

MANIFESTO: A preliminary model for discourse analysis

by



Sorel L. Thompson

A thesis in the Program of Comparative Literature
submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and
Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts at McGill University

November 1981

RESUME

Le manifeste appartient au genre de discours polémique et didactique. Utilisant les moyens de la rhétorique il cherche à la fois à persuader ses auditoires, à définir ses propres créateurs comme groupe cohérent, et à contraster ce groupe à ceux qui l'opposent. Le manifeste cherche à scandaliser; il fait violence dans les systèmes discursifs, sociaux et politiques. Situé à sa position marginale, il essaie d'instituer son idéologie dans la position centrale de pouvoir. Cela fait, il prend la position du discours hémémonique, se désagrège comme discours, tout en perdant sa position marginale dans le discours social, et aussi son caractère violent.

On peut considérer le manifeste comme modèle de tout discours marginal qui devient canonique ou institutionnalisé.

Les manifestes choisis à illustrer les phénomènes de ce discours sont le Manifeste du parti communiste de Karl Marx et les Manifestes du surréalisme d'André Breton.

ABSTRACT

Manifesto belongs in the class of polemic and didactic discourses. Using rhetorical devices, it seeks to persuade its audience, define its own creators as a cohesive group, and contrast that group with those who oppose it. Manifesto seeks to cause shock and outrage; it causes violence in the discursive, social and political systems. Situated in a marginal position, it seeks to institute its ideology in a central position of power. This accomplished, it usurps the power of the hegemonic discourse, thus losing its previous marginal position and violent character.

On a larger scale, Manifesto can be seen as a model for all marginal discourses and practices which become institutionalized or canonized.

The particular manifestoes chosen to illustrate the behavior of this discourse are The Communist Manifesto by Karl Marx and the Manifestes du surréalisme by André Breton.

Περὶ ποιητικῆς αὐτῆς τε καὶ τῶν εἰδῶν αὐτῆς,
ἣν τινα δυνάμιν ἕκαστον ἔχει, καὶ πῶς δεῖ συν-
ίστασθαι τοὺς μύθους εἰ μέλλει καλῶς ἔξειν ἢ
ποιήσῃς, ἔτι δὲ ἐκ πόσων καὶ ποίων ἐστὶ μορίων,
ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ περὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὅσα τῆς αὐτῆς ἐστὶ
μεθόδου, λέγωμεν ἀρξάμενοι κατὰ φύσιν πρῶτον
ἀπὸ τῶν πρώτων.

ΑΡΙΣΤΟΤΕΛΟΥΣ.
ΠΕΡΙ ΠΟΙΗΤΙΚΗΣ.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Résumé.	ii
Abstract.	iii

CHAPTER I--Present State of Research

1. Toward the institutionalization and disintegration of Manifesto as discourse	
I. Static and dynamic genre systems.	1
II. Genre as discourse; discourse as speech act	6
III. Manifesto as discourse.	8
IV. "Discours-manifeste" and hegemonic discourse: Institutionalization of discourse	9
V. Institutionalization of ideology.	10
VI. Disintegration of discourse	12
2. A brief look at two types of Manifesto	
I. Political Manifesto	13
II. Poetic Manifesto.	15
III. Evolution of Literary Manifesto	16
3. Related genres	
I. A topology of polemic genres.	19
II. Common elements	23
4. Argumentation	
I. The Classics.	24
II. The types of persuasion	25
5. Manifesto as speech act	
I. Speech Acts	29
II. Manifesto as speech act	32
6. Synthesis	36
Notes to Chapter I.	37

CHAPTER II--The Communist Manifesto: Political
Manifesto, Literary Manifesto

1. <u>The Communist Manifesto as a text of rupture</u>	
I. The idea of process	43
II. Rupture and intertextuality	45
2. <u>Oppositions</u>	
I. Purpose and definitions	46
II. Illustrations of oppositions by means of examples	48
III. Protagonistic oppositions and the question of audience	50
IV. Process and strategy	55
3. <u>Manifesto-on-literature, Manifesto-as-literature.</u>	
I. Manifesto-on-literature	56
II. Manifesto-as-literature	62
4. <u>The disintegration of The Communist Manifesto</u>	67
Notes to Chapter II	71

CHAPTER III--The Manifestes du surréalisme: Toward
the Politicization of Manifestoes

1. <u>Overview.</u>	73
2. <u>Argumentative aspects of the Manifestes du surréalisme</u>	
I. Reiteration	82
II. <u>The first Manifeste du surréalisme:</u> the building of paradigms.	83
III. <u>Exempla:</u> The process explained	88
IV. <u>Language as action:</u> toward meta-speech act	89
V. <u>The Second manifeste:</u> Toward politics.	91
VI. <u>The building of levels.</u>	97
Notes to Chapter III.	99

Conclusion.	101
---------------------	-----

Appendix: Chronologies of surrealism	105
--	-----

Bibliography.	106
-----------------------	-----

The idea for this thesis grew out of a graduate seminar in Comparative Literature at McGill University given by Professor Marc Angenot. The subject of this seminar was non-fictional narrative; The Communist Manifesto was one of the texts studied.

I became interested in the functioning of persuasive discourses in general, and in Manifesto in particular. This thesis is a result of that curiosity.

The questions of genre emergence and transformation are central to the study of poetics and literary history. Therefore, any study of a particular genre must include a review of basic poetic paradigms in (Western) literature. This in itself is an enormous task; Chapter I of this thesis is a schematic introduction to that problem. My intention was to develop a model in which the potentialities of discourses were elements of major importance. The spectrum model, elaborated in this chapter, although not an original conception (see Zgorzelski, 1979), seems to take into account the role of potentialities of discursive emergence.

A second major question is the one concerning methods of persuasion and argumentation. The source which I use for this problem is Aristotle's Rhetoric and other texts of his. I use "rhetoric" to describe the argumentative strategies and the building of paradigms employed by the authors of the various

manifestoes examined in this study.

The reader is cautioned not to expect a conventional analysis of either The Communist Manifesto or the Manifestes du surréalisme. This thesis is not intended as an historical evaluation of the success or failure of either of those movements. Information is given in the reference bibliography for those readers who wish to pursue the ideologies of these movements as objects of study. These texts were chosen as examples of manifestoes for their fame and/or notoriety as catalysts in two major movements within the last one hundred and fifty years in Western politics and art. They are generally accessible to the reading public in several languages.

The reader may object to a purely discursive analysis of a text such as The Communist Manifesto. However, my intention was to examine this text in terms of its initial position as a type of discourse which speaks from a non-hegemonic position, and to discover the ways in which it attempts to overtake the ideology of the central hegemonic power.

What follows is neither a comparison of communism and surrealism, nor a contentual analysis and comparison of the manifestoes of these movements, but an examination of the manner in which these texts defined themselves, their authors, their audiences. This study attempts to describe the moment in which these manifestoes are examples of discours-manifeste, that is, texts which speak from a marginal social position.

This thesis is itself offered as a type of discours-manifeste. It attempts to expand the areas of accepted topics

in academic study. It is offered in the hope that so-called "minor" genres will be accorded major attention.

I would like to acknowledge the assistance given me by my advisor, Marc Angenot.

I would also like to acknowledge the encouragement and support, moral and otherwise, of my parents.

CHAPTER I

PRESENT STATE OF RESEARCH

1. Toward the institutionalization and disintegration of Manifesto as discourse

I. Static and dynamic genre systems

In order to understand how a genre such as Manifesto emerged from, or is related to, a system of social discourse, one must first examine the methods by which genres and systems of discourse and literature have been described in the Western tradition. This in itself is a complicated and enormous task, one which would furnish information for many theses. A fundamental problem exists in just attempting to understand the concept of "genre":

Even in the most ambitious academic reports and monographs, the very concept of genre--surely the most fundamental notion in any systemic approach to literary history--is used in the most diverse ways. It is understood either as a theoretical construct, an essentially stable and extremely limited set of features common to a group of texts (Suvin, 1972; Todorov, 1970), or as a historical phenomenon, a dynamic system of features evolving in its variants (Scholes, 1975); or--quite simply--as a class of works defined more or less arbitrarily according to occasional needs of the observer (Rabkin, 1976).¹

In this article, the author, Andrzej Zgorzelski, describes a system which accounts for the potentiality of

discourses over time, a concept which will be elaborated below in terms of the spectrum model of social discourse:

The feeling of systemic continuity is easily lost in the case of temporally distant structures; they often manifest completely different features and their systemic nature could only be exposed by a study of the whole evolutionary sequence, (297)

As it is not possible in the space of this short inquiry to study the entire evolutionary sequence of discourse and metadiscourse, I will propose the spectrum model as a means for examining the behavior of discourse as it moves from a position of marginality to a position of acceptance, institutionalization, or canonization.

This process of institutionalization of a previously marginal type of discourse is accompanied by its critical reception by the reading public and academic circles. Zgorzelski elaborates:

...it cannot start to function in the tradition of literature without the contemporary reading public becoming aware of the genre's basic difference from the traditionally accepted conventions. (297)

Genre emergence, or movement from one position to another in social discourse, can be considered a violent act, one which causes shock waves in the entire system:

When a new genre is born, it is often diametrically opposed not only to its own immediate tradition, but also to the rest of the previously accepted genre hierarchy.... (297)

A new genre, or the critical acceptance of it, is always, at first, a discours-manifeste, that is, an act coming from the outskirts of social discourse.² It tries to create a space for itself in order that it be accepted and treated in the same

manner as other discourses; it seeks the same attention, academic or otherwise, as established forms of discourse in their traditional systems.

How can one describe the form of these traditional systems? Again, what follows can be considered only as an outline, against which to situate the new, spectrum model to be elucidated below, beginning on page 4.

In "Literature as System"³ Claudio Guillén examines the evolution of literary systems and generic relationships from Aristotle up to the Romantic period. He discovers that these systems seem to appear in dyads and triads, e.g. Aristotle's three-way division of poetry into epic, dramatic and lyric.⁴ Guillén stresses the continuity in European poetic theory, as well as the "articulation of dyads and triads--that renders this continuity most visible." (388)

This tradition reaches us through the works of 16th and 17th century Spanish and Italian theoreticians, such as Scaliger, Cascales and Minturno,⁵ through Gravina (1708), the Abbé Batteux (1746), to its climax around 1800 in the German Dreiteilung der Dichtkunst, the threefold division of the poetic art. (404-5)

A crisis in genre theory can be expected at this point, and not simply due to the problems caused by the Romantic poets' and playwrights' disrespect of generic boundaries. Modern genre theory must now accommodate all discourses produced in and by a society, including so-called "non-fictional" or "non-literary" ones. The entire imaginative structure of

the system must be revamped. Genres can no longer be seen as blocks of discourses, separate in both form and content from one another. All of social discourse can be viewed, instead, as a spectrum, in which each genre is represented by a different intensity and hue of colour. This model allows for the inclusion (and therefore the elucidation of the poetics) of genres hitherto neglected by academic study. It is in this model that one can situate, articulate and study the elements and behaviors of the genre of Manifesto.

A second consequence of Guillén's study stems from the basic problem of order and continuity in the intellectual tradition from Aristotle up to the last half of the nineteenth century. At the turning point between traditional and modern poetics, one loses the rigid (dyadic, triadic, etc.) structure of systems of intellectual pursuits, and finds, in its place, a fragmented constellation of co-intelligible phenomena which constitute the totality of social discourse. This is another way in which to view the spectrum model of social discourse, in terms of its co-intelligible elements.

Genres which share common elements are closer together in the spectrum model; in fact a genre can be viewed as an aggregation of common elements. (See also 3: "Related genres".)

The question of emergence of genre can be examined in this light as well. The spectrum of social discourse is one of potentialities, rather than of realities. A particular type of discourse can be institutionalized, canonized, or "academicized" in any particular historical period, depending on certain

factors. Tzvetan Todorov explains:

Dans une société, on institutionnalise la récurrence de certains propriétés discursives.... Un genre, littéraire ou non, n'est rien d'autre que cette codification de propriétés discursives.⁶

In this fashion, genres have a certain behavior. They can be seen as "horizons d'attente" for readers and "modèles d'écriture" for authors (Todorov, 50-51). Manifesto as genre is a case in point, up to a certain extent. In designating a text as a "manifesto", the author signals to the reader a particular intentionality, a specific set of rules to which both the author and the reader must adhere.⁷

Genre, therefore, is the institutionalization of certain properties in common in social discourse. This adds another element in the elucidation of the spectrum model. Institutionalization of discourses changes through social time, as particular genres are replaced by others (Epic by Novel, for example), or discarded. The new poetics must not define genre in a static manner, in terms of what a particular genre is, but in a dynamic way. Questions relevant to this method inquire of the emergence, transformation and behavior of a particular genre in social time.

This method suggests that one no longer speaks of genres as ideal spaces in which to write, but as positions in relation to other genres and to the totality of social discourse. Todorov continues: "Le genre est le lieu de rencontre de la poétique générale et de l'histoire littéraire événementielle," (52) or, in other words, the actualization of

discursive potentialities as a function of social time. A work, therefore, rather than being defined as a "novel", an "epic", a "lyric" in short, as a "representative of genre X", can be defined in terms of the elements that it shares with related texts, with its past, with its social and literary context, and in terms of its purpose or effect in a society.

