Portland State University

PDXScholar

Dissertations and Theses

Dissertations and Theses

5-1976

Revolutions: A Comparative Study

Thomas E. Gill

Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds

Part of the [European History Commons](#), [Political History Commons](#), and the [Social History Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Gill, Thomas E., "Revolutions: A Comparative Study" (1976). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 2269.

<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.2266>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS of Thomas E. Gill for the
Master of Arts in History presented May 20, 1976.

Title: Revolutions: A Comparative Study.

APPROVED BY MEMBERS OF THE THESIS COMMITTEE:

[REDACTED]
Michael Reardon, Chairman

[REDACTED]
Franklin West

[REDACTED]
Victoriano Dahl

This thesis is a comparative study of three abortive revolutions, i.e., the Paris Commune of 1871, the Zapatista Movement of the Mexican Revolution between 1910 and 1919, and the Spartacist Rebellion in Berlin in 1919. Comparison of common characteristics in each case suggested several uniformities, e.g., that in each case the incumbent government did use effective force to smash the insurgents. Part of that effective use of force was the use of assassination, i.e., the political murder of key insurgent leaders. In each case causal evidence indicated that the incumbent governments intended to eliminate these insurgent leaders.

REVOLUTIONS: A COMPARATIVE STUDY

by

THOMAS E. GILL

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS
in
HISTORY

Portland State University
1976

TO THE OFFICE OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The members of the Committee approve the thesis of
Thomas E. Gill presented May 20, 1976.

Michael Reardon, Chairman

Frank West

Victoriano Dahl

Stephen Kosokoff, Graduate representative

APPROVED:

Michael Reardon, Head, Department of History

Dean of Graduate Studies and Research

PREFACE

I went into history because I wished to undertake the comparative study of revolutions, and to see if I could learn what historians had to say about revolutions, and not, when I came to do this thesis, to discover that I had nothing new to contribute. I did not wish to overlook differences of perspective, such as that of a scientific rationalist and of a revolutionary marxist. After all, what is the use of comparative historiography if all that it does for you is enable you to talk with some plausibility about events that changed the world, without also understanding how those events were viewed, and if such understanding does not enable you to contribute to the understanding of others?

My understanding of revolutions evolved from first reading the classic in comparative study of revolutions, The Anatomy of Revolutions, by Crane Brinton, and then reading Eric Hobsbawm's speech, "Revolution," which includes four significant claims:

1. This is the epoch of social revolution.
2. Revolutions are inevitable.
3. Revolutions are uncontrollable.
4. Revolutionaries are of little historical interest.¹

Hobsbawm's claims are not supported by the bulk of findings derived from my understanding of three abortive revolutions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	111
INTRODUCTION	
Statement of Purpose	1
History of the Idea of Revolution	2
Revolution to a Scientific Rationalist	5
Revolution to a Marxist of the Old Left	7
CHAPTER	
I. DESCRIPTION OF THREE ABORTIVE REVOLUTIONS	
A. The Paris Commune of 1871	11
B. The Mexican Revolution of 1910	21
C. The Spartacist Rebellion of 1919	31
II. COMPARISON	
A. Analysis	41
B. Conceptual Scheme	47
C. Thesis Argument	53
CONCLUSIONS	60
FOOTNOTES	63
BIBLIOGRAPHY	69

INTRODUCTION

Statement of Purpose.

The purpose of this thesis is to describe and then to compare common descriptive characteristics (uniformities) evident within three historical events: the Paris Commune of 1871, the Zapatista Movement of the Mexican Revolution between 1910 and 1919, and the Spartacist Rebellion of 1919. One such uniformity is the fact that all three are abortive social revolutions.

Of course, the historian must begin with what he finds. The fact that some revolutions are abortive refutes the universal generalization that all revolutions are successful.

The semantic usage of the term "revolution" must be considered. Hobsbawm's preference for a "steam-boiler" analogy of revolution, insofar as it fails to support his claims, is considered in reference to Brinton's "fever" analogy.² Hence, a difference in perspective is introduced by way of examination of the views of Crane Brinton, a scientific rationalist³, and of Eric Hobsbawm, a marxist of the Old Left.⁴

The uniformities drawn from the comparative study of the three abortive revolutions suggest all four of Hobsbawm's claims are refutable. Hence, the purpose of this thesis has a secondary aim, i.e., the refutation of his four claims.

History of the Idea of "Revolution"

1. Astronomic Sense. The term "revolution" was originally used in the astronomic sense when Copernicus in 1543 wrote De revolutionibus orbium caelestium. His use of the term explained celestial movements, such as the orbit of planets, where motion returns to its starting point. This original astronomic sense of the term "revolution" was later applied to socio-political events, since such events seemed analogous to the motion of planets.⁵

Renaissance historians -- e.g., Guicciardini, Nardi, and Machiavelli -- applied the term rivoluzione, which is the Italian equivalent of the Latin term revolutionibus, to events either of political disorder or change in rulership. In 1660 the English equivalent, "revolution," was used in Clarendon's History of the Rebellion when speaking of the "many and great revolutions" in the preceding twenty years in England. Significantly, the astronomic sense was retained in the early use of the term in English. Clarendon, for example, attributed governmental changes in England to the influence of an evil star. Thomas Hobbes also retained the astronomic sense -- but without the evil star -- when he wrote Leviathan, where he wrote of the governmental changes taking place in England: "I have seen in this revolution a circular motion of the sovereign power through two usurpers from the late King to his son."⁶

2. The Non-astronomic Sense. Herodotus and Thucydides knew of course of uprisings against rulers; Plato and

Aristotle knew of changes of constitutions; Cicero knew of people eager for new things; Polybius and Aristotle knew of historical cycles in political forms; and many of these same writers living in pre-Copernican times are often translated as having known the non-astronomic sense of the term "revolution," as in the case of one translator who has Plato observing in the Republic that "revolutions" start within the ruling class⁷ or as in the case of the translator who has Aristotle observing in Politics the state of mind of those who create "revolutions."⁸

What is meant whenever the term "revolution" is applied to socio-political events in the non-astronomic sense? The circularity of motion has evidently dropped out of what the term once had meant in the astronomic sense. What is retained whenever the term is applied to socio-political events depends solely on the user of the semantic device. As a universal, the term "revolution" is a semantic device without any single definition. Peter Amann finds that the term needs a re-definition. Crane Brinton finds that the term has a general usage. Indeed, Brinton dismisses the need for an "exact definition of 'revolution'" but says he will "cling to the general term⁹," while Eric Hobsbawm defines "revolutionary situation" as offering "good chances of a revolutionary outcome."¹⁰ He leaves open what he would consider "a revolutionary outcome": "Except insofar as 'failure' implies a definition of 'success', this leaves the problem of the outcome of revolutions open."¹¹ Thus, he leave it open. Also,

Hobsbawm seems to say that "success" is more than merely the establishment of state power or its equivalent.

Obviously, a revolutionary situation can have either good chances of a revolutionary outcome or not. Only after establishment of a state power or its equivalent can those chances be assessed as good or bad with any degree of historical exactitude. Indeed, it is unhistoric to predict whether chances of a revolutionary outcome are good or bad. Hence, Hobsbawm is not too helpful in arriving at a concise definition of the concept of revolution.

In contrast, Crane Brinton, who deals with the Paris Commune of 1871 as an "abortive" revolution, is historical and therefore more helpful. For example, he says, "By abortive is meant simply the failure of organized groups in revolt." Since the three revolutions to be considered failed to establish state power or its equivalent, the term "abortive" applies to all three cases.

The Communards under such leaders like Gustave Flourens, the Zapatistas under the leadership of Emiliano Zapata, and the Spartacists under leaders like Rose Luxemburg each as an organized group failed to overthrow the respective incumbent governments and then to establish their own state power or its equivalent. How did they fail? In each case the cause was similar: i.e., the respective incumbent governments used effective force to smash each insurgent group. Part of that use of effective force was the assassination of the respective insurgent leaders mentioned above.

B. Revolution to a Scientific Rationalist.

Historians need conceptual schemes in order to understand revolutions. Crane Brinton's conceptual scheme is that of a scientific rationalist with a detached disposition. His classic study, The Anatomy of Revolution, has the modest aim of attempting to establish, "as a scientist might, certain first approximations of uniformities to be noted in the course of four successful revolutions in modern states."¹² In contrast, this study analyzes three unsuccessful modern revolutions.

Brinton finds one relevant uniformity in all four successful revolutions he compares: the respective rulers did not use force effectively. He says, the "determined use of force on the part of the government might prevent the mounting excitement from culminating in an overthrow of the government." But "in all four their attempt was a failure."¹³ In contrast, in all three abortive revolutions here studied the incumbent government did effectively use force. Part of the determined use of force of all three respective incumbent governments was the use of assassination of insurgent leaders. The common uniformity of assassination may become the pattern in the future to effectively control revolutionary situations.

The theme that Brinton stresses is that of understanding revolutions in order to protect ourselves against them.¹⁴ He finds a parallel between understanding thunderstorms and understanding revolutions: i.e., in both cases steps can be taken to protect ourselves against them.

In order to understand how to protect ourselves from revolutions, if that is our intention, Brinton offers the conceptual scheme of a scientific rationalist, who uses inductive facts that are empirically verifiable about phenomena to support tentative hypotheses. He aims at establishing first approximations of uniformities by comparing the course of four revolutions, i.e., the American, English, French, and Russian revolutions. This thesis has a similar aim: i.e., to analyze the common descriptive characteristics (uniformities) by comparing the course of three abortive revolutions.

Some historians draw the distinction between science, which deals with approximate uniformities that are similar and therefore not unique, and history, which deals -- they claim -- with human events that are unique. Brinton rejects this distinction. He says, "the doctrine of absolute uniqueness of events in history seems nonsense."¹⁵ Since uniformities are limited generalizations, it would seem to follow that uniformities are types of common characteristics. Thus, specific, particular characteristics of events are typical, i.e., insofar as particular events are similar and therefore of a type, they are not unique.

A specific revolution may at first seem to be singularly unique in all particulars, but these same type of particularities lose their uniqueness when compared to similar particularities common to other revolutions upon comparison. Such uniformities, however, ought to retain the limitations of the inductively drawn generalizations.

C. Revolution to a Marxist of the Old Left.

In August 1975, Eric Hobsbawm spoke on "Revolution" at the Fourteenth International Congress of Historical Sciences. Although he does not claim professional expertise in the fields of marxist ideas and of the history of revolutions and revolutionary movements, he is regarded generally as a marxist of the Old Left. Since the concluding arguments in this thesis attempt to refute four claims that he makes in his speech, the stress will be on elaboration of those claims. This attempt at refutation of his claims is secondary. But it will help to understand revolutionary chances.

Hobsbawm's four claims are basically the following:

1. This is the epoch of social revolution.
2. To accept this as the epoch of social revolution is to recognize that revolutions are inevitable.
3. These revolutions are uncontrollable.
4. Revolutionary personality is of little historical interest.

Retaining the same numbers as the claims, he states them as follows in the more extended elaboration of context:

1. Historical analysis of modern times as an "epoch of social revolution" is profitable.

1. We are following Marx, who "provided the most powerful guide to revolution," which "we may call the macro-phenomenon of 'an epoch of social revolution.'"

1, 2, 3. To accept Marx's analysis of modern period as "an epoch of social revolution" is "to recognize that at certain periods specific kinds of drastic historical change are inevitable, and that therefore historic forces beyond the control of will, must 'break asunder the integum' of the old systems...."

2. "...there can be no serious dispute that some functionally revolutionary changes have been inevitable, some actual revolutions avoidable, because avoided,"

2. "...his (Marx's) belief in the inevitability of violent revolutions was qualified - he allowed for the possibility of a peaceful transition in some countries...."

2. It is a disadvantage "to assume that no revolution is in the long run inevitable."

2. & 3. "I specifically wish to disclaim as unhistorical any version of the view that 'revolution is always avoidable if....'"

3. "...changes by revolution are likely to be...(initially) more uncontrollable,"

3. "This (Lenin's analysis of the revolutionary situation) suggests that a revolutionary situation is not a crisis controllable, at least from within, by deliberate policy or 'crisis-management', being characterised by relative uncontrollability."

3. "I agree with Dahrendorf who rightly finds the analogy of the steam-boiler more illuminating than Brinton's 'fever' (analogy)"

4. "...though approaches which seek to identify... 'revolutionary personality' are of little historical interest,"¹⁶

These statements can be restated in different ways, but the four claims are basically reducible to the paraphrasing above.

Only an extended argument will refute these four claims. But such an argument can be here simply put as follows: The assassination of key insurgent leaders with a high level of control over both the insurgent movement and the revolutionary situation has greatest impact on changing the course of history and in particular controlling the revolutionary situation. In order to determine the amount of impact of the assassination of a particular revolutionary personality, the historian has no recourse but to show more than a little interest in the revolutionary personality. Assassination plots in defense of the state presume that the revolutionary situation can be controlled (and sometimes avoided, if predicted) by the use of determined effective force. Any revolutionary situation that is controlled or avoided proves that revolutions can be controlled and therefore are not

inevitable. Examples of abortive revolutions refute the claim that all revolutions are inevitable. Indeed, during a revolutionary situation -- i.e., one that has the possibility of a revolutionary outcome -- it is unhistoric to speak of those possibilities before they occur. Only after the revolutionary outcome can Hobsbawm or any historian speak of the historical inevitability of the chances of success. Most of Hobsbawm's notions are -- e.g., "inevitable," "chances," "outcome," and "success" -- future-bound possibilities which are blatantly unhistoric.

