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From 1870 to 1871, the French Empire and the Kingdom of Prussia fought a war that proved devastating for France. The war, culminating in the Battle of Sedan, at which the French army under Emperor Napoleon III was decisively defeated by Field Marshal Helmuth von Moltke, resulted in the loss of the traditionally French territories of Alsace and Lorraine, and a months-long Siege of Paris, which ultimately devolved into the Paris Commune. Following the Commune and the war, France went through a protracted period of both nationalism and liberalism. The post-war period, highlighted by the continued growth of industry and mass media worldwide, came to be defined, in part, by the political battles that erupted in it. The French public engaged in caustic debates over a nationalistic desire to exact vengeance on Prussia’s newly formed German Empire called revanchism, and a liberal desire to lift France as a nation through growth, innovation, the sciences, and the arts. A study of one painting, *Les Dernières Cartouches*, and its recreations in the subsequent years, details the various reinventions of the ideology of revanchism, and reveals the characteristics of diverging strains of patriotism and nationalism that arose throughout Europe during the fin de siècle.

*Les Dernières Cartouches*, painted by French artist Alphonse de Neuville in 1873, depicts a scene from the Battle of Sedan. The scene, in which French soldiers put up a heroic defense of a house in the village of Bazeilles, was painted in the Romantic style, and epitomized the revanchism of the post-war period. The movement, which was best characterized as a thirst for vengeance against Germany and a fierce desire to reclaim the lost territories of Alsace and Lorraine, emerged as a common sentiment among the French during the post war years. The feelings of bitterness and shame that French citizens felt in the wake of France’s defeat fueled this thirst for vengeance, and served as the accelerant for the revanchist ideology. Neuville’s paintings, like *Les Dernières Cartouches*, capitalized on this public sentiment. Emblematic of
this deep-seated hatred for Germany, the paintings identify the birthplace of the revanchist and hyper-nationalist ideologies that defined France from 1872 to 1910.

The revanchist and hyper-nationalist ideologies accompanied much of the France’s political activity in the post-war period. The actions of the nation were defined by this sense of loss, as well as by emerging populist, nationalist, and often xenophobic rhetoric. The Paris Commune became the first in a long line of events that demonstrated this popular rhetoric. The Commune, launched in March of 1871, introduced an emerging ideology of populism amongst the working class to the rest of France. Max Breaugh describes this ideology as centered around the “notion that the Commune was engaged in a struggle between two worlds: on one hand, the old world of hierarchy, competition, and domination, and on the other, the new world (yet to be built) based on equality, association and liberty.”

Despite the Commune’s collapse by May 1871, this ideology remained common amongst the people of France. Its effects were felt long after, as the Mur des Fédérés, a socialist procession, was held yearly to commemorate the “lost promise” of the Commune.

The emergence of nationalist movements throughout France soon succeeded the Commune. As the government of France’s Third Republic attempted to revive the nation, men like Paul Dérouléde and his League of Patriots arrived on the national stage. Their presence exhibited some of the most radical versions of revanchism, and their antics received a great degree of national attention. Dramatically, those sentiments of revanchism, nationalism, and

---

3 Dérouléde and his followers spread their message through many types of media. For example, a number of poets after the Franco-Prussian war wrote about their anger and desire for revenge against Germany. Aaron Schaffer explores the Revanchist messages in the medium of poetry and indicates numerous similarities to the Revanchism of the paintings. Aaron Schaffer, "Parnassian Poetry on the Franco-Prussian War." PMLA 47, no. 4 (1932): 1167-192.
xenophobia eventually culminated in the Dreyfus Affair of the late 1890s, which split the country apart.\(^4\) In his documentary history of the affair, Michael Burns references the coalescing of these political theories. After first touching on the nationalist and revanchist influences on French politics, Burns quotes historian George Mosse: “France ... seemed destined to be the country within which racism might determine national politics.”\(^5\) Burns discusses this combination throughout his study of the affair, and directly references the anti-Semitic statements of Edouard Drumont and Maurice Barrès. For example, Barrès, in a discussion of how France may return to international relevance, decried Jews for their positions within French society, declaring that “[We] must do away with that dangerous inequality and obtain more respect for our authentic citizens, the children of Gaul and not of Judaea ....”\(^6\) Such a study identifies the clear trends of converging nationalism, revanchism, and xenophobia.\(^7\)

