hand. A prisoner’s ball and chain are wrapped around his left leg hindering his progress. Meanwhile, a small figure, Madame Anastasie, personifying censorship bursts into a maniacal laugh as she clutches a pair of scissors. The threat on these artists was so persistent that Gill actually lost some of his desire to produce caricatures in the months that followed the publication of his *L’enterrement de la caricature*. He directed a good part of his energy instead towards painting and writing theater plays. The shift in artistic output was such, that by 1875 a couple of his paintings were exhibited at the Salon for the very first time in his career. Although Gill continued to produce caricatures in 1874 and 1875, his decision to explore other venues of artistic production during that time period, meant that political caricatures of higher quality were harder to come by over those years in France.

The law requiring the written consent of an individual prior to the production of any caricature, first introduced by Napoléon III, was also observed during the *gouvernement de*

---

51 Of course, Polo and his journal would also experience a crucial loss if Gill were no longer to produce caricatures.

52 For more on Gill’s works between the latter half of 1873 and the early part of 1875, refer to Jean Valmy-Baysse, *André Gill: L’impertinent*, edited by Jean Frapat (Paris: Éditions du Félin, 1991), 159-161.
MacMahon forbade all caricatures of his likeness, and he even censored certain foreign satirical journals that targeted him. This caused an explosion in the number of allegorical representations in satirical prints throughout most of the 1870s. These circumstances led Gill to visually personify Madame Anastasie (fig. 94), a figure who embodied censorship in France but had yet to be portrayed in images previously. Anastasie was mentioned sporadically in the columns of journals prior to Gill’s depiction, and she became a mainstay after L’Éclipse published Gill’s lithograph on July 19, 1874. The name Anastasie links back to Pope Anastasius I (399-401), the man who inaugurated the notion of censorship in the Catholic Church. Since MacMahon’s presidency was synonymous with clericalism, personifying censorship as Madame Anastasie was a clever move on Gill’s behalf. While figures symbolizing censorship had appeared in visual imagery before, no caricaturist had labeled her Anastasie prior to Gill. More so than on any censor or other government official, Madame Anastasie is an attack on MacMahon’s character and his course of action.

Gill’s Madame Anastasie was created on the heels of having his previous print for L’Éclipse refused by authorities. In the July 12, 1874 issue of the newspaper, instead of showing Gill’s image on the front cover, L’Éclipse was driven to circulate a portrait of Thiers (fig. 95). As the caption to this image discloses, President Thiers always afforded the artist’s crayon a relative liberty. Anastasie is an old figure who wears glasses and is armed with a giant pair of scissors (not dissimilar from Le Petit’s portrayal of Censorship in Mon boulet (fig. 93)). An owl with

---

55 Columnists writing for satirical newspapers had referred to censorship as Madame Anastasie prior to the publication of Gill’s image.
large bulging eyes is perched on Anastasie’s shoulder in Gill’s image, emphasizing her vigilance. Her facial expression exposes her malicious character; her open mouth reveals two teeth that look like fangs, and the index finger she raises to the height of her glasses is extremely sharp, displaying her vicious side. Her lack of judgment is described in the article that accompanies Gill’s depiction in *L’Éclipse*: “Elle retourne les croquis du caricaturiste républicain avec des défiances infinies … dix fois sur sept elle accouche de cette solution: Je ne vois rien, donc il doit y avoir quelque chose: elle repousse le dessin.” Astiasie’s arbitrariness had already shown its rear end on several occasions under MacMahon’s reign. Another issue of *L’Éclipse* dating from 1874 clarifies the frustration experienced by Gill and his colleagues. When censoring an image, Anastasie “comme d’habitude, ne donna même aucune raison de son refus. Pour l’amour de Dieu!...qu’Anastasie nous dise donc une bonne fois ce qu’elle veut – ou ce qu’elle ne veut pas – si elle le sait elle-même, toutefois.” The unpredictability of censorship laws and the hatred of their implementation was the essence that Gill encapsulated in his representation of Madame Anastasie. The timing of publication of Gill’s image (fig. 94) and that of Thiers’s portrait (fig. 95) by Edmond Morin (1824-1882) in *L’Éclipse* would not have been lost on contemporary viewers. Even though the Fête nationale (Bastille Day) was not publicly celebrated until 1880, both works are only days removed from July 14 – the anniversary of the storming of the Bastille in 1789 – a celebration that many republicans observed in their private dwellings in the early 1870s. Knowing that artists faced restrictions at this time only heightened the aggravation of

---

56 “She returns the republican caricaturist’s sketches with endless resistance … ten times out of seven she rears the following solution: I do not see anything, therefore there must be something: she rejects the drawing.” Touchatout, “M’ame Anastasie,” *L’Éclipse* (July 19, 1874), 2.
57 “As always, [she] did not give any reason for her refusal. For the love of God! Can Anastasie for once tells us what she wants – or does not want – that is, if she even knows herself what she wants.” The editors of *L’Éclipse*, “Dossier d’Anastasie,” *L’Éclipse* (March 22, 1874), 2.
those in support of liberty of the press. Since the authorities did not seize visual attacks on censorship, Gill’s Anastasie became a tangible enemy. Portraying Anastasie required no written authorization, and her presence in the graphic arts was understood by all. Through Madame Anastasie, Gill had given new energy to oppositional caricature in the age of l’Ordre moral.

3.8 Manet’s Polichinelle

MacMahon was President of the Republic, but he did not support such a political regime. He merely served his country as an executive figure. Not only did he govern the Republic in a strict fashion, he had only contempt for politicians on the Left. Édouard Manet skillfully brought this sentiment to life in a lithograph titled Polichinelle (fig. 73). This lithograph was created after Manet had exhibited a similar watercolor at the 1874 Salon. The exact date of production for the print is unknown, but it is likely that Manet fashioned it in the spring of 1874, as the artist had reached an agreement with Le Temps (1861-1942) to have a large separate edition of the image published in June 1874. The original plan was to offer 8,000 subscribers of Le Temps the opportunity to own an impression of Manet’s Polichinelle. This was an attractive offer, since the image had an impressive scale, measuring at 58 x 42.7 cm. However, approximately 1,500 prints were seized and destroyed by the police, and at some point during the production process, authorities put an end to the entire project by confiscating the printing plate from which Manet’s image was struck. Government officials confiscated Manet’s work because they discerned a resemblance between the figure in the lithograph and Marshal MacMahon. M. Rançon (active

58 For more, see T. A. Gronberg, ed., Manet: A Retrospective (New York: Park Lane, 1990), 135.
59 The number of seized prints is borrowed from Robert J. Goldstein, Censorship of Political Caricature in Nineteenth-Century France (Kent: Kent State University Press, 1989), 205. Though brief, a useful account of the Polichinelle affair is provided by Philip Nord in “Manet and Radical Politics,” The Journal of Interdisciplinary History 19, n. 3 (Winter, 1989), 462. Only twenty-five prints signed by Manet have survived and scholars believe they were destined for collectors.
1874-1910), a man who served as an apprentice at Lemercier’s print shop at the time of the affair, claimed, when asked about the incident, that “le Polichinelle, c’était tout à fait le “maréchal Bâton” … le tirage se fit un dimanche … le lundi matin, des policiers pénétraient dans l’imprimerie, saisissaient les feuilles tirées et, séance tenante, les faisaient couper au massicot.”

The argument was that Manet’s print made a clear mockery of the president.

Even though Manet used his friend Edmond André (1837-1877), a fellow painter, as a model for his Polichinelle, the resemblance to MacMahon is hard to deny, and it is my contention that Manet intended his work to be an attack on the president. Manet’s Polichinelle conveys an older man who is characterized by his white facial hair (he has a white beard, a white moustache, and white eyebrows). While not identical, these traits are similar to MacMahon’s when compared to a photograph of the president (fig. 96) taken by Pierre Petit (1831-1909) in 1873. MacMahon does not have a beard, but his eyebrows are light in tone, his moustache is thick and white, and the hair on his head is of the same color. Pulcinella, a character first made famous by Italian commedia dell’arte plays in the seventeenth century, and adopted by the French as Polichinelle shortly thereafter, almost always sports a hat. This hat has taken on a variety of forms over the years. The one worn by Manet’s figure is quite tall, yet it further underlines another parallel between Manet’s print and MacMahon, especially when one views a photograph of the Marshal in military garb (fig. 97).

---

60 “The Polichinelle was without a doubt the “Maréchal Bâton” … it was printed on a Sunday … on the Monday morning, policemen entered the print shop, seized hold of the printed images, and cut them all up in quick succession.” Quoted in M. Tabarant, “Une histoire inconnue du “Polichinelle,” Bulletin de la vie artistique 4, n. 17 (September 1923), 368. For more on the association between MacMahon and the “Maréchal Bâton” see below.

61 Goldstein remarked that a resemblance between MacMahon and André could also be found. Goldstein, Censorship of Political Caricature, 205.
Another element in Manet’s work that draws a connection to MacMahon, is the stick held by Polichinelle. This object is a type of baton, an award bestowed on French military generals who have earned the distinction of Marshal. Unlike a staff, it is not rested on the ground because of its shorter size, and its round edges distinguish it from any type of scepter. MacMahon received this military distinction from Napoléon III during the Second Empire. The baton’s presence in Manet’s lithograph is controversial, because Polichinelle was not always equipped with an object in his hands, let alone a baton, in other visual representations or in theatrical plays. For instance, Manet opted not to portray the stage performer with a baton in a painting he made in 1873 (fig. 98). Clearly, the presence of this attribute in the lithograph was meant to bring attention to the commander’s persona and heighten the print’s political connotation; it is not a futile detail. MacMahon’s involvement in the vicious killing of Communards was being brought to the fore through this violent tool. Furthermore, the baton is a symbol of oppression, and it is identical to the one held by Ratapoil, a stock figure Daumier invented and showcased in dozens of prints during the Second Republic. Ratapoil is a shady figure who spreads Napoleonic propaganda by threatening others with the use of his cudgel (fig. 99). By virtue, Ratapoil is a supporter of imperialism, and he personifies Napoleonic repression. Ratapoil appeared in nine

62 According to Beth Archer Brombert, MacMahon was sometimes lampooned as “Maréchal Bâton” establishing an additional link between Manet’s Polichinelle and MacMahon. Beth Archer Brombert, Édouard Manet: Rebel in a Frock Coat (Boston: Little Brown, 1996), 349. It is also noteworthy that in February 1878, one of Le Petit’s prints was censored because it depicted an image of Polichinelle armed with a saber: “un superbe polichinelle armé d’un beau sabre de bois. Qui diable la Censure a-t-elle pu reconnaître la-dedans?” (a superb Polichinelle armed with a wooden saber. Who the hell could Censorship have recognized in such a figure?) The editors of Le Pétard (February 4, 1878), 4.

63 Jules Michelet (1798-1874), a reputable historian, and one of Daumier’s acquaintances, said of Ratapoil upon first seeing a visual rendition of the figure: “Ah! Vous avez atteint en plein l’ennemi! Voilà l’idée bonapartiste à jamais pillorisée par vous” (Ah! You have fully captured the enemy! You have forever pilloried the Bonapartist image). Quoted in Arsène Alexandre, Honoré Daumier, l’homme et l’oeuvre (Paris: H. Laurens, 1888), 295.
of Daumier’s prints after the fall of the Second Empire (between 1870-1872). Manet was likely familiar with these works and he fancied the opportunity to pay homage to Daumier through his Polichinelle print. It goes without saying, that Polichinelle, like Ratapoil, is an agent provocateur, and it is his aggressive behavior that Manet chose to underline in his lithograph. Simply put, the polysemic nature of Manet’s Polichinelle meant it presented a hazard to MacMahon’s public image, an element the authorities could not afford to overlook.

The classical character’s role in theater performances was also problematic, and thus comparing Polichinelle to a human being was unfavorable. Polichinelle is often portrayed as someone who deceives others and is disruptive. Moreover, he is combative and a troublemaker. His behavioral patterns would have been well known to French people at the time, who immersed themselves in plays and other live spectacles for entertainment purposes and would have been exposed to theatre reviews through daily papers on a recurrent basis. Individuals would have also been aware of the numerous literary adaptations recounting the adventures of Polichinelle that circulated at the time. For instance, Pierre-Jules Stahl’s (1814-1886) Les méfaits de Polichinelle happened to be published in 1874. In this particular rendition, Polichinelle is characterized as a younger boy who commits crimes. He victimizes almost everybody who lives in his village and he fakes his death in front of a jury in order to break free from punishment. While Manet and Stahl did not collaborate in conceiving their projects, the works nevertheless complemented each other. In Les méfaits de Polichinelle the French try to rid themselves of such offspring, and similarly republicans wanted nothing to do with MacMahon as their president.

---

64 For representations of Ratapoil during the Second Republic and early Third Republic, see Delteil.
Therefore, it was a clever feat to portray MacMahon as a subversive character, and given that Manet’s lithograph was censored proves that its satirical bite unsettled officials of the gouvernement de l’Ordre moral.

Manet was a risk taker. He did not shy away from politically charged subjects. Prior to the publication of Polichinelle, Manet had asked a few of his literary friends to write an epigraph for his image. The inscription that accompanies his work was written by Théodore de Banville (1823-1891), but some of the other submissions Manet received still survive. Charles Cros’s (1842-1888) short composition is of particular interest. Cros’s epigraph consists of three stanzas, and some of its verses are especially trenchant. The last stanza ends as follows: “[he] cares not a damn about society … He’s most immoral. Why then is he loved?”\textsuperscript{66} Surely this version was not used for Manet’s print because it was too piercing. Had Manet’s image not been a disguised caricature of MacMahon, the biting nature of Cros’s inscription would not have mattered. Yet, with the hope of disseminating the lithograph to scores of people in Le Temps, it was wiser to opt for Théodore de Banville’s less cutting description. By transforming MacMahon into a puppet figure, he was without the use of his moral capacities. Removed from the political arena, his actions lacked amplitude. Manet’s feat could be placed on par with Gill’s representation of Napoléon III as Rocambole (fig. 13), because his work targeted an individual in a concealed fashion, and that person (MacMahon) had never given his consent to Manet (or any other artist for that matter) to have his likeness portrayed. Manet intentionally undermined MacMahon’s public authority with his image. The artist had found a way to personify conservative repression as it pertained to the reactionary regime at the time. It was a calculated and daring move that

very few artists of Manet’s stature would have tackled, and none other accomplished at the
time.\textsuperscript{67} In summary, \textit{Polichinelle}’s public appearance may have been short lived, but the print’s
attack on the opposition – MacMahon and the \textit{gouvernement de l’Ordre moral} – expressed an
enduring sentiment of republican enmity.

3.9 The Wallon Amendment and the Inauguration of Two Chambers

The struggle to overcome the political opposition continued in 1875 from both ends, but
adjustments were on the horizon, and they took place early on in the year. While the \textit{septennat}
had been passed in November 1873, the regime was still provisional in official terms, because
the Assemblée nationale had continuously delayed the process of drafting constitutional laws for
the government. That changed when the Wallon amendment was introduced at assembly sessions
in January 1875, and accepted by vote on the 30\textsuperscript{th} of that month.\textsuperscript{68} The Wallon amendment was
passed by only the slightest of margins, as the motion received 353 votes in favor of it and 352
votes against it.\textsuperscript{69} The difference of just one vote laid the foundation for the Republic to be
declared and lawfully accepted. The organization of the government, along with the terms of its
laws, would be decided over the next months; however, the word \textit{république} as the title of the
regime officially entered the constitutional proclamation.\textsuperscript{70}

\textsuperscript{67} While other artists (mainly caricaturists) did criticize MacMahon’s principles and the
government’s policies, none of them targeted the president directly (during his reign) by
depicting his likeness as did Manet.

\textsuperscript{68} Henri Wallon (1812-1904), a member of the assembly, proposed that legislative power should
be shared between two chambers, and the president of the Republic would be named by those
two governing bodies. A copy of Wallon’s manuscript can be found at the Archives nationales.

\textsuperscript{69} For a summary of the proceedings revolving around the Wallon amendment, see Bury,
\textit{Gambetta and the Making of the Third Republic}, 225-228.

\textsuperscript{70} Wallon’s amendment stipulated that the \textit{septennat} was an order of the Republic, rather than
that of the president. Ibid., 226.
Wallon was a Catholic orléaniste, but the stalemate in which the Assemblée nationale found itself throughout 1874 led him to propose the changes. He was not a statesman who the Left had championed prior to his amendment; however, his action did benefit the Republic and republicans saw it as a cause for celebration. Gill honored Wallon’s deed in a print (fig. 100) published by L’Éclipse on March 6, 1875. Since the decision to create a Senate and a Chamber of Deputies was made on February 24, 1875, Gill’s image circulated in the days following this event, rather than after the passing of the Wallon amendment earlier in January. In this lithograph, Henri Wallon emerges from a stack of clouds – like a genie from a bottle – and he holds up a young baby personifying the Republic. The Republic is wrapped in a blanket and she is crowned with a laurel wreath. Notably, a bonnet covers her head, which bears semblance to the Phrygian cap worn by countless Marianne figures in other visual representations of the nineteenth century. Since the Wallon amendment marked the beginning of the Republic in some ways, it is fitting that the allegorical figure is shown as a very young individual. The Republic will need to be attended to, especially in her formative years, but her presence can no longer be effaced. Below Wallon and in the foreground of the image, the hands of two unidentified men are clasped together in a gesture of agreement because the Wallon amendment has been approved. This unassuming man ushered in the Third Republic in 1875, and with it, the Constitution that would be drafted that year and remain in place until the start of World War II. The amendment, however, did not relieve MacMahon of his title as President of the Republic, and the configuration of the Senate firstly, and then that of the Chamber of Deputies, still needed

71 The bonnet is blue, visual proof that the amendment occurred under conservative leadership, and that not every statesman approved of the change that benefited Left-wing politics.
72 The Constitution was drafted between February and July 1875. Pierrard, Dictionnaire de la troisième République, 77.
to be determined. How different the two governing bodies were going to be from the previously conservative oriented Assemblée nationale was unresolved.

The new law, passed in February 1875, aimed to get applicants in office by the end of the year.73 Men from both sides of the political spectrum wanted to be included in this elite group, or at least to become a member of the Senate, a situation Alfred Le Petit emphatically demonstrates in *A table; Le morceau est bien mince pour tant de convives!* (fig. 101). In this work, Le Petit showcases dozens and dozens of men gathered at a lengthy dinner table, and they eagerly desire the small amount of food that rests on the flat surface. Given the tiny portion, most of the figures will not receive a piece, and thus, they will not be associated with the Senate. The majority of the lifetime senators comprised of members of the Left; however, the Right did everything in its will to make sure that it would have a majority when it came to the total number of men in the Senate. This accounts for the men’s antagonistic expressions in Le Petit’s print, who also happen to be wearing blue blazers and white bibs. Instead of electing the remainder of the senators by way of universal suffrage, a system of election by departmental sections was orchestrated by reactionaries supporting the Right, with the goal of producing a conservative body.74 Such an arrangement favored rural parts of the country over urban ones, and gave a greater opportunity for conservative-minded people to vote for their candidates. This tactic proved to be successful; the Right gained a majority in that tier of elections, and it meant that overall the Right edged out the Left 151 to 149 in senatorial representation.

73 300 members were to form part of the Senate. 75 of those individuals were to be elected for life, while the other 225 senators would be rotated on a regular basis. The 75 senators elected for life were appointed to the Senate from the Assemblée nationale – marking the end of this governing body. For more on the selection process, see Grubb, *The Politics of Pessimism*, 238-241.
74 Ibid., 238.
In the winter of 1876, when the elections for the Chamber of Deputies were completed, the results differed significantly. In this case, the polls favored Republicans. The Left captured 340 out of the 533 seats available.\footnote{The elections ended in late February 1876. Ibid., 251.} Even though progress for the Left would be hindered by MacMahon’s conservative customs and the Senate’s conservative majority, winning the elections for the lower governing body was still a major breakthrough for Republicans. The conservative cause was losing some of its strength, and what better way to acknowledge that than by showing the growth of the Republic. That was the conclusion that Gill reached in *La tirelire* (fig. 102). In comparison to Gill’s image distributed by *L’Éclipse* a year earlier (fig. 100), *La tirelire* portrays a distinctly older personification of the Republic. No longer an infant that needs immediate care, here the Republic – as a young girl in a red dress – stands on her own feet. Her values, like her body, are taking shape, but they still need some time to triumph at the societal level. Nevertheless, she is overcome by joy, as votes in favor of Republicans (labeled by the RF on individual sheets which stand for République Française) keep appearing from an urn that is being emptied by a man cut off by the frame on the left. Her raised hands denote her exhilaration. Since this print was published days after the elections were finalized, not only has the Republic grown, her red dress indicates her political maturity. Gone are the blue baby clothes – she is now an autonomous young figure, and her true alliance is made plain. Gill’s choice of a young girl is also meant to be endearing and encouraging, as such a figure calls in family values of the era. Therefore, with the Republicans holding a decided advantage in the Chamber of Deputies and nearly equaling the numbers of conservatives in the Senate, was the transfer of political power slowly taking place?
3.10 The Rise of *La Lune rousse*

Victory in the Chamber of Deputies for the Republicans was soured by MacMahon’s decision to form a cabinet that relied on a conservative leader to appoint ministers. Instead of turning towards someone like Gambetta, undermining the results of the lower governing body elections in the process, the president opted to make Jules Dufaure (1798-1881) in charge of the cabinet in March 1876.\(^\text{76}\) This, in part, led Gill to reinvigorate his attacks against the *gouvernement de l’Ordre moral*, by founding a new illustrated satirical journal called *La Lune rousse*. That year, Gill started to distance himself from *L’Éclipse*, because the newspaper was becoming too moderate in his perspective. Polo, the original editor of *L’Éclipse*, had passed away in 1874, and the new management had different opinions about the purpose of the journal. In July 1876, the scale of *L’Éclipse* was officially reduced.\(^\text{77}\) Such a format did not serve Gill’s drawing talents or his interests, causing his own change of direction.

Gill wanted to oversee a journal that showcased his passion and could fight against the political injustices of his day. Gill’s desire was to create the finest republican illustrated journal in France, a sentiment he shared with one of his friends weeks before the first edition of *La Lune rousse* was published: “j’ai la volonté de faire une chose unique dans le genre et parfaite … faire le meilleur journal de caricature de France.”\(^\text{78}\) The first issue of *La Lune rousse* appeared on December 10, 1876, and it did not take long before Gill decided to use the second and third

---

\(^\text{77}\) The last full-sized print Gill produced for *L’Éclipse* was published on June 25, 1876. On the changes *L’Éclipse* underwent in 1876, see Valmy-Baysse, *André Gill: L’impertinent*, 163-164.
\(^\text{78}\) “I have the will to do something unique and perfect in the genre … create the best caricature journal in France.” André Gill, “Gill à Philippe Gille,” (October 23, 1876), quoted in *André Gill: Correspondance et mémoires d’un caricaturiste*, ed., Tillier (Seyssel: Champ Vallon, 2006), 147.
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pages of the journal for his weekly image. This way, the caricatures nearly doubled in scale (measuring on average 70 x 51 cm), giving them an impressive presence, and they could be hung like posters. The journal still contained columns that commented on political affairs, but the images now held greater prominence. Gill was the first editor to employ this strategy of a double page spread on a hebdomadal basis – a fitting stylistic change since he was a caricaturist first and foremost. The next years became some of the most productive ones in Gill’s career as a printmaker, and he used this opportunity to bolster republican ambitions. Workers, craftsmen, and students were the primary audience members that his paper targeted. Members of the working-class, more than ever before, concerned themselves with political matters, and Gill hoped, like other journalists, that his paper would influence their decisions at times of votes.

One of those critical moments was not far away, as midway through the year 1877 the fate of the gouvernement de l’Ordre moral took another twist, when President MacMahon triggered a major political incident that forced a new set of general elections to be held in France later that year.

3.11 May 16, 1877

May 16, 1877 was a pivotal moment in the history of the Third Republic. That day, MacMahon revealed his blatant partisanship by coercing Jules Simon, the prime minister of his
Simon’s precarious situation was outlined by Gill in one of the first prints the artist made for *La Lune rousse*. In *Bonjour! – Bonsoir!* (fig. 103), the prime minister is shown walking on eggshells as he tries to leave the premises of his office building. Émile de Marcère (1828-1918), the Ministre de l’Intérieur at the time, a role he also occupied during the previous ministry, glances back at Simon from his office door in an unfriendly manner, while the latter seeks refuge. The prime minister hides a figure under the left side of his overcoat who happens to be Thiers. Simon was a minister during Thiers’s presidency, and his political ties were not forgotten by those serving the *gouvernement de l’Ordre moral* a few years later. The briefcase Simon carries under his shoulder is red indicating the republican (albeit conservative) nature of his agenda. It would seem as though Simon and other members of the cabinet, underlined by de Marcère’s presence, will not be able to coexist. These tensions cause the prime minister to feel the burden of his task. Even if he is able to overcome certain difficulties, he will need to act cautiously in order not to break any of the eggshells that will continue to confront him during his term in office. Hence, with time, it appeared that MacMahon’s ploy would work.