Consider, for example, the claim that any successful revolution is uncontrollable. The success of a revolution cannot be forecasted with any degree of historical exactitude. To claim that all successful revolutions are inevitable also cannot be asserted with any degree of historical exactitude. To define revolutionary situation in unhistoric, future-bound terms is to reduce the concept of revolution to the semantic games that historians play: i.e., a revolution is successful when state power is established or its equivalent, but only after it is established, while a revolution is controlled -- if it is ever controlled by the incumbent state power by the effective use of force -- before its equivalent is established. Hence, the claim that any successful (future-bound) revolution is uncontrollable (past-bound) is self-contradictory, because a given revolution cannot be both in the future and in the past at the same time.

The term "avoidable" makes Hobsbawm self-refuting:

All social revolutions are unavoidable.
Some social revolutions are not unavoidable.

No social revolution is avoidable.
Some social revolutions are avoidable.

The former is an example a particular negative proposition opposed to its general positive counterpart. Hobsbawm does claim that social revolutions are uncontrollable and inevitable. But he refuted himself by also suggesting that some revolutions are avoidable, i.e., not unavoidable. And the latter is an example of a particular positive proposition opposed to its general negative counterpart. Hobsbawm, it must again be pointed out, does claim that social revolutions are uncontrollable and inevitable, which is to say that no social revolution is controllable and not inevitable. But his claims are again refuted by his own suggestion that some revolutions are avoidable.

The introduction of the term "successful" is in keeping with Hobsbawm's own understanding of revolution. A revolution is either a failure or a success. But it cannot be considered a failure unless "success" is defined: "Except insofar as 'failure' implies a definition of 'success'," Hobsbawm says, "this leaves the problem of the outcome of revolutions open." He goes on to say,

Obviously the establishment and maintenance of state power or its equivalent is a minimum condition of success, but success is more than this unless the objects and functions of a revolution are defined merely as the establishment of state power where previously none existed....

Thus, when he speaks of revolutions as inevitable, he is speaking of successful revolutions as being inevitable.

CHAPTER I

DESCRIPTION OF THREE ABORTIVE REVOLUTIONS

A. The Paris Commune of 1871.

The Paris Commune of 1871 -- not to be confused with the Paris Commune of 1793 and the Paris Commune of 1848 -- is regarded by Karl Marx, V.I. Lenin, and Rosa Luxemburg as the best model of a proletarian revolution that established a programme for working-class political power. As an abortive revolution the Paris Commune of 1871 is also a practical model for anti-marxists concerned in protecting the state's monopoly of power.

The following description of the Paris Commune will stress the revolutionary personality of Gustave Flourens. Related to his personality as a leader of the Paris Commune is the death sentence in absentia issued by the incumbent's military court, which provides the sort of evidence needed to prove that the incumbent government considered Flourens a key insurgent leader of the Paris Commune. His later capture and assassination after leading one of the major Commune assaults against Versailles must be seen in relation to the anti-Commune myth created by the incumbent government in terms of the moral righteousness of the determined use of force, including assassination.

The opportunity for the rise of the Paris Commune occurred when Louis Napoleon Bonaparte's liberal Empire was

cut short by losing the Franco-Prussian War of 1870. He had suffered three defeats in six days in August of 1870, when demonstrations broke out in Paris against his Empire. On September 2, 1870, he surrendered himself and his army. With the collapse of the Republic in the person of Napoleon III, there no longer existed a legitimate government to rule. On September 4, insurrectionary demonstrations broke out in Paris. That night a Central Committee -- dominated by Flourens and other revolutionary personalities¹⁷ -- began considering elections, national defense, and provisioning of the city.

Jules Favre, foreign minister for the Government of National Defense, spoke to Bismarck, who would not negotiate with a government which did not represent the whole of France. The group led by Favre sought peace, while the republican insurgents in Paris prepared to defend Paris against the Prussians, who completely encircled Paris by September 18, the beginning of a long siege that was to unite Parisians. Meanwhile, Favre and Adolphe Thiers, on behalf of the incumbent government, prepared to seek an armistice.

During the months of the siege, the Paris National Guard made several abortive revolutionary attempts to overthrow the provisional government. The Central Committee of the Twenty Arrondissements (i.e., neighborhood power centers or communes, which are forerunners of the Soldiers' and the Workers' Councils -- or "soviets" -- of the Russian Revolution and of the German Revolution of 1918) issued a pro-republican "Red Poster" on January 7, 1871, seeking to replace

the provisional government with a Paris Commune.

On January 28, the provisional government finally signed an armistice with the newly proclaimed German Empire under Bismarck. The signing of the armistice gave Favre and Thiers a favorable role in French politics, especially the elections to a National Assembly, which designated Thiers as "Head of the Executive Power."

Reaction to the pro-monarchist National Assembly was to again unify Parisians. The International, the Federation of Trade Unions, and the Delegation of the Twenty Arrondissements sought working-class political power and worker ownership of means of production, if they ever gained control of Paris.

On March 10, the National Assembly transferred its seat to Versailles and then passed several decrees, each of which angered Parisians. It ended the moratorium on rents and payment of commercial bills; it abolished pay for members of the National Guard; and it suspended six pro-republican newspapers. And a military court directed that Flourens, one of the two most popular revolutionary leaders, receive a death sentence in absentia.¹⁸

By March 17, Thiers, seeking the respect of the Germans as well as the rest of France, sought to demonstrate his government's control over Paris. He sent troops to Paris with the orders to seize the National Guard's cannon. But the troops bungled their orders and Parisians soon gathered and fraternized with them. "A mob brought together by

chance¹⁹ that morning murdered two of Thiers' generals, Lecomte and Clément-Thomas. Neither the National Guard, nor the Central Committee, were responsible for the murders. Nevertheless, Thiers and the National Assembly propagated the myth that these crimes were deliberate acts of the National Guard in defiance of the "legal" government of France, although as soon as Thiers made the fateful decision on March 18 to withdraw all regular troops and government officials from Paris to Versailles, Paris suddenly lacked a "legal" government.

Parisians were first enraged by Thiers' attempt to take their cannon -- because the cannon in question had been paid for by public subscriptions and they considered them not state property but their own -- and then surprised by Thiers' abandonment of Paris. All the talk in Paris was of the provocation of Thiers. A political vacuum had been created in Paris, which was now lacking a "legal" government. Auguste Vacquerie, who was Victor Hugo's son-in-law and a pro-republican dramatist, used the funeral of Hugo's son, who had been killed in the Franco-Prussian War, as the occasion to proclaim the democratic social Republic. And soon barricades were up everywhere in Paris and the red flag flew over the Hôtel de Ville tower.²⁰

A Paris Commune was declared. And soon communes were proclaimed in Lyons, Marseilles, Toulouse, Narbonne, St. Etienne, Le Creusot, and Limoges. Thus, Paris was not an isolated centre of republican sentiment.

Members to the Paris Commune were elected on March 26. Its membership has been carefully analyzed by historians with great interest in order to identify whether the Paris Commune's revolutionary personalities were proletarian, since the "socialist myth" holds that the pro-republican programme of the democratic social Republic was pro-working class. The proletarian political power base of the Commune can be considered a practical model, if its membership can be identified as working class. Of the membership, 17 members were of the International, 13 of the Central Committee of the National Guard, 8 members of Blanquists, 10 members -- including Gustave Flourens -- of the Radical Press and Revolutionary Party, 21 members of the Clubs, and 15 members of the bourgeoisie, who did not sit or else resigned. The Communards numbered 100,000 and the elected members listed above were the Commune's leadership.²¹

One of the first acts of the Commune was to renew war-time moratoriums on rents and extend payment of commercial bills. The next act was an anti-cleric decree that separated Church from State. Later acts included giving to the workers the means of production, i.e., vacant shops. And a "Declaration" of the Commune proclaimed its intentions:

...Paris and the entire nation must be informed of the character, the motives and the aims of the revolution that is taking place at this moment; it must be known that those who are ultimately responsible for our sorrows, our sufferings and our misfortunes are the same who, after betraying France and delivering Paris to foreigners, proceed to destroy the capital with a blind and merciless determination, so that the two-fold evidence of their betrayal and their crime may perish with the downfall of the Republic and of freedom.²²

The Communards themselves in the midst of a revolution blamed all the sufferings of Parisians on Versailles, which was depicted as mercilessly determined to destroy Paris.

Of the Commune's elected leadership, Gustave Flourens was regarded as a high-minded radical revolutionary with Jacobin sentiments. He was not, however, a proletarian, because he was independently wealthy. Yet he had been elected to the Commune from the Twentieth Arrondissement. The fact that the Versailles' military court had singled him out, along with Blanqui, to be sentenced to death in absentia -- since he had been one of the major revolutionaries in the earlier insurrections in 1870 -- made him a hero to the Commune. A measure of his role as Communard leader is seen again when he led the abortive sortie of April 3, 1871, against Versailles. It was one of the first and last attempts to overthrow with force the Versailles government. Since he had been condemned to death and since he was captured during the sortie, it comes as no surprise that the political murder of Flourens thereafter took place.

Flourens had gone to battle against an adversary with all the ardor of great heroes. After his assassination, the Communards had a martyr in the person of Flourens.

Thereafter, Thiers prepared to attack Paris with loyal troops. Bismarck gave him captured French troops. On May 21, 1871, Thiers' troops breached the walls of Paris. From May 21 to 28 street fighting took place. Between 15,000 and 30,000 Parisians were killed. Thousands were

later deported. In order to support the moral righteousness of the assassination of Flourens, the slaughter of Communards and their sympathizers, and mass deportations to New Caledonia, Thiers flooded France with misleading pamphlets which slandered the dead. Thus, a "reactionary myth" was created that aimed at propagating an anti-insurgent climate in France in order to restore law and order.

Pro-Communard socialists propagated a "socialist myth" of the Paris Commune, which became the model for marxists. One historian has found three myths of the Paris Commune:²³

(1) The reactionary one, successfully launched by Thiers even before the Commune was elected; this myth links Blanqui with Buonarrotti and Babeuf of the last revolution of the French Revolution and accuses it of being the instrument of communists of the International and atheists, whose attacks on both property and the Church were labeled deplorable. (2) The socialist one, supported by Marx and later Lenin, emphasizes the spontaneous and popular nature of the Commune, e.g., rather than a premeditated outbreak; this myth links the International and believers in the Communist Manifesto -- with its programme for the Revolutions of 1848 -- to the Communards and their proletarian programme. And (3) the revolutionary one, inspired by Lissagaray's famous history, Commune of 1871 (which was translated by Marx's daughter) and the memory of Charles Delescluze, who was killed on the last barricades as a 1793 republican.

Certainly one of the roles of a historian must be that of an iconoclast, since only historical fact can break the fabricated myth. Consider the "socialist" myth which almost romanticizes the Paris Commune. Crane Brinton says that "The Paris Commune of 1871 is an abortive social, though hardly socialist, revolution."²⁴ Karl Marx in 1881 said that "...the majority of the Commune was in no sense Socialist...."²⁵ In order for the "socialist" myth to hold, the members of the elected officers had to be socialist workingmen, but "The majority of the elected officers consisted not of workingmen but of journalists, club orators, and what Marx himself called 'shouters.'"²⁶ And the International, which was socialist, was not marxist. One delegate, Leo Frankel, was the only marxist in the French section of the International. Since "the majority of the leaders of the Paris Commune were not members of the French Section of the International,"²⁷ the historian must look elsewhere for the possibility of justifying the myth that the Communards were "socialist." The National Guard might be considered the only possibility of a majority of workingmen. But "There is no real evidence extant that the majority of the National Guard consisted of workingmen, although this is not unlikely, given the nature of the Paris population, the large numbers of unemployed, and the guaranteed pay."²⁸

Nevertheless, V.I. Lenin in State and Revolution calls the Paris Commune "the first attempt of a proletarian revolution to break up the bourgeois state machinery...."²⁹

And official Soviet views generally agree with I. Stepanov who wrote in Parizhskaya Kommuna (Moscow) in 1921 that the Paris Commune "was socialist because the proletariat can fight for no other cause than Socialism."³⁰

Much of course is made of the correspondence between Marx and Frankel, the jewelry worker. Since Frankel both knew Marx and was a member of the French section of the International, a degree of believability is given the "socialist" myth. Moreover, the "reactionary" myth feeds on the acceptance of the "socialist" myth, because Thiers claimed that the Paris Commune was a "red" revolution.