Many nationalists in France did not advocate revanchism the way Déroulède and his followers did, nor did all nationalists exhibit Déroulède’s xenophobia. Instead, they had a very different goal for France. Historian Bertrand Joly wrote on this topic in 1999, opening his paper with a firm claim that “France never wanted Revenge, except in the first months that followed

\(^4\) The Dreyfus Affair was a nationwide social conflict over anti-Semitism and nationalism in France during the latter half of the 1890s. Alfred Dreyfus, a Jewish officer in the French army was court martialed and falsely convicted of treason after the discovery of an unsigned letter addressed to Germany. After further evidence was revealed and the media began to pick up the story, the treatment of Dreyfus became an international issue. French nationalists and like-minded individuals clashed with French republicans over the culpability of Dreyfus, and the affair did not end until a new prime minister arrested hundreds of nationalists in 1899. Afterward, the Affair became a symbol of the nation’s struggle with anti-Semitism and nationalism.


\(^7\) This topic is also discussed briefly in an essay by Lynn Palermo. In the essay, Palermo identifies the unequal treatment of foreigners that existed in France. Although she does not explicitly use the word “xenophobia,” it certainly played a role in why “colonized peoples were undeniably not French – nor could they ever become French in the fullest sense, given the immutable cultural and racial hierarchy communicated through the exposition, which overlaid the criteria for civilization.” Lynn Palermo, “Identity Under Construction: Representing the Colonies at the Paris Exhibition Universelle of 1889,” *The Color of Liberty* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003), 297.
the defeat.”

Joly says that the majority of the French public never wanted revenge, and that the idea of revanchism has been largely inflated by history. He backs this claim up with evidence of French writers being virulently anti-Déroulède, and later states that “the rare revanchards were not all nationalist. Far from it. It is necessary to renounce the erroneous concept of the ‘nationalist revanchard.’” Furthermore, Joly cites the writings of Marcel Sembat as justification for saying that “the nationalists do not want to hear about revenge.”

According to Joly, many nationalists did not agree with Déroulède’s hardline stance, and would prefer to not hear of the talk of revanchism. These quotes depict revanchism as an individual movement with some connections to French nationalism, rather than as a subset of French nationalism. It operated independently, with Germany as the focal point of France’s ambition and vengeance, whereas French nationalists instead viewed Germany as one of a number of nations which actively sought to curtail French growth. Thus, Joly draws a clear distinction between nationalism in France and the idea of revanchism, and his description directly contradicts Michael Burns’ analysis.

Further study on the ideological rhetoric of nationalism, xenophobia and revanchism is thus justified, and Les Dernières Cartouches and its recreations provide a fantastic opportunity.

---


The quote he cites from Marcel Sembat says: “La paix avec honneur, mais la paix assurée, et par eux mieux que par les autres, car ils adorent la paix.” To some extent, I believe that this quote may have been misread, as the meaning of this quote doesn’t seem to mesh with Joly’s statements. When I read this quote, I instead think Sembat is saying that the French people want an honorable and an “assured peace, made by those[the French] better than by the others[the Germans], for they adore the peace.” When read this way, it makes more sense as a justification for conflict, rather than as justification for the lack thereof, as the French want peace, but only if they get it the right way. Marcel Sembat, Faites un roi, sinon faites la paix, op. cit., p. 152.
for such research. The original painting, as previously noted, was painted in the Romantic style. The scene itself is reminiscent of paintings of battles by Eugene Delacroix, one of the preeminent Romantic painters. It romanticizes the battle and soldiers themselves in a way that was typical of such paintings. Where the painting differentiates itself is in the context. The Battle of Sedan was a disaster. Nearly everything that could have possibly gone wrong in the battle did. In just two days, two Prussian armies surrounded the 120,000-man Army of Châlons and forced its surrender. Over 100,000 French soldiers passed into Prussian hands during the battle, with Emperor Napoleon III among the captured. As such, there was very little about the battle to romanticize. Neuville painted the scene anyway.\(^{11}\)