---

83 After Dufaure had vacated the role in early December 1876, Jules Simon was summoned to be in charge of a new ministry. By placing Simon in charge of the cabinet, MacMahon’s goal was to create a divide amongst those on the Left, leaving Simon to make bad decisions, which would ensure that the following cabinet leader would be a Right-wing statesman. The plot was that MacMahon would be able to dissolve the Chamber of Deputies because a republican body was not governable. Jules Simon’s cabinet was made up of men from the two centers, and it could be labeled as conservative republican. For a thorough analysis of the events related to the May 16, 1877 coup, see Fresnette Pisani-Ferry, *Le coup d’état manqué du 16 mai 1877*, 140-145. This study discusses the circumstances that led to the May 16 incident, the climax of the affair, and its aftermath in the French political arena. While focus is placed on Patrice de MacMahon, all the key political figures of the period are mentioned in Pisani-Ferry’s narrative.
The decisive moment came on May 16, 1877 when MacMahon sent Simon a letter which stated that the prime minister was failing at his job, and the note was, in essence, a dismissal.\textsuperscript{84} This maneuver came after Simon had struggled to show leadership skills at parliamentary sessions earlier in the month.\textsuperscript{85} What was particularly odd with MacMahon’s coup, is that Simon was named a lifetime senator in 1875; he was a respected man, even if not the most liked, making MacMahon’s action a clear show of spirited resistance. The following day, the president dismissed the entire cabinet and appointed Albert de Broglie as the head minister.\textsuperscript{86}

One of MacMahon’s next decisions was to dissolve the Chamber of Deputies (with its Republican majority) calling for new elections, even though the members of this governing body had been established by certified law. The \textit{gouvernement de l’Ordre moral} appeared to be plotting the subversion of the regime.\textsuperscript{87} Under these circumstances, the Left truly rallied to form one distinct Republican party. Like brothers in arms, faction leaders – from Charles Floquet (1828-1896) to de Marcère to Philippe Devoucoux (1819-1889) – shared the same mission: to overcome the political opposition in the upcoming election campaigns.\textsuperscript{88} As Gill had it in a print

\textsuperscript{84}The letter is reproduced in Pisani-Ferry, \textit{Le coup d’état manqué du 16 mai 1877}, 147-148.
\textsuperscript{85}He was relegated to a submissive position in front of individuals such as Gambetta, who since April 1876 occupied the role of President of the Budget Committee, and always knew how to take command of political debates. Grubb discusses the proceedings of the May sessions in \textit{The Politics of Pessimism}, 269-271.
\textsuperscript{86}This was disquieting to republicans, who feared that the circumstances would mirror those in 1873 when de Broglie was named prime minister after Thiers was forced to give up his role as president. Not surprisingly, the de Broglie led cabinet was made up entirely of members of the Right. Prefects and other officials were also substituted to reflect conservative allegiances. Pisani-Ferry, \textit{Le coup d’état manqué du 16 mai 1877}, 174-175.
\textsuperscript{87}The constitution drafted in 1875 permitted the President of the Republic to dissolve the Chamber of Deputies with the accord of the Senate. However, MacMahon was the first and only president to make use of this right. Accordingly, it gave dissolution a negative characteristic in French history, since it appeared that MacMahon desired to exercise personal power. For more, see Pierrard, \textit{Dictionnaire de la troisième République}, 94-95.
\textsuperscript{88}The unification of the Left is discussed by Bury in \textit{Gambetta and the Making of the Third Republic}, 406-407.
(fig. 104) that payed direct tribute to Jacques-Louis David’s (1748-1825) *Oath of the Horatii* (fig. 105), these men came together to swear an oath in front of Louis Blanc (1811-1882) – a driven social reformist.

The crisis that transpired from the May 16 incident proved that the Right was incapable of negotiating in a tranquil manner. The Left’s goal was to make French citizens understand that the country’s peaceful growth now solely depended on the ability of Republicans to be fully in charge of political affairs. Voters were in a position to determine the country’s future; if their ballots favored republican representation in the Chamber of Deputies, then the Republic would emerge stronger than ever, triumphing over conservative reactionaries.

MacMahon indirectly became the target of visual attacks shortly after the aforementioned debacle. With the Chamber of Deputies elections set for October 14, 1877, Victor Hugo decided to revisit his *Histoire d’un crime* manuscript, which he first began while in exile in Belgium in the early 1850s. At that time, Hugo abandoned the project in order to focus on writing *Napoléon le Petit*, a work that was published as a political pamphlet in 1852. In 1877, Hugo felt it was time to update his *Histoire d’un crime*, reminding people why it would be important to vote for Republicans, instead of allowing MacMahon to carry out his coup, much like Louis-Napoléon had done during the Second Republic. Hugo’s goal was to publish the first volume of his manuscript prior to election day in order to sway voters towards the Left. On September 26, 1877 the author commenced the task of making final edits, and a few days later, on October 1, volume one of *Histoire d’un crime* was issued publicly in Paris. As noted by Arsène Alexandre,

---

90 Ibid., 118.
Histoire d’un crime marked the pinnacle of Hugo’s political writing career, and it is this enterprise that Gill, and later Le Petit, wanted to honor in the press in visual terms.91

Gill desired to acknowledge Hugo’s accomplishment as soon as possible by depicting the author in a print in the first issue of La Lune rousse produced after the release of Histoire d’un crime. The image, scheduled to be published on October 7, 1877, was censored by the authorities as indicated by La Lune rousse that day (fig. 106). Even though Gill’s image did not convey MacMahon’s likeness, in the eyes of the authorities its timing was fraught with danger. Hugo aimed to recount the past offenses of Louis-Napoléon at this particular time, because Hugo strongly disapproved of the monarchist coup d’état that MacMahon sought to engineer. Not deterred by the possible consequences, Gill opted to publish his print a few days later as a supplement of La Lune rousse (fig. 107).92 In the lithograph, entitled Le nouveau livre de Victor Hugo, Hugo is shown seated in a chair or a throne that has representations of lions as its armrests, indicating his king-like status. Hugo’s broad forehead acts as a focal point in this image, underlining the head as the site of intellect. The special treatment that Hugo’s forehead received in images of the press certainly had ties to the study of phrenology – first introduced in France by Franz Gall (1758-1828) in the first third of the nineteenth century.93 Classifying people into types according to outward bodily signs had gained tremendous currency in Paris at mid-century, and it became a common strand of representation amongst caricaturists in the years

91 Arsène Alexandre, La maison de Victor Hugo (Paris: Hachette, 1903), 100.
92 Pouchain, Victor Hugo par la caricature, 118.
93 Interest in physiognomy was further heightened by Johann Caspar Lavater’s (1741-1801) illustrated publication L’Art de connaître les hommes par la physionomie, which first appeared in Paris in 1806-1809. For an insightful discussion about the influence of phrenology and physiognomy in nineteenth-century French illustrations, see Judith Wechsler, A Human Comedy: Physiognomy and Caricature in 19th-Century Paris (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), 15-40.
that followed. In Gill’s image, Hugo has momentarily paused from writing his manuscript to look down at an eagle – a symbol of the empire – that lies senseless at his feet. The tablet he holds is labeled “Le crime du 2 décembre” in large letters. There is no denying what political crime Hugo’s book profiles. As a man who seeks retribution for the wrongs committed by the former emperor, Hugo wears the robe of a judge. By writing *Histoire d’un crime*, Hugo is the one passing judgment on the accused. Hugo denounced the politics of the Second Empire, and he felt cheated that history seemed to be repeating itself with President MacMahon. Moreover, Hugo was an active member of the Senate, thus giving Gill’s image immediate currency. Why would MacMahon dissolve a governing body that has acted lawfully and now turn his back against the constitution, if not by the letter of the law, but in spirit? Was he seeking to annihilate the Republic? The political crisis that was brewing in France at the time clearly made Gill’s work a sensitive subject. This style of caricature was particularly effective because it evoked the hardships and betrayal that French citizens endured at the hands of autocratic rulership under the previous regime, exactly at the time when the President of the Republic sought to usurp power of the current regime.

Hugo’s *Histoire d’un crime* undeniably resonated with other republicans, including Alfred Le Petit. Although there was no collaboration between Gill and Le Petit in visually documenting Hugo’s political essay, when Le Petit’s *Le justicier* (fig. 108) appeared in March 1878, it functioned as a pendant to Gill’s *Le nouveau livre de Victor Hugo* (fig. 107). Le Petit’s print was published to mark the release of the second volume of Hugo’s *Histoire d’un crime*. The image was issued in *Le Pétard* on March 24, 1878, a journal that Le Petit founded in 1877, whilst
volume two of *Histoire d’un crime* was made available on March 15.⁹⁴ Hugo’s manuscript, and possibly even Le Petit’s lithograph, similarly prompted a response from Charles Gilbert-Martin (fig. 109), the editor-in-chief and sole caricaturist of *Le Don Quichotte* – one of the leading satirical newspaper operating outside of Paris at the time.⁹⁵

In *Le justicier* (fig. 108), Hugo is presented as a justiciary carrying out the role of an executioner by stamping the forehead of Napoléon III with a burning hot piece of iron that has just been removed from a flaming cauldron. The imprint left on the former emperor’s head bears the date of his crime and indicates the source of his corruption – a clear contrast to Hugo’s proverbial genius, highlighted by his unmarked forehead. Hugo’s face is unscathed, an indication that Le Petit likely drew inspiration from a photograph taken of the poet when he made this print.⁹⁶ On the contrary, Napoléon III’s features are deliberately altered to debase him. The body of the villain takes on the shape of an eagle, as he is crouched on his knees and wings emerge from the middle of his back. Napoléon III’s zoomorphism disqualifies the notion that he is superior to any other human being. He is unable to move, as his hands, which are growing claws at the extremities, are chained to a post that looks like a cross, signaling the burden he has to face for the sins he has committed. Hugo shames him by removing the crown from the top of his head.

---

⁹⁴ Pouchain, *Victor Hugo par la caricature*, 121. Le Petit established *Le Pétard* a week after parliamentary sessions resumed for the first time since the May 16, 1877 incident. In the opening issue of the newspaper, Le Petit declared that the purpose of his journal was to cause uproar. Like Gill, he was not going to remain silent about political affairs, especially in the wake of MacMahon’s coup. For more details, refer to the first issue of *Le Pétard* published on June 24, 1877.

⁹⁵ *Le nez dedans!* was published on March 29, 1878. In this image, Hugo forces Napoléon III to put his nose in a pool of blood that was caused by the coup d’état the latter staged on December 2, 1851 – the crime that serves as the subject of *Histoire d’un crime*. To further belittle the emperor, Hugo holds up a copy of his publication to Napoléon III’s face.

– giving further visibility to the iron mark that will permanently deform his skin. As observed by Gérard Pouchain, when viewing this scene, one cannot help thinking of some of the satirical verses Hugo wrote in Les Châtiments a few years earlier: “Je t’ai saisi. J’ai mis l’écrieau sur ton front … toi, tandis qu’au poteau le châtiment te cloue … je tiens le fer rouge et vois ta chair fumer.”97 The parallels between Le Petit’s lithograph and Hugo’s Les Châtiments also bring to mind one of Daumier’s prints which he had produced earlier that decade in homage to Hugo’s poetical composition. Page d’histoire (fig. 110) conveys a bound edition of Les Châtiments crushing an imperial eagle, which simultaneously happens to be struck by lightning. Les Châtiments acted as a Bible to those opposed to imperialism in the last third of the nineteenth century, and Hugo, undoubtedly, was a favored messenger of republican sentiments in caricature at the time. Although the Chamber of Deputies elections were finalized by the time Le Petit’s Le justicier was published, it still complements Gill’s version, which was circulated at a crucial moment with regards to the voting campaign. It was further proof that republicans were unwilling to overlook MacMahon’s earlier attempt to seize power. The relevancy of Le Petit’s print (as well as that of Gilbert-Martin’s Le nez dedans!) was heightened by the fact that MacMahon still occupied his role as president in 1878. The punishment for his actions had yet to be doled out.

### 3.12 Glorification

From the perspective of republicans, MacMahon’s status paled in comparison to Hugo’s – a man who over the course of the first decade of the Third Republic came to embody the epitome

---

97 “I grabbed you. I placed the notation on your forehead … you, while the chastisement nails you against the post … I hold the red iron and see your flesh smoking.” These lines are taken from “La famille est restaurée,” the third book of Les Châtiments. See Pouchain, Victor Hugo par la caricature, 121.
of republican principles. Victor Hugo saw personal power as the Republic’s greatest enemy; he championed freedom: “dire mon nom, c’est nier le despotisme; dire mon nom, c’est affirmer la liberté.”98 From the moment he was elected to the Senate in 1875, his likeness became a mainstay in illustrated journals. Hugo is a prime example of how caricatures can glorify an individual as much as they can ridicule a person’s character. It is fair to say that in the majority of images made of Hugo in the Third Republic, graphic artists focused more on drawing his likeness than on caricaturing him. Gill admired the distinguished writer, and most often he aimed to please Hugo when he produced portraits-charges of him.99 Gill rarely deviated from a portrait-like representation of Hugo as first seen when the artist depicted the literary master in the late Second Empire (fig. 20). The only thing that changed in the later years, is that the author was shown as an older man, yet this feature contributed to his wisdom and public appeal. For instance, Hugo’s facial expression in L’homme qui pense (fig. 111) practically became the model from which Gill would carry out his renditions of Hugo in the latter part of his career. Hugo was an intellectual beyond all else, and thus, it was important to highlight his face and his forehead, as a site of thought, in visual representations.100

Moreover, Gill, and other artists, commonly depicted Hugo as a larger than life, and even heroic figure. This was certainly the case in Gill’s Victor Hugo (fig. 112), a lithograph published on March 8, 1877 in La Lune rousse. This image is full of symbolism, and it stars a figural

98 “To say my name is to reject despotism; to say my name is to affirm liberty.” This statement was made by Hugo while in exile during the Second Empire. Victor Hugo, quoted in La Gloire de Victor Hugo, Maurice Agulhon et al. (Paris: Galeries nationales du Grand Palais, 1985), 91.
99 In his foreword to Charles Fontane’s Un maître de la caricature: André Gill (Paris: Éditions de l’Ibis, 1927), Émile Cohl (1857-1938), one of Gill’s closest friends noted how “la grande admiration de Gill fut Victor Hugo” (Victor Hugo was the great admiration of Gill).
100 Hugo’s forehead is the focal point in numerous prints depicting the author. It was a common practice for artists to emphasize this attribute throughout Hugo’s life, not just at the end. For more on Hugo’s portrayal, see Pouchain, Victor Hugo par la caricature.
representation of Hugo of heroic proportions. A tall Hugo stands on a spherical surface – likely a rendition of the earth – while the sun illuminates him from the left side of the picture plain. Stars fill the sky in the distance. Robed in white, Hugo has a glowing quality and the appearance of an Olympian god or that of the famous Roman poet Virgil (70-19 BCE). His facial expression reveals his sophisticated demeanor and his warm spirit. He occupies the center of the composition, and his celestial presence towers above the other figures. He is flanked by a lion and a lyre. The lyre is indicative of his creative genius. Very few compared to Hugo as a writer. He embodied so many of the qualities of the greats that came before him: “poète il est à la fois Horace et Juvénal, Ovide et Aristophane, Pétrarque et le Dante, Byron et Shakespeare; romancier il élève le roman à la hauteur de l’épopée et il donne à ses personnages la taille des héros d’Homère; historien, il est plus farouche que Suèteone et plus impitoyable que Tacite.”

His works have serenaded countless people. Meanwhile, the lion serves as Hugo’s faithful companion. The large animal also serves as a protector. The beast’s mouth is half open, revealing its sharp teeth, and it helps to steer away the eagle, which symbolizes oppressive power (and particularly, the regime of Napoléon III). Relegated to the bottom of the picture frame, the bird has clearly lost the power dynamic battle between the animals. The lion, as ruler of the animal kingdom, embodies the capacity to overcome evil. The burly beast is a guardian of Hugo’s principles, and it is his humanitarianism that needs safeguarding. Hugo holds a baby in his

101 “As a poet, he is at once Horace and Juvenal, Ovid and Aristophanes, Petrarch and Dante, Byron and Shakespeare; as a novelist he elevates the novel to an epic level and he gives his characters the attributes of Homer’s heroes; as a historian he is more passionate than Suetonius and more relentless than Tacitus.” The editors of Le Pétard, “L’histoire d’un crime,” Le Pétard (March 24, 1878), 2.

102 In French caricatures, representations of lions often have political connotations. The lion is traditionally associated with the monarchy, yet it can also symbolize universal suffrage as desired by republicans. For more on the animal’s symbolism, refer to Doizy and Houdré, Bêtes de pouvoir, 163.
right arm as if he were the caregiver of humanity. The pose of these two figures recalls Madonna and Child images, a subject well known to the catholic readership of this journal. The same tenderness and unbounded love that the Virgin Mary has for her son and for the human race emerges in Gill’s portrayal of Hugo. As a firm believer in democratic ideals, Hugo personified the aspirations of an entire generation of Frenchmen. Although he was not one of the founding fathers of the First Republic (Hugo was born in 1802), he reached divine status in the Third Republic because of his republicanism. Hugo was, as Gill depicted him, an astral figure on the Left.

Another individual who reached the heights of glorification in the republican press around this time was Adolphe Thiers. His abrupt death on September 3, 1877 inspired this veneration. After Thiers stepped down as President of the Republic in 1873, he still maintained an interest in the country’s political affairs. In comparison to their response to MacMahon, Leftists continued to see Thiers in a positive way after his fall from the presidency, and it would not be an overstatement to suggest that some Left-wing politicians courted him in the years following his dismissal. In October 1875, far away from the French capital in Arcachon, he even encouraged republicans to rally together in order to fight for their beliefs. Thiers, the paramount bourgeois, was not only able to accept the Republic, he openly promoted it. It is as such, that Thiers came to be embraced by republicans in 1877, especially after the old statesman had passed away.

At the time of Thiers’s death, the illustrated satirical paper *Le Pétard* dedicated its next issue to the memory of the former president. Le Petit paid Thiers the utmost respect by portraying him in a lifelike manner in a satirical journal. This proved that the business of satire could willingly

---

103 For more on the speech Thiers made in Arcachon on October 17, 1875, see Bury, *Gambetta and the Making of the Third Republic*, 252.
be suspended in serious circumstances.\textsuperscript{104} Certain events did not call for humor and mockery, and for a satirical journal to step away from its customary habits underlined the gravity of the moment. On September 9, 1877, the front page of \textit{Le Pétard} offered a lithographic portrait of Thiers (fig. 113) to its viewers. Le Petit’s work can be compared to the lithograph Gill made of François Polo after the latter died in 1874 (fig. 92). Both images are true to life; they are commemorative, honorific portraits. In Le Petit’s image, Thiers’s head is circumscribed by a wreath that has the words ‘regrets de la France’ written on it. This sentiment was shared by \textit{La Lune rousse}, which noted the same day that Thiers’s death was “une perte cruelle pour la République, une perte plus grande peut-être pour la France.”\textsuperscript{105} Thiers, though no longer alive, benefits from a particular treatment in Le Petit’s image, because the portrait is designed to resemble the last photograph (fig. 114) that Nadar made of the statesmen in 1872. Le Petit’s drawing is faithful to Nadar’s photograph – there are absolutely no satirical elements in his work. \textit{Le Pétard} even notified its subscribers that there would be no comical features in that day’s issue: “nos abonnés ne s’étonneront pas si nous supprimons pour cette fois tous texte comique.”\textsuperscript{106} Essentially, in honor of Thiers’s contributions to the Republic, Le Petit toned down the humorous and aggressive tone of his journal for this particular issue.

Thiers’s funeral, which had taken place the day before on September 8, was a grandiose event. Republicans organized the funeral, proving their admiration for Thiers. This left the

\textsuperscript{104} Such occurrences were rare, because satirical journals were not fashioned to deliver information in the same way that other newspapers did at the time. Reporting current events was not the primary task of satirical journals. Instead, they produced opinionated viewpoints on (political) matters.

\textsuperscript{105} “A cruel loss for the Republic, and perhaps an even greater loss for France.” The editors of \textit{La Lune rousse}, “Il est mort,” \textit{La Lune rousse} (September 9, 1877), 2.

\textsuperscript{106} “Our subscribers will not be surprised if we remove all comical texts on this occasion.” Alfred Le Petit, \textit{Le Pétard} (September 9, 1877), 1. That day’s issue only consisted of the front page; there was no second, third, and fourth page, a typical feature of the journal’s other publications.
current government in a humiliated position as it took no part in the memorial service. Burials had been fraught with political menace since the days of the Second Empire as they were used as vehicles to express opposition to the presiding regime. Thiers’s funeral was no different, especially since the Chamber of Deputies elections were fast approaching. Cries of “vive la République” could be heard at Thiers’s funeral. It was a rallying moment for republicans, who attended the memorial service in large numbers. Victor Hugo and Léon Gambetta were key members of the cortège. The potential for political unrest led the gouvernement de l’Ordre moral to dispatch over 3,000 armed officers and military men to surveil the premises. Government officials were clearly unsettled by the cult following that Thiers had gained, especially because of the national implications of this phenomenon. Thiers was buried at the Père Lachaise cemetery in Paris, the same location where many Communards had been killed in 1871, even though he died at Saint-Germain-en-Laye (a suburb on the western limits of the French capital). Republican unity seemed ubiquitous, and the entire event was capped when Thiers’s widow read out a statement that her husband had delivered in a speech a few days prior to his death. The message encouraged Frenchmen to vote republican, and it vilified the Right as the real party of agitators.

Although La Lune rousse had already commented on Thiers’s death on September 9, it also felt compelled to honor the former president through an image the following week. In Adieu!... (fig. 115), an allegory of la patrie is about to deposit a laurel wreath on Thiers’s head at his

---

109 Crucial details about Thiers’s funeral are offered in Bennett, “Long Live the Revolutions,” 46-47.
deathbed. By holding out the garland above his head, it also serves as a halo glorifying the statesman. A single star shines at the top of the frame denoting the harmony between the two figures. As he had done with the portrait of his friend Polo (fig. 92) and that of Victor Noir (fig. 34) after the republican journalist was killed in 1870, Gill chose a simple black and white lithograph. The serene nature of the image complements the sincerity of the message.111 Praise for the old man was also carried out in written form in that day’s issue of La Lune rousse. The journal noted how Thiers’s death occurring on September 3 happened to coincide with another signature date for Republicans – the same day that Napoléon III had capitulated at Sedan seven years earlier. The careers of Napoléon III and Thiers were intertwined, but the author Bayeux projected an imagined contrast between how the men would be remembered. In a fictional comparison, the journalist noted how the tombstones of the two men would reveal their contrasting legacies. The emperor’s stone would show “des soldats éplorés, ensanglantés, chargés de fers, brisant leur armes, et la France, étouffant d’horreur, ivre de larmes”, while Thiers’s would be decorated by “la Liberté que nous avons aimée, riante à l’avenir avec la jeune armée.” In short, Thiers’s death did not bolster the Right’s political position, but rather it ignited republican passion amidst the electoral campaigns.