After the fall of the Commune, many Communards left France for England, where they met Marx and some became what could be termed "marxists." Lissagaray, however, was too autonomous a revolutionary personality to be the follower of Marx. Lissagaray, visiting the Marx household, formed an attachment with Eleanor Marx, who spent some of her time -- when not flirting with Lissagaray -- translating 500 pages of his present-tense history from French to English.³¹

Lissagaray's evaluation of Gustave Flourens included:

Flourens, chief of the 63rd battalion, but who was the real commander of Belleville, could no longer restrain himself. With the head and heart of a child, an ardent imagination, guided by his own impulse, Flourens conducted his battalions....³²

Obviously Flourens must be considered almost a revolutionary hero, since nothing could restrain him in conducting his insurgent leadership role, which was guided by autonomy.

An autonomous revolutionary personality is not controllable from without because he does not recognize any legitimacy of authority. The ardent spirit of such a leader is more like a "fever" than a steam-boiler. (Indeed, a steam-boiler is controllable. A "fever" is a healthy state of either the state or the individual. But with understanding a "fever" can be cured. A fever usually takes a period of time to cure, while a steam-boiler can be controlled instantly and continuously.)

In order for Eric Hobsbawm to find the "steam-boiler" analogy more "right" than Crane Brinton's "fever" analogy, the "steam-boiler" analogy must correlate with his four claims. How is a revolution like a "steam-boiler"? In the mechanical sense, the steam-boiler is instantly and continually controllable. If revolutionary situations are not controllable as Hobsbawm claims, then the "steam-boiler" analogy does not support his claim, because it is indeed controllable. If a revolution is not initially controllable, then a "steam-boiler" must be initially uncontrollable, which is not the case.

Moreover, Eric Hobsbawm's claim that approaches that seek to identify revolutionary personality are of little historical interest does not serve the historical need to show evidence as to whether the Paris Commune was "socialist" or "proletarian." The historian must seek the evidence needed to adequately support his claim with such an approach.

B. The Mexican Revolution and Zapata between 1910 and 1919.

In order to describe the Zapatista Movement (i.e., the guerrilla movement of the peasants in Morelos, south of Mexico City, led by Emiliano Zapata), it is necessary to describe other revolutionary events in the north. The stress will be placed on key revolutionary leaders, the habits of obedience of Zapatistas to Zapata and of Villistas to Villa -- rather than to the federal government -- and the plurality of political murders (i.e., assassinations) during the Mexican Revolution.

In September 1910 Mexicans celebrated their 100th year of independence. September was also the 80th birthday of Mexico's dictator, Porfirio Díaz, who had ruled for 30 years. During Díaz's dictatorship, he had brought both stability and material prosperity to Mexico. His generals and judges were rich, fat, relaxed, and old. Landowners, clergy, army, intelligentsia, and even bandit chiefs -- i.e., all possible opposition to his rule -- were converted into followers of the dictator.

Bandits were hunted down and given the choice of either joining Díaz or dying. Those who did not surrender were pursued and then killed by the very bandits who had accepted government pardons. Thus, peace was achieved by making the bandit the symbol of authority in Mexico.³³

All segments of society, except the Indian peasants, were considered vital to Díaz's monopoly of power. For

the loyalty of the army was assured by allowing generals unlimited opportunities for graft, including haciendas as gifts, collecting pay for regiments where only platoons existed, and granting of concessions for gaming houses and brothels. Even the loyalty of the Catholic Church was ensured by granting them universal influence over the Indian population as well as access to great wealth and power as landlord, banker, and trustee. In return, the Church preached obedience to Díaz.

Thus, Díaz was almost without opposition. He announced that he favored political opposition in the presidential election of 1910. One candidate, Francisco Madero, a member of a rich, landowning family in northern Mexico, presumed that the elections would be free. Since his campaigning in Sonora brought out large crowds, he was arrested and jailed until after the elections. Then the results were announced: 196 votes for Madero and millions for Díaz.

Madero, after his release, denounced the election as a fraud in his famous "Plan of San Luis Potosí," which launched the Mexican Revolution. Pascual Orozco and Pancho Villa in the north and Emiliano Zapata in the south answered this call to revolution against the dictatorship of Díaz. But Madero soon found that he could not control Orozco and Villa. Orozco, with 1500 effectives under his command, felt that Juárez, a city near the United States-Mexico border, could be taken with nothing but a rifle and two cannon.³⁴ When Madero rejected the plan, Orozco with Villa's compliance

had their revolutionaries exchange insults and then shots with the federal troops on May 8, 1911. Soon the battle was impossible to stop, as the revolutionaries dynamited their way from one building to another until the city surrendered. The federal loss of Juárez to insurgents shook Mexico and encouraged the Zapatistas to seize Cuautla, just south of Mexico City. On May 21, 1911, the Zapatistas occupied Cuernavaca, the capital of the state of Morelos, and soon federal troops were retreating from Morelos. And on May 24, rumors circulated throughout Mexico City that Díaz would soon resign. As crowds gathered, Díaz did resign and boarded a German ship sailing for Europe.

Díaz gave Madero the battle, but deprived him of winning the war. Thus, Madero's victory was incomplete.³⁵ He would not be able to consolidate the Díaz bureaucracy and army into a revolutionary programme, partly because those government structures were still wholly intact and partly because those structures would soon be undermining whatever government and agrarian reforms he had intended in his "Plan of San Luis Potosí."

The provisional incumbent government was led by De la Barra, not Madero. De la Barra appointed Juan Carreón, the manager of the Bank of Morelos, to the office of provisional governor of Morelos. Carreón sided with the hacendados (i.e., the hacienda owners) against the villagers and peasants. The first day Madero arrived victoriously in Mexico City, June 8, 1911, and again on August 13, 1911, Zapata asked that Carreón

be replaced by a revolutionary governor favoring agrarian reforms. Meanwhile, Carreón and hacendados disseminated fabricated accounts of depredations in Morelos by Zapatistas. These accounts led De la Barra to order General Victoriano Huerta to press the campaign into Morelos either to eliminate or to disperse the Zapatistas. Thus, instead of withdrawing federal troops, as Zapata requested of Madero on August 13, 1911, Carreón's exaggerated accounts of chaos in Morelos had the opposite effect on De la Barra, who used the accounts to justify reinforcing federal troops.

Madero was inaugurated on November 6, 1911. Instead of withdrawing federal troops, he offered to absolve Zapata of the charge of rebellion in return for unconditional surrender and exile from Morelos. The hacienda Madero offered him was rejected: Zapata opposed hacendados and did not seek to be one. Ultimately, his response to Madero was the famous Plan of Ayala, which demanded popular government and agrarian reform.

As General Huerta pressed the fight against the Zapatistas, the hacendados saw their homes burned, their haciendas taken over and subdivided by peasants (i.e., their lands redistributed), animals stolen (i.e., redistributed), their families killed, and towns razed. Where prosperity (for a few) had earlier existed, desolation reigned (for the hacendados, at least). Their anti-Zapatista myth continued as the press slandered the Zapatistas by claiming they were guilty of "rape, rapine, pillage, and brigandage."³⁶ The citizens of Mexico City read only what the hacendado press propagated.

By the end of 1911, Orozco, bribed by rich cattle barons in the north, revolted against Madero also. Madero gave the job of running down Orozco to General Huerta, who was assisted by Pancho Villa. Orozco's loyalty to Madero had been freely given and therefore freely withdrawn. But Huerta and Villa disputed over a horse and Madero intervened. Huerta had ordered Villa shot, but Madero saved Villa's life.³⁷ Huerta was not to forgive Madero for intervening, because soon the tide had turned against Madero. The Zapatistas by October, 24, 1911, had succeeded in assaulting Milpa Alta, just outside Mexico City, with several thousand insurgents. By May 22, 1912, Huerta, who had succeeded in capturing Rellano from some 8,000 poorly organized Orozquitas, was no longer interested in being loyal to Madero. In October of 1912 Félix Díaz, the nephew of the former dictator, revolted, but even after his capture and imprisonment, he was able to conspire to revolt again.

Félix Díaz was aided by General Bernardo Reyes in plotting against Madero in 1913, when officers from the army freed Félix Díaz and marched on the National Palace in what is commonly called the "Ten Tragic Days." They were met by burst of machine gun fire, which killed Reyes and 200 others. Madero, sealing his own doom, called on General Huerta to command the palace troops.

Meanwhile, Henry Lane Wilson, the U.S. Ambassador, sought to use his influence to bring order to Mexico. He

convinced several foreign diplomats and Mexican senators that Madero ought to resign and General Huerta ought to form a military dictatorship. Huerta took Madero into custody and then Madero was assassinated. Huerta proclaimed himself provisional president.

The conservative governor of Coahuila, Venustiano Carranza, denounced Huerta after the assassination of Madero. Soon Carranza's righteous cause found supporters: the forces under Alvaro Obregón in Sonora; Villa and Pablo González in the north; and Zapata, who had been an anti-Huertista since as early as August of 1911, in the south. The most ardent anti-Hueristas were Villa and Zapata. Huerta sought and got the loyalty of Orozco, who made five demands, including federal pay for his irregulars. Having met with success with Orozco, Huerta sent negotiators to Zapata with the same conditions for an alliance, but Zapata would never ally with Huerta.

Huerta, fearing that governors might ally with Governor Carranza, began replacing them one by one. But this policy backfired and inadvertently drove ex-governors and their supporters into arms against Huerta. Perhaps Huerta would have been able to direct sufficient military force against the Constitutionalist under Carranza in the three northern states and next against the Zapatistas in Morelos to effect an overwhelming victory -- and thereby brought peace and order to Mexico that Ambassador Wilson had envisioned -- if it had not been for isolated rebellions

breaking out in thirteen other states by the summer of 1913. Each insurgent outbreak drew strength in troops and demanded more supplies.

Huerta sent General Robles, a Huertista career officer, into Morelos in May 1913. Robles arrested and expelled the anti-Huertista governor and legislators of Morelos. He then razed villages suspected of harboring Zapatistas, took hostages and sometimes executed them, and herded thousands into resettlement camps in other states. Robles, however, soon found out that he could control only the larger towns. Zapata was master of rural Morelos.

By late September 1913, Villa began a vigorous campaign in the north, where he forced a federal surrender at Torreón, taking 116 valuable artillery pieces, and executing all captured federal officers. This defeat stunned Huerta, who resigned. Then Carranza made an attempt to rid himself of Villa, who became enraged. Villistas were loyal to Villa first and only then loyal to the Constitutionalist Movement.³⁸

Carranza, since he had been a governor under Díaz and was pro-hacendado, was not the sort of ruler that either Villa or Zapata would obey. Hence, neither Villa in the north nor Zapata in the south would consider Carranza the legitimate provisional president. Thus, Carranza -- like Madero and Huerta before him -- failed to end the revolution.

Meanwhile, Obregón convinced Carranza to leave the forming of a new Mexican government to a Convention at Aguascalientes. In October 1914, delegates there soon

discovered that Villa was boss. Indeed, Eulalio Gutiérrez, the provisional president elected by the Convention, found himself a virtual prisoner of Villa's. But Gutiérrez soon escaped to Carranza, who was in Vera Cruz. Villa entered Mexico City with his troops in December 1914 and sent word to Zapata to join him there. Villa, the fat revolutionary, and Zapata, the trim revolutionary, met. The Villistas had supported the Plan of Ayala at the Convention, so the two insurgent leaders were in agreement as to their revolutionary aims: popular government and agrarian reform. However, the Mexican Revolution was not to end in December of 1914.

Carranza sent federal troops under Obregón to drive Villa from Mexico City. The Villistas retreated and on April 6, 1915, Obregón defeated Villa at Celaya, where 12,000 lives were lost. With Villa on the run to the north, Carranza turned his attention to Zapata. By late summer 1916, Carranza sent General Pablo González into Morelos with 40,000 troops. These troops tortured and mutilated and executed unarmed peasants. They raped women, sacked towns, burned villages, deported natives to other parts of Mexico, and destroyed crops, animals, and implements of work. All civil guarantees were suspended.³⁹

Zapata had to refine his guerrilla tactics. He laid traps and ambushes, cut supply lines, stormed towns, and generally destroyed small federal units and harassed larger federal forces. Whenever González divided his forces, he exposed them to ambush and assaults.

In June and August of 1916 Carrancistas killed 466 men, women, and children in Tlaltizapán, Morelos, where Zapata had his headquarters. The Carrancistas returned again in 1917 and 1918 to raid Morelos, killing peasants, burning crops, driving off cattle, spreading misery and hunger. The federal troops even destroyed the sugar mills by carrying off the mill machinery to Mexico City, where they sold it for scrap iron. Of the 70,000 Zapatistas with Zapata in 1915, only 10,000 remained by 1919.⁴⁰

One of González's officers, Jesús Guajardo, was out to get the reward being offered for the head of Zapata. He simulated desertion from the federal army by attacking his own fellow Carrancistas in Jonacatepec. When Zapata heard of the desertion, he sought out his new ally, because to Zapata with a dwindling force more allies were needed.

On April 10, 1919, Guajardo ambushed Zapata. He and his men riddled the body of Zapata with bullets when Zapata entered the hacienda Chinameca at Guajardo's invitation. Carranza promoted Guajardo to general and rewarded him with 50,000 pesos. The assassination of Zapata crushed the Zapatista Movement, which never again gained strength. The impact of the assassination was so great that the heart of the Movement had been lost.