Neuville thus painted the scene to convey a message. Since the painting was atypical in that it romanticized an embarrassing defeat, that message had to resonate with French society or sentiment. The sentiment that appears most throughout the painting is that of revanchism. As was previously mentioned, revanchism was, in part, a sentiment of anger, bitterness, and shame toward the German Empire. It was a highly visual sentiment that emerges throughout Neuville’s paintings during the post-war years. Neuville painted *Les Dernières Cartouches*, for example, with mostly muted colors and tones. The room inside the house is dimly lit, with the only light coming from the windows through which the French soldiers are firing. It is a deeply somber shading. Furthermore, the faces of the wounded French soldiers showcase the mood of France in the immediate aftermath of the war. Akin to French society, the soldiers appear lethargic and dulled, as if in shock. Simultaneously, Neuville imbues the painting with a sense of fortitude. The soldiers in the window, despite their knowledge that the battle is lost, maintain their composure and make their last stand. This combination of shock and fortitude is the prism

through which Neuville’s message of revanchism should be viewed. The two details highlight the foundational traits of revanchism, in which French people who were both shocked and shamed by the loss at hand, looked to the future to exact vengeance.  

This analysis of the painting is not solely rooted in the painting itself, as it also depends upon contextual information regarding Neuville. As paintings are inherently a creative work by the artist, one must have an understanding of the author’s motivations to fully grasp the meaning of the work. Neuville was a former student in a French naval school, and he developed an admiration for the military in that role. As he began to paint, his subject matter often focused on military paintings, and by the time he painted *Les Dernières Cartouches*, he had created a large portfolio of military work. Les Dernières Cartouches was the painting that gained him critical significance and popularity. His obituary, for example, described the work as “[that] which gave him a Europe-wide reputation.” Neuvill’s paintings were clearly done out of an admiration for the military, and the scene and tones depicted in this painting are in line with what would be expected of a military man. The sentiment in the painting seems consistent with how Neuville himself felt, and the fact that the painting gained him international fame implies that the broad French public shared his sentiments. It therefore provides valuable insight into the

12 The idea that military paintings were highly correlated with French sentiments is discussed at length in an essay by François Robichon. Robichon explains that the styles of military painting that emerged in the post war period should be more thoroughly studied, as they created the important narrative of Revanchism. Robichon directly mentions Neuville’s paintings as exhibiting “the tragic current that tried to combine outstanding heroism with extreme disaster in scenes of desperate tension.” That “tragic current” combined with “heroism” characterizes the ideology of Revanchism which swept through France during this period. François Robichon, “Representing the 1870-1871 War, or the Impossible Revanche.” *Studies in the History of Art* 68 (2005): 85.


opinions of the nation during this period, and provides evidence that the sentiment of revanchism was popular.

Neuville’s painting does not showcase the xenophobia that swept the country later, however. In fact, Neuville’s inclusion of a French-African man dispels any pretenses that xenophobia is inherent in revanchism. The inclusion of the French-African soldier alone represents an idealized version of France that was not solely European. A tirailleur algérien – an Algerian national fighting in the French army – the soldier was likely not present in the actual battle. The soldiers tasked with defending the house in Bazeilles were members of the Blue Division, an elite French infantry unit. A tirailleur algérien would not have been a part of such a division. Furthermore, it is important to note that Neuville painted this image largely out of his own imagination. He was not present at the battle, and many of the details came from his own imagination. His inclusion of a tirailleur algérien in the battle thus implies that Neuville purposefully placed him there, in a heroic pose at the window. Such an implication supports a greater thesis that Neuville identified the man as French, like the rest of the men in the room. In a painting that has been largely described as nationalist and revanchist, the inclusion the French-African man provides a large degree of evidence that the classic version of racial xenophobia is not included within the painting.

Some recreations of the painting display alternative sentiments, however. For example, an 1897 silent film, which recreates the scene in the painting as a performance, originally echoes the revanchist spirit, but showcases the changing sentiments within it. A play written in 1903 about the scene plays with the tone and result, emerging on a nationalist and triumphant note.