111 Although this work may not be an honorific portrait like Le Petit’s Monsieur Thiers (fig. 113), it is void of caricatural elements. Gill’s representation of Thiers differs from the many portraits-charges he made at the time.
112 “Tearful, bloody soldiers, burdened by chains, breaking their arms, and France would be choking in horror, impaired by tears” and “the Liberty we have loved, happily embracing the future with the young army.” Marc Bayeu, “Deux tombeaux,” La Lune rousse (September 16, 1877), 2.
3.13 The October Elections

As soon as the Chamber of Deputies was dissolved in June 1877, campaigning for the October elections began.\textsuperscript{113} Since the last session of the inaugural Chamber of Deputies of the Third Republic came on June 25, 1877, and the new elections were scheduled for October 14, 1877, the cabinet led by de Broglie strove to extend the campaign period in order to have more preparation time to sway voters. This decision would have given the Left the same amount of time to strategize for the elections; however, it was a violation of Article 2 of the Constitution and republicans viewed it as a premeditated maneuver by de Broglie’s reactionary cabinet. As a campaigning tool, the Right harped on the notion that republican leadership was equated with the Paris Commune and its damaging legacy.\textsuperscript{114} Yet by 1877, such an argument was more inflammatory than substantive. Revolution and disorder could not be rightfully associated with republicanism, because republicans had maintained peaceful activities in the political arena since Thiers’s presidency. At the Right’s suggestion, MacMahon toured parts of the country that summer to prompt voters to support the candidates who favored the \textit{gouvernement de l’Ordre moral}. Oddly however, President MacMahon was often dressed in military attire during these visits, and he rarely articulated his political opinions.\textsuperscript{115} Hence, these actions exposed how the Right did not have a bona fide program during the campaign period.

\textsuperscript{113} The Constitution of 1875 decreed that any elections to be held after the termination of a governing body needed to be carried out within the following three months. Article 2 of the Constitution outlines the set timeframe, as noted by Pisani-Ferry in \textit{Le coup d’état manqué du 16 mai 1877}, 199.

\textsuperscript{114} Such a claim was meant to thwart the electoral campaign of the Left. For more, see Bennett, “Long Live the Revolutions,” 50-52.

\textsuperscript{115} Alan Grubb further discusses how several of MacMahon’s campaign appearances did not turn out as expected in Grubb, \textit{The Politics of Pessimism}, 309.
With the Right constantly insisting that liberal principles inevitably led to disorder and potential anarchy, censorship commands were tightened in the months between the May 16 incident and the October elections of 1877. Since the press was the most effective agent of communication, the Right wanted to limit the Left’s means of spreading information about the elections and its candidates. Leading up to the elections, journal seizures and caricature refusals abounded. In this short timeframe, over 400 individuals were prosecuted for press offenses.\footnote{Details about the number of seizures and prosecutions over this time period can be found in Grubb, \textit{The Politics of Pessimism}, 302-303.}

\textit{Le Pétard}, Alfred Le Petit’s primary means of production, since his exclusive contract at \textit{Le Grelot} had ended, endured close to twenty rejections. Similarly, Gill’s \textit{La Lune rousse} was repeatedly seized and fined in 1877. The journal was fined 700 francs for two offenses, both of which occurred during the election crisis.\footnote{\textit{Le Pétard} was censored on twenty-three occasions in 1877, the majority of which came in the months before the elections. It is unclear which two convictions led to Gill’s fines. For more, see Goldstein, \textit{Censorship of Political Caricature}, 207.}

\textit{La Lune rousse} even reported that on one occasion seventy-two policemen raided the French capital in order to remove a print by Gill from store fronts and kiosks.\footnote{"… Soixante-douze commissaires de police sur pied, jeudi dernier à deux heures de l’après-midi, pour enlever le dessin de Gill des boutiques de journaux et des kiosques à travers Paris!" (Seventy-two police officers on foot, last Thursday at two in the afternoon, removed Gill’s drawing from print shops and kiosks throughout Paris!) Maxime Rude, “Libre Gazette; A Victor Hugo,” \textit{La Lune rousse} (June 3, 1877), 1.}

Moreover, in an attempt to cripple the opposition, government officials censored republican papers in the provinces. In rural areas, republicans often had a limited number of press organs (historically the provinces favored the conservative press), and during the campaign months, they were forced to rely on even fewer. Certain newspapers had to fold because they could no longer be sold publicly.\footnote{Pisani-Ferry describes in greater details the barriers on the provincial press in Pisani-Ferry, \textit{Le coup d’état manqué du 16 mai 1877}, 219-223.} By executing such an undemocratic operation,
Republicans felt that the gouvernement de l’Ordre moral was acting in a more repressive way than the Second Empire had been in the final years of the regime’s existence. Republicans were greatly annoyed by the Right’s usurpation of power, as it showed that conservatives were unwilling to work side by side with their political opponents, an undertaking that Thiers had been capable of during his presidency.

Alfred Le Petit interpreted this oppressive situation in his print L’ange gardien des journalistes (fig. 116), an image published by Le Pétard on September 2, 1877. This print shows a gigantic figure sitting on top of a cage, that contains dozens of small individuals. The entrapped people represent the journalists who have lost the right to publish because of the government’s censorship regulations. The “guardian angel” is an old reactionary man, a Ratapoil-like figure, who instead of protecting the journalists, ensures they suffer within the confines of the small cell. Furthermore, the guardian is not portrayed with angelic wings, but rather ones that invoke wicked creatures, bats, or birds of prey, especially since the head of eagles appear at the tip of each wing. This man also wears a bicorn hat similar to the one Napoléon III would have worn during his reign. The visual connection to the former emperor is deliberate, as this lithograph is identical to one Le Petit had issued in La Charge on June 4, 1870 (fig. 117). While it is unusual to see the exact same print distributed in two different journals at two different moments, given that Le Petit was the editor-in-chief of both newspapers, he had the prerogative to reintroduce the image on this occasion. La Charge had appeared at the tail end of the Second Empire, and it was one of the more memorable journals to attack Napoléon III’s rule. The link to MacMahon’s

---

120 Several French caricaturists adopted the stock character in their works of the second half of the nineteenth century.
121 Many readers would have been able to recall Le Petit’s La Charge when looking at issues of Le Pétard in 1877.
gouvernement de l’Ordre moral in 1877 was deeply appropriate, because the government had curtailed republican opinion at a crucial time in relation to French political affairs. Bonapartistes had elected to choose the conservative path since the fall of the empire; they also played a role in removing Thiers from his position as head of state. Accordingly, maintaining the same guardian figure in the print seven years later served its purpose. The image was indicative of a fundamental problem. Censorship had come to be expected under monocratic power, however its application during the Republic, a regime synonymous with liberty, was a pressing ideological issue for republicans.

The press, nevertheless, remained a vital organ during the election campaign, and it was an instrument that republicans used persistently to accomplish their mission of winning the polls. Léon Gambetta was one of the leaders of the republican press campaign, and the offices of La République française (1871-1924) acted as the headquarters of this endeavor. At this crucial time, Édouard Manet also made his painting atelier available for an electoral meeting, which was led by Eugène Spuller (1835-1896), a man who was one of Gambetta’s key collaborators as the chief editor of La République française.122 Gambetta had wanted to create a journal since the Second Empire, and his goal was to use his publication to convert people towards a “republican” republic. In an effort to achieve this, Gambetta’s journal was sold for fifteen centimes everywhere throughout the country.123 This was uncommon at the time, because the vast majority of papers required subscribers to pay an extra fee for copies sold in the provinces.

122 This event is mentioned by Philip Nord in The Republican Moment, 170. Manet’s act in the heat of the electoral campaign demonstrates that he wanted to be as helpful as possible to the republican cause.
123 Fifteen centimes was equivalent to the selling price of individual copies of Le Figaro and La Presse at the time. For more on the beginnings of La République française, see Bury, Gambetta and the Making the Third Republic, 56-63.
However, Gambetta’s aspiration was to republicanize the departments of France, which had been primarily dominated by conservatives in electoral votes in the past. Gambetta’s undertaking was not a futile endeavor, as other republican newspapers surfaced in the provinces at different points in the 1870s. In 1876, Gambetta established another journal, which was meant to reach an even broader audience because it was sold at five centimes per copy. The paper was named *La Petite République française* (1876-1938) and was directly linked to *La République française*. The lower cost of the paper meant that more members of the working class were engaging in political affairs, and the sharing of journal issues within the community was a widespread practice. Gambetta achieved a lot in the name of the Republic through his publications, and it became evident that the government wanted to limit his efforts. Once the Chamber of Deputies was dissolved, many of the deputies vied for the reinstatement of a lower governing body with a republican majority; these men came to be known as the 363 because of the number of individuals who formed part of the group. Although *La République française* was not an illustrated journal, Gambetta planned to offer its subscribers a sheet that depicted these 363 men as a supplement to the paper; however, the gouvernement de l'Ordre moral intervened by

124 Jeanne Gaillard specifies that Left-wing papers outnumbered the creation of Right-wing papers two to one in the years that followed the Franco-Prussian War. Not all of these journals were directly influenced by Gambetta, but a new pool of people were exposed to oppositional newspapers. For more on the provincial press, see Jeanne Gaillard, “La presse de province et la question du régime au début de la IIIe République,” *Revue d’histoire moderne et contemporaine* 6, n. 4 (Fall, 1959), 307.

125 At first, *La Petite République française* sold approximately 60,000 copies, but that number quickly grew to over 125,000 after the May 16, 1877 incident. Bury, *Gambetta and the Making of the Third Republic*, 307-309.

126 Such an occurrence was not common amongst Right-wing supporters, where journals rarely left the confines of a single household. Jean-François Viple, *Sociologie politique de l’Allier; La vie politique et les élections sous la Troisième République* (Paris: Librairie générale de droit et de jurisprudence, 1967), 261.
preventing this project from succeeding.\textsuperscript{127} The task would have to be carried out by someone else, if at all possible.

Andréd Gill, who ideologically aligned himself closely with Gambetta, was the one to tackle a similar project. Starting in July 1877, Gill created portrait busts of the deputies who belonged to the 363 with the goal of disseminating them in a journal solely devoted to these men and their political competence. The original intention was to create an issue for each of the deputies who felt robbed of their status once the Chamber of Deputies was dissolved. Time restrained Gill and his team at \textit{Le Bulletin de vote} (1877) from portraying more than seventy-two men, yet the paper contributed to the success of the Republican electoral victory. Gill named the journal \textit{Le Bulletin de vote}, because the individuals represented in its pages were candidates in the October elections, and Gill wanted the recipients of the paper to vote for them at the polls. To emphasize this message, the last issue of \textit{Le Bulletin de vote} depicted a single hand depositing a ballot into an urn with the names of some of the Republican candidates floating around it (fig. 118).\textsuperscript{128} More importantly, each edition of \textit{Le Bulletin de vote} contained a biographical notice written by Maxime Rude (active 1870-1885), one of Gill’s collaborators at \textit{La Lune rousse}, to accompany Gill’s portrait of the candidate. These descriptions are eulogistic. For instance, it was said of Pierre-Henri de LaCretelle (1815-1899) that he was “un chrétien dans le sens élevé du mot, un des hommes qui dissent à la face des défenseurs de l’obscurantisme: “Je suis convaincu que le progrès est une des manifestations de la divinité”.”\textsuperscript{129} In the department of Cher, \textit{Le Bulletin de

\textsuperscript{127} Bury, \textit{Gambetta and the Making of the Third Republic}, 416-417. As noted by Bury, a copy of this sheet is preserved at the Assemblée nationale in France.
\textsuperscript{128} The bottom portion of the last page of each copy of \textit{Le Bulletin de vote} could be detached, and since the name of a candidate was printed on it, the piece of paper could act as a ballot.
\textsuperscript{129} “A Christian in the elevated sense of the word, one of those men who says directly to the faces of defenders of obscurantism: “I am convinced that progress is a manifestation of divinity”.” Maxime Rude, “Henri de LaCretelle,” \textit{Le Bulletin de vote} 4 (1877), 3.
vote wanted to make Philippe Devoucoux one of the successful candidates, because of “son passé, sa connaissance des choses administratives, son utilité politique, tout a fait de M. Devoucoux une personnalité de la démocratie française.” Similarly, Gambetta was an exceptional candidate, since he was “à la tête du parti républicain, dont il devient le premier porte-parole … il parcourt la France, prêchant partout la République.” The focus was placed entirely on the individuals, as this four-page paper did not contain a single piece of advertisement. As for the images, given that Gill took the elections to heart, the artist stepped away from making caricatures. The busts of the deputies are placed against a red background, a reference to their republican allegiance (figs. 119-121). The foreheads of these individuals are enlarged, to emphasize these men as thinkers, as Gill had done when depicting Victor Hugo on various occasions. The deputies are also presented with laurel wreaths around them – making these images look like honorific medallions. In this case, the mission was to serve the Republic, rather than attack its opponents.

Gill was keen on launching a successful journal, and he advertised the forthcoming publication of *Le Bulletin de vote* through his *La Lune rousse*. Starting on July 15, he reserved a slot on the fourth page of *La Lune rousse* to announce that his newest paper would become available on July 29. The advertisement indicated that *Le Bulletin de vote* would only cost five

---

130 “His past, his knowledge of administrative affairs, his political value, all of which have turned M. Devoucoux into a personality of French democracy.” Maxime Rude, “M. Devoucoux,” *Le Bulletin de vote* 7 (1877), 3.

131 “At the head of the Republican party, of which he becomes the first spokesperson … he travels around France, preaching the Republic everywhere he goes.” Maxime Rude, “Gambetta,” *Le Bulletin de vote* 26 (1877), 3.

132 As Bertrand Tillier claims, the figures in this series are portrayed with “un visage non chargé” (a non-loaded face). Aude Fauvel and Bertrand Tillier, *André Gill caricaturiste: Derniers dessins d’un fou à lier* (Tusson: Du Lérot, 2010), 12. This is an important distinction. Viewers were not meant to consider these images as *portraits-charges*. As upstanding citizens, these deputies were portrayed in a candid manner by the artist.
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centimes, and that the production rate would be massive, as the printing house would issue over one million copies of each edition. Clearly, *Le Bulletin de vote* was intended for a broad audience in Paris and beyond. A particular event incited Gill to make this series, and the impact had to be immediate because the date of the elections was set for October 14. The editing team of *Le Bulletin de vote* did what it could to expedite the printing process to make as many issues available as possible. As Maxime Rude explains, to meet demands, *Le Bulletin de vote* had to be published on a daily basis instead of three times a week:

Dès la première heure. *Le Bulletin de vote* était enlevé; il fallait des tirages supplémentaires. Nous avions notre imprimerie à Meaux; notre publication ne paraissait que trois fois par semaine. La vivacité du succès nous obligea de changer notre installation et de devenir au moins journal quotidien. Au bout de quelques jours les 24.000 francs de cautionnement étaient versés; *le Bulletin de vote* était mis en vente à Paris tous les matins, expédié en province tous les soirs.

In addition, Gill continued to make use of *La Lune rousse* as a channel of self-promotion for *Le Bulletin de Vote* in the weeks after his latest journal had been established. The first image to appear in *La Lune rousse* after July 29, featured a peasant holding a copy of *Le Bulletin de vote* (fig. 122). The large sabots worn by the man denote that he makes a living in the countryside. The colors of his clothes – red, white, and blue – suggest that he represents the real patrie. He smiles as he reads the biographical notice of the deputy portrayed in that day’s edition of the journal. He is consumed by the material in his issue of *Le Bulletin de vote* – a detail further underlined by his attentive body language. By learning about the candidate in Gill’s publication,

---

133 See the copies of *La Lune rousse* on July 15, July 22, and July 29, 1877.
134 “From the very first hour. *Le Bulletin de vote* was removed; additional issues were needed. We had our printing house in Meaux; our publication only appeared three times a week. The vivacity of its success forced us to change our format and become at least a daily journal. Within a few days the 24,000 francs deposit was paid off; *Le Bulletin de vote* was on sale in Paris every morning and shipped to the provinces every night.” Maxime Rude, quoted in Fontane, *Un maître de la caricature: André Gill*, 114-116.
the peasant will be able to make an informed decision when the time comes to cast his vote.

Hence the title of the work – *Et la lumière fut* (And Then There Was Light). The election results in Paris were perhaps already a foregone conclusion by the summer, but the battle in the provinces still needed to be determined. Undoubtedly, the creation of *Le Bulletin de vote* and its shipment to different French departments was a breakthrough moment in the larger campaign that republicans were conducting in the months before the elections.

Only a few weeks later, when censors disallowed Gill’s original design from being published in *La Lune rousse*, he circulated a print (fig. 123) with four of the electoral candidates represented in *Le Bulletin de vote*. The four men conveyed are Louis Blanc, Prosper Duvergier de Hauranne (1798-1881), Émile de Marcère, and Pierre-Henri de Lacretelle. The portrait busts of these figures from *Le Bulletin de vote* were reused in *La Lune rousse*, as noticeable when comparing the two representations of de Lacretelle. Each figure occupies a corner of the frame, while a large pinkish-red cross fills up the center of the image. The presence of the cross suggests that the work is under protection by oath; censors should not sanction its content. These were men who wanted to improve the fate of the Republic by participating in governmental decisions; they wanted to be deputies once more. The 363 were fighting for a good cause according to Gill, and the men that formed part of this group needed as much recognition as they deserved. Gill helped build the personal image of these politicians by disseminating their portraits. Short-lived as it was, *Le Bulletin de vote* prospered: “cette petite feuille, créée pour les élections d’octobre, contribua pour une large part à la victoire des 363 qui, à leur tour, firent

---

135 It is likely that the cross was entirely red when the journal was first distributed in 1877, and that over time its original hue has faded.
triompher Jules Grévy à la présidence de la République.” Jules Grévy’s succession to the presidential role took place in 1879, but the initial step towards such an achievement started with the Republicans winning majority in the October 1877 Chamber of Deputies elections.

Once the electoral campaign was over, Le Bulletin de vote ceased publication as the journal had served its purpose. As an artist, Gill’s political efforts were exemplary for that time, and the format of his ephemeral paper even earned him commercial success. A turning point was reached, as there was enough evidence to suggest that the political order of the regime would be settled once and for all.

3.14 The Triumph of Republicans

The October elections proved that the majority of the country was in favor of republicanism and that those elected condemned the politics related to the May 16 incident. The language of denunciation that monarchists relied on simply had not been effective, and this led to a growing number of French citizens to associate with republican ideals by this stage of the decade. Divisions between the republican factions existed, but they were disciplined and able to set aside their differences (an issue the Right coalition was not able to overcome as easily) in order to rally in unison against the gouvernement de l’Ordre moral in 1877. The electoral victory was a cause

136 “This small paper, created for the October elections, contributed in large part to the victory of the 363, who in turn, helped Jules Grévy succeed to become the President of the Republic.” Fontane, Un maître de la caricature: André Gill, 113.

137 As Bertrand Tillier explains, Les hommes d’aujourd’hui (1878-1899), a popular illustrated journal to which Gill contributed between 1878 and 1881, adopted a very similar format. Tillier, La République. La caricature politique en France, 1870-1914 (Paris: CNRS, 1997), 72.

138 Jacques Chastenet indicates that, on the whole, the middle bourgeoisie was republican and disassociated from the Church in the latter half of the 1870s. Similarly, the petite bourgeoisie supported the Left and was anticlerical. Chastenet, Histoire de la Troisième République: L’enfance de la Troisième 1870-1879 (Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1952), 289-293.
for celebration, and Alfred Le Petit’s response came as a lithograph he produced for Le Pétard at the end of October.

In Arbre de liberté; Planté à Paris le 14 octobre 1877 (fig. 124), Le Petit depicts a large liberty tree with the heads of deputies emerging from the budding leaves that are dispersed on the tree’s branches. The heads of the figures resemble those Gill had made for Le Bulletin de vote. Le Petit wanted to establish a visual dialogue between his print and the series of images Gill produced for the elections. The type of tree Le Petit conveyed suited the occasion, because the oak tree had been a popular symbol of liberty since the days of the French Revolution.139 It symbolizes strength, growth, and durability, and republicans felt these characteristics applied to them after winning the October elections. The liberty tree also proclaims the arrival of the peaceful Republic by this time; it does not signal an insurrecional revolt as it once did during the French Revolution. In Le Petit’s print, the massive oak rests at the top of a mound, making it visible from a far distance: the republican victory will not be soon forgotten. This liberty tree is also growing at a healthy pace; its upper half is deliberately cut off at the top of the frame by the artist. The head of Anatole de la Forge (1820-1892) no longer hangs from the tree, since he was outperformed by a conservative candidate in the ballot results. Nevertheless, the names of a handful of departments are identified near the roots of the tree, because of their contribution to the success of republican deputies. These individuals belonged to the founding corps of men who would put an end to the era of revolutions in France. With the elections over, the conservative cause took a major blow, even if MacMahon refused to resign from his position as president, and

139 For more on the symbolic meaning of the liberty tree, see J. David Harden, “Liberty Caps and Liberty Trees,” Past & Present 146 (Winter, 1995), 66-102.
the Republic was on more solid grounds than it had been in 1875 after the Wallon amendment was approved.

In the immediate aftermath of the elections, Albert de Broglie and his ministers tried to resist the oncoming pressure of republicans. However, it became clear that the Chamber of Deputies would not approve any of the cabinet’s decisions, and as a result, the ministers who came into office the day after the May 16 coup were forced to resign on November 23, 1877. Instead of succumbing with these men, President MacMahon attempted to form another ministry with the aim of gaining a personal advantage. He appointed Gaëtan de Rochebouët (1813-1899), a man removed from the recent political struggle, as the head minister. The Chamber of Deputies’ response was to refuse to engage in any form of administrative negotiation and it had leverage, because MacMahon desired de Rochebouët to have access to the budget but the lower governing body dismissed such a request. MacMahon was cornered. He contemplated dissolving the Chamber of Deputies once more but doing so twice would be illegal and was not supported by the Senate. Thus, he was forced to admit that public opinion in France favored a republican mandate.

When the conservative republican Dufaure was named prime minister on December 14, 1877, and he was urged by the Senate to form a cabinet that reflected the republican majority, it

141 There was nothing parliamentary about this act, as no deputy from the recently elected governing body was selected for this group.
142 The Chamber of Deputies simply did not recognize de Rochebouët’s appointment. Accordingly, the Budget Committee, led by Gambetta, withheld any funds that the minister wanted. Bury, *Gambetta and the Making of the Third Republic*, 451-452.
143 On December 14, 1877 MacMahon conceded that the Rochebouët cabinet could not succeed, and the president agreed to form a ministry that contained members from both the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies. This gesture conformed to the provisions of the Republic’s constitution. Ibid., 459-461.
marked the end of the May 16 crisis. This was a significant accomplishment for the republicans, and for them, the year ended on a high note. The ministerial defeat that MacMahon experienced at the hands of republicans after the October elections became the subject of a large scale feuille volante that Gill produced as a supplement to La Lune rousse in late December.

Le Jugement dernier 14 octobre – 14 décembre 1877; Grande fantasie triomphale (fig. 125) is a print made after Michelangelo’s (1475-1564) famous Last Judgment (fig. 126) fresco painting in the Sistine Chapel in Rome. Gill’s recreation contains the three levels of spaces that form part of the original work painted by the Italian master (in the painting the upper portion refers to the heavens, the middle part portrays the weighing of the souls, and the bottom third is a rendition of hell). At the top of Gill’s image, one finds the triumphant republicans, led by Hugo, Grévy, Thiers, and Gambetta. Their political alignment has earned them the right to inhabit Heaven. At the opposite end, the damned, represented by members of the gouvernement de l’Ordre moral, struggle to move because their bodies lie so close to each other. Their political faith will soon lead them to the underworld. Meanwhile, the group of trumpeting angels in Michelangelo’s fresco have been replaced in the middle of Gill’s lithograph by a horn blowing Émile de Girardin, a man who supported Thiers’s policies. Thiers occupies the central position in Heaven, and accordingly, he is the Christ-like figure who judges the fate of French politicians. In the middle right section of the composition, a figure with glasses and Thiers’s facial features carries out the task of forcing an individual to join the lowly perpetrators at the bottom of the image. From his commanding position at the top, Thiers looks down at those who have been

---

144 Bennett, “Long Live the Revolutions,” 260-263.
145 The December 23, 1877 issue of La Lune rousse informed its readers that the print would be offered free of charge to its subscribers, and that it would be delivered in a special package due to its large size.
condemned with a threatening expression. Although he had passed away before the elections, Thiers’s viewpoint from the heavens is one that would have resonated with viewers of *La Lune rousse*, since the former president was also shown looking down on earth in a print Gill published a couple of months earlier on October 23. The implication of *Sourire d’en haut* (fig. 127) is that MacMahon’s stand is coming to an end, a message that is further reiterated in *Le Jugement dernier 14 octobre – 14 décembre 1877; Grande fantasie triomphale*. As Gérard Pouchain suggests, the figure at the bottom left corner of the image wearing a blue shirt and who has his right hand covering his face is likely a representation of MacMahon. He is in a position of shame and defeat. His judgment day has come, and he is repulsed by the verdict. In the meantime, none of the inhabitants of Heaven plead on behalf of this man or any of the other lost souls. It became increasingly evident that neither the *gouvernement de l’Ordre moral* nor MacMahon was the right fit for the majority French political concerns of 1877. It was time to overhaul the alignment of prefects and mayors throughout the country, but on this occasion, it was to favor the Left. Like the saints and angels in Michelangelo’s painting, the Republic stood for the good. In Gill’s judgment, if the right individuals were in charge, such as the virtuous Hugos and Gambettas of the world, the Republic could defy personal power and hereditary rights with impunity.