Zapata's assassination, however, was not the only assassination of a key revolutionary leader during the Mexican Revolution. Madero had been assassinated in 1913, Carranza in 1920, Villa in 1923, and Obregón in 1928.

As a model of revolution, the Mexican Revolution provides the following criteria: (1) The dictatorship of Díaz had provided stability through loyalties of the army, the Church, the bandit chiefs, and political bosses. (2) The bureaucratic and military structure did not fall when the dictator went into exile. (3) Habits of obedience were towards a revolutionary leader, and then to the state. (4) Loyalty freely given was often freely withdrawn. (5) Peasant revolutionary leaders like Zapata and Villa were frustrated by the bureaucratic and military structure that remained basically pro-hacendado. (6) As a prolonged revolution, the Mexican Revolution was a series of revolutionary situations. (7) Insurgents continued to challenge the state as long as their aims were not recognized and as long as they did not recognize the legitimacy of the pro-hacendado state structure. (8) Only when overwhelming use of force was used against the insurgents did such force have effect. (9) The plurality of assassinations in the Mexican Revolution indicates that assassination was considered an effective use of incumbent power or insurgent power. (10) The hacendados propagated an anti-Zapatista myth from early in the Mexican Revolution in order to ensure that the bureaucratic and military structure would protect them. And (11) The price placed on Zapata's head was in effect a sentence of death in absentia.⁴¹ The impact of the assassination is difficult to measure, since the morale of his troops was low in 1919 at the time he was assassinated.

C. The Spartacist Rebellion of 1919.

By December 1915, the Imperial German armies were bogged down on the western front and Germany's two top military leaders, General Hindenburg and General Ludendorff, admitted defeat. Together they convinced the Kaiser, Wilhelm II, that an immediate armistice and an immediate change in Germany's political system (a change favored by President Wilson of the United States) must occur.

The major party groupings in that political system were: the Right, a middle group, and the Left. The Right comprised the Conservatives and the Reichs Party (i.e., the Junkers, court society, and landowners); the middle group comprised the National Liberals (i.e., big business) and the Center Party (i.e., the Roman Catholics); and the Left comprised the Progressives (i.e., the intelligentsia and certain radical banking and commercial circles) and the strong Social Democrat Party (i.e., the party of labor and trade unions).

The loyal Social Democrat Party (SPD) remained supporters of the government during the war, while a small "International" group -- led by Rosa Luxemburg of the Spartacists, i.e., a pro-marxian party -- by 1916 had moved out of the ranks of the loyal SPD and agitated openly against the war and for revolution.

Since Prince Max von Baden was acceptable to the SPD and his liberal views towards labor well-known, he was asked to form a new government as the Reich Chancellor.

Prince Max then invited Friedrich Ebert, the leader of the SPD to a conference, where the Prince suggested to Ebert the the Kaiser might abdicate if Ebert promised to have the SPD, the largest party in the Reichstag, wait before undertaking radical changes. Ebert felt duty-bound to use his leadership to save Germany.⁴²

Meanwhile, the conservative Right sought to establish a military dictatorship under a general. The Spartacists sought immediate radical changes, including the dictatorship of the proletariat.

On October 4, 1918, the SPD formed a coalition government. Prince Max forwarded a message to President Wilson requesting an armistice on the terms General Ludendorff endorsed. And by October 28, 1918, a new constitution of a parliamentary monarchy went into force. But the parliamentary monarchy did not last long, because some Center Party members retreated from Right to Left and the transition from war to peace in the face of defeat and disintegration of the traditional legitimacy of the state was conducive to rebellion, which broke out in November 1918.

On November 9, 1918, Prince Max announced the abdication of the Kaiser and he then resigned the Chancellorship. His natural successor was Ebert, the leader of the majority SPD. "Soviets" -- i.e., Workers' and Soldiers' Councils -- had gained control of most urban centers, and were in the process of self-creation throughout the country and at the front. Sailors had mutinied and civilians supported them.

A general strike broke out in Berlin, where large groups of armed workers and soldiers gathered. The Spartacists in Berlin encouraged the strike and attempted to proclaim a Socialist Republic, the same afternoon that Philip Scheidemann, Ebert's SPD cohort, had on his own initiative declared a Democratic Republic. Where no legitimate government existed, any group could proclaim that it was as legitimate as any other group to rule the state.

Army officers on the streets of Berlin had their decorations torn off. The red flag was hoisted on public buildings, and hawkers suddenly were everywhere selling red rosettes, red ribbons, and red tags. Prince Max, in one of his last acts before leaving office, persuaded the Minister of War, General Groener, to order his troops not to fire on civilians.

Emil Eichhorn, a member of the coalition Independent Socialists, became the Berlin Chief of Police in the wake of the November Revolution. Monarchy throughout Germany had suddenly collapsed. Imperial Germany and the old regime had been overthrown. And the Berlin Workers' and Soldiers' Council formally approved Eichhorn's appointment. Later the Independent Socialists (a minority amongst the coalition government) favored the Left, i.e., they became supporters of the Spartacist insurgency in Berlin towards the end of December 1918, because of the new Democratic Republic's suppression of a justified mutiny among sailors of the Berlin Naval Division. Since Eichhorn was an Independent Socialist

and since the Independent Socialists under Georg Ledebour had suddenly broken with the SPD coalition, the Prussian government sought to dismiss him from the office of Berlin Chief of Police. The Democratic Republic intended to ensure its monopoly of power over Berlin by a new appointment. The Spartacists gave Eichhorn immediate support after he refused to comply.

Since both Ebert and the Minister of War, Groener, opposed radical changes in Germany, Ebert -- with his slogan of Order, Freedom, and Peace -- turned to General Groener, who could provide the most reliable armed force to bring law and order to Germany. Indeed, General Groener still controlled all field armies. The Ebert-Groener Pact was formed with specific demands being made by Groener in return for his military assistance to the new provisional government. These demands included: summoning a national assembly, disarming the civilian population, and abolition of all Workers' and Soldiers' Councils. A secret telephone line connected thereafter the Reich Chancellery to the High Command's headquarters at Spa. On this line Ebert and Groener were able to review the situation from day to day and thereby exploit a determined use of effective force whenever necessary.

Ebert's first duty was to agree to the Allied armistice terms and to authorize Erzberger to sign them. In mid-December the first Congress of Workers' and Soldiers' Councils met in Berlin. The SPD had no doubt by then that the Congress would decide in accordance with its wishes. The Congress

rejected an early proposal to invite Rosa Luxemburg and other Spartacist leaders to their deliberations. Published minutes of the cabinet meetings of the SPD leadership prove beyond question that Ebert invested a great deal of energy in reducing the Councils to impotence by conjuring up "an utterly profound threat of bolshevism."⁴³ The Congress soon endorsed the SPD plan for elections to a National Assembly with a 400 to 50 vote. Rosa Luxemburg's reacted to the vote by identifying the National Assembly as "a counterrevolutionary fortification against the revolutionary proletariat."⁴⁴

The anti-Spartacist propaganda spread by Ebert's office slandered the Spartacist leadership, even suggesting that Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht were lovers.⁴⁵ Rosa was name-called "Red Rosa." And she reacted against the counterrevolutionary efforts of Ebert and Groener by demanding on December 14, 1918, in the Red Flag that the entire adult male proletarian population be armed and that a revolutionary tribunal be installed "to try the two Hohenzollerns, Ludendorff, Hindenburg, Tirpitz, as well as all counterrevolutionaries."⁴⁶

The Spartacists, ejected from the seats of power, had no recourse but to assert themselves in acts of force against the incumbent government. Yet they were unable to control the adventurism, rioting, street fighting, looting and other excesses carried out by the Lumpenproletariat during the months of December 1918 and January 1919. The Spartacists

did attempt to stop the flood of anti-Spartacist propaganda in the press by seizing newspaper offices in Berlin. The incumbent government, however, held the upper hand in all negotiations over those offices. And Spartacist negotiators carrying white flags were even shot at.

The Spartacists, backed into a corner, had no choice but to open relations with Joffe, the Soviet ambassador in Berlin, who provided them with money, leaflets, and arms. The Spartacists merged with the German Communist Party and became known as KPD by the end of December 1918.

The first incidents of violence between Spartacists and the incumbent government was on December 6, 1918, when a posse of noncommissioned officers raided the headquarters of the Berlin Workers' and Soldiers' Councils and arrested (and in some cases executed key Spartacists) many of the Councils' leaders. Wels, the military commander of Berlin and himself a SPD, called out loyal troops and roped off all approaches to the inner city of Berlin. The incumbent government was determined to teach the Spartacists a lesson.

By January 1, 1919, the Independent Socialists had resigned from the provisional government's coalition in protest to the suppression of the People's Naval Division in Berlin. They denounced Ebert as a lackey of the High Command. Gustav Noske, the Governor of Kiel during the November naval mutiny there and himself a SPD, became a member of the new provisional government's leadership. He

volunteered to organize loyal troops -- including Free Corps units under former officers of the Imperial Army -- to smash the Spartacists in Berlin.

On January 5, 1919, the Independent Socialists and the KPD Spartacists published a joint manifesto denouncing Eichhorn's mistreatment at the hands of Ebert, Scheidemann, and the Prussian Ministers. Masses of workers had demonstrated in front of Eichhorn's headquarters and he urged them to insurrection in an inflammatory address. Eichhorn's sympathies were influenced by Joffe, who was asked to leave Germany by Ebert's government and who was caught with discriminatory leaflets in his baggage.⁴⁷ The issue of Eichhorn's dismissal unified various Left factions, including the Shop Stewards, who were in favor of revolution. Their joint Proclamation declared:

Attention! Workers! Party Comrades! The Ebert- Scheidemann government has heightened its counterrevolutionary activities with a new contemptible conspiracy directed against the revolutionary workers of Greater Berlin: it tried maliciously to oust Chief of Police Eichhorn from his office. It wished to replace Eichhorn with its willing tool....⁴⁸

Since the crowds were large, the Left leaders felt ensured of mass support. But the next morning they were to discover that loyalty freely given can be freely withdrawn.

If violent revolution was ever to succeed in Germany, Karl Liebknecht reasoned, it must be now. Rosa Luxemburg was reluctant and wanted to hold back. But Liebknecht went ahead and formed a Revolutionary Committee and called on the workers to rise in rebellion.

By the next morning, however, the only groups determined to take an active role in the rebellion were a small number of Eichhorn's personal followers, a few thousand KPD Spartacists, and sections of the Independent Socialists and the Revolutionary Shop Stewards. The Berlin Naval Division had suddenly discovered its oath of loyalty to the incumbent government binding. By the evening of January 6, the revolutionary action that had begun with such passionate enthusiasm was a miserable failure in terms of numbers.

The Spartacists ought to have known that the strong habits of obedience of the common German civilian -- worker or non-worker -- were rigidly authoritarian and submissive. Moreover, the average German wanted only peace after years of war, suffering, hunger, and misery.

Gustav Noske, the SPD Reichstag Deputy, sought to re-establish order in Berlin by first surrounding the center of the city and then attacking the Spartacist strong-holds. Berlin soon became a bloody battlefield as machine gun fire was exchanged. The Spartacist Rebellion lasted but seven days, from January 5 to January 12, 1919. The police headquarters was the last insurgent strong-hold to fall.

After the arrival of the bulk of Noske's forces, a cleanup operation began that was aimed at disarming civilians by confiscating any and all unauthorized weapons. The Spartacist leaders became major targets as the Free Corps distributed leaflets to its troops calling for the elimination of all communist leaders, including Rosa Luxemburg.⁴⁹

These leaflets, sponsored by the incumbent government, were in effect a sentencing to death in absentia of Rosa Luxemburg. She was finally captured and brought into the headquarters of one Free Corps unit in the center of Berlin and struck over the head with a rifle butt. She was then carried to a car, shot in the head, and her body dropped from a bridge into a canal, where it was found weeks later.

The Ebert government announced by the end of January that casualties were in excess of a thousand and that the Spartacist Rebellion was smashed. The assassination of both Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht were also announced, but only after their movement was slandered and their pro-Bolshevik sentiments overly-stressed. The obvious intent of such anti-insurgent propaganda was to make the assassinations seem morally righteous acts.

Philip Scheidemann in his Memoirs speaks of the Spartacist Rebellion as "the Bolshevist reign of terror". He describes the Spartacist insurgents as "Lunatics" and "Russian agents": "Lunatics were let loose, and Russian agents."⁵¹ Captain Horst von Pflugk-Hartung, who had shot Karl Liebknecht, took pride in freeing Germany of Bolshevism by his act.⁵² There can be no doubt that the Ebert-Scheidemann incumbent government made maximum use of the historical facts of Bolshevik terror and violence in Russia against the Spartacists. The fact that one Right wing group by the end of December 1918, had put a price on Rosa Luxemburg's head meant that hired killers would seek her out.⁵³

Placing the blame of the assassination on the incumbent government and assessing the impact of the assassination of Rosa Luxemburg on the success of the Spartacist attempt to turn the German Revolution of 1918 into a proletarian revolution of 1919 are two issues open to debate. Part of the blame must be placed on the incumbent government, which (1) stressed the bolshevik character of the Spartacists, (2) condoned the placing of a price on the heads of Rosa and Karl Liebknecht, (3) instrumentally distributed leaflets calling for the elimination of Spartacist leaders, and (4) feared repercussions after the assassinations. Obviously, the putting of a price on the head of Rosa Luxemburg unleashed bands of hired killers in search of her. Full responsibility ought to be placed on the Right wing group that put up the money. But the incumbent government's leaflets calling on the elimination of Spartacist leaders such as Rosa Luxemburg made the incumbent leaders instrumental in providing the direction of its effective use of force.