---

Perhaps most glaringly, one recreation of the painting, a cartoon in a French newspaper in 1912, depicts the xenophobic and nationalist sentiments that sometimes accompanied revanchism.

The silent film from 1897, produced by George Méliès and his Star Film Company, recreated the scene from Neuville’s painting, and came to the big screen as one of France’s first silent films. Only a minute and a half long, it follows the beginning and end of the defense of the house in the painting. At the beginning of the movie, French soldiers, led by an officer, march into the house as they attempt to defend it. After a short time setting up defenses and firing out of the broken window, an artillery shell bursts into the room, injuring the officer, and forcing the rest of the men to retreat.

The scene in the movie is a much bleaker one than the scene in the painting. In the painting, the somber mood of the wounded soldiers is offset by the fortitude exhibited by the remaining defenders. The movie’s outlook maintains that dichotomy, but it adds an ending to the scene. The inclusion of the defenders’ final moments before being hit by artillery establishes a much darker tone, despite the romanticized elements that remain. It separates the heroism and strength that the soldiers display from the results, and in the process, it changes the character of the scene. Whereas in the painting, the scene was an exhibition of revanchism and the spirit of the French, the movie dispels that notion, and instead portrays the scene as a more depressed memory. A memory of a great moment that should’ve ended in triumph, but instead ended in failure.

The scene, of course, is a product of its time period. The original painting attempted to romanticize the soldiers and regain the strong spirit of France, but the movie, like its environment, showcases a certain resignation to fate, as if France must resign itself to its defeat.

---
France at this point was in the throes of chaos. Its government was relatively weak and dealing with the aftermath of an assassination of the president in 1894. The nation as a whole was still recovering from the Boulanger affair, and the Dreyfus affair had just begun.\(^\text{18}\) The Boulanger Affair, in which the idea of Revanchism reached its height, raised serious questions about the efficacy of such sentiment. Georges Boulanger symbolized the revanchist spirit, and his downfall at the hands of a more measured republican government deflated its support. As such, it is not surprising that a movie of this nature would be made and would demonstrate the melancholy spirit of the nation.\(^\text{19}\)

The result is that the movie exhibits neither the revanchism nor the nationalism that existed in the original painting. It internalizes France’s suffering, and in the process, casts the scene in a new light of melancholy and despair. This change illustrates the ideological uncertainty that France experienced throughout this later period and does provide some support to Bernard Joly’s point that revanchism never achieved the popular support that modern historians credit it with.

Conversely, the play from 1903 returns to the original style where the movie does not. Instead of having an unsuccessful ending to the battle serve as the final scene of the play, the writers play up the heroism factor and romanticize the scene once more. Written by Jules Mary

---

\(^{18}\) George Boulanger was a young, brilliant general and republican who ascended into the public spotlight after successfully putting down a strike. Nursing greater political ambitions, Boulanger involved himself in international politics despite his apolitical role as a general. As such, he was relieved of duty. After being relieved of his command, Boulanger entered the political arena, and won an electoral victory over a prominent republican by calling for revanchism and war with Germany. Seeing his rhetoric as dangerous in combination with his immense popular support, the sitting government ordered his arrest and forced him to flee the country.