### 3.15 The Denouement of a Crisis

For much of the 1870s, conservatives plotted to restore a monarchy in France, but the measures they took irked popular opinion over time. Furthermore, several of the bureaucratic

---

146 The verse that accompanies Gill’s *Sourire d’en haut* at the bottom of the work is a popular saying implying that a certain subject (in this case MacMahon) has seen his last days in office.

147 Pouchain, *Victor Hugo par la caricature*, 120.

148 That process began in the last days of December 1877 and continued into the new year. Pisani-Ferry, *Le coup d’état manqué du 16 mai 1877*, 312.
decisions taken at various points throughout the decade worked in favor of consolidating the Republic even though that was not always the intention of those in charge. For instance, the *septennat* was introduced in part to give MacMahon time to revive monarchist convictions or to allow another candidate from the ranks of the Right to emerge as the country’s political leader. However, since the *septennat* was initiated under the Republic, republicans viewed it as a product of the regime that was taking shape, rather than a provisional tactic. Conservatives were also involved in passing the Wallon amendment a few years later, and even though the law was approved by the slightest of margins, it was a detriment to their party’s objectives in the long run. Yet while the regime embodied the Republic in name, its roots were growing at a very slow pace at the institutional level. The *gouvernement de l’Ordre moral* was the principal cause for these circumstances, inspiring republicans to fight with ardent tenacity to change current affairs.

The struggle to dislodge the government which did not align itself with the Republic, and the gradual resistance that republicans mounted in the constitutional realm was also fought and recorded by visual artists working for illustrated journals at the time. Republican artists by the likes of Gill, Le Petit, Manet, and Daumier drew, convinced of the justice of their political mission. At the beginning of the decade, prints such as Daumier’s *Je vous assure que vous serez très bien assise* (fig. 76) and Gill’s *Les pretendants; Henri V* (fig. 78), attacked the standards of monarchists in an attempt to sway Frenchmen from accepting such individuals. Allegorical personifications of the Monarchy and the portrayal of the comte de Chambord were the enemy. The Third Republic had been declared in September 1870, and these artists wanted the regime to maintain its course for a longer period than it had at the time of the Second Republic, which encountered an abrupt end twenty years earlier. Later on, it was the course of action of the *gouvernement de l’Ordre moral* which became the target of republican political prints. While
Manet primarily focused on his painting career during these years, he made use of a portrait-charge, a mode of representation within the art of caricature, to demonize the government’s leader, Patrice de MacMahon, in Polichinelle (fig. 73). Manet partially masked the identity of his figure, but his work captured the essence of a satirical portrait-charge in a skillful manner making it a controversial image. The fact that it was illegal to convey the president’s likeness without his consent distinguishes Manet’s Polichinelle as a politically provocative work of its day. This print suggests that republican caricature succeeded in mobilizing significant sentiment amongst French citizens during these years.

MacMahon’s public image only worsened after he forced Jules Simon to resign in May 1877, even though the prime minister had the backing of both governing bodies at that stage. In the election campaign that ensued from this incident, Gill worked tirelessly to orient voters towards Republican candidates by making a series of works distributed as Le Bulletin de vote both in Paris and in the provinces. Through these honorific portraits, Gill sought to make the corporate entity of these politicians knowable and personable to the readership of his journal. Once the election results returned in favor of republicans, Alfred Le Petit was quick to hail some of the same figures whom Gill had portrayed individually, a few weeks before, in a lithograph the former titled Arbre de liberté; Planté à Paris le 14 octobre 1877 (fig. 124). Le Petit’s image proves how closely aligned he was to Gill in political sentiment. He intently established a visual dialogue between his work and Gill’s Le Bulletin de vote in order to heighten the significance of the men who would impact the election of ushering in a new President of the Republic shortly after.

When the Chamber of Deputies elections in October 1877 yielded a majority of seats for Republicans, the tide had turned. From then on, MacMahon became more of a figurehead, and
his political power decreased significantly. The Senate and the Chamber of Deputies were the nation’s driving force, and the next item on the political agenda for republicans was to gain control of the upper governing body. Then, republican principles could thrive both in parliament and in everyday society, an aspiration that several artists continued to work for through their artworks and actions. In short, the “republican” Republic was no longer a distant dream; it was a goal that would materialize over the next three years. As we shall see in the following chapter, the more in charge republicans became of the political scene, the less relevant caricature, an inherently public art form, became as a form of visual resistance and a venue for political opposition to the current regime.
Chapter 4: Cementing the Third Republic’s Legacy, 1878-1881

The period between 1878 and 1881 saw many changes that impacted the outlook of the Third Republic and contributed to the regime’s durability. With every step that the Republicans took in gaining a firmer hold of the political arena, new regulations were ushered in to overhaul the country’s administration system. Some of the more significant changes in this short period include: the return of the upper and lower chambers to Paris from Versailles, the granting of amnesty to Communards, the passing of decrees en route to establishing obligatory laic primary education, the restoration of “La Marseillaise” as France’s national anthem, the public proclamation of Bastille Day (July 14) as a national holiday, and the introduction of new liberal press laws.¹

The magnitude of the country’s political realignment was such that Progress began appearing as an allegorical personification in the works of visual artists during this period.² This was a transitional moment in the French Republic’s history; however, it was not without its fair share of trials. Major shifts only began taking place after Republicans won the senatorial elections in


² For more on the types of figures and concepts that French artists depicted in images in the final decades of the nineteenth century, see Jean-Michel Renault, Censure et caricatures: Les images interdites et de combat de l’histoire de la Presse en France et dans le monde (Paris: Pat à Pan, 2006), 91.
January 1879 – almost a full decade after the Third Republic had been established. The emergence of new parliamentary leadership was critical for the growth of the Republic, because only then did topics such as amnesty and “La Marseillaise” stand a chance of legislative acceptance. For Republicans to win the elections, a battle had to be fought both in the political sphere and on the streets – where artists working for the illustrated press turned their prints into propagandistic instruments.

The electoral victory led to another significant triumph which helped solidify the “republican” Republic: on January 30, 1879, Jules Grévy replaced Patrice de MacMahon as the President of the Republic. To some, this was the ultimate manifestation of the French Revolutionary heritage’s conquest, but in reality, it was only the beginning of the operation that led to the consolidation of power in favor of the Left. Initially, the “republican” Republic was plagued by a sense of insecurity, forcing politicians to urge its supporters to remain patient while government officials worked out the kinks. The frustration that republicans experienced is summarized in one of the issues of Gill’s La Petite Lune: “quel malheur que la République soit encore si jeune, et ne puisse pas faire tout ce qu’elle doit! Mais patience!”  

All forms of liberties were not immediately granted, and some restrictions even persisted. This was hard to swallow for many republicans who felt that the regime owed them instant compensation, now that conservatives were no longer at the helm. In the world of graphic arts, censorship of the press was the major obstacle that republican artists wanted to see abolished. Visual artists working for the press had utilized caricatures to combat their ideological enemies every step of the way since 1830, and they were disappointed, to say the least, to have to wait until July 1881 to witness the re-establishment of

---

“What a pity that the Republic is still so young and cannot do everything she should do! But, patience!” Jean Populot, “Aux grévistes d’Anzin,” La Petite Lune (July 28, 1878), 2.
freedom of the press. However, once the new press laws were introduced in 1881, the attitude towards political caricatures had changed because there was no longer a significant oppositional force for the artists to resist or to overcome. By inaugurating a new set of policies that contributed to the Third Republic’s legacy, political caricatures in France, ironically, had lost some of their verve.

In the four years leading up to the liberal press laws, certain elements of caricature remained the same as before, while others gradually began to shift. The tension between presenting things as they are and how they should be, regularly came to the fore. By envisioning a certain utopia for the regime, caricaturists often portrayed changes that they wanted to see as realities. Some prints were published as reactions to specific events, while others were created as means to project expectations onto the political world at the time. By projecting ideologies onto reality, artists such as Gill and Le Petit aimed to illustrate the benefits that a republican regime could bestow on French citizens.

As the political Left continued to make a push to secure a “republican” Republic, several of the stock characters that had marked the first half of the 1870s retained their significance at the end of the decade. Not surprisingly, figures personifying an orléaniste, a légitimiste, and a bonapartiste regularly surfaced in prints at the time. Légitimistes and orléanistes remained targets because they always sought to restore the monarchy and they typified antiquated ideals. Bonapartistes were viewed as enemies because they wanted to exert revenge on the Republic for how the Second Empire had ended. Moreover, attacking the Prince Imperial, Napoléon IV, became a common theme. This act stemmed from the hatred the Left had expressed towards Napoléon III and the bonapartiste camp since the days of the coup d’état staged on December 2, 1851. It appeared as though Alfred Le Petit made it his personal mission to debase Napoléon
III’s son each time he had a chance – an occurrence that will be discussed at greater length in this chapter.

Meanwhile, another stock figure that increasingly became visible in images of the satirical press was the Jesuit. Jesuits continuously desired to extend their spiritual authority over France’s vast territories and its people, and they were blamed by republicans for most of the country’s problems as the regime struggled to define itself in the early stages of the Third Republic. The presence of Jesuits in caricatures is also indicative of how the root of conflicts in France, and the one that played out in satirical prints at the time, began to veer in a different direction after Jules Grévy became the President of the Republic. Once monarchical ambitions no longer posed a threat, the political debate took a backstage to the religious one in France. Starting around 1880, allegorical scenes no longer showed Marianne fighting against political opponents, but rather she was combatting characters, including Jesuits, who symbolized the Church and clericalism.\(^4\) It was a turning point in the history of nineteenth-century France, and it had clear reverberations in the output of the graphic arts.\(^5\)

The course of events which took place during the period of time I examine in this chapter had an impact on the artistic output of the four artists whose careers I have been studying throughout this project. Daumier, for one, passed away in February 1879. Although Daumier had ceased to make caricatures a few years before he died, he lived long enough to witness the termination of MacMahon’s spell as president. Furthermore, it was the ascension of republicans to the top of the

\(^4\) Jesuits were the group of individuals to represent the Church that made the most public statements about politics. Accordingly, they were obvious targets of the republican press.

political spectrum in the late 1870s that enabled a retrospective exhibition in honor of Daumier to be held in 1878. Daumier was celebrated as the arch-republican by many of his fellow compatriots from the moment he passed away. His ardent fight for the republican cause was recognized by the government at the time, which took it upon itself to have his remains transferred to Père-Lachaise cemetery in 1880 (even though he had been buried in Valmondois the previous year), in order to have the artist remembered on a national level. These momentous events would not have transpired a few years earlier when conservatives had held a tight grip on political affairs, and the Republic’s probability of survival was tenuous.

Gill, for his part, did everything he could to help republicans rise to a position of power during this period. Until the end of 1879, his La Lune rousse remained a vital source for political debate and he saw several of his issues affected by censorship, because the content of his paper posed a threat to those in charge. However, with each political victory the Republican party earned, Gill’s motivating force to create his oppositional caricatures started to fade. In some ways, he was a victim of his own success. Once the Third Republic reached its second decade of existence, he increasingly turned towards painting as a source of inspiration. In addition, while he lived until 1885, he began experiencing mental health problems in 1881 – the same year freedom of the press had been won – and he barely produced any works of art after 1882.

Unfortunately for Manet, his career was heading in a similar direction. By 1879, Manet started facing his own set of health problems, and while it did not bring his artistic production to a complete halt, he opted not to create any more prints because of the toll this form of artmaking took on his deteriorating body. Nonetheless, the favorable times for republican artists in 1881 gave Manet the opportunity to win an award at that year’s Salon – a portrait of Henri Rochefort (fig. 128), one of France’s most controversial political figures in the second half of the
nineteenth century. Timing was key for such a venture, as Manet had waited until amnesty had been granted to those involved in the Paris Commune before painting Rochefort. Moreover, Antonin Proust (1832-1905), one of Manet’s closest friends, was the minister of Fine Arts at the time, a department that the cabinet led by Gambetta had administered. The portrait of Rochefort was the last political work of Manet’s career.

In the late 1870s, Alfred Le Petit found success as the founder and chief editor of two satirical illustrated newspapers: *Le Pétard* and *Le Sans-culotte*. Some of the most striking images to have surfaced in the illustrated press from the early days of the Third Republic, several of which will be analyzed in the following pages, originate from these journals. However, over time, the demand for Le Petit’s political caricatures diminished as more and more republican principles had been institutionalized in France. Le Petit certainly did not shy away from expressing his anticlericalism in the years following the enactment of liberal press laws, but the 1880s also marked a period of his life when he dedicated a greater amount of time to painting and photography. The times had changed and so had Le Petit’s artistic priorities. In short, all four artists had promoted a certain brand of republicanism through their prints and they helped contribute to the making of the “republican” Republic, which forged its legacy in the late 1870s and early 1880s. How this came about and how it impacted the careers of Daumier, Gill, Manet, and Le Petit is what I shall investigate next.

**4.1 The 1878 Exposition Universelle**

The 1878 Exposition Universelle occurred at an opportune time, as it temporarily allowed French citizens to remove themselves from the political saga that had been disrupting the country for several years. Political affairs were not entirely put on hold during the festive event; however, it offered a welcome contrast to the May 16 crisis that had transpired the previous year. The
exposition lasted from May 1 to November 10, 1878, and it was viewed by organizers and participants as an overwhelming success. Since the Third Republic condemned the principles of the Second Empire, the 1878 Exposition Universelle was not only used as a means to draw a veil over the accomplishments of that era, it showcased the current regime’s superiority over the previous one. Surpassing the achievements of the 1867 Exposition Universelle, with its imperial aura, was as important as highlighting innovative developments in specific domains. France wanted to show the world that it had recovered from its hardships after losing the Franco-Prussian War and dealing with the Paris Commune, and that the major reason for the country’s ascending status was due to the current orientation of the regime in the late 1870s. The 1878 Exposition Universelle was thus intended to signal that the so-called “era of revolutions” was coming to an end in France.  

Different forms of measurements were used by members of the press to assess how the republican exposition had outdone the imperial one from the 1860s. This, for instance, included assessing the number of visitors who attended each event. Since a greater number of people turned up at the 1878 exposition, the Third Republic could flaunt the successful result of its spectacle – a feat that bolstered the Republic’s public image. Less than two weeks after the 1878 Exposition Universelle had opened, Gill juxtaposed the Empire and the Republic in a print that contained a single figure. In Le renouveau (fig. 129), a Ratapoil-like figure is overcome by the sight of dozens of tricolor flags. The flags are so close to each other and occupy such a large

---

6 The “era of revolutions,” as noted in the introduction, refers to the tumultuous years between the French Revolution in 1789 and the establishment of the “republican” Republic in the late 1870s – a period of nearly one hundred years that witnessed constant regime changes.

portion of the picture frame, that only the sliver of an opening at the middle back of the print indicates that the tricolor banners hang from buildings on a very narrow street (perhaps suggesting a working-class neighborhood). The claustrophobic space heightens the sense of bewilderment experienced by the bonapartiste character. Although the figure is not small, he is completely engulfed by his surroundings. Moreover, the lower part of his body is cutoff, adding to the perception that his actions are inconsequential. The large quantity of flags underscore the popularity of the Republic, and its current acceptance. Ratapoil is frightened by the scene, and he is reminded by this outburst of support in favor of the current regime that the window of opportunity to restore an empire is dwindling away. Having this realization, Ratapoil has suddenly aged.

Gill also mocks the figure through transforming wisps of his hair into satanic horns, a detail that is further highlighted by the pointy tips of his very long moustache. Clearly, the good days have left him behind. The cruel character has forced Frenchmen to suffer long enough, and now it is his turn to sulk as citizens of the Republic celebrate their triumphs. La patrie has chosen to side with the tricolor – a symbol of the nation’s well-being and prosperity. Ultimately, the bonapartiste figure no longer commands. The caption at the bottom of the print indicates that such a sight has been customary on the streets of Paris since the beginning of the month – the day the Exposition Universelle opened – further humbling Ratapoil’s achievements and those of the 1867 Exposition Universelle in the process. Hence, Le renouveau was Gill’s way of showing that the Second Empire had been defeated.

The following week, Gill made a print that served as a pendant to his Le renouveau, which poked fun at conservatives who still clung to the ideals of the gouvernement de l’Ordre moral. In the Glorieux anniversaire du 16 mai (fig. 130), a man stands above the railing of his apartment
balcony, disappointed that the cause he supports has lost its former appeal. A single flag, or
rather a white shirt with sleeves and cuffs displayed on a pole to look like a flag, drifts aimlessly
– a far cry from the dozens of tricolor flags that hang in solidarity in Le renouveau. The man
angrily stares at the “flag,” contemplating his political misfortune. A year after the May 16 coup,
there is not much to celebrate for conservatives, and the success of the 1878 Exposition
Universelle only adds to their sorrows. The man’s grotesque nose mimics the shape of the
éteignoirs that hang from two separate strings above his head.\(^8\) He has been duped into believing
that the gouvernement de l’Ordre moral will give rise to a bright future. While the éteignoirs are
meant to be decorative elements in this man’s lackluster celebration, given that they are placed
above him (one éteignoir rests directly on top of his head), it is he, and other individuals of his
ilk, who will soon be extinguished. Thus, in an ironical twist, the éteignoir is about to stifle its
owner. Evidently the festive mood that the 1878 Exposition Universelle engendered was meant
to reflect the Republic’s progress and the exploits of its proponents. Meanwhile, those opposed
to the regime’s doctrines are depicted as outsiders, as potently demonstrated by Gill’s Le
renouveau and his Glorieux anniversaire du 16 mai.

4.2 June 30, 1878: The Fête Nationale

To commemorate the country’s renewed vitality and the exposition’s favorable outcome,
officials decided to celebrate a national holiday in 1878. Deciding on the exact date was not an

---

\(^8\) The éteignoir is a satirical device which was widely in use in French caricatures of the first half
of the nineteenth century. The éteignoir, or candle-snuffer, extinguished lumière, a French word
that stands both for light and Enlightenment, and was meant to identify individuals associated
with reactionary political views who continuously attempted to stifle liberty. The symbol was
first introduced in visual works during the Restoration period and it has appeared in countless
of caricatures since then. For more on this subject, see Jean-Paul Clément and Philippe Régnier,
Caricatures politiques, 1829-1848: de l’éteignoir à la poire (Châtenay-Malabry: Maison de
Chateaubriand, 1994).
easy task, because of the potential symbolism and the memories it could evoke. Accordingly, a neutral date was deliberately chosen in order to offend the fewest. It was determined that June 30 did not carry a particular meaning for any of the political factions, that the summer weather would benefit the festivities, and that the Exposition Universelle could play a part in the grand spectacle. Hence, June 30, 1878 was officially declared a national holiday – the first of its kind since the late Second Empire. Gill’s *Le renouveau*, while produced on a separate occasion, clearly shares similarities with paintings Édouard Manet and Claude Monet made at the time of the Fête nationale. Perhaps the painters even had Gill’s lithograph in mind when they created respectively *The Rue Mosnier Decked with Flags* (fig. 131) and *The Rue Montorgeuil in Paris* (fig. 132). The sheer number of flags in each of the three works binds them together. Without knowing what further developments were going to impact the Third Republic in the ensuing months and years, the Fête nationale was regarded as true victory for the current regime. An element of national pride shines through in these works, which can be traced to the contentment that a growing number of people felt towards the government’s outward appearance and decision-making attitude. The Fête nationale also demonstrates that Gill had reason to revel in the Republic’s ascendancy earlier that year, because the regime had accomplished even more in the name of republicans as opportunities presented themselves. With that in mind, it is time to analyze how Gill himself responded to the June 30 holiday.

Gill originally intended to publish a print on the day of the Fête nationale showcasing President MacMahon tipping his cap while standing at the foot of a statue of the Republic (fig.

---


10 Monet went on to produce another canvas dedicated to the national holiday celebrated in 1878, which is titled *Rue Saint-Denis in Paris*. 
Although Gill was not trying to exaggerate MacMahon’s features, he carried a sad expression, and his gesture in front of the effigy suggested defeat, so censors refused to allow the image to be published.\textsuperscript{11} While this daring attempt did not succeed, Gill was not deterred, and to mark this special occasion, he created a work that further underscored the strength of the Republic to the detriment of its opponents.

*La Fête nationale de Dimanche* (fig. 134) is a scene in which a lightbulb – enhanced to look like a personification of the Republic – serves as the protagonist and two male figures – a Jesuit and a bonapartiste – hover near the lightbulb as they strive to blow out the source of light. This print is quite simple, but its message carries a lot of weight. Several factors contribute to its effectiveness. To begin with, one would expect to see a candlestick with a flame burning on top of it, especially since Gill has drawn a wick to allude to the conventional source of lighting that people often used in personal settings throughout the nineteenth century. However, it appears that it is a lightbulb that emerges from the wick, which would make it practically impossible for the two gnats to extinguish no matter how hard they try. Gill’s lithograph recalls Daumier’s *Les moucherons politiques* (fig. 135), a print the latter produced in 1850 in reference to the revolutionary flame that helped ignite the Second Republic. In Daumier’s work, four insects with the heads of politicians (from left to right: Pierre-Antoine Berryer (1790-1868), Louis-Matthieu Molé (1781-1855), Adolphe Thiers, and the comte de Montalembert (1810-1870)) float around a lit candlestick, while others lie wounded on the ground.\textsuperscript{12} Some of the figures blow at the flame – one even tries to use an *éteignoir* to snuff it – yet in the moment they are unable to accomplish

\textsuperscript{11} This incident is briefly referred to in Bertrand Tillier, ed., *André Gill: Correspondance et mémoires d’un caricaturiste* (Seyssel: Champ Vallon, 2006), 12.

\textsuperscript{12} To learn more about Daumier’s *Les moucherons politiques*, see Valérie Sueur-Hermel et al., *Daumier l’écriture du lithographe* (Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France, 2008), 105.
their task, because the source of light is too strong. The light created by the flame in Daumier’s lithograph adds to its compositional strength, and it is undeniable that the ray of light acts as the dominant force here, much like the lightbulb does in Gill’s print. So why did Gill use a lightbulb as the main character of *La Fête nationale de Dimanche*?

A lightbulb – i.e. the use of electricity – symbolized modernity. The 1878 Exposition Universelle actually contained an electrical display and it was the first exposition in France to experiment with electrical lighting. The 1877 Salon was the first exhibition to make use of electricity in France, and from that moment on, it was increasingly employed for public displays. By 1881, Paris even served as the host city for the International Exposition of Electricity. Electrical lighting allowed a greater number of workers – who did not have the time to free themselves from their jobs during the day – to partake in organized events at night. The use of electricity clearly became politicized, an element Gill was aware of and he wanted to highlight that in *La Fête nationale de Dimanche*. Thus, since it was the Republic that had the brilliant idea (“a lightbulb moment”) to introduce electricity at major public events, it is only fitting that the lightbulb in Gill’s image is portrayed as the Republic. The upper part of the spherical object is outlined in the shape of a Phrygian cap and her facial expression exudes confidence. She knows that the gnats that blow air towards her have no chance of defeating her. The light she emits cannot be blown out. The two figures will never be closer to achieving their

---

goal; they will only tire themselves out. Therefore, representing the Jesuit and the bonapartiste as gnats is particularly clever, because they are insignificant in the presence of the lightbulb.

The lightbulb has an additional significance that would have resonated with viewers at the time Gill published his work in _La Lune rousse_. Only a month prior to the June 30 celebrations, another important date had been singled out on the calendar by many republicans. May 30, 1878 marked the centenary of Voltaire’s (1694-1778) death. Although this anniversary did not result in public festivities, and some Parisians chose not to honor Voltaire altogether, others organized smaller gatherings to pay tribute to the great writer. \(^{14}\) Republicans truly admired the philosopher who championed liberty, especially freedom of speech, and felt it was their duty to commemorate the man who had been one of the primary advocates of the French Enlightenment.