II. Genre as discourse; discourse as speech act.

If a genre can be examined in terms of its discursive properties, what, then, is discourse? Todorov defines discourse in terms of Speech Act Theory:

Un discours n'est pas fait de phrases, mais de phrases énoncées, ou plus brièvement, d'énoncés.... Cette énonciation inclut un locuteur qui énonce, un allocutaire à qui on s'adresse, un temps et un lieu, un discours qui précède et qui suit; en bref, un contexte d'énonciation. (48)

As described (above, page 4), genre is the result of the institutionalization of certain discursive realities, or speech acts. If all genres come from speech acts, why are not all speech acts institutionalized into literary genres? Todorov offers an explanation: "...un société choisit et codifie les acts [de parole] qui correspondent au plus près à son idéologie...." (51). There seems to be a problem of simplification here. All possible speech acts are present in the spectrum model of social discourse, but not all are, or can possibly be, at any one given period in social and literary history, considered as the basis for a particular genre.

Their appearance as genre depends on the needs of a society, or segments of it, to express a particular problem in a certain manner.⁸

Todorov offers three examples which describe different relationships between speech acts and literary (or other) genres.

Prier est un acte de parole; la prière est un genre... la difference, est minime. Mais... raconter est un acte de parole, et le roman, un genre où certainement se raconte quelque chose; cependant la distance est grande... le sonnet est bien un genre littéraire mais il n'est pas d'activité verbale "sonneter"; il existe donc des genres qui ne dérivent pas d'un acte de parole plus simple. (53).

It is the third case that offers the most difficulty, and yet the most stimulation. It is true that there is no activity called "to sonnet"; one cannot say "I sonnet", the same way in which one can say "I promise" or "I bet". But the genre of the sonnet, although not derived from one particular simple speech act, can be viewed as the expression and junction of more complicated discursive activities.⁹

The genre of Manifesto is a case in point. Although one could argue that there is a speech act "to manifest", it seems more likely that the activity is more complex: "to make manifest" by means of a constellation of other discursive activities. Before describing Manifesto in these terms, (see 5.), the basis of research available up to this point must be examined.¹⁰

III. Manifesto as Discourse

Claude Abastado opens his "Introduction à l'analyse des manifestes"¹¹ with the following questions:

Les manifestes sont-ils un bon objet sémiotique? Se prêtent-ils à l'analyse, comme le conte populaire ou l'épopée? Forment-ils un "genre"? Ou, y a-t-il, entre tous les textes manifestaires, des traits discursifs communs? (3)

The first question seems to be embryonic in the process of academic institutionalization of genre. Once metadiscursive phenomena start to appear, one can assume the beginnings of serious consideration of such a genre.¹² Taking as a starting point the final question one can look for discursive elements in common in manifesto-texts, in order to elucidate (in the beginning) the aspects of the content, rather than of the form, of this genre.

Manifesto, continues Abastado, is a text, "qui prend violemment position et institue, entre un émetteur et ses allocutaires, une relation injonctive flagrante." (4). And, "on appelle 'manifestes' tous les textes programmatiques et polémiques, quelles qu'en soient les formes." (4) [my emphasis]¹³

In terms of its praxis, Manifesto proclaims, provokes and publicizes; it intimidates, teaches and terrorizes. It occupies a precarious position: it is marginal, but, if successful, "transforme la marginalité en norme." (6). Shelly Yahalom describes the relationships between marginal discourse (which she terms "discours-manifeste") and the hegemonic

discourse which it attempts to replace, in her article "Constantes fonctionnelles du discours-manifeste."¹⁴

IV. "Discours-manifeste" and hegemonic discourse:

Institutionalization of discourse

A power struggle exists between these two types of discourse; hegemonic discourse attempts to retain its central position of power, while discours-manifeste aims to subvert the former, to usurp its position, and to become hegemonic in its place. This can be viewed as another feature of the spectrum model, in which the conservative discourse fades into disuse, after having been replaced by a novel¹⁵ form of discourse which institutes its own models into the system.

Discours-manifeste uses elements from outside the system in order to strengthen its position. Yahalom terms this phenomenon "la rhétorique du transfert systémique" (116).

She explains: "Elle peut consister en l'évocation d'un autre système artistique...[ou d'un] autre système de comportement culturel non artistique" (116). The function of this type of rhetoric "est d'associer, d'une certaine manière, le produit de la nouvelle esthétique à un système extérieur à celui dans lequel il vise à s'intégrer... (117). She gives as an example the Manifestes du surréalisme:

... le nouveau type de cohérence présenté par les textes surréalistes est considéré comme interdit d'après les normes de la littérature de l'époque, mais il est permis en tant qu'originaire du système de l'inconscient, où la notion de cohérence est d'un tout autre ordre. (117)

Yahalom's research plays a double role in this paper: one in terms of Abastado's question concerning the appropriateness or possibility of designating Manifesto as an object worthy of academic attention; a second implies the acceptance of this type of metadiscourse (i.e. discours-manifeste) and its gradually becoming central in intellectual pursuits.* Yahalom's study deals with the problems of (meta-) discourse in its attempts to occupy a central position; Anne-Marie Pelletier's article, "Le paradoxe institutionnel du manifeste"¹⁵ deals with the problems of the ideological content of Manifesto, or the attempt of Manifesto to institute its programme of change in a central position of power.

V. Institutionalization of ideology

According to Pelletier, Manifesto belongs to "une dynamique du déplacement, de la transformation" (18). One of its paradoxes concerns its position:

...même s'il est la concrétion écrite d'un travail antérieur de maturation et de mobilisation, il ne se présente pas comme aboutissement, mais comme point de départ. (18)

Manifesto has a two-pronged attack which serves as a mobilizing call to action. Its discourse is divided into "celui de l'évocation critique et celui de la projection

*In other words, both the marginal discourse and its meta-discourse are discours-manifeste.

utopique" (18).¹⁶ One method used by Manifesto in order to institute and centralize its ideological position is described by Pelletier: "Le manifeste cite abondamment, comme ce sur quoi il prend appui pour le repousser, l'ordre qu'il prétend dépasser ou supplanter" (18). Marx uses this method in his argumentative strategy in The Communist Manifesto. He continually describes the present bourgeois system in order to contrast it with the system proposed by the Communists. This has the following effect: "citant et analysant ce qui organise l'ordre régnant qu'il dénonce, le manifeste contribue à en signer la fin" (19).

Institutionalization or recognition of certain manifestoes (as texts of historical importance, for example) can take several forms. One is the republication of such texts in readily available mass-market paperback editions. Judging the success (or failure) of a particular manifesto (that is, the acceptance and institutionalization of the ideology contained within it) is a much more complicated matter. In the simplest terms, one could agree that The Communist Manifesto has enjoyed (both commercial and ideological) success:

Thanks to The Communist Manifesto, everyone thinks differently about politics and society, when he thinks at all [sic]. More than this, Marxism has become the accepted creed or religion for countless millions of mankind, and The Communist Manifesto must be counted as a holy book, in the same class as the Bible or the Koran. Nearly every sentence is a sacred text, quoted or acted on by devotees, who often no doubt do not know the source of their belief [my emphasis].¹⁷

VI. The disintegration of discourse

A paradoxical phenomenon has been observed by Claude Leroy, as indicated in his article "La fabrique du lecteur dans les manifestes."¹⁸ Manifesto can be regarded as a discours-manifeste which subverts the ideology of the hegemonic discourse, all the while subverting itself as discourse. It does this in terms of, and at the hands of, its reader. Leroy explains:

... Car le bon narrataire du manifeste ne lit pas: il effectue la demande du texte..., mais il ne lit pas. Il ne doit surtout pas lire, c'est-à-dire percevoir le discours en tant que tel, étant donné que la condition de son efficacité est directement proportionnelle à la dissimulation de sa machinerie verbale. Le manifeste est un discours qui n'opère qu'au prix de sa propre dénégaration.

Paradoxe qui n'a rien d'une boutade: le manifeste est un type de discours auquel il est essentiel de se faire méconnaître comme tel. [his emphasis]. (124)

The purpose of Manifesto is to motivate the reader to action, and further, "transformer son lecteur en événement" (124). This phenomenon puts the critic of Manifesto in a peculiar position. Unlike the critics of other types of literary works, who are also readers, the critic of Manifesto must recognize Manifesto-as-discourse before it disintegrates into Manifesto-as-action. In other words, the critic can choose to evaluate Manifesto-as-discourse (Manifesto in its as-yet-uninstitutionalized form), (not to be confused with discours-manifeste, of which manifesto is a type), in terms of its historical position, its ideological foundations, etc. Or the critic can choose to become reader of Manifesto, in

which case the ideological content and argumentative strategy of a particular manifesto convince him to internalize its principles, and motivate him to action. It is in this second case that Manifesto ceases to be discourse, therefore ceases to be subjectable to metadiscursive analysis. This examination will proceed along the lines of the first alternative; an example of the second can be found above (p. 11), in the case of the "devotees" of The Communist Manifesto, who, having internalized its ideological principles, "often no doubt do not know the source of their belief." For these readers, The Communist Manifesto-as-discourse has ceased to exist.

2. A brief look at two types of Manifesto

I. Political Manifesto

Can a manifesto that deals with political issues be described in different terms than one dealing with other problems (such as aesthetic ones)? On what way is Manifesto different from other discourses that have as their subject a different, or better, society? Alain Meyer addresses these problems (among others) in his article, "Le manifeste politique: modèle pur ou pratique impure?"¹⁹ All manifestoes, according to his observations, must be considered political, because of their social position:

Tout manifeste, parce qu'il émane d'un groupe cohérent qui prétend agir sur le tissu social, parce qu'il cherche à ruiner l'ordre antérieur déjà ébranlé

(pour exalter d'autre institutions liées par un ciment nouveau, ne serait-il pas politique, puisqu'il intervient dans la cité? (29-30)

In what way, then, is Manifesto different from other discourses dealing with ameliorated societies?²⁰ In the first place, any manifesto is inextricably linked to the historical era in which it is created. Its success or failure as a catalyst for heightened political awareness depends on its appearance at the correct moment. (It is the publication, rather than the writing, of the manifesto which is the important action). (See below, page 17). This is one way in which it differs from Utopian discourse:

... un manifeste politique se veut efficace à court ou à moyen terme. Sinon, il s'agit d'un discours utopique, et c'est là un genre différent.... Il y a une date opportune pour lancer un manifeste politique: un mois, une semaine trop tôt ou trop tard, il serait prématuré ou périmé. (30)

Meyer allows for flexibility in the temporal appearances of other manifestoes which do not deal with political issues as such. This seems to contradict his earlier thesis that all manifestoes are political. A clarification of this problem could be suggested: all manifestoes behave in a political manner in terms of their interaction with society, even if their main point of contention is not a political one.

Another way in which Manifesto is different from Utopian discourses is in the point of contact that each type of discourse shares with the proposed society. Whereas Utopian discourses sketch an image of the preferred society, political manifestoes tend to outline the series of stages necessary for the present society to evolve into the projected one.

This question of strategies for social change will be examined in greater detail in the section dealing with The Communist Manifesto.

II. Poetic Manifesto

Poetic Manifestoes can be defined as those events, "happenings", social phenomena such as "hippies" or "punk", or documents dealing with a poetic or a literary issue in order to put in question the system from which that issue arises.²¹ Jeanne Demers explains the difference between Poetic Manifesto and Poem, in terms of their relationships to a hegemonic literary system:

Le poème...complice du système par définition, il explique ce dernier, le rend évident, le consolide en quelque sorte.... La fonction avouée [du manifeste] est justement de mettre en question le système. (6)

Poetic (or Literary, as it will be referred to later in this paper) Manifesto, like Political Manifesto, must cause crisis in the system, in order that its own poetic ideology be established in place of the previous one in a position of power. Like Political Manifesto, Poetic Manifesto can be recuperated in two ways: it can be recuperated as ideology (concurrent with its own disintegration as discourse), or it can be recuperated as document (with the application of a metadiscursive praxis):

Le manifeste poétique est très vite récupéré: tantôt, la critique le situera parmi les oeuvres et

l'analysera comme texte, tantôt elle s'en servira à titre de document, pour éclairer tel ou tel point d'histoire, mieux lire tel ou tel poème.... Dans l'un et l'autre cas, le manifeste perd son caractère immédiat de crise et réintègre le système [my emphasis] (8).

This phenomenon seems related to the one described above (pages 12-13) concerning the disintegration of Manifesto-as-discourse. Both in terms of the reader's position, and in terms of the recuperative relationship between Manifesto and hegemonic system, Manifesto loses its character of crisis. Perhaps it is this phenomenon that necessitates the action of "reiteration" of Manifesto:

Le véritable manifeste paraît rarement en solitaire. Il est le plus souvent marqué par un phénomène que je nommerai de réitération et qui n'a pas son pareil en littérature.... La réitération peut être simple: un premier manifeste est lancé, un deuxième le suit, puis un troisième, etc.....

La réitération se complique lorsque l'un des manifestes de la série, le deuxième généralement, se fait explicatif, rationnel même, le premier étant plus lyrique, plus provocateur. Si troisième manifeste il y a, les chances sont fortes pour qu'il constitue alors une sorte d'art poétique. (12)

This phenomenon will be illustrated in greater detail in Chapter III, 2: Argumentative aspects of the Manifestes du surréalisme.

III. The evolution of Literary Manifesto

Daniel Chouinard traces the semantic evolution of the word manifesto from its early uses to the nineteenth century in his article, "Sur la préhistoire du manifeste littéraire (1500-1828)." ^{2.2} Around 1575, manifesto was borrowed from the

Italian, where it had the following meaning:

"feuille volante, manuscrite ou imprimée, de format varié, qu'on affiche dans les lieux publics, dans une intention publicitaire ou progagandiste, afin de divulguer des faits intéressant la communauté." (23) [my emphasis] (from S. Battaglia, Grande Dizionario della lingua italiana, Turin, U.T.E.T., 1975, t.9, p. 692.)