Rosa Luxemburg was a strong leader of the Spartacists. She was the "mind" of the Spartacist Movement.⁵⁴ She had been an active and vocal member of the International. Her critique of capitalism, The Accumulation of Capital, was regarded as a sequel to Karl Marx's Das Kapital. She had formulated the Spartacist's "demands" in her editorial in Red Flag, "What Does the Spartacus League Want?" And she had been one of the first proletarian leaders to recognize the role of strikes. Her loss had more than a little impact.

CHAPTER II

COMPARISONS

A. Analysis.

With the fall of French Emperor Napoleon III, with the fall of Mexican dictator Porfirio Díaz, and with the fall of Kaiser Wilhelm II, the habits of obedience of the respective subjects weakened because of the similar absoluteness of coercive power held in the hands of these respective rulers. As rulers with a monopoly of power in their respective countries, they were able to command obedience and loyalty through fear and coercion. The sudden fall of each ruler left an absence of charismatic leadership with authority to rule. The result was a degree of lessening of obedience to respective provisional states which depended on habits of obedience for its loyalty, since each ruler had fallen after a defeat in war that somewhat disintegrated its ability to use coercive weapons of force. Thus, the political vacuum that resulted after Napoleon III and most of his army were captured by the Prussians, that resulted after Don Porfirio abdicated and left for exile in Europe, and that resulted after the Kaiser had gone into exile in Holland left each respective country without a legitimate ruler with legitimate authority to rule the state. Thus, socio-political change depended on new loyalties.

Defeat in war left the French army in 1870 and the German army in 1918 disintegrated, while the defeat in war at the battle of Juárez did not disintegrate the Mexican army. However, the habits of obedience of Mexicans were not as much towards the state after Díaz went into exile as loyalties were towards individual revolutionary personalities, such as Zapata and Villa. The elections to the National Assembly in France split the loyalties between monarchists favoring peace with Prussia and republicans in urban centers seeking a Republic rather than an Empire. And the collapse of the German army in World War I left Germany in the hands of the Social Democrats, who favored a monarchy and who needed the support of the Imperial army to maintain law and order. Because of the strong habits of obedience of the German military, Germans generally were obedient to the will of the state, regardless of whether it was legitimate in commanding that obedience.

The absence of a strong ruler in each respective state meant that whatever habits of obedience were present in the general population would be lessened as a result of the socio-political vacuum and the lack of a state with any legitimacy of authority to command obedience. In such a transitional vacuum arose revolutionary personalities with autonomous wills. Such personalities questioned the legitimacy of the provisional government's authority to govern. And these insurgent personalities found followers who were suddenly free to switch loyalties, since loyalty freely

given can be freely withdrawn.

Since the state lacked a monopoly of power, suddenly it found that it could not command obedience, i.e., use coercive power to intimidate. Without fear, the insurgent forces grew with the switching of loyalties. But in the case of the Mexican Revolution loyalties were often to the bandit leader, if a member of a band of bandits, or to the hacendados, if a member of a hacienda, or to the village leader, if a member of a peasant village. Since the army was not disintegrated by one battle, the Zapatistas of the peasant villages of the state of Morelos found themselves faced with federal troops seeking to disperse them. The provisional President of Mexico, De la Barra, appointed Carreón, a pro-hacendado manager of the Bank of Morelos, to the office of provisional Governor of Morelos, Zapata had reason to demand both political and agrarian reforms of Madero, the revolutionary leader predisposed to reforms but unable to command the obedience of the Díaz bureaucracy, which Díaz had left essentially intact. Thus, Zapatistas remained loyal to Zapata and Villistas to Villa.

Of the three abortive revolutions, only the Mexican Revolution was a case where the military remained basically intact. That the Paris Commune of 1871 could not have stood a chance against the full military might of Napoleon III and that the Berlin Commune of the Spartacists of 1919 could not have stood a chance against the full military might of the

Kaiser tends to place the stress on the opportunity for insurrection that opened up after the collapse of that military might in the respective cases. The rise of charismatic revolutionary personalities -- such as Flourens and Rosa Luxemburg -- with the natural propensity to be autonomous and to question the legitimacy of authority of any provisional government corresponded with the rise in opportunities for insurrection. The switching of loyalties freely given and freely withdrawn was natural in the respective transitions. And the loyalty given Flourens so freely before the sortie against Versailles soon faded after the first shots, just as the loyalty given Luxemburg (not to mention Liebknecht) during the rallies in Berlin soon faded by the time Noske's forces surrounded Berlin. Suddenly, the Naval Division found that it ought to remain loyal to the provisional government, as did many of the German workers -- the masses of proletarians who the Spartacists had counted on for support -- by the next morning when they had time to consider whether they were for peace, freedom-order, i.e., the themes of Ebert's government.⁵⁵

Establishing the legitimacy of authority of a new incumbent state is as difficult as a given revolutionary personality has in establishing his right to lead. Much depends on the strength of incumbent leaders to lead and on their effective use of force against insurgent leaders. The presumption behind assassination plots against the stronger insurgent leaders is that their elimination will

effectively control revolutionary situations. The final decision of incumbent leadership to assassination or to eliminate those insurgent leaders is usually correlative to the presumption that that decision would bring the predicted results, i.e., control of change. Indeed, the incumbent wants control of change in order to protect itself from insurrection, while the insurgent wants control of change in order to overthrow the state.

By use of assassination the incumbent wants a maximum amount of control of change and at the same time wants a maximum amount of uncontrol of change among the insurgent forces: i.e., the elimination of an insurgent leader with strong loyalties of his followers presumes that the degree of control over the revolutionary situation he possessed will thereafter be uncontrolled. New leaders with mixed loyalties of followers -- some freely given and some freely withdrawn soon thereafter -- will have to struggle for leadership of the insurgent movement. Such presumption must have been foreseen by plotters among the incumbent elite who sought the maximum amount of impact on the insurgents by the most effective use of force.

Analysis of the descriptive content of the three abortive revolutions indicates that the three provisional governments used coercive force both effectively and determinately. Thiers used coercive force to massacre 20,000 Communards. Carranza -- after De la Barra, Madero, and Huerta failed -- succeeded in using coercive force against

the Zapatista insurgents and reduced their forces from 70,000 in 1915 to only 10,000 by 1919. And the provisional government under Ebert used coercive force to kill about a thousand pro-Spartacist rebels.⁵⁶

Analysis also indicates that the respective incumbent governments sought the elimination of key insurgent leaders. The Versailles government's military court sentenced Flourens to death in absentia. Carranza placed a reward on the head of Zapata, which in effect sentenced Zapata to death in absentia. And Noske's troops distributed leaflets calling for the elimination of Rosa Luxemburg, which was in effect sentencing her to death in absentia.

After the assassination of these key insurgent leaders, the propagation of an anti-insurgent myth was needed to give moral justification for the self-rigtheousness of these assassinations and the death of so many insurgents. The anti-Zapatista myth began early in the state of Morelos where pro-hacendado news accounts fabricated Zapatista deprecations. The anti-Communard myth propagated by Thiers began with the accusation of National Guardsmen for the deaths of two government officers following orders. And the anti-Spartacist myth propagated by Ebert and pro-incumbent newspapers -- many of them taken over by the Spartacists in Berlin in order to stop the anti-Bolshevik slander of key Spartacist leaders -- began during the war when both Luxemburg and Liebknecht were jailed for protesting the war, and name-calling later, e.g., "Red Rosa."

B. Conceptual Scheme.

1. An Explicit Conceptual Framework. The comparative study of revolutions can either draw from the tradition of similar studies (e.g., Crane Brinton's Anatomy of Revolution) or seek an original path. This thesis has followed the traditional path because the reader is more apt to be familiar with it. The need for a Conceptual Scheme such as Crane Brinton provided is also stressed by Peter Amann:

Merely "reliving" the chaos "as it really was" is unlikely to provide such an understanding (i.e., "a rational understanding of the dynamics of a revolution"). Actually, though the advocates of Rankean detachment also want to draw conclusions and discover patterns, they feel that they can do this without bringing to their study any conceptual apparatus at all--merely a healthy curiosity and the canons by which they were trained. I believe that they are deceiving themselves. The real alternative lies between a conceptual framework which is never made explicit and therefore remains beyond the reach of criticism, and one which is open to critical inspection.⁵⁷

Brinton sought scientific "detachment" but also provided an explicit Conceptual Scheme based on facts drawn from empirical phenomena to support hypotheses of first approximations of uniformities.

In the next sections an explicit conceptual framework will blend the notion of "habits of obedience" in Amann's "redefinition" of revolution with the notion of the distinction between autonomy and authority in Robert Paul Wolff's In Defense of Anarchism. Hopefully, such a blend will provide the sort of general identification of the moral state of mind common to the revolutionary personality: i.e., the "revolutionary personality" can have a moral basis.

2. The Revolutionary Personality. The conception of the autonomous individual -- i.e., one who rejects all authority as illegitimate⁵⁸ -- ought to be of more than a little historical interest to the student of revolution. Doing what one is told to do because another tells him is not the basis for a rational moral foundation. Some claims of authority, such as the robber's, may be morally wrong. For example, if a robber holds you at gunpoint and says "What is yours is mine," he has power over you, but hardly authority over you.⁵⁹

Men generally acknowledge claims of authority because of the force of tradition. But tradition to the revolutionary personality is usually an inadequate reason to obey. Yet there does not exist a rational basis for legitimate authority outside tradition.

Analysis of the three abortive revolutions indicate that strong rulers -- Napoleon III, Díaz, and Kaiser Wilhelm II -- fell just before the revolutions took place. Habits of obedience determine how that transition effected each respective state. If the habits of obedience are strong (as in the case of the Germans), then the transition is smooth. But if the habits of obedience are weak (as in the case of the Mexicans), then the transition is rough. Indeed, after a strong ruler has fallen, generally only another strong ruler can take his place, i.e., if a ruler must be strong to command obedience in a given state. The disintegration of the respective armies after defeat in war also weakens the

coercive force available to the respective strong rulers and of course to the surrogate rulers who replace them. When the surrogate ruler replaces a strong ruler, a momentary breakdown of the state's monopoly of power is likely to occur, because the autonomous revolutionary personality -- who rejects all claims to legitimate authority and would not believe such a claim if it were made by a surrogate ruler -- capitalizes on "a lessening of the habit of obedience" that naturally arises during such transitional transfers of power.

Autonomous insurgent leaders -- such as Flourens, Zapata, and Luxemburg -- called into question the legitimacy of the respective incumbent governments led by surrogate rulers. In other words, they challenged the new rulers, who lacked a monopoly of power, who lacked unquestioned obedience, and who lacked legitimacy of authority (at least in the eyes of the autonomous insurgent leaders). As Peter Amann points out,

Obedience based on loyalty independent of habit or fear is, as Machiavelli saw, an insecure basis of state power. Loyalty freely given may be freely withdrawn.⁶⁰

The lack of strong loyalties to a given surrogate incumbent ruler lessens the habits of obedience to the state. As Amann maintains, "the power monopoly of the state depends largely... on their (i.e., the governed) habits of obedience":

It is the habit of obedience that, extended to institutions like the army and the bureaucracy, makes it possible for the state to delegate vital functions without jeopardizing its own effective monopoly of military, judicial and administrative power.⁶¹

The strong habits of obedience, for example, of the Germans made such power responsible and obedient to Ebert himself.

3. A "Redefinition" of Revolution. If the term "revolution" is a semantic device, then the pragmatics of what is the best available definition to use within a conceptual scheme will determine appropriateness. Neither Brinton's common usage, nor Hobsbawm's vacuous open-ended definition of revolutionary situation, are adequate. Brinton's definition is too broad, while Hobsbawm's definition depends on a definition of "success" and "good chances of a revolutionary outcome." And the "circular motion" of the Copernican idea of revolution in the astronomic sense is inadequate.

Peter Amann proposes to "redefine" the term as "a breakdown, momentary or prolonged, of the state's monopoly of power, usually accompanied by a lessening of the habit of obedience." The revolution lasts until the state's monopoly of power is seriously challenged by one or more "power blocs." And it ends when either the incumbent leadership or the insurgent leadership is victorious. In other words, the insurgent forces succeed in establishing state power or its equivalent as in the case of a successful revolution, or the incumbent forces smash the insurgent forces as in the case of an abortive revolution.