Republican artists working for the press, such as Alfred Le Petit, did their part to contribute to the occasion. Accordingly, on June 2, 1878 Le Petit’s image for _Le Pétard_ (fig. 136) portrayed Voltaire shining a source of light on a group of owls and bats, driving many of the nocturnal creatures away in the process. As a philosopher from the _Siècle des Lumières_ (Age of Enlightenment), the symbol that identifies Voltaire is a lantern – i.e. a source of light. Voltaire was an intellectual, and in 1878, the Third Republic was also pictured as a source of light – now in a modern lightbulb. Although the Republic does not propel away the flies from her sight in _La Fête nationale de Dimanche_ (like Voltaire is able to do with some of the creatures in Le Petit’s print), her luminosity contrasts with the dark clothing worn by the two antagonists in Gill’s image. She is full of life and is directly opposed to their dark ambitions. In the late 1870s, Jesuits and bonapartistes were figures that embodied obsolete principles in the minds of republicans,

\(^{14}\) For a thorough analysis of Voltaire’s centenary, including the types of individuals who participated in celebrating the anniversary, see Olivier Ihl, _La fête républicaine_, 100-104.
much like bats and owls symbolized outdated ideas during the Enlightenment.\textsuperscript{15} By giving the bonapartiste character Ratapoil-like features, Gill further drew connections to a visual language Daumier had developed in 1851, and one that Gill employed on a common basis during the Third Republic. The figure’s allegiance could not be mistaken. As for Jesuits, they were viewed as prime emblems of reaction and they became major targets of the satirical press throughout the period in question as we shall further discover shortly. Starting in 1878, the Republic’s time to shine was the present, and Gill captured her glory by personifying her as a radiant lightbulb. To identify the Republic as such on June 30, the day of the Fête nationale, a day that was also regarded as the \textit{fête de la paix} only added to \textit{La Fête nationale de Dimanche}’s victorious status.

4.3 Striving for a Senatorial Majority

Once the elections for the Chamber of Deputies were over in October 1877, republicans wanted to take advantage of their momentum. They desired to shift the balance of power even more by turning their attention towards the elections for the upper chamber, which were scheduled for January 1879.\textsuperscript{16} Artists working for the satirical press took it upon themselves to convey that what the Republic yearned for was a Senate with new members, to reflect a republican majority. In 1878, no artist demonstrated this more compellingly than Alfred Le Petit. On two separate occasions, and in two different journals, Le Petit emphasized the growing

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{15} For more on the connection between bats and Jesuits in visual representations, see Guillaume Doizy and Jacky Houdré, \textit{Bêtes de pouvoir: Caricatures du XVI\textdegree\ siècle à nos jours} (Paris: Nouveau Monde éditions, 2010), 74-77.

\textsuperscript{16} Until the senatorial elections in January 1879, conservatives did not lose hope of restoring a monarchy. Especially since some of the individuals who participated in the May 16, 1877 coup still held a position in office. The state of affairs is summarized in an issue of \textit{Le Sans-culotte} (1878-1879): “quelques-uns de ceux qui ont participé au coup d’Etat sont encore en place … l’ordre moral se promène librement et n’a pas abdiqué ses espérances” (a few of the ones who have participated in the coup d’état are still in office … moral order still walks freely and has not abdicated its hopes). P. Martin, “Une page d’histoire,” \textit{Le Sans-culotte} 9 (1878), 3.
change of power in the political arena. He first showed how the balance of power was tilting in favor of republicans in *Un phénomène* (fig. 137), a print published in *Le Pétard* on March 17, 1878, and then again in *Au coin d’un bois* (fig. 138), a work circulated by *Le Sans-culotte* later that year.

In *Un phénomène* (fig. 137), a two-headed man personifying the Senate sits on a chair and is approached by two figures who represent their political parties respectively. The central figure is a “phenomenon” because he is at once fat and skeletal, and his appearance is completely different based on whether one looks at him front the right or the left. The more he grows in size on his left, the smaller he becomes on his right side. As the inscription below the image states, this man is not an urban legend or some artificial creation – he actually exists. This “marvel of life” manifests himself in a way that reveals the relationship he has with those who surround him. On his right, he is attended to by a légitimiste, who is recognizable by his clothing and the fleur de lis at the end of his ponytail, and by a man who is barely discernable, but appears to have the facial features of a bonapartiste. Meanwhile, on his left, a burly man, who could pass for a peasant, clearly in republican garb, moves towards him. The Senate exchanges greetings with each of the men who appear next to him. The bonapartiste and légitimiste are greeted by a skeletal face, which they can barely look at because of its ghastly appearance. The légitimiste even holds up a handkerchief in front of him in an attempt to shield his eyes. The bony Senate seems to be grinning, as if he were mocking the weakness of the conservative characters who embody the political Right. The légitimiste is having a hard time dealing with the circumstances, as large tears of blood drop from his right eye – surely symbolic – into a bucket. He has clearly lost a lot of bodily fluid, as the bucket can no longer contain all of it. The loss will lead the légitimiste to pass out, and he will soon find himself in a similar state to the cadaver. It was only
a matter of time before the senatorial Right would be extinct. In contrast, the vigorous Senate
smiles at the man to his left, who returns his cheerful expression. It is as though they are long-
lost friends who are elated to have been reacquainted. Perhaps they even share a laugh at the
expense of their rivals. On his left side the Senate has rosy cheeks, further underlining his
healthy demeanor. In essence, matters are flourishing on the political Left. The configuration of
the Senate would favor Republicans after the elections, and thus, the occurrence that Le Petit
envisioned as a phenomenon would become reality.

The second of Le Petit’s works to deal with this subject, *Au coin d’un bois* (fig. 138),
appeared in *Le Sans-culotte*, a journal the artist founded in September 1878. Unlike Le Petit’s *Le
Pétard*, *Le Sans-culotte* was a fairly small publication, but it was also issued on a weekly basis
and contained four pages. *Le Sans-culotte* proclaimed itself as a political journal and each issue
included a caricature by Le Petit. In this work there are two figures: one represents the Senatorial
Right and the other is a female allegory of the Republic. This was the first time that Le Petit
personified the Senatorial Right as such, rather than depicting one or more of the reactionary
characters who in his mind made up the right-wing portion of the Senate – i.e. the légitimiste,
orléaniste, and bonapartiste. Nevertheless, in case the label ‘Droite Sénatoriale’ on the right
shoulder of the hunched man was not enough to identify him, Le Petit drew several small
emblems on his coat to make clear where his sympathies lay. Noticeable on this green clothing
article are: a crown, an umbrella (a symbol associated with King Louis-Philippe and his orléanist
supporters), a fleur de lis, a pear (also tied to King Louis-Philippe and the July Monarchy), an
éteignoir, and an imperial eagle. This man clearly fashions himself as an advocate of
monarchical regimes. He is a deceitful figure, a detail Le Petit has chosen to illustrate by
portraying the Senatorial Right’s shadow as that of a toad. Toads are characterized as repulsive
creatures because of their ugliness, and they often seek to take refuge in dark spaces because they are humiliated by their physical traits.¹⁷ This description is certainly applicable to the old man, who occupies a crouching stance, is bald, holds a crutch under his right arm, and has a menacing look on his face. And in addition, he attempts to solicit the Republic near a wooded area, far away from civilization and any eyewitnesses.

The Senatorial Right’s ambitions are not shared by the younger Republic. Although he offers his arm to her as an act of political marriage, she vehemently rejects his proposal. The way her right arm is positioned in midair suggests that she has removed it from the man’s vicinity as soon as he made his gesture. Moreover, she holds the lower part of her clothing closer to her body with her left hand as a means to further distance herself from the vile figure. Her mind has been made up, and the color of her clothing firmly signals her political allegiance. *Au coin d’un bois* recalls a lithograph Daumier completed nearly thirty years earlier with similar implications. In – *Belle dame, voulez-vous bien accepter mon bras? – Votre passion est trop subite pour que je puisse y croire!* (fig. 139), the Republic refuses to accept Ratapoil’s extended arm, because she believes her sly counterpart might trick her into doing something against her will.¹⁸ The Republic is repelled by Ratapoil’s offer and looks at him with disdain. Le Petit substituted the male figure that seeks to entice the Republic in his own print, but was obviously aware of his predecessors work when he decided to make *Au coin d’un bois*. The Senatorial Right wanted to corrupt the Republic, just like Ratapoil did a few decades earlier; however, this pursuit would end

---

¹⁷ Toads are enemies of light and are regarded as deformed creatures in caricatural imagery. In addition, they have hideous breath, making them foul subjects. For more on the identity of toads in French caricature, see Doizy and Houdré, *Bêtes de pouvoir*, 110-111.

¹⁸ Ratapoil, a fictional agent of bonapartist propaganda, strove to tempt the Republic with the purpose of elevating Louis-Napoléon to a position of power. The latter achieved his goal, as he became emperor of France.
fruitlessly. In 1878, the Republic was not to be fooled by her opponent’s dishonesty, and the age gap between the two figures in Le Petit’s image only added to the chasm that separated their political views. Therefore, with *Au coin d’un bois* and *Un phénomène*, Le Petit wanted to demonstrate that the political Right had been defeated even before the Senate elections had taken place.

4.4 1879: A New Year, New Elections

On January 5, 1879 Senate elections were organized, and for the first time in the Third Republic’s history, Republicans won majority representation in the upper chamber. Out of the 82 available seats, 66 were secured by Republican candidates, and this meant that on the whole, Republicans occupied 174 of the 300 seats in the Senate.\(^{19}\) Conservatives were not only outvoted, but to add insult to injury, the results of the Senate elections were announced publicly the following day, on January 6, a day that was known in France as *la Fête des Rois* (Epiphany). The urns had largely embarrassed supporters of the crown, and accordingly, the day of the kings was overridden by republican jubilation in 1879. For many republicans, January 5, 1879 marked the true beginning of the Third Republic as noted by a columnist of *La Petite Lune*: “ce triomphe-là, c’est, pour nous, l’établissement définitif d’une vraie et sérieuse République.”\(^{20}\) It must have brought great satisfaction to Le Petit to witness this victory, and he credited his fellow countrymen for voting in favor of Republican candidates at this crucial moment.

In *La nouvelle mitrailleuse* (fig. 140), a large urn shaped in the form of a machine gun blasts out paper ballots, which are destroying the watch tower of a fort identified as the Right-wing of


\(^{20}\) “This victory, is for us, the definitive establishment of a real and serious Republic.” Jean Populot, “À Jacques Boulon, dit Bras-de-Fer,” *La Petite Lune* (January 20, 1879), 2.
the Senate. The machine that cranks out the ballots is manned by an allegory of the Republic dressed entirely in red – the color associated with left-wing politics in France. She smirks at the viewer, because the “bulletin de votes” knock over a bonapartiste riding a horse and the tower is about to topple over; two men hanging on for their lives are destined to fall with it. In the meantime, a group of left-wing politicians, led by Gambetta, look over the fort’s wall gleefully as members of the Right-Senate take a beating. The citizens of France have spoken, and it is time for delegates of the old guard (which includes men with pear-shaped heads and the hunched man who first appeared in Le Petit’s *Au coin d’un bois* (fig. 138) as the Republic’s vile tempter), to vacate their positions. The title of the print, *La nouvelle mitrailleuse*, as well as the object that serves as the “mitrailleuse,” intensify the satirical nature of Le Petit’s work. The ammunition released from the apparatus is only paper. Yet, ballots in political elections are the arms that decide the race. They do not cause death but can be considered as weapons in their rightful way, a fact that Daumier also alluded to in *V’là ma cartouche* (fig. 141) the previous decade. In Daumier’s lithograph, a man alarmingly points to a piece of paper, which serves as a voting tool that will help determine an election. As the caption indicates, the piece of paper is the Frenchman’s cartridge. Meanwhile, in *La nouvelle mitrailleuse*, Le Petit conveys how the “bulletin de vote” machine gun is equally, or more, effective than the traditional ones used in warfare.21 In the artist’s view, the “new” mitrailleuse undeniably had more benefits than did

---

21 It is also possible that Le Petit is commenting on the fact that the use of machine guns does not guarantee victory (for instance, the French did not win the Franco-Prussian War, a war of which Le Petit was highly critical, even though they had access to machine guns), whereas the impact of ballots is decisive. It is worth remembering that the plebiscite that extended Napoléon III’s tenure as emperor in 1870 ultimately ignited the country’s decision to fight the Prussians. France’s defeat occurred on the battlefield; however, one could easily argue that it was the casting of ballots that prompted its loss – therefore proving the power of votes. For more, refer back to Chapter 1, 57-62.
earlier models, as it removed detractors from its trajectory without fail. A purge of conservative politicians certainly began in the weeks that followed the elections, and it was a pattern that continued in the early 1880s as well. By the end of January 1879, some of MacMahon’s leading army officials had even been replaced by the new Senate, which rubbed the president the wrong way, leading to his resignation. This was further proof that the momentum that the “republican” Republic had been gathering over the past twelve to sixteen months was at a pivotal juncture.

4.5 Jules Grévy: The First Republican President of the Third Republic

When Jules Grévy replaced Patrice de MacMahon as the President of the Republic on January 30, 1879, the regime truly belonged to republicans. With the change of leadership, most republicans felt as though they had finally transitioned from being subjects to citizens. A sense of unity characterized the nation that simply had not existed while MacMahon was at the helm: “ce qui me plait dans le message du nouveau président, c’est qu’il ne dit pas comme l’autre: mon gouvernement, mon peuple, mon armée, etc. Il dit, au contraire: “Je n’entrerai jamais en lutte contre la volonté nationale”.” Grévy won the presidential title by a landslide. He earned 563 of the 713 votes – proof that he had the backing and trust of more than three quarters of the voting population. Grévy became MacMahon’s successor without allowing the country to lapse into a violent theater of war. During the “era of revolutions,” France had often turned to warfare (i.e. 1830, 1848, and 1870) in order to determine who should rule the country, but that was not the case in 1879 – a sign of the overall effectiveness of the parliamentary system instituted by the

22 The events leading up to MacMahon’s resignation are discussed at length in Fresnette Pisani-Ferry, Le coup d’état manqué du 16 mai 1877 (Paris: Robert Laffont, 1965).
23 “What pleases me about the new president’s message, is that he does not say like the other one: my government, my people, my army, etc. He says, on the contrary: “I will never fight against the nation’s will”.” Anonymous, “Premier sans-culotte,” Le Sans-culotte 20 (1879), 2.
Third Republic. The smooth transition and Grévy’s new appointment were applauded by *La Lune rousse*: “grâce au peuple, à sa patience, à sa fermeté, à sa sagesse, les mauvais jours sont passés.” But, the journal also felt it was necessary to take a parting shot at the former president’s resignation. Accordingly, on February 9, 1879, the same day *La Lune rousse* saluted the Republic’s latest achievement as noted above, Gill mocked the way in which MacMahon had to cede his position in office to Grévy in a print titled *J’y suis, j’y reste!* (fig. 142).

Gill’s image depicts a tall allegory of the Republic standing on a platform, holding a long pole with a large tricolor flag on it in her left hand, while pointing to the ground with her free hand. The artist portrays the Republic as much more mature than he did in images he created earlier in the decade (see, for instance, *M. Walon* (fig. 100) and *La tirelire* (fig. 102)). She is a full-grown figure – she is no longer an infant or a child. Moreover, she is quite muscular, as shown by the size of her biceps, and the length of her hair gives her an added level of vitality. Although her appearance and actions are not identical to those of Marianne in Eugène Delacroix’s *Liberty Leading the People* (fig. 143), she nonetheless recalls the strength and determination of the patriotic allegory from the Romantic painter’s iconic work. Both figures have a commanding presence. Additionally, both figures are exemplary models of *la patrie*, deserving of the highest respect. And at the time of their creation, both artworks referenced key political victories of anti-monarchist sympathies that helped shape the nation’s political structure in the years that followed.

Gill’s figure opens her mouth as she assertively declares “I am here, and I will stay [here],” words that also serve as the title of the print in French. The significance of this statement relates

---

25 “Thanks to the population, its patience, its firmness, its wisdom, the bad days are gone.” The editors of *La Lune rousse*, “Chronique Parisienne,” *La Lune rousse* (February 9, 1879), 1.
directly to the political events that marked the first month of the year: the Senate elections won by a Republican majority and Grévy’s ascendancy to his newly appointed ranking as President of the Republic. These events guaranteed that the Republic was going to remain France’s governmental regime for the foreseeable future. However, the phrase “j’y suis, j’y reste” had another meaning, which takes aim at MacMahon in this particular case. As Jean Frapat explains, it is the title that lends Gill’s print a satirical bite, because “MacMahon était, on le sait, coutumier des formules creuses, telle ce “J’y suis, j’y reste,”” yet when Gill’s print was distributed by *La Lune rousse*, MacMahon no longer was in office. Instead, it was Grévy, an authentic republican, who presided over the country, and he could indeed claim, if he chose to, that “I am here, and I will stay [here].” To produce a confident effigy of the Republic and to complement it with the words “j’y suis, j’y reste” must have been extremely gratifying to Gill, especially since he was not able to publish the lithograph (fig. 133) he originally wanted to issue in *La Lune rousse* on June 30, 1878 showcasing MacMahon overwhelmed by a statue of the Republic. *J’y suis, j’y reste!* was a more subdued form of attack, but one that was equally important to Gill, because he could claim the ultimate revenge: the regime was now heading in an operational direction that suited republican (rather than conservative) aspirations.

When Grévy took over as President of the Republic, his former position as President of the Chamber of Deputies opened up. This position was almost immediately filled by Léon Gambetta. With these men in charge of the political arena, the Third Republic could seriously turn its attention to the affairs that it had previously been forced to set aside. Reforms that the

---

26 “MacMahon was, as we know, accustomed to make hollow statements, such as “I am here, and I will stay [here].”” Jean Frapat, *André Gill 1840-1885* (Paris: Musée de Montmartre, 1993), 25.
27 This work was censored, as mentioned above on page 222.
28 The statesman first performed duty in his new role on February 6, 1879.
country had been asking for several years were not only going to be taken into consideration by the government, sooner or later, they would be adopted by administrative officials. The climate had definitely shifted.

4.6 Daumier’s Funerals and the Recuperation of an Arch-Republican

These all-important events were followed by another one which had profound implications on supporters of the Republic. Only a mere two weeks after Grévy replaced MacMahon as head of state, Honoré Daumier passed away on February 10, 1879. Although the artist was nearly blind and had removed himself from the political scene for a few years already, Daumier lived long enough to witness a final victory in favor of the republican cause. It is almost as if the political world timed the victory of Jules Grévy as the first Republican President of the Third Republic out of respect for the expiring Daumier. André Gill, who was unable to attend Daumier’s funeral, captured this exact sentiment and Daumier’s long combat for republican values in a poem he passed along to Étienne Carjat – a man who took part in Daumier’s funerary ceremonies. Thus, on February 14, 1879, at the cemetery of Valmondois, after sharing his own thoughts on Daumier, Carjat read out the following lines written by Gill: “du moins vous aurez vu, mourant, la bonne cause Triomphante, vous qui sans cesse avez lutté, Pauvre et modeste, pour la grande Liberté. L’avenir aura soin de votre apothéose.”

Jules Champfleury (1821-1889), the renowned art critic and champion of caricature, and M. Bernay, the mayor of Valmondois at the time, were the other individuals who gave discourses at the funeral.

29 “At least you will have seen, dying, the good triumphant cause, you who have fought incessantly, poor and modest, for eternal liberty. The future will take care of your apotheosis.” Gill also published these words, and his poem in honor of Daumier, on the front page of the February 23, 1879 issue of La Lune rousse.

30 For more on Daumier’s death and his funerary ceremonies, see Michel Melot, “La Mort de Daumier,” Humoresques 10 (1998), 57-61.
The vast majority of those who attended the burial shared republican sympathies with Daumier. The republican press, for one, was well represented, as Jules-Antoine Castagnary, Philippe Burty (1830-1890), and Edmond Bazire (1846-1892), amongst others, made the trip from Paris to Valmondois to pay homage to the deceased artist. Members of the press knew how critical Daumier had been in transforming how French citizens related to republican sentiment and politics throughout much of the nineteenth century, and it was their moral duty to salute one of the most industrious and talented men in the business. Moreover, between February 14 and the end of the month, no less than fifteen different journalists wrote eulogies of varying lengths in honor of Daumier.\footnote{Here is the list of writers and newspapers that published dedications to Daumier: Philippe Burty – *La République française*; Henry Garnier – *Le Voltaire*; Firmin Javel – *L’Événement*; Albert Wolff – *Le Figaro*; Pierre Véron – *Le Journal amusant*; Charles Laurent – *La France*; Louis Leroy – *Le Charivari*; Henri Fouquier – *Le XIXe siècle*; Théodore de Banville – *Gil Blas*; Paul Foucher – *Le National*; Jean Bérard – *La Marseillaise*; Charles Blanc – *Le Temps*; Edmond Bazire – *Le Rappel*; Camille Pelletan – *Le Rappel*; André Gill – *La Lune rousse*.}

Alfred Le Petit’s *Le Sans-culotte* did not draft a eulogy for this occasion. However, it alluded to the artist’s death in a single phrase that summarized the magnitude of the loss in a heartfelt way: “ainsi les bons s’en vont.”\footnote{“Thus, the good go away.” Anonymous, *Le Sans-culotte* 21 (1879), 3.} Therefore, within a matter of days, the Republic went from rejoicing in its recent successes to mourning the loss of one of its artistic heroes.

In an effort to recuperate Daumier’s career and his vast contributions to the republican cause, a retrospective show was organized by some of his closest friends in 1878. The sculptor, Adolphe-Victor Geoffroy-Dechaume (1816-1892), and Daumier’s neighbor in Valmondois, was one of the chief organizers of the exhibition. The show took place at Paul Durand-Ruel’s (1831-1922) gallery in Paris; it opened on April 17 and lasted until June 15, 1878. The organizing committee asked Victor Hugo to be the honorary president of the exhibition – a position which
the poet, an avid admirer of both caricature and the Republic, accepted – giving the event an added republican undertone. Furthermore, Léon Gambetta was named an honorary member of the Daumier exhibition, even though the statesman was not particularly fond of the artist’s aesthetic style.\textsuperscript{33} Gambetta still made sure to visit the exhibition to express his support for a man who had championed republican principles throughout his illustrious career. In 1878, Gambetta also had demonstrated his support for Daumier by carrying out a notable act of patronage: he doubled the artist’s pension.\textsuperscript{34} Such a gesture of kindness and the organization of the retrospective exhibition were possible because of the stronger foothold republicans now held in the political arena. Expressing republican sentiment in public settings was only starting to come around after the October elections in 1877. But since not all forms of celebrations were approved just yet (Voltaire’s centenary was practically non-existent outside of private parties), it was quite the feat to assemble a solo exhibition in honor of Daumier.\textsuperscript{35} Daumier was, after all, as Cham, one of Daumier’s main collaborators and competitors at \textit{Le Charivari} for several decades, put it: the king of caricature. As part of his \textit{Croquis} (fig. 144) that appeared in \textit{Le Charivari} on April 28, 1878 – shortly after the opening of the Daumier exhibition – Cham depicted a personification of Caricature entering the gallery where the show was being held. The figure carries a wreath in his hand as he is about to crown his worthy master.\textsuperscript{36} In short, Daumier was a heroic figure in the

\textsuperscript{33} Gambetta’s favorite artworks were landscapes and military subjects. He considered Ernest Meissonier (1815-1891) to be one of the best French painters of his time. For more on Hugo’s and Gambetta’s involvement in the Daumier exhibit, see Melot, “La Mort de Daumier,” 60.

\textsuperscript{34} After Gambetta’s noble act, the pension Daumier received from the state increased to 2,400 francs. J. P. T. Bury, \textit{Gambetta’s Final Years: ‘The Era of Difficulties’ 1877-1882} (London: Longman, 1982), 12.

\textsuperscript{35} In comparison, no exhibition was assembled in praise of Gustave Courbet – who died the year before in 1877. Yet, Courbet was equally deserving of such recognition.

\textsuperscript{36} \textit{Le Charivari} had lost some of its republican verve when Daumier stopped producing prints for the journal.
eyes of many, and to further preserve his legacy at a national level, he was re-buried at the Père-Lachaise cemetery in Paris in 1880, a year after he was buried in Valmondois.