At about the same time, the problems of reception are noted with regard to the function of Manifesto:

Cependant le Roy de Navarre faisoit publier des manifestes, afin de montrer la justice de sa cause [...]. Ces manifestes neantmoins firent grand effet sur les esprits qui n'avoient point pris de party, ils en gagnèrent plusieurs [...]. (26) [my emphasis] (from François-Eudes de Mézeray, Abrégé chronologique, ou extrait de l'histoire de France, Paris, t.3, avril 1585, p. 1165.)

The question of writing versus publication (and therefore reception) is elaborated in a recent text, le Manuel de la parole, (ed. Daniel Latouche, Québec, Boréal-Express, 1977), in which Latouche asserts that "le manifeste se définit avant tout par sa publication et non par son écriture" (15-16).

However, in order to be received by the public, certain elements must be included in the writing of a manifesto:

Les puissances modernes étalent à leur tour, dans leurs écrits publics, tous les artifices de la rhétorique, et tout ce qu'elle a d'adresse, pour exposer la justice des causes qui leur fait prendre les armes, et les torts qu'elles prétendent avoir reçus. (Chouinard, 24) [my emphasis] (from De Jaucourt (?), Encyclopédie ou dictionnaire raisonné ..., Neufchâtel, S. Faulché, 1765, t.10, p. 37-38).

These aspects will be elaborated in greater detail in the sections of this paper dealing with argumentative strategies and the applications of Speech Act Theory to Manifesto.

The question of demand for reform and formulation of a

strategy or programme for governing (and by extension, for instituting a particular political or aesthetic ideology) is raised in the following:

On donne aussi le nom de manifeste à des documents par lesquels un groupe de députés expose au pays la conduite qu'il veut tenir, les réformes qu'il veut demander; ou bien à ces sortes de proclamations par lesquelles des prétendants à un trône exposent leurs prétentions et formulent un programme de gouvernement. (27) [My emphasis] (from P. Larousse, Larousse universel du XIXe siècle, Paris, 1878, t.10, p. 1078).

The use of the term "manifesto" with regard to literary documents poses some problems. Most so-called "manifestoes" were named as such by compilers of anthologies, such as Bonner Mitchell, in his Manifestes littéraires de la Belle Epoque, 1886-1914 (Paris, Seghers, 1966). Most of the documents in this anthology are letters appearing in newspapers; very few are called "manifesto" as such by their authors. In order to avoid the retrospective naming of prefaces, declarations, or proclamations and other documents as Manifesto, examples for the illustration of theoretical problems will be drawn from those documents named "manifesto" by their authors, such as The Communist Manifesto and the Manifeste du surréalisme.

However, it is enlightening to discuss some genres related to Manifesto, those nearest to it in the spectrum model, in order to understand both the similarities and the differences among these types of discourse.

3. Related genres

I. A topology of polemic genres

If one can situate Manifesto as a genre in a topological field of related genres, it becomes clear that Manifesto shares the characteristics of these related genres. It also becomes apparent as to the existence of many factors that separate Manifesto from other types of polemical, critical, or didactic writings. These differences, as well as the similarities, help to delineate and elaborate the basic elements of Manifesto.

Within the spectrum model, let us choose a small segment of social discourses which share a common goal, to enlighten or convince their audience of a particular political point, and which draw from a common pool of literary and rhetorical devices. This small segment will be situated somewhere on the edges of social discourses, in a marginal position, some of its members being closer to the central locations of powerful discourses, some clinging to the edges of acceptable social discourse, trying to establish themselves and their ideology as worthy of consideration by the more powerful members.

The genres under consideration, (in no particular order at this preliminary moment), are: Utopia, Essay, Pamphlet, Panegyric, Declaration, Constitution, Proclamation, "appel" ("call to action"), Preface, Petition, and of course, Manifesto. These will be considered in terms of their many elements in common with one another, as well as the manners in which they differ from one another.

First, Utopia. The similarities and differences between Utopia and Manifesto have already been suggested elsewhere in this paper (above, pages 11, 13-14). Like Manifesto, it is a genre critical of existing systems, which draws on narrative strategies to illustrate its point. Briefly, it does not design a programme which can be instituted to accelerate or cause social change; rather, it illustrates (using narrative devices) a better society in order that the reader be able to see the inherent contradictions and injustices in his own present system.

The genre of Essay is vast, and can itself be subdivided into sub-genres worthy of careful consideration themselves, as Rockwell Gray suggests in his article "The Essay Tradition".²³ He suggests distinctions between the discursive essay and the narrative essay: "The former presents a case through argument and the devices of rhetoric (Emerson); the latter follows the meanderings of a tale whereby hangs a point (E.B. White)." (542). One can make a distinction as well between the didactic and the reflective essay:

Here one can return to the two great progenitors of the genre itself, Montaigne and Bacon. Bacon is predominantly the teacher. By contrast, Montaigne is the introspective, reflective author whose lessons are subordinate to his primary intention to explore his own experience. (542).

Of the four types suggested by Gray, discursive and didactic essays would seem to be the ones closest to Manifesto in method and purpose, that is, in the use of argumentative devices to teach and inform the public.

Essay seems closest to Manifesto in the following respect, described by Jean Terrasse in "L'essai ou le pouvoir des mythes":²⁴

L'essai est le produit d'une tension entre deux désirs apparemment contradictoires: décrire la réalité telle qu'elle est en elle-même, et imposer un point de vue sur elle. (129).

Pamphlet literature is interesting to mention in connection with Manifesto, in that it, too, addresses an audience from which it expects a response. In the case of Manifesto, the response is intended to be active, whereas a pamphlet may elicit another pamphlet. Like Manifesto, its success depends on its publication and dissemination; it occupies a marginal position in the spectrum; and it draws from the same argumentative strategies as does Manifesto.²⁵

Another type of genre which occupies a marginal, even paradoxical (that is, contrary to commonly-held opinion) position, is Panegyric. Its use of rhetorical devices to convince its audience of the supremacy of its position in an argument can be compared to the use of such devices by Manifesto.²⁶ These problems will be further elaborated in the sections of this paper dealing with argumentation.

In an article already discussed in this paper (above, p. 5), Abastado concisely points out the differences which separate Manifesto from "appel," Declaration, Petition, and Preface:

L'appel invite à l'action sans proposer de programme (Appel du 18 juin 1940); la déclaration affirme des positions sans demander au destinataires d'y adhérer (Déclaration sur le droit à l'insoumission dans la

guerre d'Algérie, publiée en 1960; la pétition est une revendication ponctuelle signée de tous ceux qui la font; la préface accompagne un texte qu'elle introduit, commente et justifie. (3).

Further similarities and differences between Manifesto and Preface, specifically, can be found in Jean-Marie Gleize's article, "Manifestes, préfaces: Sur quelques aspects du prescriptif."²⁷ Manifesto shares with Preface the character of being didactic, pedagogic and polemic. Manifesto can be considered as an "archi-préface", which, according to Gleize,

réalise économiquement une des fonctions de la préface particulière; une preuve de cette économie spécifique c'est que, lorsqu'il existe un manifeste (ou un corpus de textes en tenant lieu), il n'est plus besoin de préface aux oeuvres qui se placent explicitement sous sa dépendance. (13).

Preface, more than any other of these related genres, implies a text which follows. It cannot stand alone, even to conceive of a preface with no text would be an absurdity. Although a manifesto may behave as a preface at times, in certain situations it acts on its own, when its important elements are the publication of an ideology, or the catalyzing of public awareness.

Proclamation and Constitution are two forms which share with Manifesto the desire to make public a certain position or set of rules. They occupy a position at the other extreme of social discourse than that occupied by Manifesto and other marginal discourses. Proclamation and Constitution are usually thought of as the discourses of those in power, although marginal groups can and do publicize their proclamations and constitutions which, then, behave as Manifesto. A constitution

can be considered as the grammar of an already established society, or of one in the position of being established. Its purpose is not to shock the society into change, but, on the contrary, to create an accepted codification of the basic principles of behavior of that society. A proclamation makes the public aware of a certain, usually ceremonial, situation.

II. Common elements

The previously discussed genres share with Manifesto certain fundamental elements. For one, the desire to illuminate, some by using particularly violent methods intended to cause enlightenment by shock. Each of these genres addresses itself to one or more audiences, some expecting direct responses, whether written or active, others, such as Essay or Preface, expecting no direct response from their audience.

In terms of content, most of these genres direct their attentions to the amelioration, or at least change, in social or political issues. Their range can be limited to one particular issue (Petition), or extend to condemn an entire system (Manifesto).

The strongest link between these genres is a rhetorical one:

L'essai littéraire... le plaidoyer, l'homélie, l'éditorial, la polémique, le pamphlet [le manifeste-my addition] sont alors conçus comme appartenant au mode enthymématique et à la classe doxologique et persuasive.²⁸

In the following section on argumentation and argumentative

strategies questions only suggested up to this point will be elaborated.

4. Argumentation

I. The Classics

In the writings of the classical theoreticians, problems relating to different types of discourses are discussed. In the Poetics Aristotle deals with discourses that we would now call "literary" or "fictional", such as tragic and epic forms. In the Topic and Rhetoric the subject matter is a type of discourse that we would now call "non-literary" or "non-fictional" such as oratory dealing with political or judicial matters, among others.

In each of these works by Aristotle, there are further subdivisions, in order to describe more adequately and completely different types of discourse according to specific criteria. Literary discourse is described in terms of its manner, means and object of "imitation", these elements being further organized into an eventual system of genres of classical literature. Rhetoric includes discussions of the many elements necessary to oratory, including those pertinent to persuasion and argumentation in different situations. Although a system of genres in so-called "non-literary" discourse is not made explicit in Rhetoric, the suggestion is that the rules governing this type of discourse are as important as those dealing with

the "literary" types discussed in the Poetics.

The Topic and Posterior Analytics deal with the basic principles of truth versus the "opinable":

The purpose of the Topica is..."To discover a method by which we shall be able to reason from generally accepted opinions about any problem set before us and shall ourselves, when sustaining an argument, avoid saying anything self contradictory". (100 a 18ff).²⁹

Aristotle describes the differences between truth and opinion:

Knowledge and its object differ from opinion and its object in that knowledge is of the universal and proceeds by necessary propositions; and that which is necessary cannot be otherwise.... Therefore we are left with the conclusion that it is opinion that is concerned with which is true or false and which may be otherwise. (167).

According to Aristotle, science deals with truth, whereas rhetoric and dialectic deal with the probable, the opinable.

There is a close relationship between rhetorical and dialectical methods of argumentation:

The means by which rhetorical arguments carry conviction are just the same[as logical, or dialectical] arguments; for they use either examples, which are a kind of induction or enthymemes, which are a kind of syllogism. (25)

Rhetoric seeks to persuade, using dialectical reason, which is reason "from generally accepted opinions." (273).

II. The types of persuasion

Just as there are different types of "imitation" described in Poetics, Aristotle explains in Rhetoric that there are also various modes of persuasion:

Of the modes of persuasion furnished by the spoken word there are three kinds. The first kind depends on the personal character of the speaker; the second on putting the audience into a certain frame of mind; the third on the proof, or apparent proof provided by the words of the speech itself.³⁰

Some of these guidelines can be applied equally as well to the written type of the same discourse, just as the Poetics are used today as the basis for theories of written literature, whereas in classical times, they were based on oral discourses. It seems, however, that the mode of persuasion which depends on the personal character of the speaker is more of a factor with regard to political speeches (those given by Hitler would be a case in point), or courtroom oratory. In written discourse the character of the speaker/writer plays a secondary role in relation to the text. There is no direct confrontation between the speaker and the audience (as in oral discourse), but the speaker/writer addresses his audience through the medium of the text.

The second mode of persuasion deals with the emotional position of the audience at the outset of a confrontation with persuasive discourse, and is connected, in part, with the ability of the speaker to induce in the audience a frame of mind convenient to his argument. Terrasse explains the relationship between persuasion and the psychology of the audience: "La persuasion se fonde sur la connaissance psychologique du public dont l'orateur veut gagner la sympathie." (132) But it is not by means of the personal character of the speaker that an argument is won and the public is persuaded.

Terrasse continues: "Les passions doivent résulter des arguments avancés par l'orateur et de leur agencement dans le discours ." (133)

Turning to the third mode of persuasion, the speech itself, one discovers that Aristotle codifies the various types of argumentation suitable to different rhetorical problems:

Persuasion is affected through the speech itself when we have proved a truth or an apparent truth by means of the persuasive arguments suitable to the case in question. (25)

Aristotle describes three types of oratory, each with its particular method of argumentation and subject matter specific to it. They are political (or deliberative), forensic (or legal) and epideictic (or ceremonial) oratory.³¹ As far as means of argumentation suitable to each type of oratory,

... 'heightening of effect' is most suitable for declamations, where we take our hearer's actions as admitted facts, and our business is simply to invest these with dignity and nobility. 'Examples' are most suitable to deliberative speeches, for we judge of future events by divination from past events. Enthymemes are most suitable to forensic speeches; it is our doubts about past events that most admit of arguments showing why a thing must have happened or proving that it did happen. (63)

Examples can be described as "listes raisonnées d'anecdotes historiques servant d'illustrations à une même sentence morale"³² or methods of inductive reasoning. Examples can also be described as "representative" illocutionary acts, (see pages 31, 33). The enthymeme, on the other hand, is a method of deductive reasoning. It can be considered as

a/persuasive enunciation that relies on an underlying proposition which is not articulated.³³ Recent research dealing with the presupposition explains the functioning of the classical enthymeme.³⁴

Just as each type of oratory has a method of argumentation most suited to it, each also has a subject matter most suited to it, for example, political oratory:

Clearly counsel can only be given on matters about which people deliberate; matters, namely, that ultimately depend on ourselves, and which we have it in our power to set going. For we turn a thing over in our mind until we have reached the point of seeing whether or not we can do it. (35).