The selection of a definition appropriate to abortive revolutions must include the possibility of a "momentary" breakdown of the state's monopoly of power. Though the Paris Commune and the Spartacist Rebellion were in both cases smashed within a week of bloody street fighting, a week must be considered to be a momentary existence of revolution.

4. Historical Fallacies. No broad, general claims are made in this thesis, which aims only at primarily seeking tentative uniformities through comparative analysis of three revolutions and at secondarily refuting four general claims. The three abortive revolutions, for example, suggest that the general claim that all successful revolutions are inevitable is unhistoric and that the general claim that all successful revolutions are uncontrollable is self-contradictory. If, as Hobsbawm maintains, the term "revolution" can only be defined in terms of "success," -- a term which he himself leaves open -- then abortive revolutions are not revolutions at all. Are abortive revolutions merely "revolutionary situations"? A revolutionary situation, Hobsbawm says, is a short-term or long-term crisis with the possibilities of a revolutionary outcome. He implies by revolutionary outcome -- if failure can only be defined in terms of success -- a successful revolutionary outcome. And by success he seems to seek something more than merely the establishment of state power or its equivalent. Obviously, abortive revolutions do come within the scope of his classification of revolutionary situation. But it is arbitrary to ignore abortive revolutions when he claims that this is the epoch of only successful revolutions. Hobsbawm has made a fallacy of semantical distortion in his argument, or a fallacy of composition in his explanation, or perhaps both, when he makes such general claims of such a universal, unlimited nature that any given abortive revolution is adequate to refute them.

The semantic distortion in Hobsbawm's use of the term "revolution" might be due to the use only of the great successful revolutions as models, which in turn provide the criteria to classify all such events. But such a great successful revolution as the French Revolution fails to provide the ultimate criteria for defining the term. It fails because (1) historians draw upon enough possible factors as the cause that entirely different sets of causes have been given; (2) historians disagree as to whether it was one or more revolutions, e.g., the Revolution of the Aristocracy, the Revolution of the Third Estate, the Democratic and Republican Revolution of August 10, 1792, the Social Democratic Revolution of June 2, 1793, and the Babeuf Revolution during the Directory; and (3) historians disagree on when it ended, one group (Mathiez, Thompson, Goodwin) claim the French Revolution ended in 1794, while another group (Lefebvre, Soboul, Richet) claim it ended in 1799.⁶²

In terms of success even an abortive revolution can later have consequences leading to success, as Brinton points out:

The abortive revolution is especially important in the welding together of oppressed nationalities, which after a few heroic uprisings attain a pitch of exalted patriotism and self-pity that makes them almost unbeatable.⁶³

The term "revolution" means more than just "change," as even Hobsbawm implies when he criticizes two definitions of the term with only the term "change" in common.⁶⁴ Moreover, he says "analysis is not predictive"⁶⁵ but that revolutions are "initially" more "uncontrollable,"⁶⁶ which is predictive.

C. Thesis Argument.

1. Refutation of "little" Historical Interest Claim.

Eric Hobsbawm claims that all approaches seeking to identify revolutionary personality are of little historical interest. By explicitly rejecting the need to identify revolutionary personality, he has self-refuted his claim, because he has indeed shown more than a little interest in claiming all such approaches wrong. As a historian, he either can present adequate evidence to warrant his claim, or he cannot. If he cannot, then his claim lacks support and can therefore be discounted as not a claim at all. An unsupported claim is not a strong objection to all such identification approaches.

For Hobsbawm to be persuasive, he must support his claim. By supporting it, he self-refutingly shows more than a little historical interest in identifying revolutionary personality. Thus, his approach becomes a kindred approach. Categorically, his approach (i.e., supporting with more than a little interest the rejection of all approaches that seek to identify revolutionary personality) is nevertheless an approach to revolutionary personality. He refutes himself:

All approaches are wrong.
Hobsbawm's approach is such an approach.
Therefore, Hobsbawm's approach is wrong.

Since he rejects revolutionary personality as being of little historical interest, he must have good reason. Marxism is often considered to be a repudiation of the role and significance of the individual in social development, although Marx himself was a humanist, i.e., man was not nameless and impersonal.

2. Refutation of the claim that revolutions are both uncontrollable and inevitable. Hobsbawm contradicts himself by maintaining that "some revolutions are avoidable, if avoided,"⁶⁷ and at the same time claiming that revolutions -- i.e., successful revolutions -- are both uncontrollable and inevitable. For example,

All revolutions are unavoidable.
Some revolutions are not avoidable,
i.e., some revolutions are avoidable.

The semantic difference between "unavoidable" and both uncontrollable and inevitable is significant only insofar as any use of effective force by an incumbent government to protect itself from revolution aims at avoiding revolution. During a revolution an incumbent government either controls or not controls the revolutionary situation. If the incumbent controls it, then the revolution fails. Any of the three abortive revolutions provides inductive support to support the qualified suggestion that some revolutions are controlled. And, similarly, an incumbent government that succeeds in controlling a revolution by smashing the insurgent forces avoids, at least momentarily, what chances the revolutionary situation had of becoming successful. At that point in time the historian would be unhistoric to make any claims concerning the inevitability of a predicted outcome. Either a revolution is inevitable in time or it is not. It would be therefore unhistoric to predict a successful outcome of revolution before, during, or momentarily after an abortive revolution. Inevitability is unhistoric in time.

3. Refutation of "Epoch of Social Revolution" Claim.

That some revolutions are successful and that some revolutions fail cannot be denied. The existence of revolutions in modern times cannot be denied. Indeed, the existence of revolutions in history provided the basis for the primary comparative study of the uniformity of three revolutions that failed. But it is unhistoric to generalize about the future by claiming that all social revolutions are unavoidable, uncontrollable, and inevitable. Hobsbawm contradicts himself by making such universal claims of modern history:

No social revolution is avoidable (i.e., all social revolutions are unavoidable) is contradicted by the fact that some social revolutions are avoidable.

Success is avoidable. Unfortunately, success is not inevitable in the affairs of man. Indeed, success cannot always be controlled. Moreover, what happened yesterday might not happen again. Perhaps modern history up to now has been an epoch of social revolution, but it would be unhistoric to predict the future will be like the past.

Three abortive revolutions inductively refute the universal claim that no social revolution is avoidable (i.e., controllable and not inevitable). Indeed, the three abortive revolutions tentatively suggest that this is the epoch of abortive social revolutions. As models, abortive revolutions provide the criteria or understanding necessary to protect ourselves from successful revolutions tomorrow.

4. Summary of Secondary Argument. The secondary purpose of this thesis was to refute Hobsbawm's four claims. These arguments of refutation do not aim to be conclusive. However, the understanding of how to protect ourselves from revolutions -- i.e., the sort of understanding that Brinton sought -- may be better found in abortive revolutions than in successful revolutions. In the four revolutions that Brinton studied, the respective incumbent governments failed to use determined effective force against the insurgent forces. In the three abortive revolutions studied in this thesis, the respective incumbent governments succeeded in using effective force to smash the insurgent forces. Hence, two distinct types of models of revolutions can be focused upon: the abortive revolution model and the successful revolution model. Hobsbawm's four claims depend on models that succeed,⁶⁸ if he claims that the inevitability and the uncontrollability of revolutions are universal. But inevitability of revolution is found only after a successful revolution and uncontrollability is found during a successful revolution, if at all. Some revolutions are avoided, controlled, and thus were not inevitable. Abortive revolutions were controlled by the effective use of force by the incumbent governments in the cases studied. From the study of abortive revolutions alone, one might suggest that this is an epoch of abortive revolutions and not an epoch solely of successful revolutions. If abortive revolutions become universal in the future, perhaps it will be so because of understanding derived from abortive models.

5. Assassination. Historians who consider history as biography find great interest in the personalities of

1. Archduke Ferdinand	7. Leon Trotsky
2. Lincoln	8. Gandhi
3. JFK	9. Rasputin ⁶⁹
4. Malcolm X	10. Rosa Luxemburg
5. Rev. Luther King Jr.	11. Emiliano Zapata
6. Dr. Marat	12. Gustave Flourens

These individuals are not nameless and impersonal. Each was murdered. And some were without a doubt political murders, i.e., assassinations. Hence, interest in assassinations has more than a little relevance to historians and to historical biographers.

In some abortive revolutions the incumbent government uses effective force to smash the insurgents. A part of the effective force used may be the use of assassination of key insurgent leaders. In each of the abortive revolutions studied, the incumbent government used assassination as part of the effective force to smash the insurgents. In each case evidence indicates that the incumbent government sought to eliminate key insurgent leader. Such evidence, however, provides only a possible causal link between motivation and assassination. Such a link can also be regarded as a moral one between cause and effect.

In comparative historical study some factual evidence may answer the question, "How did it happen?" The moral implications of such an answer sometimes answers the moral question, "Who is to blame?" The two different questions seem to merge and demand a single answer.

6. The Fallacy of Responsibility as Cause. Various historical fallacies must be avoided. One such fallacy is the fallacy of responsibility as cause, which occurs when the causal question, "How did it happen?" seems to have the same answer as the moral question, "Who is to blame?" When these two different questions are merged and seem to demand one answer, the fallacy is said to occur. Is it not post hoc? It is not a post hoc fallacy to tie the causal evidence of the incumbent government to eliminate the insurgent leaders in each case, because such evidence is tied to the evidence of the effect, i.e., the key insurgent leaders in each case were eliminated by assassination. Of course, one event is not the cause of another event merely because it comes in temporal succession before the other. These key leaders were eliminated. Who was to blame? The moral question must remain unanswered. But the causal question has been answered.

Suggestions, not claims, are tentatively put forward in this thesis as inductive generalizations limited by the scope of the study, which is to three abortive revolutions. Another fallacy, the fallacy of the single case, is therefore avoided. When it is suggested that no claims are here made, such a statement, if made, ought not be taken as an insidious claim. Of course, over-generalizations that go beyond the inductive generalizations within the scope of the study must be considered unjustifiable, as over-generalization tends to distort the tentativeness and the limitations of scope of the inductively limited uniformities the study supports.

7. Summary of Argument. Just as it is difficult to⁷⁰ assess the impact of assassination of a given leader on the controllability of a given revolutionary situation by the incumbent state, so is it difficult to identify whether a given revolutionary personality -- such as Gustave Flourens -- had a high degree of control over the Paris Commune. He does provide an example of the sort of insurgent leader the historian would have to identify and to assess. If one revolutionary personality proves the point that identification is of more than a little historical interest, the example of Flourens will serve to prove the point.

The fact that marxists have found the Paris Commune to be the best model for the establishment of proletarian power allows us here to use Flourens as the best example.

The assumption that the Versailles' incumbent government was motivated by the "presumption" that the assassination of Flourens would effectively protect the state must be considered self-confirming, because the assassination took place with the aim of controlling the revolutionary situation. To attempt to provide evidence pro or con to this assumption would only confirm the counter-claim that the approach seeking to identify revolutionary personality has more than a little historical interest.

If successful revolutions have been avoided (e.g., controlled by assassination of insurgent leaders), then revolutionary situations are controllable and successful revolutions are not inevitable.

CONCLUSIONS

The foregoing argument is supported by the analysis and comparison of descriptive historical evidence to warrant nine approximations of uniformities: (1) the presence of habits of obedience to a strong ruler, (2) who fell after defeat in war, and (3) a lessening of habits of obedience towards the surrogate incumbent government ensued among insurgents; (4) lessening of habits of obedience towards the incumbent government meant that autonomous leaders, who naturally questioned the legitimacy of any state, would find followers; (5) the incumbent government assumed that these insurgent leaders were a threat to their monopoly of power, authority, or legitimacy, as is indicated by a determined attempt by each incumbent government to eliminate key insurgent leaders, who (6) generally held the loyalties -- at least temporarily -- of their respective insurgent followers; (7) the effective use of determined force by each incumbent government included (8) the presumption that elimination of key insurgent leaders was necessary; and (9) an anti-insurgent myth was needed by the victorious incumbent state power to give moral justification for the righteousness of the act of assassination as well as the overwhelming use of force in smashing the insurgent forces in bloody encounter. Finding these tentative uniformities from inductive evidence was the primary purpose of this thesis. Since the study involves a

comparative analysis of revolution, a conceptual scheme that stressed the need for identification of revolutionary personality and the need for a "redefinition" of revolution was developed utilizing a blend of Wolff's distinction between autonomy and authority and of Amann's redefinition of revolution in terms of loyalty and habits of obedience. The revolutionary personality was identifiable in each of the three abortive revolutions. The presumptive decision to assassinate the insurgent leaders entails that the incumbent's plot was based on predictive possibility that elimination of an identifiable revolutionary personality would have an impact on the insurgent's morale and a weakening of insurgent's habits of obedience to new leadership. The possibility of a leadership struggle among insurgents would weaken their threat to the incumbent government. In order to analyze whether assassination had an impact involves the identification of such revolutionary personalities, which become more than of little interest to historians of revolutions.

The revolutionary personality is one who does not find any claim to legitimate authority persuasive and who would not believe such a claim if it were made. Such an autonomous individual is in direct conflict with whatever state seeks to impose its will, i.e., demand obedience and use coercive force if commands are not obeyed.