Edmond Turquet (1836-1914), the sous-secrétaire d’État aux Beaux-Arts in 1880, was the man who recommended Daumier’s body be transferred from Valmondois to Paris. Members of the committee who had helped organize the retrospective show in 1878, as well as other friends of the artist, fully approved this plan, since the Republic needed to rightfully revere one of its own forefathers: “ce vieux combattant républicain.” Accordingly, the state took it upon itself to pay for the expenses of Daumier’s second funeral. As Michel Melot states, the burial that took place at Père-Lachaise on April 16, 1880 had a nationalistic spirit: “le second enterrement de Daumier, dans la capitale, prenait des allures de funérailles nationales.” Approximately 200 people attended Daumier’s funeral in Paris. Moreover, Daumier’s funeral showed that a cult of political personalities emerged exactly when republicans began dominating the political scene in France. No longer were large-scale funerals strictly reserved for political figures. Instead, the Third Republic used funerals as a way to further democratize the nation and to instill a sense of community amongst citizens. In 1880, the state recognized Daumier’s spirit to rally for the republican cause at all times, starting with the caricatures he made for satirical journals in the 1830s. It was this personality that was being championed on a spring day at the Père-Lachaise

---

37 For more on the decision to have a second funeral in honor of Daumier, see Melot, Daumier: L’art et la République (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2008), 51-60
40 Between 1878 and 1900, only about a third of the funerary ceremonies with national implications were dedicated to politicians. The others honored writers, artists, musicians, militaries, etc. Bertrand Tillier discusses the significance of the cult of personalities in the last third of the nineteenth century and its impact on visual culture in Tillier, La Républicature. La caricature politique en France, 1870-1914 (Paris: CNRS, 1997), 43-45.
cemetery in the French capital. As his body returned to Paris, the site that inspired his artistic career, Daumier assumed a place of honor in the republican paradise that the regime could now offer to its national heroes.

4.7 The Prince Imperial Passes Away

In 1879 another individual passed away, leaving an imprint on the Third Republic’s political spectrum. Napoléon IV – the Prince Imperial – died on June 1, 1879. Although political developments already favored republicans prior to the pretender’s death, the news of his demise, in the Anglo-Zulu War, dealt a severe blow to bonapartiste ambitions. While the incident left many members on the Right devastated, it gave republicans a reason to revel and an added level of comfort: “le petit prince est mort … une assurance de plus pour la stabilité de la République.”41 As he grew of age, and since the day his father passed away, the Prince Imperial had been a constant target of the Left-wing press. Republicans persistently regarded him as someone incapable of ruling.42 The prince’s impotence was rendered explicitly in a lithograph published by Le Pétard, in which Le Petit compared him to his father and great-uncle.

In La trinité bonapartiste (fig. 145), Le Petit not only mocked the Prince Imperial, but also the degeneracy of the bonapartiste lineage. Each figure that forms part of the “trinity” is given an effigy of varying size and material. Napoléon I is represented as a large bronze statue, Napoléon III is portrayed as a somewhat smaller plaster statue, and finally, Napoléon IV is depicted as a gingerbread cookie that can be held in one’s hands. Not only is Napoléon IV much smaller than

42 Philippe Rivière, “Alfred Le Petit (1841-1909) un caricaturiste inventif et engagé,” M.A. Thesis, Université Paris I Panthéon-Sorbonne, 2003, 32. This unpublished thesis is the most comprehensible overview of Alfred Le Petit’s career as a caricaturist. Since it covers the length of Le Petit’s artistic life it is not particularly detail oriented; however, it has proven to be a useful source for my own study.
the other figures, he is turned upside down and is missing his feet, as a young personification of the Republic has begun eating parts of his lower body. Additionally, dates included at the base of Napoléon I’s and Napoléon III’s statue indicate the period during which they ruled over the country respectively. However, there is no such equivalent for Napoléon IV because he never presided over France – not even after the print was published. The bonapartiste legend, which thrived during the First and Second Empires, has vanished by the late 1870s. A setting sun with the word ‘Empire’ written on it rapidly disappears in the background of the print, putting an end to any hopes of restoring an empire in the process. Napoléon IV has failed his destiny. The bonapartiste “trinity” has also engendered a lot of bloodshed over the years, as a sea of skulls (some of which have the name of battles imprinted on their foreheads), make up the crowd of onlookers. Only the dead salute this “trinity,” and thus, viewers are left with macabre memories of the bonapartiste lineage.43

By turning the Prince Imperial into a mere cookie, Le Petit markedly debased him beyond repair. Depicting someone as a gingerbread cookie had particular connotations for a French audience in the nineteenth century. In the nineteenth century, a fair, known as the “Foire aux pains d’épice,” took place around Easter on an annual basis. Merchants and bakers from different areas of the country would create gingerbread cookies in different shapes, often fashioned to look like figures. What began as a religious tradition during the Middle Ages, turned into a commercialized event, and by 1875, the fair was so popular that a song was invented to celebrate the “Foire aux pains d’épice.”44 In Paris, the fair was held at Place du Thrône and its neighboring

43 The title of Le Petit’s print also mocks the Holy Trinity – a catholic reference viewers would surely have grasped at the time.
district – an area that was renamed Place de la Nation in 1880 by the Third Republic. Prior to the name change, André Gill produced a print for L’Éclipse which referred to the location of the fair by making use of a clever pun. In La foire aux pains d’épice (fig. 146), Gill portrays an allegory of the Republic as a young girl biting into a gingerbread cookie shaped in the form of a Ratapoil-like figure. The caption (La République, à la place du Trône) can be read in two ways. Literally, the phrase indicates that the Republic is at the (“à la”) Place du Trône. However, figuratively, Gill suggests that the Republic replaces (“à la place du”) the throne. The gingerbread cookie is quite large in Gill’s image, seen as the Republic had not yet fully established its political roots at the time, but he evidently meant to show that the Republic will chip away at its task even if it requires patience. The Republic will overcome and consume its opponent – a message that is rendered clear in Le Petit’s La trinité bonapartiste. Although the scene in Le Petit’s image takes place in a nondescript area (it is not a representation of the Place du Trône), the Republic has replaced Napoléon IV on the platform that serves as her pedestal. The prince is completely dwarfed by the size of the Republic. As a gingerbread cookie, he remains motionless, while the Republic stands in the flesh. Hence, as the lone figure that has functioning limbs, only the Republic can have an impact on the regime moving forward. The bonapartiste heritage was literally crumbling.

To degrade the Prince Imperial even more, artists would, at times, depict him as an ass. This was the case in Alfred Le Petit’s Le premier prix (fig. 147) – the first of a series of prints which directly targeted Napoléon IV in Le Pétard in the months leading up to the prince’s death. In

---

45 Frapat, André Gill 1840-1885, 25.
46 The other works are: Entrée triomphale du petit Badinguet dans sa bonne ville de Paris (October 20, 1878), Napoléon IV, Empereur des Français par la grâce de Dieu distribute à ses fidèles sujets les récompenses dues à leur dévouement (November 24, 1878), and Mariage du
satirical images, representing someone as an ass is one of the lowest forms of zoomorphism. Much like a pig, an animal Le Petit made use of earlier in his career to satirize Napoléon III (see, *Le Porc des Tuileries; Adieu mon étoile!* (fig. 39)), an ass is viewed as lazy and stupid.

Furthermore, asses are characterized as ignorant, and are discernible by their long ears. The word *baudet*, a synonym of donkey in French, was often used to refer to the Prince Imperial. In Le Petit’s “dictionnaire républicain,” a column that appeared on a regular basis in *Le Sans-culotte*, a *baudet* is described as an “âne, homme stupide” and as “Napoléon III, son gosse et toute sa sélquelle.” While one does not see the facial appearance of the human/animal hybrid figure in the foreground of *Le premier prix*, it is clearly meant to portray the Prince Imperial. Unlike the other donkeys drinking water from the trough, the ass at the front of the line is attired in a black suit with stiff white collar. On this piece of clothing appears a sign marked ‘premier prix.’ Part of the humor here is the absurd contrast of the well-dressed humanoid ass, and the rest of the livestock. Le Petit implies that even amongst one of the most ignoble and basest forms of creatures, the metamorphosed prince earns the title of being the most idiotic and ridiculous. The donkey nearest to the human/animal prince even seems to laugh at the latter’s appearance. Le Petit reduces the man, who professed himself as the successor to the imperial throne, to a mere ignorant quadruped.

The ass nearest to the viewer in Le Petit’s lithograph, also has grotesquely large ears. They are nearly three times the size of the ears of the other animals in the print, and one is inclined to

---

*Prince Longuesoreilles avec la Princesse Eudoxie Beaubec célébré le 18 ... à l’église Saint-Augustin* (February 2, 1879).

47 For more on how donkeys have been characterized in satirical works, see Doizy and Houdré, *Bêtes de pouvoir*, 46-49.

associate them with the ears of elephants. Subscribers of *Le Pétard* would have been encouraged to make such a connection; in a later issue of the illustrated newspaper, an anecdotal tale, with a satirical twist, detailed how the prince had enormous elephant ears. “Les enfants du voisinage, Lorsque l’eau tombait à torrent, Venaient se garer de l’orage Sous mes oreilles d’éléphant.”\(^{49}\) Therefore, the exaggerated ears also allowed viewers to identify the primary ass as Napoléon IV even without seeing the front of his face.\(^{50}\) The zoomorphism of Napoléon III’s son was a crude way of degrading both his moral character and biological status, while simultaneously calling attention to his political ineptitude. In short, the resurgence of the Republic in early 1879 set a climate in which the satirical press could attack bonapartiste sentiment from a position of great strength, even given the irrelevance of the prince before his unexpected death.

### 4.8 The Return of “La Marseillaise” and of the Chambers to Paris

When the Republicans assumed command of the political sphere in 1879, what were some of the reforms they introduced to the nation? The government began by replacing administrators who had been loyal to MacMahon’s regime with bona fide republicans, in order to facilitate the passing of bills and regulations. Within the first weeks of Grévy’s appointment as President of the Republic, “La Marseillaise” was restored as the country’s national anthem. Given the connection of “La Marseillaise” to the French Revolution and the People, the song was viewed as controversial throughout most of the nineteenth century and had been banned from public

\(^{49}\) “When the rain poured down in torrents, the neighborhood kids would come find shelter from the storm under my elephant ears.” Ripelet-Bertal, “Les oreilles de Loulou!!,” *Le Pétard* (March 30, 1879), 1.

\(^{50}\) Though not as drastically large as the prince’s ears in *Le premier prix*, it is interesting to note, that Napoléon III is given large ears when transformed into a pig by Le Petit in *Le Porc des Tuileries; Adieu mon étoile!* In other instances, it was Napoléon III’s large nose that enabled viewers to identify him in political prints. Clearly, facial distorting was a powerful element that formed part of the caricaturist’s trade.
performance during the Second Empire. However, the “republican” Republic sought to rekindle some of the spirit first established in 1789, and accordingly, it was during a historic parliamentary session held on February 14, 1879 that “La Marseillaise” was brought back as France’s anthem. “La Marseillaise” was again sung at theaters, night clubs, on national holidays, and schoolchildren were even taught the lyrics while attending school. From 1879 onwards, “La Marseillaise” became a fixture of the Third Republic and modern French history.

1879 also witnessed the return of the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate to Paris from Versailles. On June 19, 1879 an agreement was reached to permanently relocate the chambers to the capital; the government commissioned the erection of a commemorative medal to mark the occasion. For the government to take such action proved that the French capital was no longer considered to be primarily a site of revolutionary uprising and political disturbances. This display of confidence reflected the majority’s mandate and solidified the Republic’s democratic image. Thus, a permanent link was forged between the legislative bodies and Paris – a bond that remains intact to this day. Other major changes were on the horizon, as the Republic would stand on even firmer grounds in the years that followed.

4.9 Establishing Secular Roots

Once Republicans took control of the regime, the Church was viewed as the primary opponent of the Republic. Since the early days of the Third Republic, the Church had fused its

51 Napoléon III and previous government officials were well aware of the song’s power to mobilize the people. Michel Vovelle, “La Marseillaise: War or Peace,” in Pierre Nora, Rethinking the French Past: Realms of Memory; Symbols, vol. 3 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996), 44.
52 Ibid., 57.
53 The following month, the move was complete, as the Palais du Luxembourg became the seat of the Senate, while the Palais Bourbon welcomed the Chamber of Deputies as its new home. Maurice Agulhon, Marianne into Battle: Republican Imagery and Symbolism in France, 1789-1880, translated by Janet Llyod (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 163.
cause with that of the restoration of a monarchy in France – a capital crime according to the political Left. The Church was regarded by republicans as a form of authority that destroyed the well-being of a republic. Members of the press were fed up with the weight that the Church had on social mores and on people’s consciences, because it put a halt to the development of progressive ideas. Accordingly, the need to secularize institutions in order to distance the regime from its long-standing adversary became a common topic of discussion in newspapers.

Anticlericalism started gaining momentum in the late Second Empire due to the Church’s connection to the imperial government, and it became even more predominant at the time of the Paris Commune. During that period scientific theories started garnering attraction and the number of popular publications vilifying the Church increased. The Commune even declared the separation of the State and the Church in April 1871.

It was on the heels of this phenomenon that Daumier had insinuated that Jesuits, figures who embodied the Church, had replaced the Prussians as the main enemy of the country in Une invasion remplace l’autre (fig. 148). In Daumier’s lithograph, an army of Prussian soldiers can be seen leaving the country, while a group of Jesuits parade their way into the foreground. These were clericalist men who formed the majority of the Assemblée nationale in 1871 and fought resolutely against the establishment of the Third Republic, keeping the country in a state of

---

54 As Richard Thomson explains, the Catholic Church was the Republic’s ideological rival: “French Republicanism had long taken a hostile attitude to the Church. The Church’s commitment to Christian dogma contradicted liberté of thought and even expression. Its hierarchical structure and traditionally close allegiance to monarchy jarred with the concept of égalité. And the setting of priest apart from people skewed the ideal of fraternité.” Richard Thomson, The Troubled Republic: Visual Culture and Social Debate in France, 1889-1900 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 118-119. The tensions between the two sides are discussed through caricatures in Guillaume Doizy and Jean-Bernard Lalaux, A bas la calotte!: La caricature anticléricale et la Séparation des Eglises et de l’Etat, especially 69-87.

uncertainty and agitation with the purpose of reviving monarchical hopes. According to the Left, representatives of the Church were corrupt individuals who had pushed the country into a negative tailspin for much of the first decade of the Third Republic’s existence. By cutting off figures at the left side of the picture frame, Daumier suggests that many more Jesuits form the invasion – they simply cannot all be represented. The threat was palpable, and only time would allow republicans to resolve the situation. The separation of Church and State only eventually happened in 1905.

In the years that followed, the denunciation of clericalism held, in large part, the republican camp together. After the Wallon amendment had been approved, republicans accentuated their anticlerical agenda in propagandistic terms, an action plan that reached an apex in 1877, when Gambetta famously stated: “Clericalism? There is the enemy!”56 The words that the statesman proclaimed during a speech he made at the Chamber of Deputies session on May 4, 1877 became a standard republican war cry in the last third of the nineteenth century. In Gambetta’s opinion, the Church had ruled the State for too long, weakening the latter’s strength, and clericalism threatened to destroy national unity.57 To reinforce Gambetta’s message, Gill visually portrayed the enemy in a print the following week. Jovial office (fig. 149) is an exceptionally grotesque representation of a Jesuit. The level of spite and disdain evident in this print reveals Gill’s disposition toward clergy. This work, unlike the vast majority of his portraits-charges, recalls the work of Louis-Leopold Boilly (1761-1845), an artist best known for his Receuil de grimaces, a series of 96 lithographs depicting expressive heads. Boilly’s series places an enormous

emphasis on the facial features and expressions of a variety of characters (e.g. fig. 150).\textsuperscript{58} In \textit{Jovial office}, Gill shows a full-length figure, but greater attention is given to the man’s face, especially since the entire background is left blank. The Jesuit has a twisted grimace, highlighted by his wide-open mouth and his raised eyebrows. His teeth are filthy, adding to his repulsive appearance. One can barely look at him without hearing his maniacal laugh. The figure has pen and paper at his hands, and he seems to be taunting the viewer from his bureaucratic position. Since this print was published before the Republicans even won the Chamber of Deputies elections, Gill’s image served as warning that the regime was in danger with men such as this Jesuit in charge of decision-making roles. The threat that Daumier had identified earlier in the decade was still present in 1877 since the \textit{gouvernement de l’Ordre moral} outdid its predecessor in supporting the Church.\textsuperscript{59} Therefore, the enemy was, as Gambetta had noted, indeed clericalism.

In the late 1870s and early 1880s, Alfred Le Petit devoted a large part of his lithographic work to condemn the Church and clericalism. Le Petit’s \textit{Le Sans-culotte} was likely the most anticlerical journal in France at the time of its existence, and his \textit{Le Pétard} frequently included similar content. In Le Petit’s view, Jesuits personified corruption, as they commonly took advantage of those around them for their personal gain and power. This belief is rendered in \textit{A double face} (fig. 151), a print published by \textit{Le Pétard} in February 1878. A Janus-faced Jesuit, recognizable by his black hat as a veritable defendant of clericalism, stands in the middle of the print, and has two very different reactions towards figures embodying the Republic on either side

\textsuperscript{58} For a short but comprehensive overview of Boilly’s lithographic work, see Beatrice Farwell, \textit{The Charged Image: French Lithographic Caricature 1816-1848} (Santa Barbara: Santa Barbara Museum of Art, 1989), 38-46.
\textsuperscript{59} Langlois, “Catholics and Seculars,” 118.
of the picture frame. The allegory on the right offers the Jesuit a large sack of money, which the latter humbly accepts by bowing his head down in an act of gratitude. His hand is enormous – it is larger than his face – a caricatural distortion with a clear impact. However, he also looks at the Republic in a manner that suggests he is trying to hide the actions of his other half. Angered by the lack of support from the Republic on the left, the Jesuit raises his foot to kick the allegory in the face. His greed dictates his actions, which clearly are not pure or consistent.

The Church did not want to be separated from the State, because it risked losing a steady source of income. In Le Petit’s view, Jesuits, or priests, as he makes clear in *On vous rendra ça la-haut* (fig. 152), a print issued by *Le Sans-culotte* later that same year, were only interested in providing their services or offering salvation if they could receive financial support in return. For Le Petit, Church representatives did not perform any useful service. The presence of an ominous figure is apparent in both of the above-mentioned prints. It is particularly blatant in *On vous rendra ça la-haut*, where a well-fed priest, wearing all black, takes up nearly half of the space in this scene. Meanwhile, the figure nearest to the priest is skinny and starved. He wears sabots and is dressed in clothes that symbolize the tricolor flag, and the other commoners all wear white clothes. These civilians are being tricked into paying money to the priest in order to buy their freedom in the afterlife. The simple notion that the priest is “selling” heaven proves he is dishonorable. The Church did not produce miracles, and the regime felt it was time to realign

---

60 A short description accompanied Le Petit’s *On vous rendra ça la-haut* in that day’s issue of *Le Sans-culotte*, and it is worth reproducing here, because it underlines the perverted conduct of the Church, and specifically, the man collecting the money in the image. “N’oubliez pas, mes frères, Que vingt francs dans nos mains ne sont jamais perdus; Nous penserons à vous quand vous ne serez plus … Achetez! Achetez! Tout le ciel est à vendre” (Do not forget, my brothers, that twenty francs in our hands are never lost; we will think of you when you will no longer be alive … Buy! Buy! All of the sky is for sale). D. Brunot, “On vous rendra ça la-haut,” *Le Sans-culotte* 3 (1878), 2.
who had the strongest control over the masses. Not surprisingly, starting in 1880, the national educational system underwent significant retooling.

In March 1880, decrees were introduced under the leadership of Jules Ferry, which served as a major steppingstone for the establishment of free primary education in 1881, followed by mandatory and secular primary education in 1882. The decrees passed on March 29, 1880 essentially expelled religious congregations from teaching, which included the Jesuits. Although the official edict transpired at the end of the month, the education question was already a topic of debate in parliamentary sessions in early March. Caricaturists caught wind of the forthcoming changes and were thrilled by the outcome they could potentially have on society. Accordingly, on March 21, 1880, André Gill and Alfred Le Petit respectively made prints envisioning Jesuits being driven out of the country. Le Petit’s *Les triomphateurs de l’article 7* (fig. 153) showcases a slew of Jesuits passing by a sign that serves as a marker for the country’s border, while a man symbolizing the law points the way for their exit. In Gill’s *Conclusion* (fig. 154), an allegory of the Republic, fully dressed in red, pulls a Jesuit by his garment while pointing towards a high-speed train in the background, onto which the latter will soon embark. The message of both prints was basically the same: with the new rules soon to be in place, there will be no more place for Jesuits in France.

Jesuits, of course, were not officially expelled from the country, but their inability to preach the Church’s doctrine in educational settings dealt a major blow to their role and status in French

---

61 Jules Ferry was the Minister of Public Education throughout the early 1880s, and the educational changes he brought to the regime at the time even took his name – Jules Ferry Laws – given his critical role in promoting the inception of a republican school system.

62 For more on the impact that the March decrees had on social reforms in the early 1880s, see Milorad N. Vuckovic, “The Suppression of Religious Houses in France 1880, and the Attitude of Representative British Press,” *Report* 28 (1961), 9-23.
society. The regime, as Gill and Le Petit illustrate in Conclusion and Les triomphateurs de l’article 7 respectively, would no longer tolerate corruption. Since Jesuits had plagued republicans for a long time, it was only fitting that they were the ones most targeted by the satirical press when reports about educational reforms first surfaced. It was clear from then on that the regime would initiate further changes that would weaken the Church’s authority and refute its dogma.

4.10 The Granting of Amnesty

The granting of amnesty to Communards was a long and complicated affair, but the “republican” Republic was able to add it to its list of exploits in the early 1880s. A bill had been passed in March 1879, almost immediately after Grévy was named President of the Republic, granting partial amnesty to the Communards who had been deported to New Caledonia earlier in the decade.63 Victor Hugo was an influential factor in this decision. Hugo had been asking for the amnesty of Communards since he was named a senator in 1876, and he energetically renewed his quest in 1879 once the Republicans were in command of the political arena. In a senatorial session in late February 1879, his demand met with positive approval from other members of the Senate, and the wheels to grant amnesty were set in motion.64 Gill, as always, supported Hugo’s actions and he ennobled the author’s honorable pursuit in a print issued by La Petite Lune titled Amnistie! (fig. 155). In this work, Hugo is shown trying to break the chains of imprisonment. He looks old, in part because he was nearing his eightieth birthday when Gill made this print, but also because his attempts to obtain amnesty for Communards have taken a toll on him.

63 Bennett, “Long Live the Revolutions,” 301.
64 Hugo’s name was, after all, synonymous with the Republic, and he was at the height of his political career during these transitional years. Maurice Agulhon et al., La Gloire de Victor Hugo (Paris: Galeries nationales du Grand Palais, 1985), 212.
Nevertheless, his poise, strong will, and determination will enable him to reach his goal. Gill illustrates Hugo’s physical strength by revealing his muscular biceps as he elevates a hammer to smash the iron chains, which symbolically restrain the deported Communards from returning to France. Few individuals fought for the liberty of others as did Hugo at the time, and it was not long before the first wave of liberated men and women found themselves back in their home country. This feat further added to Hugo’s glory; however, for many, including Hugo himself, there was still more work to be done because while partial amnesty was a step in the right direction for the republican regime, it did not translate to a nationwide celebration. Partial amnesty equaled a partial victory.

Those who returned from exile shared their hardships with others, and it made partial amnesty seem all the more inadequate – especially since ten years had almost gone by since the Paris Commune had taken place. Rather than preach for patience, the new administrative leadership needed to fulfill its promises. A little more time elapsed before the issue was resolved; however, in July 1880 full amnesty was granted to all Communards. When the bill was passed in 1880, it became official that liberty was a guiding principle of this new phase of the Third Republic.

Édouard Manet wasted no time in expressing his joy at this pivotal moment. In a letter dated July 14, 1880 (fig. 156) dedicated to Isabelle Lemonnier (1857-1926), a lady who sat for several

---

65 The exact date of arrival of the first ships that traveled from New Caledonia to France varies according to sources, but it seems likely that they either returned in late August or early September 1879. See, for instance, Pierre Casselle, *Nouvelle histoire de Paris: Paris républicain 1871-1914* (Paris: Hachette, 2013), 114.

66 The partial amnesty bill passed in 1879 did provide approximately 3,500 individuals the opportunity to return to France, yet it also left another 1,000 still imprisoned in New Caledonia. Alain Dalotel, “Deux amnisties pour oublier la Commune,” in *Repression et prison politiques en France et en Europe au XIXe siècle*, Philippe Vigier et al. (Paris: Créaphis, 1990), 179.