Another feature of political oratory is, according to Aristotle, the role of narration (or its absence):

In political oratory there is very little opening for narration; nobody can 'narrate' what has not yet happened. If there is narration at all, it will be of past events, the recollection of which is to help the hearers to make better plans for the future. Political oratory deals with future events, of which it can do no more than quote past events as examples. (210)

The examples, then, are the small bits of narration, the récits of the argument. These examples establish the groundwork for a series of co-intelligible enunciations, which together form a cohesive argumentative paradigm. The force of persuasion arises when this strongly-built paradigm (whether representative of the injustices or drawbacks of one particular system, or a sketch for a process toward a new system) is contrasted with its opposite. Marx uses this method in The Communist Manifesto. By continually contrasting the present bourgeois system with the manner in which life will proceed

under a classless system, he builds paradigms of the bourgeois system and the proletarian system. The audience responds according to this method of contrast.

It is, therefore, the role of political oratory to convince the audience of the supremacy of a certain ideological position or doctrine. This type of oratory deals with the future, the "not-yet", while deriving its argumentative elements from the past, or the "already-there".³⁵ Manifesto fits into this framework, as it, too, is a type of argumentative discourse, which builds persuasive paradigms by examples in order to prove the possibility of change from one system to another.

Manifesto speaks in a particular manner; thus, it has a particular effect. It is helpful to examine this problem in terms of Speech Act Theory, to understand the functioning of this effect.

5. Manifesto as Speech Act

I. Speech Acts

"Speaking a language," according to John Searle, "is engaging in a (highly complex) rule governed form of behavior."³⁶ Or, more simply, "talking is performing acts according to rules."³⁷ In Searle's theory, as well as in that of J.L. Austin, there are instances in which a type of discourse

can be used to perform an action. Words may be used alone, or in conjunction with other actions to complete the act. For example, in Islamic society, for a man to divorce his wife, all he is required to do is to say, "I divorce you," whereas in other societies, there may be other actions which are required as well. The marriage ceremony is one based on the utterance of certain words decided by law or ritual. Utterances which cause the action to occur by the mere mention of words are called by Austin "performative" utterances, that is, "the issuing of the utterance is the performing of an action."³⁸

An important point in this theory is the question of context, that is, the particular situation in which an utterance takes place. This context is established by the time, place, situation, and utterances which came before any particular utterance, such as the example of the marriage ceremony. Stanley Fish explains Searle's ideas:

No sentence is ever apprehended independently of some or other illocutionary force. Illocutionary force is the key term in Speech Act Theory. It refers to the way an utterance is taken--as an order, a warning, a promise, a proposal, a request, etc.--and the theory's strongest assertion is that no utterance is ever taken purely, that is, without already having been understood as the performance of some illocutionary act.³⁹

The difference between this type of utterance and a statement is that a statement can be deemed either "true" or "false", whereas a performative utterance cannot. It can either cause the action to happen, or for reasons given by Austin, it may fail to accomplish the action (for example, if

someone says "I promise..." without intending to carry out that promise, the performative utterance fails to complete its action).

Three types of acts are described by Austin, and they will be summarized briefly here. A locutionary act is the action of saying something that has meaning (as opposed to uttering senseless sounds). An illocutionary act is the performance of an act in saying something (Western marriage, Islamic divorce), as opposed to the act of saying something, which is a locutionary act. A perlocutionary act is the action of producing effects upon the feelings, thoughts and actions of an audience. Austing elaborates:

Saying something will often...produce certain consequential effects upon the feelings, thoughts or actions of the audience, or of the speaker, or of other persons...and it may be done with the design, intention, or purpose of producing them.⁴⁰

In his publication of 1973 and 1976, Searle further subdivides illocutionary acts into five categories, two of which are pertinent to our discussion. These are summarized here:

1. Representatives: illocutionary acts that undertake to represent a state of affairs, whether past, present, future, or hypothetical, e.g. stating, claiming, hypothesizing, describing, predicting, telling, insisting, suggesting....
2. Directives: illocutionary acts designed to get the addressee to do something, e.g. requesting, commanding, pleading, inviting, daring....⁴¹

Returning to the types of rhetorical discourses discussed by Aristotle, it seems clear that those discourses of a persuasive nature can be spoken of in these terms. An

orator in the process of defending a political cause or a specific ideology can be said to be performing an illocutionary act; arguing, in fact, one of the "directive" type. If he is successful in persuading his audience, he is performing a perlocutionary act (causing a reaction or an effect in his audience): convincing.

There is a difference between these two acts. Just as someone can say, "I do [take this person as my husband/wife]", that is, accomplish something by saying something, so can someone engage in the action of arguing. However, no one can say: "I am convincing you of some point." Only the audience can attest to that fact.

The action of arguing, then, can be described in the above terms as an illocutionary act, which may be in oral or written form. The constraints determining the former, especially, can be found in Aristotle's Rhetoric, but those guidelines can be applied almost equally as well to argumentative discourses in written form.

II. Manifesto as Speech Act

Jacques Filliolet describes the role of Speech Act Theory with regard to Manifesto in his article, "Le manifeste comme acte de discours: approches linguistiques."⁴² Manifesto is a type of linguistic and literary phenomenon which uses language as a means of action:

On pourrait dire aussi qu'elle [la pragmatique] étudie l'usage qui est fait du langage par des sujets qui voient en lui un moyen d'action. (23)

Filliolet explains the illocutionary position of Manifesto:

Si 'tout énoncé, pratiquement, peut être considéré d'une manière ou d'une autre comme illocutionnaire' (réalisant ou tendant à réaliser l'action dénommée), il est bon de souligner immédiatement que le manifeste possède sans aucun doute un droit spécifique à être qualifié ainsi. (23)

The force of the author of manifestoes in his demands on his reader comes from his use and method of argumentation:


En publiant un tel texte l'auteur ou les auteurs se donnent en effet un certain rôle, celui de dénoncer un ordre établi, et demandent à ceux qui le lieront de suivre une conduite nouvelle, dont la nécessité apparente doit tout à l'autorité que ces auteurs s'attribuent grâce à une argumentation plus ou moins développée. (23)

In this article, the author stresses the difference between a statement and this type of utterance (see above, page 30):

Le "je" (ou le "nous") qui écrit un manifeste ne cherche pas à être vrai, il demande, il exige, il veut être obéi, il joue le rôle de supérieur hiérarchique [my emphasis]. (24)

This type of illocutionary act (asking, demanding), fits into the categories delineated above (page 31) by Searle. It can be considered "directive", as it is designed to motivate the audience to action. The other types of illocutionary acts, including "representatives", are used to form the basis of the argumentative strategy, that is, they describe the paradigm of one system while suggesting a new or better paradigm out of which a new system can be built.

As suggested above (page 6), the relationship between



speech acts and their institutionalization into genre can be either simple or complex. Manifesto is an example of the complexity of the interaction between speech act and genre; that is, Manifesto cannot be described as the simple result of the application of a type of speech act, "to manifesto," to a generic framework. Rather, the act is "to make manifest," to reveal, to uncover, by means of other illocutionary activities, such as the procedure of argumentation, the action of comparison, the building of paradigms, the provoking to action. Filliote elaborates:

En se référant de nouveau à J.-L. Austin, il serait donc possible de se demander si une large part de l'énoncé manifestaire ne tend pas essentiellement à servir de performatif explicite à un ou plusieurs performatifs primaires de type impératif.... (25)

Manifesto, then can be considered as the sum or product of primary speech acts, performance utterances, directive and representative illocutionary acts. It is through the use of these types of speech acts that manifest derive their force.

The problem of audience can be explained at this point. It is apparent that Manifesto serves a double audience; those being asked to join the new group, and those outside this group as well. The authors of manifestoes address themselves to the contradictions inherent in the manner in which the latter audience lives, in order to convince the former that a new manner of behavior is necessary. Marx addresses both the bourgeoisie and the proletariat in The Communist Manifesto, at times indirectly, at other times directly ("You are forbidden to admit in the case of your own bourgeois form of

property....").⁴³ It is through this method of address that the group just coming into being defines itself. This marginal discourse which has a dangerously short life span (if it is to become "successful" and therefore disintegrate as discourse) serves to unite scattered elements into a cohesive whole which defines itself by virtue of its opposition to other groups, namely the ones in a position of power.

In his "Introduction à l'analyse des manifestes" (see above, page 8), Abastado elaborates on this phenomenon:

...on peut observer qu'un manifeste a toujours pour effet de structurer et d'affirmer une identité. C'est l'acte fondateur d'un sujet collectif (...): Il s'agit de faire exister comme entité reconnue un groupe qui n'est pas--pas encore--organisé en parti, en secte, en cénacle, en école, en chapelle; un groupe animé par des convictions communes et le désir d'action. L'analyse de l'énonciation est très significative à cet égard. Cet intenté explique le rituel d'auto-destination des écritures manifestaires: les signataires y informent et contemplent en elles une image spéculaire. (7)

The introduction to The Communist Manifesto can be examined in this light. To those who do not understand the phenomenon of communism, it is something to be feared, and more, it is denied physical presence, being branded a "spectre", or considered as such by its opponents. Marx intends to contradict this belief by clarifying ("manifesting") the real shape of this phenomenon. And what is more, this marginal group will now be able to take on actual proportions, rather than being mere spectre in the mind of the society. This manifesto, therefore, serves to define the Communists to themselves and to others, in terms of their opposition to the

group in power.

6. Synthesis

From this review of critical literature, many possibilities have been found which can become the basis for the examination of manifestoes. As a member belonging to a larger constellation of polemic genres in the spectrum of social discourse, Manifesto arises out of the need, or desire, of a particular group, to, first, define itself as a group and second, describe itself outside the bounds of hegemonic discourse, and (perhaps most important), persuade outsiders to involve themselves in the evolution of this group which is coming into being. It is perhaps the irony of Manifesto, if successful (that is, if institutionalized as ideology in a central position of power), to disintegrate as discourse. On the other hand, it may lose its persuasive, didactic, polemic, or violent character due to other sociological factors, and become document for the critic to study.

I have chosen to examine two types of Manifesto, one whose admitted cause is political and economic (as well as, secondarily, social, etc.), another which professes a new pathway for all human creative activity (and which is, also secondarily, professing a new political and social system as well). These manifestoes will be examined in light of the factors outlined in this introduction. As well, a preliminary definition will be constructed in order to situate better

Manifesto as a genre in the spectrum of social discourse.

Notes to Chapter I

¹Andrzej Zgorzelski, "Is Science Fiction a Genre of Fantastic Literature?" Science Fiction Studies, Vol. 6 (Nov. 1979), p. 296. Subsequent references in text.

²Discours-manifeste will be described below in section IV: "Discours-manifeste and hegemonic discourse".

³Claudio Guillén, "Literature as System," Literature as System: Essays toward the Theory of Literary History, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971), pp. 375-419. Subsequent references in text.

⁴For conflicting view re: Aristotle's "Three-way" divisions see Gérard Genette, Introduction à l'architexte (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1979), pp. 7-12; Wellek and Warren, Theory of Literature (New York: Harcourt, 1962), pp. 227-33; Ulrich Weisstein, Comparative Literature and Literary Theory, trans. W. Riggan (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1973), p. 108.

⁵Antonio Minturno, Bishop of Ugento and Cretone, De poeta (1559) and L'arte poetica (1563); Julius Caesar Scaliger, Poetices libri septum (1561); Francisco Cascales, Tablas poéticas (1617).

⁶Tzvetan Todorov, "L'origine des genres," Les genres du discours (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1978), p. 49.

⁷This seems to be true for a manifesto such as The Communist Manifesto, but is problematic in the manifestoes of the Surrealist group, texts in which new methods of writing are used.

⁸An analogy can be drawn between the generic model and the genetic one: Living chromosomes contain all the information necessary to manufacture every type of protein needed by every cell in an organism. However, depending on the biochemical environment, only certain genetic information is "expressed", or used to make protein in a given cell. In the same way, the spectrum model can be considered as the "chromosome" of social discourse, each speech act being a potentiality to be instituted into a genre, depending on the need of a society at a particular historical juncture.

⁹I think that on closer examination, it appears that the genre of Prayer is not only composed of one simple speech act "to pray". Included in certain types of prayer are activities such as "to beg", "to extol", "to glorify".... It seems that the genre of Novel is also derived from speech acts other than "to tell", such as "to describe", "to condemn", "to expose"....

¹⁰It is interesting to examine the emergence of meta-discursive phenomena in this light as well. Obviously, one cannot describe a genre and elucidate its poetics where no corpus of texts exists. But the institutionalization of a discursive phenomenon may be catalyzed by academic attention to that particular phenomenon. On second thought, it seems that that, indeed may be the case: Genres such as Manifesto are slowly being given academic status as objects worthy of study. As this practice of examining discursive forms, hitherto ignored, continues, greater fields of human written and spoken activity will be open for consideration.

¹¹Claude Abastado, "Introduction à l'analyse des manifestes," Littérature, No. 39 (Oct. 1980), pp. 3-11.

¹²See, for example, the issues of Littérature (39, Oct. 1980) and Etudes françaises (16/3-4, Oct. 1980) devoted to Manifesto.