\(^{19}\) The historical trend in France that moved it away from Revanchism is detailed in part in an essay by François Robichon. As France entered the later decades of the 19th century, the desire for vengeance significantly cooled off in artistic expression. This could in part be because of age and generational differences, but it could have also been due to a general resignation to the defeat by the public as France dealt with more pressing internal issues. François Robichon, "Representing the 1870-1871 War, or the Impossible Revanche." *Studies in the History of Art* 68 (2005): 82-99.
et Emily Rochard as a drama, it was once again based upon the scene in Neuville’s painting. The play establishes the story of the French captain’s defense of the home, and subsequent injury during the battle, and ends with Alphonse de Neuville meeting the French officer, and painting his heroic actions. It, like the painting that it honors, romanticizes the entire scene, and despite the monumental defeat that the battle symbolizes, the play ends on a bright note. The ending scene, in which the French captain meets with Alphonse de Neuville, is meant to showcase this bright ending. Reviews of the play further support this, and a photograph included in one of the reviews provides more evidence. The photo, of the ending scene of the play, shows the French captain being honored in a full military ceremony for his actions in the house during the battle. The captain, Commandant Lambert, can be seen on the left-hand side of the photo receiving a salute from his commanding officer.\textsuperscript{20} This bright note thus identifies a positive military and nationalistic spirit that is imbued within the play itself. The poster for the painting presents this tone as well. The scene on the poster is surrounded by a bright yellow, and includes dozens of soldiers charging into the home to defend it. There are far more soldiers in the poster and the play than there were in the original painting and movie, which identifies an interesting distinction between the two. Whereas Neuville casts the original scene in a dimly lit room and portrays the soldiers as small in number and low on ammunition, and Méliès shrouds the movie from 1897 in darkness, the playwrights design a theatrical poster that is awash in light.\textsuperscript{21} These clear differences in tones cast the three reproductions in very different lights, with the latest version portraying a highly militaristic and nationalistic spirit for a France brimming with pride.

\textsuperscript{20} “Les Dernières Cartouches drame de Jules Mary et Emilie Rochard : défets de presse,” 1903, Bibliothèque nationale de France.
This tonal shift typifies French society during this period as well. As France entered the 20th century, it began to regain its old sense of pride. International recognition from events like the expositions rehabilitated France’s reputation, and in the process, France reestablished its national identity.22 The tone of the play represents this change. The celebration of the heroism of the French officer at the end of the play echoes the sense of national pride that arose. As a result, this recreation of the painting exhibits a highly nationalized nation that maintained a desire for revenge.

While the other three versions of the painting exhibit the nationalism and revanchism that typified this period, none of them directly dealt with xenophobia. While the painting itself directly rebuts the theory that race-based xenophobia inherently accompanies the ideology of revanchism, the other two recreations don’t focus on it. Xenophobia against Germany accompanies each of the recreations, since all three celebrate France at the expense of Germany, but none of the three directly attack Germany or its people with monstrous portrayals or hateful rhetoric. Thus, xenophobia is not inherent in nationalist or revanchist works. A fourth version of the painting, a cartoon, bucks that trend. The cartoon, found in a May 1912 edition of La Bastille, uses the visual of Les Dernières Cartouches to mock the central government. The caption of the image calls it “the radical socialist congress.”23 In the image, each of the French soldiers is replaced with French officials in government. One official is drawn with horns, while others are drawn with other anti-Semitic symbols. On the back wall, the words “radical jewish and freemason bloc” are written.24 These words are meant to describe the French government as a

---

22 The expositions refer to a series of international celebrations held by the nations of Europe and the United States during the second half of the 19th century. The expositions were put on to celebrate the output of each nation, as well as to encourage travel and trade with the hosting city. The city of Paris held five expositions between 1853 and 1900, with the Exposition of 1900 being the most successful.


Original French: “Le congrès radical socialiste.”

24 Original French: “bloc juif radical Franc macon”
political bloc of radical Jews and French masons. Such a description has historically been used as justification for conspiracies and racist attacks. Using the situation of *Les Dernières Cartouches*, the newspaper presents what it foresees as the last stand of France’s “socialist” government.

The articles attached to the image in the newspaper further embellish this anti-Semitic rhetoric. Opening with a sermon about the ideas of Edouard Drumont, the newspaper explains that they hope “this war” will “finally open the eyes of the Christian people and make them understand that there is a Jewish nation which they are crazy not to worry about.”25 This article alone expresses one of the calling cards of anti-Semitism and xenophobia by separating Jewish people into their own “nation.” This is a familiar refrain in the diatribes of Drumont, Barrés, Déroulède and others, and its appearance next to the cartoon emphasizes its anti-Semitic and xenophobic nature. This raises the question of whether or not these racist sentiments are included within revanchism, or whether they are popular amongst French society. As this is the only example that directly exhibits this rhetoric, it would appear that it does not, but the question exists all the same.