67 With the passing of full amnesty, the State had pardoned all but fourteen individuals who were convicted of murder during the insurrectional events in 1871. Bennett, “Long Live the Revolutions,” 354-355.
of Manet’s portraits in the final years of his life, the artist declared: “Vive l’amnistie.” Manet had sympathized with members of the Commune earlier in his career, when he had produced *La Barricade* (fig. 67) and *Guerre civile* (fig. 69), and his letter to Lemonnier proves that he fully approved the State’s decision to pardon Communards in July 1880. Manet sent a series of letters to Isabelle Lemonnier that summer, and many of them were decorated with watercolor sketches. The above-mentioned letter contains a depiction of two lightly drawn tricolor flags – Manet used the color of the paper to serve as the white part of the flag instead of applying his brush to the surface – in order to accompany his short statement and to accentuate the patriotic emotion he felt at that time. Two elements distinguish this letter from the other ones Manet wrote to Lemonnier: the content and the length of the message. Whereas the other letters deal with artistic matters, describe some of the artist’s recent encounters, or ask the recipient to offer news of herself in return, this one simply bears the announcement. Lower down, Manet did say that he will no longer write to Lemonnier because she never responds to his letters, but it further demonstrates that he really took the granting of amnesty to heart. He was sharing a spontaneous and authentic sentiment with Lemonnier. By keeping his message succinct, more so than with any of his other letters addressed to Lemonnier, Manet directly spoke his mind. Manet, truthfully, was fond of Lemonnier, but he clearly needed to share his feelings with someone, and to do so with a person in his artistic circle, rather than one of his political connections, demonstrates the extent to which amnesty was in his thoughts. July 14, of course, also marked the anniversary of the storming of the Bastille in 1789, lending the amnesty bill even greater symbolic meaning. This was no coincidence, as 1880 marked the first year that the *14 juillet was*

---

68 These letters have been published and translated in Juliet Wilson-Bareau, ed., *Manet by Himself* (Boston: Bulfinch Press, 1991), 250-258.
recognized as the true national holiday of *la patrie*. Amnesty celebrations and the Third Republic’s new Fête nationale went hand in hand.\(^6^9\) The private nature of Manet’s declaration differed greatly from the circulation of satirical prints in public, but it illustrates that republican sentiment permeated different realms of society. Manet, and other republicans, had reason to be proud of the regime.

André Gill was also thrilled to learn about the granting of amnesty, and he responded by making a public statement that nobody in Paris could fail to notice. He conceived a work of massive proportions, which was temporarily displayed at the intersection of the rue des Martyrs and the avenue Trudaine near Montmartre. With the help of Pierre Carrier-Belleuse (1851-1932), Gill raised a triumphal arch depicting Léon Gambetta shaking hands with a Communard who has returned to Paris from exile (fig. 157).\(^7^0\) The cardboard arch measured approximately two stories in height, and was cut out in a fashion that allowed passersby to walk underneath the hands of the two colossal figures. Both men smile as they affectionately shake hands to consummate the act of amnesty. By reaching out to each other across the street, the two sides are reconciled.

Gambetta had played a critical role in instituting amnesty. In the days leading up to the passing of the bill, Gambetta had urged other politicians to endorse the ruling. Many perceived the timing of the law’s initiation to be a coup de maître on Gambetta’s behalf, since he participated in several of the debate sessions discussing the matter, rather than simply overseeing the sessions.\(^7^1\) As a result, his oratorical skills were once again on display, and he could lay claim to

---

\(^6^9\) On July 14, 1880 Manet wrote a separate letter to an unknown correspondent, with the following message: “Vive la République.” Ibid., 252.

\(^7^0\) Few sources mention this work since it has not been conserved. Only photographic evidence, in the shape of postcards such as Figure 157, remains of Gill’s artwork today. On his triumphal arch project, see Charles Fontane, *Un maître de la caricature: André Gill* (Paris: Éditions de l’Ibis, 1927), vol. 1, 136-137, and vol. 2, 197.

\(^7^1\) Bury, *Gambetta’s Final Years*, 167-168.
having brokered the amnesty. Hence, his presence as one of the pillars of Gill’s triumphal arch was fully warranted.

Ceremonies in honor of the *14 juillet* took place in various areas of the city. Gambetta and other highly ranked statesmen, including Grévy, were in attendance at Longchamp for the distribution of new colors to each regiment and other official festivities.\(^2\) Not every Parisian could make it to Longchamp, lending Gill’s enormous effigy greater value. Gill’s arch enabled his fellow countrymen to be participants in the granting of amnesty and the Fête nationale simultaneously. The artist had strategically placed his banner near Montmartre – a neighborhood that many Communards called home before and after the Paris Commune. It was a highly populated area and was likely the quarter of Paris that celebrated the return of those in exile the most, because of its significance to the Commune. Gill’s triumphal arch was a public artwork with a public message, which was emphatically ideological.

To supplement his grand artwork, Gill also produced a print to commemorate this historical moment. On July 14, 1880 *Le Réveil illustré* (1880) published a lithograph conveying a similar message to Gill’s banner. In *Quel rêve!...* (fig. 158), an allegory of the Republic welcomes home a Communard. The Republic, with a massive tricolor flag floating at her back, is on the verge of receiving an amnestied man into her arms. The male figure holds his hat and cane to the side as he is overjoyed by the Republic’s greeting. The chains which have kept him a prisoner for several years (a broken piece of chain is noticeable around his right ankle – the very kind of chain Hugo is shown breaking down in Gill’s *Amnistie!* (fig. 155)), will no longer confine him. The Communard carries a similar bag at the side of his waist as the one portrayed by Gill in the image he erected at the avenue Trudaine. In the print, an embrace, instead of a handshake will

\(^2\) Ibid., 170.
serve as the act of pardon, but ultimately it is the act of acceptance that is key in both works. Whether it was on a small or large scale, Gill undeniably wanted to instill this victorious event in the collective memories of his compatriots. In short, the celebrations on July 14, 1880 marked the dawn of a new era for the Third Republic, and by making public artworks (a print and a temporary arch), Gill helped instill the sense of community victory and satisfaction at this recuperation of ardent republicans from the traumatic era of the Commune.

The national holiday celebrated in July 1880 was unlike any other. The 14 juillet had quickly replaced June 30 as France’s Fête nationale. By singling out the 14 juillet beyond all other dates, the regime was candidly drawing a link to the storming of the Bastille in 1789 and the People’s claim to their destiny, as well as the Fête de la Fédération, an event first observed on July 14, 1790. For proponents of the Republic, July 14, 1880 emerged as the occasion that put an end to the epic battle first begun in 1789. For nonreligious individuals, the public commemoration of this date “probably represented what Easter represented for Catholics.” Republican conviction rather than financial means dictated the terms of celebrations on this occasion. The central actors of the original Bastille Day holiday were the people and their relentless pursuit of pro-democratic principles. The 14 juillet symbolized the consolidation of the Third Republic even as it resulted in establishing the roots of the Republic in la France profonde. The occasion may have led individuals, such as Manet and Gill, to respond in different ways, but this historic date

---

74 Ibid., 117-118.
75 Contrary to the holiday of June 30, 1878, when each neighborhood in Paris was forced to organize festivities using its own budget, the July 14, 1880 celebrations were directly funded by the State. Ihl, *La fête républicaine*, 108.
76 Christian Amalvi, “Bastille Day: From Dies Irae to Holiday,” 125.
generated a lasting legacy. While celebrations on the day of the Fête nationale may have diminished over the years, it has survived several regime changes, lending further credibility to the Third Republic’s pioneering decision to make Bastile Day an annual holiday.

4.11 Portraits of Republican Personalities at the 1881 Salon

The celebration of amnesty and the 14 juillet in 1880, engendered the return of prominent figures to France. Henri Rochefort was one of these individuals: he had turned into a celebrity after being exiled from France, because he had successfully escaped from New Caledonia less than a year after his deportation.77 The story of Rochefort’s escape excited many people, including Manet, who read about the journalist’s adventures in a book published by his friend Georges Charpentier (1846-1905).78 Although Manet did not know Rochefort personally, his investment in the latter’s escapade gave him the idea of painting Rochefort in some capacity. Manet’s first instinct was to glorify Rochefort by painting him on board a small boat along with his fellow escapees.79

Accordingly, in December 1880 Manet convinced Rochefort to pose for a painting which would show the radical journalist escaping from New Caledonia. The artwork was meant to be a provocative tableau de sensation, much like Manet’s Battle of the Kearsarge and Alabama (fig. 26) had been more than a decade earlier, and the artist pursued the creation of his latest seascape in a similar fashion. Manet displayed a journalistic interest in Rochefort’s escape, asking the

---


78 Charpentier published the first edition of Rochefort’s novel, L’Évadé: Roman canaque, in June 1880. Other printings shortly followed. For more, see Juliet Wilson-Bareau and David Degener, eds., Manet and the Sea (Chicago: Art Institute of Chicago, 2003), 87.

79 The other men involved in the escape were: Paschal Grousset, Olivier Pain (1845-1884), François Jourde (1843-1893), Achille Ballière (1840-1905), and Charles Bastien (1833-?).
exiled man questions about his journey, a course of action which recalled Théodore Géricault’s (1791-1824) methodology when the latter had completed his famous *The Raft of the Medusa* (Louvre), a painting which depicted men at sea after a shipwreck. After learning that Rochefort and his fellow escapees had embarked on a whaleboat before reaching the rescue boat that would take the men to Australia, Manet arranged to have a whaleboat delivered to his garden to use as a study.\(^80\) This would ensure accuracy, and proved how determined the artist was to create a genuine history painting. The study (fig. 159) shows Rochefort alone in a small boat, because he would serve as the main protagonist of Manet’s painting. This prioritization translated to both of Manet’s paintings on the theme of Rochefort’s escape. Both versions (figs. 160-161) show Rochefort at the helm of the boat even though he was not actually the one in charge of directing the vessel (it was, in fact, Jourde who operated the tiller).\(^81\) In the Zürich version of *The Escape of Rochefort* (fig. 160), Rochefort is the largest figure and he is the only one to make eye contact with the viewer. Furthermore, the other men are barely decipherable, and they have no distinct facial features – unlike Rochefort whose dark moustache and bushy hair come to the fore. Even though the figures have been reduced in scale in the other rendering (fig. 161), a similar emphasis is placed on Rochefort. An unidentified source of light shines onto the journalist’s face, while the other individuals remain in relative darkness. They are but small blotches of paint, and the artist did not make any clear attempt to outline their bodies. Facing a dangerous task, the magnitude of which is underlined by the vast pool of wavy waters in both paintings, Rochefort

---

80 Wilson-Bareau and Degener, eds., *Manet and the Sea*, 87-88.
81 Eric Vatré goes as far as suggesting that Rochefort was seasick and would not have been comfortable in this role. Eric Vatré, *Henri Rochefort ou la comédie politique au XIXe siècle* (Paris: Jean Claude Lattès, 1984), 171.
emerges as the critical piece holding the operation together. Manet undeniably sought to immortalize the republican writer.

As the 1881 Salon approached, Manet opted to not submit either of his seascapes illustrating Rochefort’s escape from New Caledonia – a decision that has left scholars perplexed to this day.\(^\text{82}\) Instead, Manet shifted his attention to creating a portrait of the controversial man. Since the artist intended to place emphasis on Rochefort above all other escapees, perhaps he felt that portraying him individually would carry greater weight. Being granted amnesty was one of the high points of Rochefort’s career, and he did aid other Communards in settling back in France after returning from exile. His pride and spirit could be more easily evoked in a portrait than in a seascape with half a dozen figures. As such, it was the Portrait of Henri Rochefort (fig. 128) that awaited viewers who attended the 1881 Salon. Throughout his career, Manet concentrated his efforts on the faces of his figures when it came to portrait paintings, and the image of Henri Rochefort was no exception. The lower part of Rochefort’s body is omitted from Manet’s canvas, rendering it inconsequential. Manet wanted to show the toll that exile had taken on Rochefort by displaying patches of wrinkles on his face. His facial skin tone is the most roughly executed part of the entire artwork. Moreover, Rochefort’s eyes stare out into the distance, and it

\(^{82}\) Hypotheses as to why Manet decided not to submit one or both of his *The Escape of Rochefort* paintings for official review, include: the possibility that the artist doubted the impact a work depicting an event from 1874 would have on its audience in 1881; that he worried the paintings might not be properly displayed (if even accepted by the Salon); or that Manet was not completely satisfied with either of the renditions he created. In my opinion, the impressionist-like quality of Manet’s seascapes deterred him from submitting these paintings to the Salon. The painterly style overshadowed the political statement Manet aimed to convey in these paintings. In any case, it was not the notion of conveying a fervent republican, who had been outlawed by the country until the amnesty bill was passed, that kept Manet from submitting his seascapes, since he eventually decided to paint a portrait of Henri Rochefort that was accepted by the Salon that year. For more on Manet’s mysterious choice, see the “Manet – L’evasion de Rochefort” dossier that forms part of the Musée d’Orsay documentation.
appears as though he is reflecting on the years of his life he spent away from his home country. Rochefort’s arms are crossed suggesting that he remains firm in his personal beliefs. He does not regret the actions that resulted in his deportation, and there is no doubt that he will continue to defend his political principles. This portrait carried a powerful propagandistic cachet that would not have been welcomed during the Third Republic’s infancy, and yet, in 1881 it earned Manet only his second award at the Salon in over twenty years. How was this possible? Evidently, the timing of Manet’s creation was key to its favorable public reception.\(^8\) The artist not only waited for the Republicans to be in command of the political arena, he also refrained from undertaking such a subject until the regime had granted amnesty to those in exile.

It did not hurt, either, that Rochefort was admired by Gambetta and other individuals in administrative positions at the time, further facilitating the public showing of Manet’s painting at the Salon. When Manet submitted his *Portrait of Henri Rochefort* to the Salon in May 1881, Gambetta was the President of the Chamber of Deputies, and before the end of the year, the latter was named Prime Minister of France. Gambetta was in charge of a cabinet, which gave rise to a new department: the recently established Ministry of Fine Arts was headed by Antonin Proust, one of Manet’s dearest friends.\(^8\) Starting in 1880, Proust occupied a growing role in instituting the regime’s republican program in the French art world, and while he did not have any part in awarding Manet a medal at the 1881 Salon, Proust had championed Manet’s art from the beginning of the latter’s career, and ultimately, he was the man to decorate Manet with the Légion d’honneur in December 1881.\(^8\) To honor his friend after the artist’s premature death in

\(^8\) Aesthetically, however, the *Portrait of Henri Rochefort* was poorly received by some critics – most notably by Joris-Karl Huysmans (1848-1907). For more details, see Mary Anne Stevens et al., *Manet: Le portrait de la vie* (London: Royal Academy of Arts, 2012), 141.


\(^8\) Mainardi, *The End of the Salon*, 66.
1883, Proust engineered the Manet retrospective show that took place at the École des Beaux-Arts in 1884, and while in office he made sure the State would purchase works by Manet, and other artists of his ilk.86

The regime’s shift in orientation once the Republicans took majority control of the political arena had an evident impact on Manet’s artistic production. Manet had always fashioned himself to be a painter first and foremost, and now that the “republican” Republic had firmly established its roots, he no longer felt compelled to take up printmaking to address political issues. Printmaking had served his purpose on several occasions earlier in his career (see previous chapters), but since republican principles were now upheld in public institutions, Manet confidently shifted media for political expression at this pivotal moment. Manet, and others for that matter, could take advantage of the favorable political climate, and for this highly ambitious French artist, what better way to do so than on the grand stage offered by the Salon. With a broad Parisian audience in his reach, Manet did not shy away from paying homage to a man who had polarized the country on several occasions in previous years. The artist was not trying to please anyone by painting Rochefort’s portrait; it was an attestation of his own political volition. Manet was comfortable being the one to elevate Rochefort on a pedestal. He felt the journalist was deserving of the recognition due to those freed by amnesty, and his Portrait of Henri Rochefort reiterated the words he had proclaimed in a letter to Isabelle Lemonnier: “Vive l’amnestie.”

1881 also saw André Gill submit a portrait of a Communard to the annual French art exhibit. After sending a handful of genre paintings to the Salon in previous years, Gill decided to present

---

86 For instance, several of Courbet’s paintings were acquired by the State in the early 1880s. Mary Anne Stevens et al., Manet: Le portrait de la vie, 205.
a portrait of Jules Vallès, one of his friends, and former colleagues, at the 1881 showcase. Gill and Vallès had known each other since the mid-1860s, when Gill primarily worked for *La Lune* and Vallès was in charge of *La Rue* (see Chapter 1 for more details about this part of their careers respectively). Vallès was an active participant in the Paris Commune and he escaped to London after fighting during *la Semaine sanglante.* The writer lived in exile for the better part of the 1870s (he was condemned to death *in absentia*), before receiving pardon from his native country in July 1880. Gill and Vallès kept in touch throughout this period by writing to each other on a regular basis, and the former awaited the day he could see his friend on French soil.

When Gill submitted his *Portrait of Jules Vallès* (fig. 162) to the Salon, he had similar ambitions as Manet, who had completed his *Portrait of Henri Rochefort* (fig. 128) for the same event. Gill used the national platform of the Salon to celebrate a man who had been convicted for his actions earlier in his life. By the 1880s, Vallès’s ideologies aligned with those of the Republic and the fine arts committee’s beneficence towards such a work symbolized a marked change in attitude. In Gill’s painting, Vallès has a calm presence. His facial hair serves as an indicator of his age, but it also suggests wisdom. His pensive expression implies a thoughtful nature. He certainly found success in his old vocation after returning to France, voicing his libertarian ideas in print form primarily through a journal known as *Le Cri du Peuple* (1883-1889).

---

87 For the list of works made by Gill and accepted by the Salon between 1875 and 1882, see Henriette Bessis, “André Gill, heurs et malheurs d’une existence,” *Les Amis de Jules Vallès* 25 (1997), 105.
88 Vallès described some of his encounters from May 1871 before leaving for England in a letter he wrote to Gill dating from 1872. The letter is reproduced in Bertrand Tillier, ed., *André Gill: Correspondance et mémoires d’un caricaturiste*, 74-76.
89 Their correspondence can be found in Tillier, ed., *André Gill: Correspondance et mémoires d’un caricaturiste.*
90 *Le Cri du Peuple* (1871) was also the name Vallès used for the newspaper he published at the time of the Paris Commune.
The public commemoration of two living republican personalities (Rochefort and Vallès) at the same Salon in 1881 underscored the regime’s fortified stability. And even though Gill did not receive an award for his artwork, the Salon’s acceptance of a portrait with profound republican connotations was a victory in itself. Gill, for once, felt he could trade in his printmaking tools for paint brushes while not having to deter his political ambitions. He could sustain the Republic by expressing himself in a higher form of art. This must have been a rewarding experience for him. Gill would likely have continued to make other paintings in this vein had he lived longer, but his career was cut short by health problems. It certainly appeared as though he was ready to move on from producing caricatures for a living, since, by 1881, the regime showed signs of approving freedom of expression.91

4.12 The Decline of Political Caricature

The regime became more lenient towards liberty of expression because republicans had been asking for such a reform for a very long time. The Republic owed this fundamental right to its supporters. Accordingly, the abolition of censorship and the drafting of new press laws became a topic of discussion at parliamentary debates in 1880.92 Although new press laws were only officially introduced in July 1881, the notion of liberalization gained steam the year before, and

91 Republican officials also aimed to democratize the Salon by making it more accessible to the working classes. By introducing electricity at the art event in the late 1870s, people could attend the exhibition during the day and at night, and as such, the Salon became a commercial phenomenon. More than half a million individuals attended the 1880 and 1881 Salons respectively. It was no longer an event restricted to the elite. For more on the republican program as it pertained to the Salon in the late 1870s and early 1880s, see Mainardi, *The End of the Salon*, 66-89.

92 The legislative session on June 8, 1880 was particularly fruitful, as a committee vowed to put an end to the practice of press censorship. For more, see Goldstein, *Censorship of Political Caricature*, 229-232.
members of the press already got a sense of its impact after the Republicans acquired majority political control of the country.

In the late 1870s and early 1880s, republican illustrated journals began losing their sense of purpose as they increasingly witnessed the political triumph of their principles. Gill, for instance, a man who incessantly promoted republican values through his publications in the 1870s felt he had completed his mission as a polemicist once the Republicans arrived in power. While his *La Lune rousse* had fallen prey to censorship on multiple occasions, the journal ultimately folded at the end of 1879, because republican caricature had practically achieved its goal in political terms by then, resulting in a lack of readership. After *La Lune rousse*, Gill still produced caricatures, but he no longer took on the responsibility of issuing his own newspaper, because from his point of view, such an endeavor had lost its benefits. In 1880, the artist even drafted a letter directly addressed to the attention of the President of the Republic, stating that political caricature had lost its appeal as a result of Grévy’s and the Republic’s glorious triumph. “À cette heure, où l’œuvre de satire crayonnée que j’ai poursuivie dans les temps difficiles n’a plus, grâce à vous, de raison d’être.” In the same letter, Gill asked the president for financial assistance in a panorama project he was working on at the time, since he no longer drew a steady income from the production of caricatures. Gill knew that Grévy was an ardent fan of the caricaturist’s work, and he hoped that the president would grant him this favor in return for all the support he had shown for the republican cause over the years. In essence, Gill was a victim of his own success,

---

93 Renault, *Censure et caricatures*, 86.
94 “At this moment, the creation of satirical drawings which I pursued during the hard times, no longer, thanks to you, has a reason to exist.” Gill’s letter is reproduced in Tillier, ed., *André Gill: Correspondance et mémoires d’un caricaturiste*, 191-192.
95 There is no evidence to confirm if Gill received the money he requested from Grévy.
96 According to Charles Fontane, Grévy owned an impression of most, if not all, of Gill’s caricatures. Fontane, *Un maître de la caricature: André Gill*, vol. 1, 140.
and generating a narrative of opposition to the regime, was no longer a primary focus of the republican press.

One of the major elements that impacted the production of political caricature at the time was that the “republican” Republic, unlike the Second Empire or the conservative regimes which governed the country for most of the 1870s, was relatively faceless. As Robert Goldstein argues: “political battles were reduced to fights over relatively petty matters of personal interest between more or less anonymous parliamentary spokesmen, none of whom had the general public recognition of past royalty or even of presidents like MacMahon and Thiers.”

Parliament – a large governing body – rather than a few distinct personalities had come to rule the nation. Jules Vallès witnessed how this affected Gill firsthand as is apparent from the following passage: “au moment où il n’eut plus une cible à cribler de ses flèches, il ne sut que devenir … il perdit la raison dans sa course.” With a collective organ at the helm of the political sphere, it was much harder to arouse the passions of fellow citizens. With the marked absence of clear-cut targets, caricaturists had a harder time targeting political struggles, and fewer people showed a vested interest in satirical prints.

As mentioned earlier, Gill opted not to found an illustrated journal between 1880 and 1881, and after launching Le Sans-culotte in 1878, Alfred Le Petit was not in charge of publishing another paper either until 1888. Although both artists continued to sign caricatures, their works, for the most part, were scattered in a few short-lived journals at this stage. During these years, Gill made contributions to Le Voltaire illustré, Le Réveil illustré, and L’Esprit Gaulois (1881),

97 Goldstein, Censorship of Political Caricature, 236.
98 “At the moment when he no longer had a target to attack with his arrows, he no longer knew what to do with himself … he lost the direction of his goal.” Jules Vallès, Le Tableau de Paris (Paris: Berg International, 2007), 185.
99 In 1888, Le Petit revived La Charge, the journal that jumpstarted his career in 1870.
none of which lasted more than fifteen issues. Similarly, Le Petit offered his services to *La Jeune République* (1880), the *Lyon Républicain* (1878-1944), and *Le Petit Rouennais illustré* (1880), but neither of these journals published more than a dozen of the caricaturist’s works (*La Jeune République* only issued seven copies in total).\(^\text{100}\) In addition, several of these newspapers were categorized as *supplément illustré*, meaning they originated as non-illustrated journals, but would on occasion publish a print to supplement their articles. The partisan verve that had marked the careers of these artists in the 1870s, simply was not present anymore in the 1880s. In short, by 1880, Gill was trying to spark his painting career more than anything else, and the following year, Le Petit reduced his caricature production while developing an interest for writing songs and attending cabarets, such as *Le Chat noir*, on a regular basis.\(^\text{101}\) Thus, even before the new press laws had been introduced in July 1881, the demand for and interest in political caricature in France had begun to change.