¹³Manifesto acts as a catalyst to create shock therefore awareness, therefore change in a society. In this way it is not the formal aspect of this discursive phenomenon which is of the greatest importance, but the various acts, speech or otherwise, which violently cause instability in a social system.

¹⁴Shelly Yahalom, "Constantes fonctionnelles du discours-manifeste," Littérature, No. 39 (Oct. 1980), pp. 111-119.

¹⁵Anne-Marie Pelletier, "Le paradoxe institutionnel du manifeste," Littérature, No. 39 (Oct. 1980), pp. 17-22.

¹⁶As will be elaborated below, Manifesto is related to Utopian discourse (especially Utopian fiction) in so far as it suggests the possibility of a better society. Manifesto outlines the procedures for attaining that society whereas Utopian discourse situates itself within that hypothetical society in order to make a critique of the present system. See D. Suvin, Pour une poétique de la science-fiction, (Montréal, 1977) (Metamorphoses of Science Fiction. New Haven: Yale U.P., 1979).

¹⁷A.J.P. Taylor, Introduction to The Communist Manifesto (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1967), p. 7.

¹⁸Claude Leroy, "La fabrique du lecteur dans les manifestes," Littérature, No. 39 (Oct. 1980), pp. 120-128.

¹⁹Alain Meyer, "Le manifeste politique: modèle pur ou pratique impure?" Littérature, No. 39 (Oct. 1980), pp. 29-38.

²⁰See n. 16.

²¹Jeanne Demers, "Entre l'art poétique et le poème, le manifeste poétique ou la mort du père," Etudes françaises 16/3-4 (Oct. 1980), p. 4.

²²Daniel Chouinard, "Sur la préhistoire du manifeste littéraire (1500-1828)," Etudes françaises, 16/3-4 (Oct. 1980), pp. 21-30.

²³Rockwell Gray, "The Essay Tradition," Book Forum, Vol. 4, #3 (1979), pp. 541-545.

²⁴Jean Terrasse, "L'essai ou le pouvoir des mythes," Rhétorique de l'essai littéraire (Montréal: Les Presses de l'Université du Québec, 1977), pp. 123-141.

²⁵See M. Angenot, "La parole pamphlétaire," Etudes littéraires, 11, 2 (Août, 1978), pp. 255-264; Y. Avril, "Le pamphlet: essai de définition et analyse de quelque-uns de ses procédés," Etudes littéraires, 11, 2 (Août, 1978), pp. 265-281; J. Bonenfant, "La force illocutionnaire dans la situation de discours pamphlétaire," Etudes littéraires, 11, 2 (Août, 1978), pp. 299-312; and G. Vignoux, "L'argumentation pamphlétaire: effets de sens, effets de pouvoir," Etudes littéraires, 11, 2 (Août, 1978), pp. 283-297.

²⁶See M. Angenot, Les champions des femmes: Examen du discours sur la supériorité des femmes 1400-1800 (Montréal: Les Presses de l'Université du Québec, 1977), especially pp. 151-159.

²⁷Jean-Marie Gleize, "Manifestes, préfaces: Sur quelques aspects du prescriptif," Littérature, No. 39 (Oct. 1980), pp. 12-16.

²⁸M. Angenot, "La parole pamphlétaire", p. 259.

²⁹E.S. Forster, trans., Topica. (London: Wm. Heinemann, 1960), p. 268.

³⁰W. Rhys Roberts, trans., Aristotle's Rhetoric (New York: Random House, 1954), pp. 24-5.

³¹See n. 24 and Terrasse, Rhétorique de l'essai littéraire, p. 134.

³²Angenot, Les champions des femmes, p. 158.

³³See Hugh Tredennick, trans., Posterior Analytics (London: Wm. Heinemann, 1960), p. 25.

³⁴See M. Angenot, "Présupposé, topos, idéologème," Etudes françaises, 13, 1-2 (Avril 1977), pp. 11-34.

³⁵In somewhat the same manner as the critique of Utopian discourses, these terms imply that the change that will occur in the future is already present in the elements of the past.

³⁶John R. Searle, Speech Acts (Cambridge University Press, 1969), p. 12.

³⁷ Searle, Speech Acts, p. 22.

³⁸ J.L. Austin, How to Do Things with Words (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962), p. 6.

³⁹ Stanley E. Fish, "Normal Circumstances, Literary Language, Direct Speech Acts, the Ordinary, the Everyday, the Obvious, What Goes Without Saying, and Other Special Cases," Critical Inquiry (Spring 1978), pp. 637-38.

⁴⁰ Austin, How to Do Things with Words, p. 101.

⁴¹ Mary Louise Pratt, Toward a Speech Act Theory of Literary Discourse (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1977), pp. 80-81. See also Searle, "A Class of Illocutionary Acts," Language and Society, 5, pp. 1-23; Michael Hancher, "Beyond a Speech Act Theory of Literary Discourse," MLN, Vol. 92, No. 5 (Dec. 1977), pp. 1081-98; James A. Fanto, "Speech Act Theory and its application to Literature," The Sign: Semiotics around the World, R.W. Bailey et al., eds. (Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications, 1978), pp. 280-304.

⁴² Jacques Filliolet, "Le manifeste comme acte de discours: approches linguistiques," Littérature, No. 39 (Oct. 1980), pp. 23-28.

⁴³ The Communist Manifesto will be discussed in detail in the following chapter.

CHAPTER II

THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO:

POLITICAL MANIFESTO, LITERARY MANIFESTO

1. The Communist Manifesto as a text of rupture

I. The idea of process

The Communist Manifesto can be described, quite conveniently, by contrasting it with other types of discourse (see above, Ch. I, 3, "Related Genres"). One discovers that this text emphasizes the idea of process in social and economic history. Meyer describes the Manifesto as a text of rupture in terms of the emphasis on historical process:

le premier text théorique qui fonderait un science des formations sociales et de l'histoire.¹

Even texts destined to act as proto-manifestoes for the Communist party stressed this notion. Speaking of the introduction to the only issue of la Revue Communiste (Sept. 1847), a text on whose ideas were based those of The Communist Manifesto, Meyer asserts:

Voilà donc un texte qui met l'accent, de manière très politique, sur les étapes d'un processus et refuse de décrire un modèle tout fait de société idéale. (32)

One element, then, of The Communist Manifesto and of its predecessors as specific texts of rupture is their awareness

and insistence on historical process rather than fictionalized goal, as is a predominant element of Utopian discourses.

The Communist Manifesto can also be seen in contrast with some of its predecessors, such as Engels' Principles of Communism, a document in catechism form, or other professions of faith. Meyer explains:

A la différence d'une "Profession de foi", le manifeste n'est pas un ensemble de positions morales ou philosophiques. A la différence d'un catéchisme, le manifeste ne déduit pas les conséquences de principes généraux.... Marx part de commencements, d'origines historiques. Son manifeste se développe en terme de genèse et de processus, il souligne un mouvement historique, il précise les tendances à l'oeuvre dans la société et dans les luttes politiques. (33) (see below, page 63).

Meyer describes The Communist Manifesto as a three-part composite text. The first part outlines the process mentioned above:

The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggle.²

It is a section based on the antagonism between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The second part of the Manifesto proposes measures of transition; it illuminates the positive relationship that can exist between the Communists and the proletariat:

The Communists do not form a separate party opposed to other working class parties. (95)

The third section of this composite text outlines the political strategy of the Communists, by defining them as opposing or supporting particular Socialist parties.

Moving from a system of oppositions (bourgeoisie vs.

proletariat), Marx outlines the intent of the Communists:

In place of the old bourgeois society, with its
class antagonisms, we shall have an association
.... (105)

(The complex systems of oppositions described by Marx, and the method in which he exploits these systems in his argumentative strategy will be elaborated below.) According to Meyer, this composition of Political Manifesto is so successful that it has become a model for political manifestoes in general:

Plus tard, le Manifeste est devenu le modèle, voire le "Topos" du manifeste politique. Les manifestes politiques qui suivront ne reproduisent-ils pas les mêmes étapes: une introduction-attaque, un récapitulatif historique, une analyse de la situation, une polémique contre les autres organisations, un programme et, pour finir, un appel galvanisateur? (38)

II. Rupture and Intertextuality

The Communist Manifesto is a text of rupture, a discours-manifeste in its ability to synthesize the elements and ideas of its sources and predecessors. The problem of intertextuality can be situated at this juncture. The Communist Manifesto exists as a result of what came before it, politically, economically, socially, and in literary terms. In terms of document, one can trace intertextual influences in order to understand the relationship that exists between The Communist Manifesto and previous discourses, whether or not they are political in nature. It is perhaps because of

the inclusion of so many extra-political elements that the Manifesto was able to attain such success (i.e. disintegrate as discourse and become institutionalized as ideology).

Yahalom describes a similar process in artistic manifestoes as "la rhétorique du transfert systémique" (see above, Ch. I, p. 9): it seems possible to adapt this phenomenon to Marx's manifesto as well. According to Yahalom, the function of this type of discourse

est d'associer, d'une certaine manière, le produit de la nouvelle esthétique [= politique] à un système extérieur à celui dans lequel il vise à s'intégrer
.... (117)

In this case, it is the extra-political, or literary elements which are included in the composition of the Manifesto. The problems of intertextuality will be discussed further below.

2. Oppositions

I. Purpose and definitions

The Communist Manifesto creates a discursive system which stresses the ideas of evolution of one social system from the elements included in another; this is the notion of process in history. The discursive system uses argumentation by means of examples and other elements in order to build oppositions. These oppositions (examples of contrasting elements) form the bases of two contrasting paradigms. By examining the construction of these paradigms, the reader can

see how Marx contrasts the ideological framework of the Communists to the existing framework.

The first two sections of The Communist Manifesto serve as illustrative material for the two types of oppositions which I propose to call, somewhat redundantly, "antagonistic oppositions", and, in a rather contradictory manner, "protagonistic oppositions." In the first section, entitled "Bourgeois and Proletarians," oppositions are made manifest in several ways: by means of examples ("In the past X vs. Y, today bourgeois vs. proletarian"), in metaphorical terms (which will be discussed below in the section dealing with intertextuality), and through the use of diction (in the case of the appearance of formulas such as "more...less," words such as "instead of," verbs indicating substitution, etc.).

Why "antagonistic oppositions?" One must admit that there do exist oppositions which are not, on the most banal level, antagonistic. Such an example would be 'Male/Female', which, although some may argue are antagonistic in their basic nature, are necessary oppositions as far as biology is concerned. Therefore, antagonistic oppositions stress the notion of one member whose existence is detrimental to the other member of the pair.³ Marx's elaboration of the relationship that exists between bourgeois and proletarian is an example of this type of antagonistic opposition, which is known in its most general terms as class struggle.

II. Illustration of oppositions by means of examples

Section One opens with a passage which uses examples to describe the history of society in terms of class struggle:⁴

The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggle. Freeman and slave, patrician and plebian, lord and serf, guild-master and journeyman, in a word, oppressor and oppressed, stood in constant opposition to one another.... (79)

In this type of opposition, value is assigned by the member in the position of power to his own position, thereby increasing the antagonism of the situation.

In Marx's own society, this phenomenon of class struggle has become increasingly simplified, although more intense:

Our epoch, the epoch of the bourgeoisie, possesses, however, this distinctive feature: it has simplified the class antagonisms. Society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other: Bourgeoisie and Proletariat. (80)

This type of opposition is contrasted with "protagonistic oppositions," in which the two opposing parties are different, not in terms of their own class interest, but in terms of their organization and level of political awareness. Marx explains:

The Communists do not form a separate party opposed to other working-class parties.... The Communists are distinguished from the other working-class parties by this only: 1. In the national struggles of the proletarians of the different countries, they point out and bring to the front the common interests of the entire proletariat, independently of all nationality. 2. In the various stages of development which the struggle of the working class against the bourgeoisie has to pass through, they always and

everywhere present the interests of the movement as a whole.⁵ (95)

According to Marx, the role of the bourgeoisie has been a revolutionary one. In place of existing systems, it implants systems which are in its own interest. It is a class which performs a function of oppositions, especially in terms of the economic life of a society:

[The bourgeoisie] has resolved personal worth into exchange value, and in place of the numberless infeasible chartered freedoms, has set up that single, unconscionable freedom-Free Trade. In one word, for exploitation, veiled by religious and political illusions, it has substituted naked, shameless, direct, brutal exploitation. [my emphasis] (82)

The process of substitution and opposition is also expressed in metaphorical terms: "All that is solid melts into air, all that is holy is profaned...." (83) Marx is expressing the totality of the bourgeois process in order to expose it on all fronts. He continues his historical survey of the rise of the bourgeoisie in terms of these oppositions. In the political sphere:

Independent, or but loosely connected provinces with separate interests, law, governments and systems of taxation, became lumped together into one nation, with one government, one code of laws, one national self-interest, one frontier and one customs-tariff. (85)

The evidence of antagonistic oppositions is seen in its most absurd form when Marx reveals the labour system under capitalism:

In proportion, therefore, as the repulsiveness of the work increases, the wage decreases. Nay more, in proportion as the use of machinery and division of labour increases, in the same proportion the burden of toil also increases, whether by prolongation

of the working hours, by increase of the work exacted in a given time or by increased speed of the machinery, etc. (87)

This first section closes with Marx's prediction as to the outcome of these two antagonistic oppositions, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The historical conditions described will contribute to the destruction of the bourgeoisie: "Its fall and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable."⁶ (94)

III. Protagonistic oppositions and the question of audience

In the second section of The Communist Manifesto, that of protagonistic oppositions, Marx makes it clear that the Communists are opposed to the proletariat only in degrees of organization and level of political consciousness. It is the role of the Communists to make the truth (that is, the injustices existing under the bourgeois system) manifest, so that the proletariat will be able to unite and triumph over the existing system. The Communists and the proletariat are on the same side, with the same common interests--the implementation of a political and economic life which is better for the workers.