To understand if this version of the painting is representative of a large part of French society, more context about the newspaper itself is required. In its title line, *La Bastille* describes itself as a “journal de propagande Anti-Maçonique.”27 Since the order of Masons has long been used in conspiracy theories against governments, this would seemingly indicate that *La Bastille* focuses on conspiratorial ideas. Thus, it would seem to be a newspaper that appears on the

---

25 *La Bastille*, October 19, 1912, accessed November 30, 2018. “This war” is in reference to a conflict in the Mediterranean between the Ottoman Empire and Italy. The war, called the Libyan War, was fought over the Ottomans’ North African province of Tripolitania and over some of their islands in the Aegean. It is also possible that the newspaper is referencing a separate conflict, the Balkans War between the Ottoman Empires and a league of Balkan nations including Serbia, Bulgaria, Greece and Montenegro.

Original French: “à ouvrir enfin les yeux des peuples chrétiens et à leur faire comprendre qu’il existe une nation juive dont il est fous de ne pas vouloir se préoccuper.”

fringes of French society. Furthermore, a sub-line on the title page proclaims that “La Bastille á détruire, c’est la Société secrete.”\textsuperscript{28} The fact that the newspaper describes itself as a “secret society” further strengthens the theory that the newspaper existed on the extremes of the political spectrum and was not representative of a large portion of the French population.

Despite the fact that this newspaper was not representative of a large portion of the French population, it is clear that it had a sizable following. The newspaper ran from 1902 until 1915, which indicates that it had a large enough readership to sustain itself.\textsuperscript{29} Furthermore, the existence of advertisements for Bénédictine Liqueur on the final page of the paper suggests that companies felt like it reached enough people for those advertisements to be worth it. If companies were willing to advertise with the publication, then there must have been a relatively sizable readership, which would indicate that the ideologies and sentiments espoused by the paper are shared by a portion of France’s population, even if it is not a large one.

The original version of Les Dernières Cartouches was the principal example of revanchism appearing in artistic work. Borne out of the Franco-Prussian War, it illustrated the deep-seeded anxieties and sentiments of the French people. Those sentiments, a lust for vengeance combined with shame, emerged throughout the fin-de-siècle, and defined the era. Revanchism, nationalism and national pride were joined at the hip. The revanchist spirit could only exist where nationalism did as well. However, the same cannot be said for xenophobia. Versions of xenophobia existed in all recreations, but they were often different. The classic version of race-based xenophobia appeared on the fringes of society, as evidenced by the content of the anti-Semitic newspaper La Bastille, but in other Revanchist reproductions of the painting, xenophobia was less apparent, and likely based more on nationality than race.

\textsuperscript{28} La Bastille, October 19, 1912, accessed November 30, 2018.
\textsuperscript{29} https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/La_Bastille_(journal)
Like many things, the sentiment of revanchism went through phases, and was redefined during the era. Largely dependent upon the context of France’s internal politics, the concept of revanchism came to be defined, not solely on shame or vengeance, but also by national pride and energy. During the 1890s, that energy was low, as evidenced by the silent movie created in 1897, but during the 1900s and on, the energy reemerged and directly led to France’s excitement for war at the start of World War I.

Neither Bernard Joly, nor Michael Burns appear completely correct then. Revanchism was not a constant in France, but it did have a significant following throughout the period. Furthermore, nationalism seems to have embraced revanchism in each of the reproductions of the painting, which raises further questions about the efficacy of Joly’s analysis that nationalism and revanchism were distinct and hardly connected. Michael Burns’ analysis of xenophobia and nationalism suggested that the two were intricately connected and interdependent, however, only one of the sources studied exhibited the sense of ethno-nationalism that Burns implies. Rather, xenophobia did exist, and it may have been significant on the fringes, but the functional nationalism that exists within Neuville’s work, Méliès film, and Mary’s play is not inherently connected with it. The relationship between the three concepts can thus be best characterized as a selective one. Revanchism could only exist where nationalism existed, but nationalism did not always accompany revanchism. Xenophobia did exist to some degree within any revanchist work, as the need for vengeance against another nation inherently incorporates some degree of nation-based xenophobia, but the classic versions of race-based xenophobia did not always accompany it.
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