The redefinition of revolution in terms of fear, loyalty, and habits of obedience blends well with the conceptual apparatus used in the analysis of the three

abortive revolutions, which prove that revolutionary personality is of more than a little historical interest and that revolutionary situations are controllable (if determined use of effective coercive force is unleashed by the incumbent.) All future-bound claims tend to be unhistoric, including the suggestion that analysis of revolutionary situations is not predictive. To suggest that it is not predictive is to suggest that it would be historic if it were possible to predict future possibilities. But future possibilities are not history (i.e., of the past) and therefore can be discounted as unhistoric, just as the notion that all revolutionary situations -- initially or otherwise -- can always be controlled. Some are controlled and some are not controlled. Some are avoided, as Hobsbawm grants, while some are not avoided.

Hobsbawm ties "success" into his notion of "revolution," which allows for a refutation of his claim that "revolutions are inevitable" and his correlative claim that "this is an epoch of social revolution." Successful revolutions are not inevitable, any more than abortive revolutions are inevitable. This is the epoch of successful revolutions as much as it is the epoch of abortive revolutions. The analysis of the three abortive revolutions tends to show that revolutions can be controlled by the effective use of force, which can be decisive. Few historians would question that socio-political change is inevitable. Incumbent elites who plot assassination presume that eliminating key leaders will control change.

FOOTNOTES

1

Eric J. Hobsbawm, "Revolution," reprint of speech presented to XIV International Congress of Historical Sciences, San Francisco, August 22-29, 1975. Claims number 1, 2, 3 are on page 7 in the quotation: "To accept this type of analysis (i.e., Marx's analysis of modern age as "an epoch of social revolution") is to recognize that at certain periods specific kinds of drastic historical change are inevitable, and that therefore historic forces beyond the control of will, must 'break asunder the integument' of the old systems and regimes in one way or another." And claim number 4 is from pages 10-11 in the quotation: "This is not to deny its (i.e., "revolutionary populations") importance, though approaches which seek to identify specifically 'revolutionary behavior' or 'revolutionary personality' are of little historical interest,"

2

Crane Brinton, The Anatomy of Revolution (N.Y.: Vintage Press, revised and expanded 1965 edition), p. 18: Brinton suggests that the "very word is full of unpleasant suggestions" when referring to "fever" and goes on to predict that "To the Marxists our whole inquiry (i.e., into whether a social system can protect itself from revolution) has probably been suspect from the beginning, and our conceptual scheme will appear to them simply the expected bourgeois dishonesty." Hobsbawm (op. cit., p. 13) says that Dährendorf's "analogy of the steam-boiler" is "rightly" more illuminating than Brinton's "fever" analogy, but Hobsbawm does not say why it ought to be "rightly" so. Indeed, in terms of "controllability" a "steam-boiler" is more controllable than a "fever"!

3

Crane Brinton, op. cit., p. 8: Brinton finds the tradition of "scientific rationalism" to be the tradition he continues and extends. On p. 20 he repeats that "genuine scientific detachment is difficult to attain," but seeks to be detached, while Eric Hobsbawm (op. cit., p. 2) speaks of "the possibility of dispassionate, but not uncommitted, historical analysis" with the stress placed on committed, although dispassionate.

4

Eric J. Hobsbawm, Revolutionaries (N.Y.: Meridian, 1975), p. vii: Hobsbawm speaks of book-review editors thinking that he was "a marxist of the 'old left'", but he modestly confides that "Over the years I have acquired some knowledge both of marxist ideas and of the history of recent revolutions and revolutionary movements but, speaking as a historian, these are not fields in which I would claim professional expertise."

5

Felix Gilbert, "Revolution," Dictionary of the History of Ideas, (ed.) Philip Wiener, (N.Y.: Scribners' Sons, 1973), Vol. IV, p. 153.

6

Ibid., p. 153: The ideas on the term "revolution" in this paragraph are supported by Gilbert's history of the term.

7

Plato, The Republic of Plato, tr. by F.M. Cornford, (N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 1965), Book 8, Sec. 545, p. 268.

8

Aristotle, Politics, tr. by Benjamin Jowett, reprinted in William Ebenstein (ed.), Great Political Thinkers (N.Y.: Rinehart & Co., 1951), p. 106.

9

Crane Brinton, op. cit., p. 25: Brinton claims that the "present usage of the word 'revolution' is a class term covering quite a number of concrete phenomena" and that "the job of the systematist is to cling to the general term and devise useful subclassifications within it."

10

Eric Hobsbawm, "Revolution," op. cit., p. 18.

11

Ibid., p. 20: The distinction he makes between "revolutionary situation" and successful "revolutionary outcome," i.e., "revolution," does not establish a clear definition of "revolution," but he does establish his adherence to a definition of "revolution" only in terms of "success." Thus, the claim he makes concerning all revolutions as inevitable must be interpreted as "All successful revolutions are inevitable," which is refutable by the existence of merely one abortive revolution. Hobsbawm, however, has recourse to define "failure" (i.e., abortive) in order to judge whether a given abortive revolution actually was a failure. Indeed, as Brinton also suggests, an abortive revolution may be in some sense successful, e.g., unifying nationalities.

12

Crane Brinton, op. cit., p. 7.

13

Ibid., p. 252.

14

Ibid., p. 6: Brinton says, with understanding of revolutions and of thunderstorms "we can take certain steps to protect ourselves against them."

15

Ibid., p. 20.

16

Eric Hobsbawm, "Revolution," op. cit., number 1: pp. 7 & 17; number 2: pp. 3, 7, 8, 13, 18-19, 31; number 3: pp. 7, 18-19, 31; and number 4: pp. 10-11. These versions of the four claims are offered in the complete form in order to establish the factual basis for warranting the claim that he did claim all four claims without a questionable doubt.

17

Roger L. Williams, The French Revolution of 1870-1871 (N.Y.: Norton & Co., 1969), p. 90: Williams says that the Central Committee was "dominated" by Flourens and others.

18

Roger L. Williams, Ibid., p. 120.

19

John Flamenatz, The Revolutionary Movement in France, 1815-71 (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1952), p. 142.

20

Edmond Goncourt, Paris Under Siege, 1870-1871, tr. by George Becker (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1969), pp. 227-231: Goncourt is an eye-witness to the funeral speech, to the "red flag" and to the talk, e.g., "All around me people are talking of provocation and making fun of Thiers."

21

R.W. Postgate (ed.), Revolution from 1789 to 1905 (N.Y.: Harper Torchbooks, 1962), p. 280: Postgate examines the "proletarian character of the Commune" and offers General Appert's list of the professions of those condemned by the Versailles courts after the defeat of the Commune; that list supports the view that the bulk of the Communards were workers.

22

"An Official Programme of the Commune," in Eugene Schulkind (ed.), The Paris Commune of 1871 (N.Y.: Grove Press, 1974), p. 149: Lissagaray sought such a programme actively in the press.

23

John Roberts, "The Myth of the Commune," History Today, Vol. VI (May 1957), No. 5, pp. 291-296.

24

Crane Brinton, op. cit., p. 23.

25

Karl Marx, in a letter to Domela Nieuwenhuis, Feb. 22, 1881, as quoted by Bertram D. Wolfe, Marxism (N.Y.: Dell Press, 1967), p. 126.

26

Bertram D. Wolfe, op. cit., p. 141n.

27

Ibid., p. 131.

28

Ibid., p. 141n.

29

V.I. Lenin, State and Revolution, as quoted by Bertram D. Wolfe, Ibid., p. 126.

30

I. Stepanov, Parizhskaya Kommuna, Moscow, 1921, as quoted by Bertram D. Wolfe, Ibid., p. 126.

31

Ronald Florence, Marx's Daughters (N.Y.: Dial Press, 1975), see chapter on "Eleanor Marx," esp. pp. 19-29. Evidently, Lissagaray as a lover provided Tussy with a "sudden sexual initiation" and her father, Karl Marx, was "furious" when she announced that "she was engaged" to this dashing Frenchman.

32

Prosper Olivier Hippolyte Lissagaray, Commune Of 1871 (N.Y.: Monthly Review Press, 1967), tr. by Eleanor Marx Aveling, p. 18.

33

Ronald Atkin, Revolution! (N.Y.: John Day Co., 1970), p. 13.

34

William Weber Johnson, Heroic Mexico (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1968), p. 61: Johnson offers a comic vision of how the two cannon were used, e.g., "Its first shot whistled high and away from the battle."

35

John Womack, Jr., Zapata and the Mexican Revolution (N.Y.: Vintage Books, 1970), p. 97: Womack says, "Intentional or not, Díaz's last official act had been a stroke of strategic genius. In resigning he gave Madero the battle but deprived him of the experience necessary to win the war. The strain of an incomplete victory soon pulled the revolutionary coalition apart."

36

Charles Cumberland, Mexican Revolution: Genesis under Madero (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1972), p. 174.

37

Michael Meyer, Huerta (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1972), pp. 38-39: Huerta ordered Villa to return an expensive Arabian mare appropriated from a horsebreeder in Rellano, but Villa refused. Huerta accused him of insubordination in time of war and ordered his summary execution, but Madero intervened.

38

Frank Tannenbaum, Peace by Revolution (N.Y.: Columbia University Press, 1968), p. 121: Tannenbaum's evaluation of Mexican habits of obedience is that "The soldiers owed allegiance to the man who they followed."

39

Oscar Lewis, Pedro Martínez (London: Panther Books, 1969), p. 145: One of the only primary sources in English is this account of the life of a Zapatista who fought Carranza.

40

Robert Millon, Zapata: The Ideology of a Peasant Revolution (N.Y.: International Publishers, 1972), p. 36.

41

Frank Tannenbaum, op. cit., pp. 178-179: Tannenbaum claims that neither Madero nor Huerta nor Carranza could sympathize with the Zapatistas and that Zapata had a heavy price on his head. After he was assassinated, "terror and fear spread throughout that part of Mexico" and morale was low. He notes that in Cuernavaca he read an inscription: "Rebels of the South it is better to die on your feet than to live on your knees."

42

Eric Waldman, The Spartacist Uprising of 1919 (Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Marquette University Press, 1958), n. 7, p. 71: Waldman quotes Ebert as saying that he felt it "our damned duty to do it (i.e., to combine our demands with the "salvation" of the country)."

43

Gerhard Bassler, "The Communist Movement in the German Revolution," Central European History, VI (Sept. 1973), No. 3, p. 257.

44

Rosa Luxemburg, quoted by Eric Waldman, op. cit., p. 126.

45

Karl Liebknecht, Berlin speech on December 23, 1918, as quoted by Eric Waldman, Ibid., pp. 128-129: "The newspapers of the bourgeoisie...abound with the most fantastic lies, with the most insolent misrepresentations, with distortions, and defamations. There is nothing we are not accused of."

46

Rosa Luxemburg, "WHAT DOES THE SPARTAKUSBUND WANT?," Selected Political Writings, (ed.) Robert Looker, (N.Y.: Grove Press, 1974), pp. 281-282.

47

Carr, Edward Hallett, German-Soviet Relations Between the two World Wars, 1919-1939 (Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1951), pp. 2-3: "The police planted some forged revolutionary broadsheets in his diplomatic baggage and saw to it that his trunk accidentally burst open in transport." Carr says, "On the strength of this contrived evidence, Joffe was given his passports and despatched with his staff in a special train to the frontier on November 6, 1918."

48

"Proclamation," Die Rote Fahne, Jan. 5, 1919, as quoted by Eric Waldman, op. cit., p. 169.

49

Ronald Florence, op. cit., p. 155.

50

Philip Scheidemann, The Making of New Germany (N.Y.: Appleton & Co., 1929), Volume II, p. 292.

51

Ibid., p. 280.

52

J.P. Nettl, Rosa Luxemburg (London: Oxford University Press, 1966), Volume II, p. 775: Nettl interview Von Pflugk-Hartung, who prided himself in having assassinated Karl Liebknecht and thereby saved Germany from Bolshevism.

53

Ronald Florence, op. cit., p. 153.

54

Dr. Paul Levi, funeral oration in Feb. 1919, as quoted by Gerhard Bassler, op. cit., p. 250: "Rosa Luxemburg, the mind who thought for us." Ronald Florence quotes Kautsky's recommendation in 1906: "In Rosa Luxemburg you will be getting one of the best brains in Germany." That she was the "mind" of the KPD Spartacists ought not allow us to consider the rifle butt hitting her head and the shot through her head to be symbolic acts, but the impact of the loss to the KPD Spartacists must be judged in terms of her head.

55

Friedrich Ebert, as quoted by Eric Dombrowski, German Leaders of Yesterday and To-day (N.Y.: Appleton & Co., 1920), p. 13.

56

Francis Halsey, History of the World War (N.Y.: Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1919), Volume VI, p. 293: Halsey claims that about 700 Spartacists were wounded in a week and that the total dead reached 1,300. More than 1,000 harmless civilians were killed or wounded. About 1,000 pro-Spartacists were taken prisoner.

57

Peter Amann, "Revolution: A Redefinition," Political Science Quarterly, 77 (1962), p. 36.