By explaining the relationship that exists between the Communists and the proletariat, Marx establishes the identity of the Communists for the proletariat and for themselves. This comparison also aids to convince the proletariat that it can trust, rely on, and even join the Communists. The

Manifesto, then, helps to establish a collective subject, as explained by Abastado (see above, Ch. I, p. 35):

... on peut observer qu'un manifeste a toujours pour effet de structurer et d'affirmer une identité. C'est l'acte fondateur d'un sujet collectif(....): Il s'agit de faire exister comme entité reconnue un groupe qui n'est pas--pas encore--organisé en parti, en secte, en cénacle, en école, en chapelle; un groupe animé par des convictions communes et le désir d'action. (7)

It is interesting to note Marx's method of argumentation in this section. Rather than continuing to expose the bourgeois before the proletariat, as he has done in the first section, he addresses the same bourgeoisie in an effort to make manifest the goals of the Communists. As mentioned above, he first defines the relationship existing between the Communists and the proletariat. This can be seen in the light of two audiences. When this clarification is addressed to the proletariat, it is a call to arms*, an indication that the Communists' aim is to aid and organize the proletariat. It also shows how it is the Communists and not the bourgeoisie, who have the interests of the proletariat at heart.

This statement is also addressed to the bourgeoisie. The Manifesto's stated purpose is the public revelation of its writers' aims and purposes, in order that all parties clearly understand the role of the Communists. That one intended audience is the bourgeoisie is indicated by the fact that in this section Marx directly addresses that class ("your bourgeois notions"). It seems then, that the Manifesto is intended for the enlightenment of both classes. The

emphasis, however, in the two sections is different. Whereas in the first, Marx describes the rise of the bourgeoisie in order to show to the proletariat that the fall of the former and its own rise are inevitable, in the second section, Marx addressed the objections of the bourgeoisie in order to show that the present social and economic system already contains the elements which it fears.

Marx's method of addressing the objections of the bourgeoisie is also interesting. In this way, he proves that the seeds of the society proposed by the Communists already exist in the present system (the Utopian "pas-encore" can be seen in the "déjà-là"--see Ch. I, p. 29). And it is here where he reveals [= an illocutionary act] the hypocrisy of the bourgeois system.

Marx addresses the objections of the bourgeois one by one, beginning with the issue of private property. Against the bourgeois claim that the Communists intend to abolish private property, Marx responds, "There is no need to abolish that; the development of industry has to a great extent already destroyed it..." (96)

It is the inventions of the bourgeoisie itself which will ultimately cause the downfall of that class, as Marx mentions at the end of the first section of the Manifesto: "What the bourgeoisie, therefore, produces, above all, is its own grave-diggers." (94)

In another example, Marx both exposes and reproaches the bourgeoisie in terms of the issue of private property:

You are horrified at our intending to do away with private property. But in your existing society, private property is already done away with for nine-tenths of the population; its existence for the few is solely due to its non-existence in the hands of those nine-tenths. You reproach us, therefore, with intending to do away with a form of property the necessary condition for whose existence is the non-existence of any property for the immense majority of society. In one word, you reproach us with intending to do away with your property. Precisely so; that is just what we intend. (98)

Marx reveals to the bourgeoisie that the meaning of certain words in its vocabulary, such as "freedom" and "individual," really mean "bourgeois freedom," and "bourgeois individuality." The fears of the bourgeoisie are justified, when it claims that the Communists plan to destroy freedom and individuality, explains Marx. This is because it is "the abolition of bourgeois individuality, bourgeois independence, and bourgeois freedom which is undoubtedly aimed at." (98)

In the same manner in which the bourgeoisie believes that the loss of its freedom and individuality would mean the loss of all freedom and individuality, "so the disappearance of class culture is to him identical with the disappearance of all culture" [my emphasis]. (99) Marx's role here is to say to the bourgeoisie, "It ain't necessarily so," that is, what it believes to be natural is only its transformation of its own laws into natural ones. According to Marx, this is a "selfish misconception" which the bourgeoisie shares "with every ruling class that has preceeded you." (100)

Just as in the case of the property issue, the same logic of argumentation is used when Marx discusses the role

of women. The Communists do not plan to institute a new way of living as far as relations with women are concerned, but only to legitimize the existing system:

...what the Communists might possibly be reproached with, is that they desire to introduce, in substitution for a hypocritically concealed, an openly legalized community of women. (101)

Against the bourgeois' reproach of the Communists desire to abolish countries and nationality, Marx answers, "The working men have no country. We cannot take from them what they have not got." (102)

Marx proves that the bourgeois claims concerning a Communist "pas-encore" are, in reality, the "déjà-là," meaning, that the Communists only intend to legitimize existing circumstances and make the public aware of the reality of the existing situation. The claims of the bourgeoisie against the Communists, as well as Marx's proof that these are already existing circumstances can be represented schematically, as follows:

Bourgeois claim "Pas-encore"	Communists prove "déjà-là"
Communists will destroy private property	"private property is already done away with for nine-tenths of the population." (98)
Communists plan to institute new way of living with women	Communists plan to legitimize existing circumstances
Communists plan to abolish countries and nationality	"The working men have no country. We cannot take from them what they have not got." (102)

IV. Process and strategy

Recalling Meyer's terms that a manifesto is different from Utopian discourse in that it does not illustrate the final product of the society to come, but only outlines the direction in which the present society must go, one can examine the ten principles indicated by Marx at the close of this section of the Manifesto. These are measures which, when instituted, will gradually replace "the old bourgeois society, with its classes and class antagonisms" and, in its place, "we shall have an association, in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all." (105) In this way, antagonistic oppositions are replaced first by protagonistic oppositions (the relationship between the Communists and the proletariat), to be finally overcome by the disappearance of all classes, and the institution of an association (i.e. the disappearance of all antagonisms) among all peoples.

The ten principles sum up, in an easily accessible form, the Communists' intent (as introduced earlier in terms of the bourgeois' objections to those issues). These principles are the formulation of the Communists' strategy, and deal with the issues of private property, income tax, rights of inheritance, confiscation of rebels' and emigrants' property. In economic terms, a national bank will have a monopoly on credit, and, as well, the State will be in sole control of communication and transport. A plan will be

instituted, explains Marx, to ameliorate and expand the labour situation, especially in agricultural sectors. Child labour will be abolished; instead, there will be free education for all children in public schools.

Marx does not describe the face of the new society, only the road the present one must follow in order to attain it. The new society will be a classless one, in which existing oppositions and antagonisms will be replaced by equality and association.

Just as the society goes through a process of evolution and transformation, so will the text which described and instigated this transformation. If the ideology in The Communist Manifesto is institutionalized and instituted (and one can see many examples in the world in which it has, whether in pure or in altered form), then the Manifesto ceases to be important only as discourse, as a document or an object of study. In losing its marginal and paradoxical, even subversive, position, it ceases to be discours-manifeste. It moves into the position of accepted ideology, and disintegrates as discourse.

3. Manifesto-on-literature, Manifesto-as-literature

I. Manifesto-on-literature

The Communist Manifesto has been discussed by many critics in terms of manifesto-as-literature, that is, in

terms of the literary influences, whether formal or contextual which can be found in it. However, before resuming the findings of these researches, the Manifesto can also be seen in terms of manifesto-on-literature, as the third section of this manifesto deals with the different forms of political literature pertinent to Marx's discussion.⁷

Marx defines three types of socialism, each with its own aims and methods. He also outlines the reasons for the failure of these three types of socialism. The types are: reactionary socialism, subdivided into feudal, petty-bourgeois, and German, or 'True' socialism; conservative, or bourgeois socialism; and critical-Utopian socialism.

In the 1830's, Marx explains, the aristocracies of France and England wrote pamphlets against the bourgeoisie, who were in power at the time. They took sides with the proletariat, but only to further their own interest, and to oppose themselves to the class in power. Marx analyses their discourse as

half lamentation, half lampoon; half echo of the past, half menace of the future; at times, by its bitter, witty and incisive criticism, striking the bourgeoisie to the very heart's core; but always ludicrous in its effect, through total incapacity to comprehend the march of modern history. (106)

This literature is a weak and ineffective manifesto, written from the opposite end of the spectrum of social discourse as Marx's. It is bound to fail, because the feudalists are not aware of the process of social history. They do not realize that, under their rule, there is no modern

proletariat as such. Their literature is written from the point of view of the past, rather than from the vantage-point of the actual situation. Therefore, it cannot succeed as a catalyst for political change.

In the case of the literature of the petty-bourgeois socialists,

it was natural that writers who sided with the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, should use, in their criticism of the bourgeois régime, the standard of the peasant and petty bourgeois (108)

just as the feudal aristocrats used the proletariat cause to criticise the ruling middle class. However, the critical methods of this second school had many merits:

This school of Socialism dissected with great acuteness the contradictions of modern production. It laid bare the hypocritical apologies of economists. It proved, incontrovertibly, the disastrous effects of machinery and division of labour; the concentration of capital and land in a few hands.... (109)

This methodology fails in practical terms, as it is both Utopian and reactionary; it aims to restore "the old means of production... and the old society... or to cramping the modern means of production... within the framework of the old property relations." (109)

German, or 'true' socialism fails completely to achieve any practical status as political literature. German philosophical writers seized of the French literature which attacked the bourgeoisie as a ruling class, with the result that they were attacking a class which had not yet reached the position of power in German society. The timing of these writers was off, and as a result,

in contact with German social conditions, this French literature lost all its immediate practical significance, and assumed a purely literary aspect. (110)

This type of literature cannot behave as a manifesto, because it does not deal with topical reality. It is only a literary curiosity, a victim of intertextual transfiguration into a society whose makeup is different from that which it borrowed. It can only be examined as document, which is how Marx views it.

Marx compares this type of literary praxis with the palimpsest, only in reverse.⁸ The German philosophers "wrote their philosophical nonsense beneath the French original."

(110) Marx condemns this type of writing as existing only "in the realm of philosophical fantasy" (111) and asserts that

with very few exceptions, all the so-called Socialist and Communist publications that now [1847] circulate in Germany belong to this domain of foul and enervating literature. (113)

Marx's second major division of socialism concerns conservative, or bourgeois, socialism. Members of this group (economists, philanthropists, humanitarians, etc.)

want all the advantages of modern social conditions without the struggles and dangers necessarily resulting therefrom. (113)

That is, they want a bourgeoisie without a proletariat. Just as the bourgeoisie considers its own laws to be eternal and natural, that is, it naturalizes its own praxis and creates "a world after its own image" (94), "the bourgeoisie naturally conceives the world in which it is supreme to the best."

(113)

In opposition to the forms of reactionary socialism, which desire to change the state of affairs by returning to the old means and modes of production, conservative socialists wish, by no means, to cause change through revolution, but through administrative reforms which will conserve the status quo. Therefore, Marx argues, this plan dissolves into its own rhetoric, is merely a figure of speech, a powerless phrase.

The final group of socialists, the critical-Utopianists, desires to improve the lot of the entire society, even that of the class in power. Its method is to

reject all political, and especially all revolutionary, action; they wish to attain their ends by peaceful means, and endeavour, by small experiments, necessarily doomed to failure, and by the force of example, to pave the way for new social Gospel. (116)

The writings of the critical-Utopianists do contain a critical element, such as those of the petty-bourgeois socialists; however, similar to the German, or 'true' socialists, whose attacks were ill-timed and not grounded in reality, this type of literature is Utopian as well. The social conditions against which it rallied were not yet in their fully developed form.

At this point, it can be useful to deal with the characteristics of the types of literature discussed by Marx in order to examine more clearly his own project, The Communist Manifesto, as a type of political literature. This can be done by opposing the types of literature which Marx rejects, and instituting a set of axiomatics for a definition

of Manifesto as a type of (political or other) discourse.

Marx opposes Manifesto to Marchen (nursery tale) in the opening section of the Manifesto. A nursery tale is one of hidden meanings, implicit elements, polysemy. A manifesto, on the other hand, is explicit, clear, open, public, in other words, manifest. Its meaning is on the surface.

As opposed to German philosophical fantasy, a manifesto deals with reality. This implies that it appears at a certain historical juncture, and deals with subjects pertinent to those circumstances. A manifesto cannot be "foul and enervating literature," but a type of discourse that demystifies and clarifies.

In opposition with discourses dealing with a "some-time," such as Utopias or gospels, a manifesto must appear at the right time, and deal with the "right now." One can graphically represent these oppositions:

<u>MANIFESTO</u>	versus	<u>OTHER</u>
Explicit	Implicit [<u>Marchen</u>]
Reality	Fantasy [German philo. c. 1947]
Clear	Foul [German philo. c. 1947]
Circumstantial, Topical	Utopia, gospel

Synthesizing these elements, Manifesto as a type of discourse can be defined in a very preliminary manner, as

A tool for the demystification of existing circumstances, dealing with topical reality in order to make explicit both contradictions and injustices of

the present system, and concrete plans for changing the system, without actually describing the image of the new system.

It must be noted that this definition is subject to change through further investigations concerning manifestoes. Whether or not this definition holds true for all manifestoes dealing with all issues remains to be seen.