### 4.13 July 29, 1881: The Third Republic Has New Press Laws

The legislation of new press laws on July 29, 1881, which included freedom of expression, marked a crowning achievement of the republican regime. The arrival of new press laws was woefully belated according to some republicans; however, the government felt it needed to first establish a certain level of stability, in order to guarantee the regime’s long-term survival, before it could comfortably grant libertarian rights. The wait led to an overwhelming victory in favor of liberty of the press: amongst voting senators, 444 out of 448 elected to pass the new laws.\(^\text{102}\)

---

\(^\text{100}\) Le Petit did work for *Le Grelot* as well during these years; however, he no longer had the same lucrative contract with the journal as he did in the 1870s, and accordingly, he was not *Le Grelot*’s primary cartoonist.

\(^\text{101}\) Rivière, “Alfred Le Petit (1841-1909) un caricaturiste inventif et engagé,” 55.

new rules nullified 42 sub-laws in relation to the press. Most notably, journals were not required to obtain prior approval from officials for the publication of any of their images, and they were not obliged to post caution money before addressing political matters.\(^{103}\) Moreover, the July 1881 press laws have by and large remained intact to this day in France (some amendments have been introduced over the years, yet they have not changed the complexion of the original regulations significantly), proving their overall effectiveness. The French witnessed a press boom in the last two decades of the nineteenth century. Countless new journals were established leading up to World War I, and the press was truly able to conquer the masses as many journals were available for only 5 centimes per issue, the lowest denomination in circulation in France at the time.\(^{104}\) The 1881 press laws also encouraged poster art and artistic forms of advertisement. A whole slate of artists, including Jules Chéret (1836-1932), Henri de Toulouse-Lautrec (1864-1901), and Alphonse Mucha (1860-1939) specialized in the creation of printed posters, contributing to the fine arts and commercial design scenery in late nineteenth-century Paris.\(^{105}\) For the most part, these artists worked very successfully on non-political topics.

With the passing of the July 1881 press laws, caricature became a respectable form of art. While caricaturists in the nineteenth century may have been vying for this result for the greater part of their careers, political prints had also saturated the market. Caricatural works now lacked the vehemence and biting humor they had once displayed. Politicized caricature making suffered the most. Since political unrest was the primary factor that lent caricature its potency there, suddenly, was a void. Without being menaced by censorship, political caricature essentially lost

\(^{103}\) Renault, *Censure et caricatures*, 86-88.


\(^{105}\) For more, see Ruth E. Iskin, *The Poster: Art, Advertising, Design, and Collecting, 1860s-1900s* (Hanover: Dartmouth College Press, 2014), especially chapters 1, 3, 4, and 5.
its bite after 1881. Alfred Le Petit, a man who was at the midway point of his artistic career when the new press laws were passed in 1881, and lived into the twentieth century, best summarized the situation: “nous avons bataillé contre la censure, le jour où elle à été supprimée, la caricature politique avait vécu.”

Ironically, this historical moment, a representation of the Third Republic’s triumph and its ability to deliver one of the foundational goals – liberty of the press – conceived by men fighting for their rights during the French Revolution, left some individuals uninspired. Simply put, not everyone was ecstatic about the impact the new laws had on caricature as an art form: “l’époque actuelle avec son excessive liberté de la presse est, croyons-nous, peu favorable au relèvement de l’art de la caricature.”

Hence, the 1880s marked a new era both in the history of the Third Republic and for French political caricature and visual culture.

4.14 Shifting Trends

The Third Republic experienced many triumphs between 1879 and 1881, and ultimately put an end to the “era of revolutions” in France. By overcoming critical challenges, the regime established itself on solid grounds merging the identities of the nation and the Republic once and for all. After 1881, the roots of conflict in France were different from the ones that had engrossed the country to that point since the days of the French Revolution. With political order firmly entrenched, social reforms became a primary topic of discussion. Leading up to World War I,

---

106 “We battled against censorship, but the day it was suppressed, political caricature was dead.” Alfred Le Petit, quoted in Guy Boulnois, *Alfred Le Petit 1841-1909: Peintre du pays de Bray – de Rouen des gueux et artisans sa vie tumultueuse – son oeuvre* (Aumale: Groupe Archéologique du Val-de-Bresle, 1986), 37.

107 “The current era, with its excessive liberty of the press is, we believe, not favorable to the revival of the art of caricature.” Armand Dayot, quoted in Bertrand Tillier, *Caricaturesque: La caricature en France, toute une histoire...de 1789 à nos jours* (Paris: Éditions de la Martinière, 2016), 189.
Paris may have remained a revolutionary space, however, political matters took a back seat while cultural issues made headlines. The battleground had shifted, and so had the primary figures involved in molding the nation.

Printmaking, especially the production of caricatures, underwent a similar transition at the time. Prints continued to be published as means to comment on larger causes that individuals and factions supported or opposed. However, in the last two decades of the nineteenth century, domestic politics only surfaced as the predominant focus of caricatures on a few occasions (for instance, during the Boulanger Affair in the late 1880s and the Dreyfus Affair in the late 1890s), rather than on a daily basis as had been the case throughout the fifteen year period examined in this dissertation.\(^{108}\) For instance, the illustrated paper *Psst...!* (1898-1899), the leading anti-Dreyfusard journal at the time, ceased operation once Alfred Dreyfus (1859-1935) was convicted in 1899. The newspaper’s purpose was to address the Dreyfus Affair (which it did with great verve), but not to serve as a satirical journal independently. Political caricature survived in the form of international affairs. Matters related to imperialism and colonialism came to the fore in the final years of the nineteenth century. The artists who had come to dominate the realm of political printmaking in the late Second Empire and early Third Republic, such as Daumier, Manet, Gill, and Le Petit, were no longer the men at the forefront once the “republican” Republic had been able to cement its legacy in 1881. Each individual had devoted a great deal of his career to sustaining the Republic, and since they shared similar principles, it seems as if they had

reached an implicit consensus that their oppositional satirical work was no longer needed in this new era.

Daumier, the oldest of these four artists, had already ceased making caricatures a few years before he passed away on February 10, 1879. Nonetheless, he had lived long enough to witness Grévy’s ascension to the presidency, a critical step that helped lay the foundation for further developments in favor of the Republic. And although Daumier was the first to depart the stage, the State clearly sought to underline how inspirational he was to his fellow republicans by honoring the artist with a funeral in Paris in 1880 after he had already been buried in Valmondois the year before.

Meanwhile, 1882 marked the last year Manet and Gill made artworks. Both artists had their careers shortened by health problems. Manet passed away on April 30, 1883, and while Gill outlived him by two years (he died on May 1, 1885), he entered Charenton, an asylum on the outskirts of Paris in 1882, for the second time in as many years, never to return home. These two artists had made use of different venues to circulate their graphic works and had two distinct career paths, but in 1881 they shared the same platform when their portraits of Henri Rochefort and Jules Vallès were respectively displayed at the Salon. The State sponsored painted portraits of amnestied men because republican principles prevailed at the time. It was a liberating experience for artists, since they no longer felt threatened of having to face censorship. Painting became more viable for a greater number of artists in such an environment. In short, both Manet and Gill started moving away from printmaking as a form of representation, even for political

---

109 For a thorough analysis of the last years of Gill’s life, see Aude Fauvel and Bertrand Tillier, *André Gill caricaturiste: Derniers dessins d’un fou à lier* (Tusson: Du Lérot, 2010).
subjects, towards the end of their careers, contributing to the changing status of this mode of art in the 1880s.\textsuperscript{110}

Le Petit was the only member of these four artists to live long enough to see the regime mature in the final years of the nineteenth century. However, aside from his involvement in the Boulanger Affair, in which he expressed his support for General Georges Boulanger (1837-1891) through prints, Le Petit’s fervor for political printmaking diminished after the new press laws were introduced in July 1881. The death of some of the key figures whose careers Le Petit had followed, most notably that of Léon Gambetta in 1882 and Victor Hugo in 1885, was likely a contributing factor to his waning enthusiasm to produce caricatures on a grand scale. It was inevitably time for a new generation of artists, by the likes of Albert Robida (1848-1926), Caran d’Ache (1858-1909), Charles Léandre (1862-1934), and Jules Grandjouan, to take over the reins by fighting for their beliefs and shedding light onto significant matters, while leading France into the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{111}

\textsuperscript{110} Manet, of course, was a painter, first and foremost, so his decision may not have come as a surprise. Nevertheless, as has been demonstrated in this dissertation, he did turn to lithography to address political subjects earlier in his life, an aspect which he faded out of his career with the ascension of the Republicans to power. As for Gill, the shift from printmaking to painting as his primary mode of artistic representation in the last years of his life was quite noteworthy. Gill painted more paintings in 1881-1882 than he had in the previous ten years combined. In contrast, in the 1880s, he only published prints sporadically.

Robida, a caricaturist who had built a reputation by collaborating with Gill as early as the late 1860s, was mostly invested on commenting on urbanism and its impact on the patrimoine as noticeable in his L’Embellissement de Paris par le Métropolitain (fig. 163). Images such as this one illustrate Robida’s originality and also his primary concerns when it came to the depiction of satirical imagery. Caran d’Ache chiefly designed works in the manner of comic strips, and he is perhaps best known for co-founding the anti-Dreyfusard and anti-Jewish weekly journal Psst...! with Jean-Louis Forain (1852-1931). It is at the height of the Dreyfus Affair that Caran d’Ache published Un diner en famille (fig. 164), which humorously showed just how divided a family – let alone the country – could be with regards to nationalist matters. Meanwhile, both Charles Léandre and Jules Grandjouan produced a number of works related to the ongoing debate about the separation of the Church and the State – a subject that provided ample reactions from a variety of caricaturists. Grandjouan made his opinion felt in Délivrée !!! (?) (fig. 165), a print published in 1904 depicting France in the form of a Gulliver-like allegory being liberated by republican figures from the shackles of clericalism. A year later, it was Léandre’s turn to comment on the affair by showcasing Jean-Baptiste Bienvenu-Martin (1847-1943), a French statesman and advocate of the movement calling for the separation of the Church and the State, using a saw to cut the ties between a Jesuit robed in black and a burly Marianne figure personifying each entity respectively (fig. 166). Though these are but a few examples, it is evident that these younger artists pursued their own artistic agenda and causes (while acknowledging that some similarities arise when comparing their works with those of their forebears who contributed to the rich tradition of caricatural imagery in France).
Conclusion

The beginning of the 1880s marked the consolidation of the Third Republic and the dawn of a new era. Whether it was the granting of amnesty, the celebration of *le 14 juillet*, or the passing of new press laws, the start of that decade was viewed as a high point in republican memory. In contrast to the First Empire, the Bourbon Restoration, the July Monarchy, the Second Republic, and the Second Empire, the Third Republic was a long-lasting regime. Cycles of political oppression which had repeated themselves throughout the century were, by and large, done away with after 1881. To say the least, the continued coherence of the regime ensured the longevity of the Third Republic, which lasted until 1940.

The stability that the regime experienced substantiates the notion that the artists who formed the focus of this dissertation succeeded in sustaining the Republic through their printed works. Daumier, Manet, Gill, and Le Petit addressed political matters with consistency throughout the 1867-1881 period, and they contributed to the growth of the Third Republic. Although the political prints of these four artists may not have literally overturned the government of the Second Empire and the monarchical administration of the early Third Republic, they were highly effective at discrediting them within Paris and they contributed to a spirit of republican resistance. Daumier, Manet, Gill, and Le Petit, strove to make a political point through their works, and whether it entailed the use of allegory, zoomorphism, or wit was dependent on the exact situation. More than a mere right, these artists felt it was their obligation to bring to the fore pressing political concerns that had a bearing on the nation. By examining their artworks, I have been able to provide a fresh and synthetic analysis of both the political circumstances of a tumultuous and complex period of France’s history, and the visual art produced at that moment.
As I have shown throughout this study, political prints with satirical elements are a mode of visual representation that carries exceptional symbolic weight. The acclaimed lexicographer, Pierre Larousse, opined a similar belief in the late 1860s: “de toutes les armes adoptées par les Républicains, la plus redoutable, la plus cruelle et la plus efficace fut la moquerie.”

Simply put, there is a reason why the printed word had not been censored in France since 1822, while caricatures battled political oppression for much of the nineteenth century until 1881: French authorities deemed such visual creations to be more effective and accessible to the national audience as modes of political expression generating far-reaching thoughts and opinions. Such images had an unmatched capacity to persuade popular opinion among those targeted by the artist, and among viewers in general.

With the fundamental question of the nation’s political orientation determined, the Third Republic could place emphasis on public education, science, and on improving France’s European and international status. Domestic politics became rather banal as foreign relations gradually outgrew the pressures that the Republic witnessed from within the nation. Starting in the mid-1880s, France pursued a policy of colonial expansion under the leadership of Jules Ferry. Furthermore, in the 1890s, France was preoccupied with a growing sense of anti-German nationalism. It was by addressing such subjects of the day that political printmaking survived in France towards the end of the nineteenth and into the beginning of the twentieth centuries. Essentially, after 1890 the energy of French caricature went towards international affairs.

1 “Of all the arms adopted by the Republicans, the most formidable, the cruelest, and the most effective was that of mockery.” Pierre Larousse, quoted in Christian Delporte, “Brève histoire de la caricature,” in *La caricature...et si c’était sérieux? Décryptage de la violence satirique*, Pascal Ory, et al. (Paris: Nouveau Monde, 2015), 21.

The revanchist attitude of journals such as *Le Rire* (1894-1971) and *L’Assiette au Beurre* (1901-1912) spearheaded the visual attacks against Germany. France had sought retribution for losing Alsace and Lorraine since the days of the Franco-Prussian War, but was relatively ineffective while Bismarck oversaw the German Empire. That changed however, when Kaiser Wilhelm II (1859-1941) took over the reins and became emperor in 1888. Wilhelm II was the target of many French caricatures leading up to WWI, especially as Germany continued to challenge France’s status as a European power. In 1907, to denigrate the enemy, Grandjouan depicted the emperor embracing Pope Pius X (1835-1914), after France had cut ties with the Vatican, illustrating how set the artist was against both authority figures (fig. 167). The caption that accompanies Grandjouan’s image implies that the two men are negotiating a way to crush France. Republican order in France would be at risk if Wilhelm II’s plot were to succeed, and it was paramount to characterize the Kaiser as a transgressor. Similarly, satirical animosity towards the British grew stronger at the turn of the twentieth century, especially around the time of the Second Boer War (1899-1902). *L’Assiette au Beurre* published several special issues with the purpose of victimizing the Brits (i.e. “V’là les English!...” (November 1899) and “Kruger le grand et John Bull le petit” (November 1902)). It was only a year before the beginning of the war that Charles Léandre portrayed Queen Victoria (1819-1901) in a shockingly unflattering way (fig. 168). Although she was nearly eighty years old at the time Léandre’s image was circulated, the monarch appears particularly empty-headed, completely undermining her sovereignty. Such imagery did not improve diplomatic relations between the two nations. Regardless, the French...

---


4 Over the course of its existence, *L’Assiette au Beurre* allocated more than 1, 300 images to the representation of foreigners.
government did little to appease the complaints filed by British ambassadors who called for the removal of the work’s public circulation.5

The violent nature of colonialism also came under attack during this time period. In Caran d’Ache’s L’auteur; M. Cecil Rhodes – L’argent, c’est le sang des autres (fig. 169), the artist condemns how the expansion of Britain’s territorial dominance came about at the expense of the lives of innocent people. An ardent advocate of British imperialism, Cecil Rhodes proudly poses in front of an expansive piece of land; however, a sea of dead corpses surrounds him. He is entirely numb to the massacre that has taken place beforehand. His greed has led him to equate the shedding of human blood with a financial investment – all in the name of honoring his country. Therefore, artists continued to produce aggressive and virulent works well after the Third Republic had been established, but such images played a considerably less significant role in the day to day lives of French citizens than they had during the previous four decades.6

Having said that, caricature continues to have a significant presence in political debates and socio-cultural matters to this day in France – a country where passions for such an art form remain strong. Although this dissertation has not addressed the events related to the Charlie Hebdo (1970-1982, 1992-present) incident that occurred in January 2015, it is important to acknowledge this tragic affair.7 The shooting proved – with tragic clarity – that creating

5 Renault, Censure et caricatures, 93-97.
6 For more on the shift of emphasis of political prints in the late nineteenth century and their impact on societal affairs, see Robert J. Goldstein, Censorship of Political Caricature in Nineteenth-Century France (Kent: Kent State University Press, 1989), 238-257.
7 The Charlie Hebdo shooting took place on January 7, 2015. 12 individuals working at the offices of the Parisian satirical journal were killed, while another 11 were injured by two terrorists in retaliation for anti-Islamic satire. Numerous sources address the ramifications of this incident including: Three Days of Terror: The Charlie Hebdo Attacks, directed by Dan Reed (New York: Home Box Office, 2016), Sejal Parmar, “Freedom of Expression Narratives after the Charlie Hebdo Attacks,” Human Rights Law Review 18, n. 2 (June, 2018), 267-296, and Alana
caricatures could be a matter of life-and-death. *Charlie Hebdo* is a satirical paper that was born out of the events of 1968 and proclaimed itself as a libertarian journal. Over the years, the journal has targeted the French government, high-profile politicians, and multiple religions. Along with decries against clericalism, the denunciation of the Muslim faith has become one of the journal’s primary targets, especially as the more radical elements of different sects have tried to infiltrate civic society.\(^8\) *Charlie Hebdo* has had a long-established reputation for fueling tensions between different communities in France before the fatal attacks took place in 2015. The paper’s editing team has lived (and died) by the opinion that the journal has the right to publish whatever it wants on French soil, even if it directly targets Muslims. Though picturing the Prophet Muhammad is offensive to Muslims, *Charlie Hebdo* has opted to publish many images depicting the Prophet’s likeness. However, pushing the boundaries of freedom of expression ultimately led to the annihilation of several of the journal’s staff members.

The incident garnered immense international support. On January 11, 2015 over two million people assembled in Paris to hold a vigil, and most of those individuals adopted the slogan “Je suis Charlie” (I am Charlie). The gathering displayed how attached people were to values of liberty of expression and democracy. Similar rallies also occurred in major Western cities, including London, Brussels, New York, and Montreal, in a gesture of collective solidarity against the attacks and supporting the right of free speech. On the other hand, a week after the shooting, Pope Francis (1936-), the head of the Catholic Church, stated that one cannot insult the faith of others under any circumstance.\(^9\) And of course not everyone identified with the “Je suis

---

\(^8\) Bertrand Tillier, *Caricaturesque: La caricature en France, toute une histoire...de 1789 à nos jours* (Paris: Éditions de la Martinière, 2016), 150-151.

Charlie” motto – especially those belonging to communitarian, religious, and racialized groups. Accordingly, calls to ban Charlie Hebdo had its fair share of supporters. The complexity of the incident was further compounded by France’s long tradition of antiracist activism, dating back to the days of the Dreyfus Affair in the late nineteenth century. French republicanism has sought to protect its secular traditions after having fought for them for more than a century, and thus, individual copies of Charlie Hebdo have plenty of parallels with the more than hundred different antireligious journals that existed in France between 1881 and 1914. The heightened role of online media and its ability to disseminate information globally and instantaneously has only exacerbated the situation. In essence, modern media has enabled the controversial images of Charlie Hebdo to go viral, and to travel to places well beyond their initial intended audience.

At the heart of this tragic incident is the notion of freedom of expression and its acceptable limits. The lack of a clear-cut and precise definition as to what is tolerable to all individuals is an inherent problem with such a principle. If a particular image is not published because it would offend a certain group of people – a notion that increasingly seems to infiltrate modern societies – how does the concept of freedom of expression carry value? In Western civilization, most people would argue that they are opposed to an assault on free speech, while also insisting on the hypocrisies and inequalities related to such a standard. As Alana Lentin notes, “the suggestion that all speech is free belies the facts that the space in which speech is uttered and heard is deeply unequal and that the different actors within it have varying degrees of freedom.” Additionally, freedom of expression should not be equated to freedom to insult – a term that is difficult to

---

10 Tillier, Caricaturesque, 156.
11 Social media outlets, such as Facebook (founded 2004) and Twitter (founded 2006), have greatly impacted the availability of images throughout the world.
define in its own right. Can the caricaturists of Charlie Hebdo be blamed for disregarding the
danger of furthering discrimination and negative stereotypes, as well as for publicizing
references to race and religion that underline intolerance, all while artistic expression is – and has
been – protected by law under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)
as adopted by the United Nations since the mid-1970s?\textsuperscript{13} Addressing this question is not as
simple as a yes or no answer; it requires profound deliberation and each viewer has to determine
for themselves what they conclude on the matter. It goes without saying that reactions to
controversial artwork should not be expressed through violence, but through dialogue and
engagement – a concept that this study aims to encourage.

Simply put, protest art in France began, in large part, with the French Revolution, and it has
generated a vivid tradition ever since. I have aimed to shed light on some of this history, by
focusing on what was a highly contested period of fifteen years between 1867 and 1881. And
while none of the artists I chose to single out in this study faced life-threatening consequences
because of the nature of their artwork, it is undeniable that they were pivotal figures who fought
for the liberty of expression that many artists have been able to experience since then. In the
wake of the Charlie Hebdo shooting, and the even more recent struggles related to the
international status of political caricature, a paper dedicated to some of the leading French
forebears to have grappled with political matters in printed form has heightened relevance.\textsuperscript{14} This

\textsuperscript{13} For more on freedom of expression as a human right and its adaptation in international
\textsuperscript{14} Shortly before the completion of this dissertation, the international edition of the New York
Times (1851-present) announced the termination of its publication of political images, and the
Brunswick News Inc. publishing company, based in Eastern Canada elected to cancel the
contract of Michael de Adder (1967-), a political cartoonist with over fifteen years of experience
at the firm, leading many to believe that the end of times of political cartoons was near. Both of
these events took place in July 2019. For more, see Michael Cavna, “The New York Times cuts
study should generate productive discussion about the role visual works play in the everyday lives of individuals, and how they can unite or divide people. One is also tempted to consider how artists like Honoré Daumier, Édouard Manet, André Gill, and Alfred Le Petit would react to the current socio-political scene in France and abroad. The future of caricatures, cartoons, and political prints remains to be seen, but to conclude, I will end by echoing a statement made by Nicholas Sarkozy (1955-) in 2007, while he served as Minister of the Interior, en route to becoming the President of France later that year: “je préfère l’excès de caricatures à l’absence de caricature.”

It should come as no surprise that in order to enhance such conversations, the Ministry of Culture in France, since the beginning of the twenty-first century, has encouraged the Bibliothèque nationale de France to collect and valorize works – both contemporary and historical – from the French illustrated press. The BnF has responded by making countless images, as well as entire illustrated journals, available for free on Gallica – the institution’s digital library. Martine Mauvieux, “Plus de mille dessins de Georges Wolinski dans Gallica,” Chroniques de la BnF 85 (Summer, 2019), 23.

“I prefer the excess of caricatures to the absence of caricature.” Nicholas Sarkozy, quoted in Bertrand Tillier, Caricaturesque, 155. It is important to note that this statement came from a man who was himself a frequent target of caricaturists.
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LE CRIME DU DEUX-DÉCEMBRE.
et mesurant du regard l'aigle de l'Empire étendu
à ses pieds.
La Censure n'a pas voulu tolérer ce croquis
dénué d'enthousiasme pour l'oiseau bonapartiste.
C'est pourquoi nos lecteurs devront se con-
tenter, pour aujourd'hui, d'une réclame à l'Eau
Bazana, où la République, d'ailleurs, montre de
belles dents.

Amen!

LA LUNE ROUSSE.

M. Henri de Lacreteille a sa date de naissance dans une année de ce siècle où l'esprit de conquête et le despotisme eurent leur terrible châtiment : 1815.
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Appendix

Déclaration des Droits de l'Homme et du Citoyen de 1789

Art. 11. La libre communication des pensées et des opinions est un des droits les plus précieux de l'Homme: tout Citoyen peut donc parler, écrire, imprimer librement, sauf à répondre de l'abus de cette liberté dans les cas déterminés par la Loi.


Décret du 17 février 1852, ch. 3 art. 22.^

Aucuns dessins, aucunes gravures, lithographies, médailles, estampes ou emblèmes de quelque nature et espèce qu’ils soient, ne pourront être publiés, exposés ou mis en vente sans l’autorisation préalable du ministre de la police à Paris, ou du préfet dans les départements. En cas de contravention, les dessins, gravures, lithographies, médailles, estampes ou emblèmes pourront être confisqués et ceux qui les auront publiés seront condamnés à un emprisonnement d’un mois à un an et à une amende de cent francs à mille francs.

^ This information is quoted from André Blum, “La caricature politique en France sous le Second Empire,” Revue des études napoléoniennes 15 (1919), 170.