58

Robert Paul Wolff, In Defense of Anarchism (N.Y.: Harper Torchbooks, 1970), p. 15: Wolff argues that "For the autonomous man, there is no such thing, strictly speaking, as a command."

59

Any analogy between "robber" and "state" is accidental.

60

Peter Amann, op. cit., p. 40. Amann, a historian, says: "From the point of view of historical method, revolution may be said to be a breakdown, momentary or prolonged, of the state's monopoly of power, usually accompanied by a lessening of the habit of obedience." p. 38.

61

Ibid., pp. 37-38.

62

Eric Hobsbawm, "Revolution," op. cit., p. 22.

63

Crane Brinton, op. cit., p. 23.

64

Eric Hobsbawm, op. cit., p. 4: Hobsbawm compares a definition by Zagorin and a definition by Galtung, but finds "nothing in common except the word 'change'."

65

Ibid., p. 18: Any suggestion of "predictability" of future events must be considered here as "unhistoric."

66

Ibid., p. 31: Hobsbawm says that "changes by revolution" are "(initially) more uncontrollable".

67

Ibid., p. 8: Hobsbawm says that "some actual revolutions are avoidable, because avoided".

68

Ibid., p. 20: He says, "Except insofar as 'failure' implies a definition of 'success', this leaves the problem of the outcome of revolutions open." I relate his view to "models," p. 1.

69

Brian McConnell, Assassinations: The Murders that Changed History (N.Y.: Cavendish, 1975).

70

Murray Havens et al, The Politics of Assassination (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970), pp. 36-46.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sources Consulted: Formulation of Conceptual Scheme.

Amann, Peter. "Revolution: A Redefinition," Political Science Quarterly, 77 (1962), p. 36.

Aristotle. Politics. tr. by Benjamin Jowett, reprinted in William Ebenstein (ed.) Great Political Thinkers. New York: Rinehart & Co., 1951, p. 106.

Brinton, Crane. The Anatomy of Revolution. New York: Vintage Press, revised and expanded 1965 edition.

Gilbert, Felix. "Revolution," Dictionary of the History of Ideas, (ed.) Philip Wiener, New York: Scribner's Sons, 1973, Vol. IV, p. 152.

Havens, Murray, Carl Leiden, and Karl Schmitt. The Politics of Assassination. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Hobsbawm, Eric. "Revolution," reprint of his speech at the XIV International Congress of Historical Sciences, San Francisco, Calif., August 22-29, 1975.

Hobsbawm, Eric. Revolutionaries. New York: Meridian, 1975.

McConnell, Brian. Assassinations (The Murders that Changed History). New York: Cavendish, 1975.

Plato. The Republic of Plato. tr. by F.M. Cornford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.

U.S. News & World Report, "CIA Murder Plots," Dec. 1, 1975, p. 13.

Wolff, Robert Paul. In Defense of Anarchism. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1970.

Sources Consulted: The Paris Commune of 1871.

Allison, John. Monsieur Thiers. London: Allen & Unwin, 1932.

Baldick, Machael. The Siege of Paris. New York: Macmillan, 1964.

Boguslawski, A. von. Tactical Deductions from the War of 1870-71. tr. by Col. Lumley Graham, London: King & Co., 1872.

Brabent, Frank. The Beginning of the Third Republic in France. London: Macmillan & Co., 1940.

Brogan, D.W. The French Nation. New York: Harper Colophon, 1963.

Chapman, Guy. The Third Republic of France. London: St. Martin's Press, 1962.

Edwards, Stewart. (ed.) The Communards of Paris, 1871. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1973.

Edwards, Stewart. The Paris Commune, 1871. New York: Quadrangle Books, 1971.

Ellis, John. Armies in Revolution. New York: Oxford University Press, 1973.

Florence, Ronald. Marx's Daughters. New York: Dial Press, 1975.

Fried, Albert, and Ronald Sanders. (ed.) Socialist Thought. New York: Doubleday Anchor, 1970.

Gacon, Jean. "The Paris Commune of 1871," Revolutions: A Comparative Study. (ed.) Lawrence Kaplan, New York: Vintage Books, 1973, p. 227.

Goncourt, Edmond de. Paris Under Siege, 1870-1871. tr. by George Becker, Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1969.

Harrison, Royden. (ed.) The English Defence of the Commune. London: Merlin Press, 1971.

Jellinek, Frank. The Paris Commune of 1871. London: Gollancz, 1937.

Lenin, V.I. The State and Revolution. Peking: Foreign Language Press, 1973, esp. Chapter III.

- Lissagaray, Prosper. History of the Commune of 1871. tr. by Eleanor Marx Aveling, New York: Monthly Review Press, 1967.
- Marx, Karl, and V.I. Lenin. Civil War in France: The Paris Commune. New York: International Publishers, 1972.
- Mason, Edward. The Paris Commune. New York: Macmillan, 1930.
- Molke, General Helmuth von. "Letters, 1870-71," The Nineteenth Century, 1815-1914. (ed.) John Cairns, New York: Free Press, 1965, p. 156.
- Plamenatz, John. The Revolutionary Movement in France, 1815-71. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1952, Chapter Six.
- Postgate, R.W. (ed.) Revolution from 1789 to 1906. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1962.
- Roberts, John. "The Myth of the Commune," History Today, VI (May 1957), No. 5, p. 290.
- Schulkind, Eugene. (ed.) The Paris Commune of 1871. New York: Grove Press, 1974.
- Schulkind, Eugene. The Paris Commune of 1871. London: Historical Association, 1971.
- Spitzer, Alan. The Revolutionary Theories of Louis Auguste Blanqui. New York: Columbia University Press, 1957.
- Thomas, Edith. The Women Incendiaries. tr. by James and Starr Atkinson, New York: Braziller, 1966.
- Thomson, David. Democracy in France Since 1870. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Tint, Herbert. The Decline of French Patriotism 1870-1940. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1964.
- Trotsky, Leon. Leon Trotsky on the Paris Commune. New York: Pathfinder Press, 1972.
- Williams, Roger. (ed.) The Commune of Paris, 1871. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1969.
- Williams, Roger. The French Revolution of 1870-1871. New York: Norton & Co., 1969.
- Wolfe, Bertram. Marxism. New York: Delta, 1967, Part III.
- Wolfe, Robert. "The Parisian Club de la Révolution, 1870-1871," Past and Present, 39 (April 1968), p. 81.

- Sources Consulted: Zapata and the Mexican Revolution, 1910-19.
- Asprey, Robert. War in the Shadows: The Guerrilla in History. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1975.
- Atkin, Ronald. Revolution! (Mexico 1910-20), New York: The John Day Co., 1970.
- Calvert, Peter. The Mexican Revolution, 1910-1914. Cambridge: University Press, 1968.
- Calvert, Peter. "The Mexican Revolution: Theory or Fact?" Journal of Latin American Studies, I (May 1969), p. 51.
- Cline, Howard. Mexico, 1940-1960. London: Oxford University Press, 1962.
- Cumberland, Charles. Mexican Revolution. (Genesis under Madero), Austin: University of Texas Press, 1974.
- Cumberland, Charles. Mexican Revolution. (The Constitutional Years), Austin: University of Texas Press, 1972.
- Dunn, H.H. The Crimson Jester. (Zapata of Mexico), New York: McBride & Co., 1933.
- Dunn, John. Modern Revolutions. Cambridge: University Press, 1972.
- Gibbon, Thomas Edward. Mexico Under Carranza. New York: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1919.
- Hansen, Roger. The Politics of Mexican Development. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1971.
- Huizer, Gerrit. "Emiliano Zapata and the Peasant Guerrillas in the Mexican Revolution," Agrarian Problems and Peasant Movements in Latin America. (ed.) Rodolfo Stavenhagen, Garden City, New York: Anchor, 1970, p. 375.
- Johnson, William Weber. Heroic Mexico. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1968.
- Leiden, Carl, and Karl Schmitt. (ed.) The Politics of Violence. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1968.
- Lewis, Oscar. Pedro Martínez. London: Panther Books, 1969.
- McBride, George. The Land Systems of Mexico. New York: American Geographical Society, 1923.
- McHenry, J. Patrick. A Short History of Mexico. Garden City, New York: Dolphin, 1970.

- Meyer, Michael. Huerta. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1972.
- Millon, Robert. Zapata: The Ideology of a Peasant Revolutionary. New York: International Publishers, 1972.
- Niemeyer, E.V. Revolution at Queretaro. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1966.
- Parkes, Henry Bamford. A History of Mexico. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1966.
- Quirk, Robert. The Mexican Revolution, 1914-1915. New York: Norton & Co., 1960.
- Ross, Stanley. Francisco I. Madero. New York: Columbia University Press, 1955.
- Simpson, Lesley Bird. Many Mexicos. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1961.
- Tannenbaum, Frank. Mexican Agrarian Revolution. New York: Macmillan Co., 1929.
- Tannenbaum, Frank. Peace by Revolution. (Mexico After 1910), New York: Columbia University Press, 1968.
- Thord-Gray, I. Gringo Rebel. Coral Gables, Florida: University of Miami Press, 1960.
- Tuchman, Barbara. The Zimmermann Telegram. New York: Dell, 1965.
- Villegas, Daniel Cosío. "The Mexican Revolution," Revolutions: A Comparative Study. (ed.) Lawrence Kaplan, New York: Vintage Books, 1973, p. 405.
- White, Robert. "Mexico: The Zapata Movement and the Revolution," Latin American Peasant Movements. (ed.) Henry Landsberger, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1969, p. 101.
- Wolf, Eric. Peasant Wars of the Twentieth Century. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1969.
- Womack, Jr., John. Zapata and the Mexican Revolution. New York: Knopf, 1969.

Sources Consulted: The Spartacist Rebellion of 1919.

Bassler, Gerhard. "The Communist Movement in the German Revolution," Central European History, VI (September 1973), No. 3, p. 257.

Carr, Edward Hallett. German-Soviet Relations Between the two World Wars, 1919-1939. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1951.

Carr, Edward Hallett. Studies in Revolution. London: Macmillan & Co., 1950.

Carsten, F.L. Revolution in Central Europe, 1918-1919. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972.

Chambers, Frank, Christina Grant, and Charles Bayley. This Age of Conflict, 1914-1943. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1945.

Cowles, Virginia. The Kaiser. New York: Harper & Row, 1963.

Dombrowski, Eric. German Leaders of Yesterday and To-Day. New York: Appleton & Co., 1920.

Florence, Ronald. Marx's Daughters. New York: Dial Press, 1975.

Frölich, Paul. Rosa Luxemburg. tr. by Edward Fitzgerald, London: Gollanez, 1940.

Greene, Nathanael. (ed.) European Socialism Since World War I. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1971.

Halperin, S. William. Germany Tried Democracy. New York: Norton, 1965.

Halsey, Francis Whiting. History of the World War. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1919, Vol. VI.

Hobsbawm, Eric. Revolutionaries. New York: Meridian, 1973.

Kuhl, General von. "Report to the Reichstag, 1918," European Civilization. (Basic Historical Documents), (ed.) Paul Hughes and Robert Fries, Totowa, New Jersey: Littlefield, Adams & Co., 1972, p. 252.

Lenin, V.I. "The Junius Pamphlet," Collected Works. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1964, Vol. XXII, p. 305.

Lichtheim, George. The Concept of Ideology and Other Essays. New York: Random House, 1967.

- Ludendorff, Erich von. Ludendorff's Own Story. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1919.
- Lukács, Georg. History and Class Consciousness. tr. by Rodney Livingstone, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1971.
- Lutz, Ralph Haswell. (ed.) The Causes of the German Collapse. tr. by W.L. Campbell, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1934.
- Lutz, Ralph Haswell. (ed.) Fall of the German Empire, 1914-1918. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1932.
- Luxemburg, Rosa. The Accumulation of Capital. tr. by Agnes Schwarzschild, New York: Modern Reader Paperbacks, 1968.
- Luxemburg, Rosa. The Mass Strike and The Junius Pamphlet. tr. by Patrick Lavin, New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1971.
- Luxemburg, Rosa. The Russian Revolution and Leninism or Marxism? Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1967.
- Luxemburg, Rosa. Selected Political Writings. (ed.) Robert Looker, tr. by William Graf, New York: Grove Press, 1974.
- Meyer, Henry Cord. (ed.) The Long Generation. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.
- Nettl, J.P. Rosa Luxemburg. London: Oxford University Press, 1966.
- Remak, Joachim. (ed.) The First World War: Causes, Conduct, Consequences. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1971.
- Rosenberg, Arthur. A History of the German Republic. tr. by Jan Morrow and L. Marie Sieveking, London: Methuen & Co., 1936.
- Rudin, Henry. Armistice, 1918. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1944.
- Scheidemann, Philip. The Making of New Germany. (Memoirs), tr. by J.E. Michell, New York: Appleton & Co., 1929.
- Schorske, Carl. German Social Democracy 1905-1917. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1955.
- Taylor, Edmond. The Fall of Dynasties. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1963.
- Waldman, Eric. The Spartacist Uprising of 1919. Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Marquette University Press, 1958.