II. Manifesto-as-literature

The Communist Manifesto can be viewed in terms of its intertextuality, its position at the junction of various literary currents. Several texts discuss intertextuality in terms of the Manifesto, among them Karl Marx and World Literature by S. S. Praver, The Tangled Bank: Darwin, Marx and Freud as Imaginative Writers by Stanley Edgar Hyman, and "l'Implicite du manifeste: Métaphores et imagerie de la démystification dans le 'manifeste communiste'" by M. Angenot and D. Suvin.⁹

As the above-mentioned texts deal with the issues of the sources, imagery and intertextuality of The Communist Manifesto, what follows is not intended as an original contribution, but as a summary of the major issues presented in those texts.

The Communist Manifesto itself is based on a text by Engels entitled Principles of Communism (1847), a "question and answer catechism addressed to workers." (SEH, 100) The interesting difference between the forms of catechism and

manifesto is elucidated in the following passage:

Le modèle discursif du "catéchisme" ou de credo communiste était en effet en faveur dans les milieux socialistes des années 1840, où l'on tendait parfois à se voir comme une société secrète dont les rituels d'initiation pouvaient se calquer sur ceux des religions établies. En 1847, Marx et Engels, avaient essayé à plusieurs reprises la formule de la "Confession de foi," pour l'abandonner enfin au profit du "Manifeste." ...on peut rappeler que la forme de "Manifeste est aussi lié à l'histoire primitive du mouvement ouvrier.... (A/S, 43) (see also above, page 44).

Therefore, a discursive form more closely associated with the workers' movement was used in the place of one dealing with religious or ritual issues.

The previous section of this paper described The Communist Manifesto as Manifesto-on-literature. Here the problem of Manifesto-as-literature, that is, the inclusion of several types of literary imagery in the Manifesto, will be discussed. Of the many types of imagery found in the Manifesto, such as military imagery ("Class struggle"), Gothic imagery ("A spectre is haunting Europe"), and images of stripping away and covering up, it is the latter which will be dealt with in most detail here.¹⁰

The images of stripping away versus covering up are used in several ways by Marx. First, they describe the actions of the bourgeoisie:

The bourgeoisie...has left remaining no other nexus between man and man than naked self-interest, than callous 'cash payment'...for exploitation, veiled by religious and political illusions, it has substituted naked, shameless, direct, brutal exploitation... The bourgeoisie has stripped of its halo every occupation hitherto honoured and looked up to with reverent awe.... The bourgeoisie has torn away from the family its sentimental veil.... The bourgeoisie has

disclosed how it came to pass.... (82) [my emphasis]

Next, Marx uses these images to describe the literary production of the German socialists:

The robe of speculative cobwebs, embroidered with flowers of rhetoric, steeped in the dew of sickly sentiment, this transcendental robe in which the German Socialists wrapped their sorry 'eternal truths', all skin and bone, served to wonderfully increase the sale of their goods amongst such a public. (112)

The petty-bourgeois socialists' activities are also described in these terms:

This school of Socialism dissected with great acuteness the contradictions of modern production. It laid bare the hypocritical apologies of economists. (109)

Elsewhere, Marx describes the Communists' plans with regard to the role of women and of marriage. They wish to substitute, "for a hypocritically concealed, an openly legalized community of women." (101)

The elements suggested above (page 61) which form a definition of Manifesto as a type of discourse (explicit, clear, pertaining to reality) seem to agree with the synthesis proposed by Angenot and Suvin:

Nous croyons qu'il faut partir ici d'un couplage métaphorique primitif qui s'établit comme un reconstruction polémique de la dyade fondamentale de la grande tradition "illuministe," celle qui, pour Marx, va d'Epicure à Diderot: lumière/obscurité, la réalité dévoilée opposée à la dissimulation mystifiante. (A/S, 64)

This type of imagery relates to the purpose of Manifesto: to expose, to uncover, to make clear, to demystify.

The task of this type of critique is:

...à rendre manifeste l'implicite et l'occulté de l'idéologie, donc à démanteler la mystification; [la critique socialiste] procède essentiellement à un travail intertextuel de démystification.
(A/S, 66)

Just as it is Marx's role to uncover the truths of bourgeois ideological practice, it is the role of the reader of the Manifesto (or any manifesto) to uncover Marx's (or any writer's) literary practice. One must recognize the intertextual configurations present in this text. The following idea from J. Kristeva can be applied to The Communist Manifesto:

...tout texte se construit comme une mosaïque de citations et tout texte est absorption et transformation d'un autre texte.¹¹

Here are some examples of this phenomenon:

The Communist Manifesto is almost an anthology of revolutionary rhetoric, and some of its most effective slogans are borrowed.... "The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains" and "The workers have no country" are Marat's.... "The nexus of cash payment" is Thomas Carlyle's....
(SEH, 100)

This intertextual effect can be referred to as "political intertextuality" as opposed to "poetic intertextuality", that is, the citations come from Marx's (and his society's) "memories" of political, rather than poetic, writings. (By "memories" I mean the collection of intellectual and social awareness of literary productions of a given society). Examples of poetic intertextuality abound in The Communist Manifesto. Aside from the numerous literary forms described in the section on "Socialist and Communist Literature" (philosophical fantasy, gospel, Utopia, etc.), imagery from German

poetry is absorbed in the intertext of the Manifesto. Two such examples are given in Praver, that of Heine and Goethe. From Heine, one draws this image:

This is a beautiful reminder of the Middle Ages,
Of noble servants and squires,
Who bore loyalty in their heart
And a coat of arms on their behind. (SSP, 139)

Compare the above with the following passage from The Communist Manifesto:

The aristocracy, in order to rally people to them, waved the proletarian alms-bag in front of them for a banner. But the people, so often as it joined them, saw on their hindquarters the old feudal coats of arms, and deserted them with loud and irreverent laughter. (106-7)

Praver suggests that the phrase "workers of all countries, unite!" is from Heine as well:

Even the famous phrase which concludes The Communist Manifesto may be an echo of Heine. In his essay on Ludwig Marcus...Heine had spoken "of that fraternal union of the workers of all lands..., of that wild army of the proletariat..., which is bent on doing away with all concern about nationality in order to pursue a common purpose in Europe...." (SSP, 139-140n.)

An indication of the destruction that will be caused by bourgeois society if it is allowed to continue to flourish can be seen in Marx's use of an image drawn from Goethe:

Modern bourgeois society...that has conjured up such gigantic means of production and exchange is like the sorcerer, who is no longer able to control the powers of the nether world who he has called up by his spells. (85-86)

Praver explains the connection:

In Goethe's poem "The Sorcerer's Apprentice" it is the apprentice who calls up spirits he cannot in the end, subdue, and it is the master...who repairs the damage. In the Communist Manifesto the master-

sorcerer himself has lost control: the magnitude of that disaster can be best felt if we perceive Goethe's contrasting text in and through that of the Manifesto. (SSP, 140)

It is clear that this political document is subject to the same influences as other forms of literary production, such as the phenomenon of intertextuality. It is interesting to note, especially, the existence of trans-generic influences, that is, the appearance of poetic imagery in political texts and vice-versa. This can be described as "rhétorique de transfert systémique" (see above, Ch. I, pages 9 and 46), in which literary images and metaphors known to the public (see "memories," page 65) are incorporated into the rhetoric of the Manifesto. One of the effects of this procedure is to strengthen the relationship between the orator and his audience in terms of the method of persuasion (see above, Ch. I, p. 26). This is the mode of persuasion that depends on the frame of mind of the audience. By using images familiar to his public, Marx injects his discourse into the same popular system which absorbs these images. Therefore, his ideological discourse is easily assimilated, having been coated with familiar images and metaphors.

4. The disintegration of The Communist Manifesto

In order to succeed as a vehicle for transmitting ideological doctrine, that is, a tool for demystifying existing circumstances, that is, a manifesto, The Communist

Manifesto must, above all, be a persuasive document. As described in Chapter I, Manifesto is that type of discourse which proposes a programme and invites people to join it. The Communist Manifesto does so: it proposes ten points through which the present social system can evolve into a future one. It ends on a note which exclaims the hope for the unity of all workers.

Manifesto is a text which defines its creators; The Communist Manifesto does so in its last section, "Position of the Communists in Relation to the Various Existing Opposition Parties," (119-121), the allies and enemies of the Communists are explicitly named:

In France the Communists ally themselves with the Social-Democrats.... In Switzerland they support the Radicals.... In Poland they support the party that insists on an agrarian revolution.... (119-120)

At the moment of its appearance, The Communist Manifesto was indeed a discours-manifeste speaking from the margins of social discourse. In the prologue to the Manifesto Marx explains that the Communists are regarded as a "spectre". Those who occupy a position at the centre of ideological power are in opposition to the Communists.

All the Powers of old Europe have entered into a holy alliance to exorcise this spectre: Pope and Czar, Metternich and Guizot, French Radicals and German police spies. (78)

This manifesto, like others of its genre, belongs to the mode of persuasive discourses. Marx demonstrates his ability to persuade the reader by constructing paradigms in which he opposes the beliefs of the bourgeoisie to the plans of

the Communists. In this way, both audiences, the bourgeois and the proletarian, understand their relationship to one another, and to that group which is responsible for the Manifesto. It becomes clear to the proletariat that it is the Communist who can be of aid, and the bourgeoisie which is responsible for the actual social and economic conditions.

Marx establishes his position in terms of the fact that the changes proposed by the Communists already exist in some form in the present society. His manifesto really does make manifest what has been obscured (veiled, hidden, covered) by the ideology of the bourgeoisie.

Besides being a political manifesto, one which creates a polemical atmosphere in order to convince an audience of the superiority of a particular ideological position, The Communist Manifesto can be seen both in terms of Manifesto-on-literature and Manifesto-as-literature. In terms of the former, this text, which proclaims change in the most basic elements of society, deals with the history of its own genre. It is self-conscious of its own poetics, as well as of historical causality in other, non-literary segments of social praxis.

The literary elements of the Manifesto, whether from political or poetic sources, whether participating in the intertextual network of Manifesto as a literary text or Manifesto as a political document, serve to emphasize the definitive character of this type of discourse. Metaphors found in The Communist Manifesto can be used to talk about it itself,

in a type of metadiscursive manner. Its purpose is to "strip veils" from phenomena in order to expose, and describe their true character. Its own definition (above, p. 61-2) can here be expanded as a conclusion to this section. Manifesto, then, can be seen as

A polemical tool for the demystification of existing circumstances, speaking from the margins of social discourse, dealing with topical reality in order to make explicit both contradictions and injustices of the present system, and concrete plans for changing the system, without actually describing the image of the new system.

If Manifesto succeeds in persuading its audience that the ideology described which it will, indeed, form the basis for a better way of living, Manifesto no longer occupies a position at the edges of social discourse. Its ideology becomes absorbed, and creates a new system. Therefore, the text of the discourse itself has no longer any ideological or polemic use. Conforming to the phenomena described in Chapter I, it can be said to cease existing as discourse, and to begin practicing as ideology. Without entering into a social history of Communism and Marxism, one can assert that this disintegration has already taken place with regard to the discourse of The Communist Manifesto as a polemic tool which has formed the basis of a practicing social ideology.

Notes to Chapter II

¹Alain Meyer, "Le manifeste politique: modèle pur ou pratique impure?" Littérature, No. 39 (Oct. 1980), p. 32. Subsequent references will appear in the text.

²Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, The Communist Manifesto (Penguin Edition, 1967), p. 79. Subsequent references will appear in the text.

³Another definition of "oppositions" can be found in Glossaire pratique de la critique contemporaine by Marc Angenot (Montréal: Hurtubise, 1979), p. 146: "Rapport entre deux unités d'un paradigme, présentant un, ou des trait(s) commun(s) et un trait différentiel." I would call these pro-
tagonistic oppositions as opposed to antagonistic opposition, where a certain value is assigned, usually by a member in a position of power, to its own position over that of another in the paradigm, e.g. bourgeois/proletarians.

⁴See above, Chapter I, p. 27. Examples can be "anecdotes historiques servant d'illustrations à une même sentence morale." (Angenot, 1977, p. 158).

⁵This is an example of oppositions as described above in n. 3: one sees two members which possess traits which are in common and those which are different.

⁶This is the "sentence morale" illustrated by these "anecdotes."

⁷See S. S. Praver, Karl Marx and World Literature (Oxford University Press, 1976), pp. 138-149. [Subsequent references as SSP].

⁸"palimpsest, n. [Gr. palimpsestos, rubbed again; palin, again, and psen, to rub] 'a parchment, tablet, etc. that has been written upon or inscribed two or three times, the previous text or texts having been imperfectly erased and remaining, therefore, still visible.'"

--Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary, 1977, p. 1288.

⁹Stanley Edgard Hyman, The Tangled Bank: Darwin, Marx and Freud as Imaginative Writers (New York: Anthenum, 1962) [Subsequent references in text as SEH]; M. Angenot and D. Suvin, "l'Implicite du manifeste: métaphores et imagerie de la démystification dans le 'manifeste communiste'," Etudes françaises 16/3-4 (Oct. 1980), pp. 43-67 [Subsequent references as A/S]. See also n. 7.

¹⁰A/S, pp. 50-51 (military imagery), pp. 52-59 (Gothic imagery), pp. 60-67 (stripping v. covering imagery).

¹¹Laurent Jenny, "La stratégie de la forme," Poétique 27 (1976), p. 261.

CHAPTER THREE

The Manifestes du surréalisme: TOWARD THE
POLITICIZATION OF MANIFESTOES

1. Overview

It is not the task or the purpose of this investigation to examine surrealism as an intellectual, artistic, or political movement, or to present an historical outline of its achievements in the fields of literature or the visual arts. There are many texts to which one can refer whose express purpose is to provide such information.¹ Rather, this investigation directs its attention toward some of those texts produced by the surrealist group, particularly those written by André Breton in the early years of the movement. These texts will be examined in the light of their function as manifestoes.

The two Manifestes du surréalisme were written in 1924 and 1930, respectively. Prolegomènes à un troisième manifeste ou non (1942) exist, but they will not be intensively studied in this inquiry.

The first Manifeste du surréalisme was published in 1924 together with a collection of so-called "automatic" poems entitled Poisson soluble (Soluble fish). There is some

controversy concerning the status of this manifesto as the preface to this collection of poetry. For the purposes of this study, this manifesto will be regarded as a manifesto and not as a preface. It behaves more as an "archi-préface" explaining the functioning of surrealism as a whole, and not only as an introduction to an isolated book of poems.

In the first Manifeste Breton explains the functioning and the aims of the technique of psychic automatism (automatic writing), or pensée parlée. Briefly, this technique (originally designed to apply to the creating of poetry, and which later formed the basis of creation in the visual arts as well), consisted of allowing the contents of the mind to be transferred onto paper, without the conventional censorship of the mind of the writer. Breton believed that the speed of thought could be the same as the speed of speech, therefore, the possibility existed for transferring thought directly into spoken, or written, language.

Psychic automatism presupposed the existence of a sub- or unconscious level of the mind as active and as important as the waking levels of consciousness. It was through the technique described by Breton that man could tap the resources of these, as yet unused, portions of the mind. In this manner, man's imagination could be given free reign in the creation of poetry. This presupposition was directly related to Breton's awareness of, and interest in, the writings of Freud:

C'est par le plus grand hasard, en apparence, qu'a été récemment rendue à la lumière une partie du monde

intellectuel, et à mon sens de beaucoup la plus importante, dont on affectait de ne plus se soucier. Il faut en rendre grâce aux découvertes de Freud. Sur la foi de ces découvertes, un courant d'opinion se dessine enfin, à la faveur duquel l'explorateur humain pourra pousser plus loin ses investigations....²

Besides explaining the process of automatic writing, Breton first defines Surrealism in this manifesto:

SURREALISME, n.m. Automatisme psychique pur par lequel on se propose d'exprimer, soit verbalement, soit par écrit, soit de toute autre manière, le fonctionnement réel de la pensée.... (37)

Breton also uses this text as an opportunity to introduce his Surrealist colleagues, and to praise their accomplishments. One notes, however, that some of these same colleagues are viciously attacked by Breton in the Second manifeste du surréalisme. Breton asserts that they have sold out to the opposing factions, and therefore deserve to be discredited as surrealists.

The first Manifeste also contains a poem composed according to one of the techniques suggested by Breton: newspaper headlines, drawn at random from a paper bag, are recorded in the order in which they appear. The result is a Surrealist poem composed according to the laws of chance, with no interference from conventional censorship.

The tone of the Second manifeste is quite different from that of the first. As described above, this text contains vitriolic attacks on some of those colleagues praised in that text. One example is the case of Robert Desnos, of whom Breton said in the first Manifeste:

celui d'entre nous qui, peut-être, s'est le plus
 approché de la vérité surréaliste, celui qui...a
 justifié pleinement l'espoir que je plaçais dans
 le surréalisme et me somme encore d'en attendre
 beaucoup. Aujourd'hui, Desnos parle surréaliste
 à volonté.... (41-42)

and retracts in the second Manifeste:

C'est ainsi qu'après lui avoir laissé un temps
 incroyable pour se reprendre à ce que nous espérions
 n'être qu'un abus passager de sa faculté critique,
 j'estime que nous nous trouvons dans l'obligation de
 signifier à Desnos que, n'attendant absolument rien
 de lui, nous ne pouvons que le libérer de tout en-
 gagement pris naguère vis-à-vis de nous. (124)

Other elements of both these manifestoes will be discussed in
 detail in the following sections devoted to each individually.

As documents worthy of critics' consideration, the Mani-
 festes du surréalisme have experienced considerable recogni-
 tion. As described above (Chapter I, page 12) the relationship
 between the critic and the manifesto can be a complicated one.
 The critic can deal with the manifesto as a type of discourse,
 analysing it in terms of its pertinence as an argumentative
 tool. Or he can agree or disagree with the ideological con-
 cepts put forward by the writer(s) of a manifesto. J.H.
 Matthews (1975) suggests that the time has arrived when one can
 consider the Manifestes du surréalisme from a comfortable dis-
 tance. That is, the critic can enter into a relationship free
 from emotional attachment to the ideological precepts expressed
 in those texts, and examine them as instruments of argumenta-
 tion and persuasion. These manifestoes, claims Matthews,
 "succeeded in inspiring, among critics anyway, more condescen-
 sion than anything else, and continued to do so for a long
 time."³

In Matthews terms, the Manifestes du surréalisme are documents, that is, they occupy a position as discourse, and have not yet (or ever) disintegrated as discourse (as opposed to the case of The Communist Manifesto, which has, in some situations, achieved success as ideology and has disintegrated as discourse. See above, Chapter I, pages 11-13).

What is the role, then, of the Manifeste du surréalisme in its own time, toward the entire surrealist aspiration? According to Matthews,

The first manifesto simply marked the opening of surrealist activities according to a concerted plan. It codified ideas that had been in gestation for up to half a decade, and it gave a sense of unified purpose to forms of protest and exploration, already tried out, projected, or just anticipated. (2) [my emphasis]

He claims that "the first surrealist manifesto is not a programme for revolutionizing art and literature, but a programme that appeals for a revision of human values." (3) Perhaps it is closer to the spirit of Breton's text to say that surrealism, through art and literature, intended to appeal to all human values:

L'homme propose et dispose. Il ne tient qu'a lui de s'appartenir tout entier, c'est-à-dire de maintenir à l'état anarchique la bande chaque jour plus redoutable de ses désirs. La poésie le lui enseigne. Elle porte en elle la compensation parfaite des misères que nous endurons. (28) [my emphasis]

A paradoxical situation exists concerning the use of the manifesto form in Breton's case. His method of argumentation does not appear to be as logical as that used by Marx in The Communist Manifesto. Marx's argumentation appears to be rather straightforward. He compares the present bourgeois system and

all its ills to the future, egalitarian proletarian system. He answers all the objections of his opponents in a systematic, persuasive manner. At first sight, Breton's manifestoes seem to be a confusing conglomeration of theory, poetry, diatribe. However, as shall be elaborated in greater detail in the section dealing with the first Manifeste, it becomes clear that Breton builds paradigms in order to contrast two systems, in much the same manner as Marx.

Matthews views the problem in this way:

In turning to the manifesto form, André Breton was borrowing a mode of verbal communication that supposedly owes its persuasiveness--its very *raison d'être*--to the reasonable clarity of its dialectical presentation. ...when addressing himself to the problem he had created for himself, he succeeded in demonstrating, within the manifesto itself, that the message of surrealism owes its force to the spirit, rather than the letter of its definition. (4-5)

One should also note the obvious connections which exist between the title "Manifeste du surréalisme" and the then-familiar entity, the "Manifeste du communisme." Breton's borrowing of the manifesto form was not only because of its persuasive capacity, but for the parallels which would be drawn in the minds of the readers between these two texts. Not only does Breton shock his audience by providing a definition of his movement, he uses his text as a mimicry or plagiarism of political discourse, thus attempting to give to an essentially aesthetic movement a political character.

Rather than employing the methods of unveiling and demystification used by Marx throughout his manifestoes, Breton draws the critic or the reader into a surrealist, or

provocative, relationship with the text. Matthews explains that this precisely is the difficulty with an article by R. Champigny.⁴ Champigny tries to confront Breton's text using reasonable language, in a logical manner, when Breton's text is one which uses language in an unreasonable manner. However, there is an important product of the relationship between critic and author in terms of this text, as elaborated by Matthews:

Those weaknesses that reason brings to light, those all-too-evident breaks in logical sequence, are less significant as signs of dialectical inadequacy or muddy thinking than proof that the Manifeste du Surréalisme was never intended to measure up to the demands of reasonable argument. Thus the excitement Breton's text is capable of generating in the mind of a surrealist is not simulated by persuasive deduction at all. It comes directly from the spectacle of successive intuitive leaps.... In a very literal sense, André Breton practiced what he preached. (5)

This relationship can be taken one step further. Returning to the two options with which one is confronted when describing Manifesto, that of Manifesto-as-discourse (document) or Manifesto-as-ideology (when discourse has disintegrated), one can describe critical discourse in these terms. The first Manifeste du surréalisme is a tool for the disintegration of its own meta-discourse. Since it operates on the ideological basis of a creation of a new process for using language, if one accepts this ideological position, that is, if the discourse disintegrates as such, one immediately enters into a realm in which there can be no creation of critical language, or meta-discourse. Champigny's article is situated somewhere

between the two options. He fails to understand the argumentative methods employed by Breton, and, as such, blames Breton for his lack of argumentative prowess.

Breton's strategy is correctly recognized by Matthews when he claims that Breton practices what he preaches. The exempla, or indications of inductive reasoning, are not ré-cits, or narrative units from which one can draw conclusions (see Chapter I, Part 4, Section II), but they are a mise-en-oeuvre of ideology. "André Breton," continues Matthews,

never felt the need to draw a line between theory and practice, between the language of theory and the language of creative action, even in that initial formulation of basic ideas which he issued as a manifesto. (6)

Matthews' assessment of the Manifeste du surréalisme can be seen as an understanding of the new way in which Breton used language, in terms of its new inductive and deductive powers. Through the relationship established between the critic and the text, one can examine not only the disintegration of discourse, but the disintegration of (any possibility of) meta-discourse.

Another illustration of the critic-Manifesto relationship and of the problems arising from it, can be seen in the treatment given Breton's texts by Anna Balakian.⁵ In light of the situation described above, it seems that some of her statements constitute an incorrect assessment of Breton's manifestoes. For example, speaking of the Manifestoes, she states:

These two prose writings are not essays in the strict sense of the word because they have neither a uniform theme nor a contrived, logistic development of ideas. They constitute philosophical meanings[!], a genre particularly characteristic of the French tradition.... (3)

It is unnecessary to continue to quote from Balakian's description of the Manifeste du surréalisme, because it is clear that she belongs to the same school of criticism as Champigny. She is approaching these texts from a logical, reasonable point of view. However, had she suspended her judgment, and examined these texts carefully, she may have found that they indeed do have a theme, and have developed ideas.

Perhaps her criticism falls short due to the fact that she fails to recognize that Manifesto, besides being a genre of didactic literature, must contain an element of crisis and violence; its power of persuasion stems from its marginal position and its ability to create shock waves in the discourse of power from its position. Balakian fails to recognize these elements of Manifesto:

What is a manifesto? It is a proclamation, containing a strong didactic vein; it stems from a need to inform and convince; it is a resolution, a call to action. It often spells out in trite[!] form a series of precepts, or attempts to popularize an elusive kernel of concept. How little the above description of the genre "manifesto" applies to these two writings of Breton. (4)

The writings, indeed, do not fit the description, mainly because the description is lacking in some of the most important elements of the genre of Manifesto. However, even in her own terms, one must disagree, because Breton's manifestoes do contain a strong didactic vein, and spell out

(although not in trite form) the basic precepts of Surrealism.

It is at this juncture that one can begin to examine the texts themselves, to discover (or uncover) the mechanics of the argumentative and persuasive strategies used by Breton in his manifestoes..

2. Argumentative Aspects of the Manifeste du surréalisme

I. Reiteration

The existence of more than one Surrealist (or other) manifesto can be explained by the suggestions offered by Jeanne Demers.⁵ She describes the phenomenon of reiteration, that is, appearance of more than one manifesto in a series. The first manifesto in a series is usually the lyric or provocative of the series; the second can serve to explain or rationalize the first. If there is a third manifesto in a series, it can be considered as an art poétique. A series of manifestoes, then, can have three phases, "une phase déclaratoire, une phase explicative, une phase art poétique." (13)

The Manifestes du surréalisme can be described in these terms. The first is, indeed, provocative: note the critical controversy surrounding it. The second, although more vehement, projects the aims of surrealism into greater realms of human activity. One can imagine that the actual products of the surrealists can be considered as the art poétique, whether visual or verbal. In other words, the entire opus of

surrealist creation behaves as a Troisième Manifeste du surréalisme.

Another way in which to consider the phenomenon of reiteration could be as a function of Manifesto's marginal position in social discourse. Manifesto must cause crisis in a system; perhaps reiteration is an intensification of that crisis-producing mechanism (see above, Chapter 1, page 16). Reiteration could also be seen as the failure of Manifesto to cause crisis. A first manifesto, being ineffective in its aims, is followed by a second which tries to expand its field in order to encompass greater issues. This explanation cannot prove either one of these claims in this short space, discussing only this series of manifestoes. Suffice it to say, each manifesto appears at a particular juncture in the social discourse and at a specific moment in social time. The need, or ability, of Manifesto to cause crisis is altered as a function of these variables. Perhaps there is the solution to the appearance of Manifesto in a series.

II. The first Manifeste: The building of paradigms

As seen in Chapter II, Marx describes his activity as creator of a manifesto in opposition to other forms of literary production. Whereas other types of literature serve to make implicit, his manifesto is designed to be explicit. In cases where discourse deals with a far-distant future, his manifesto expresses the hope for the very near future. By

making these types of oppositions clear to the reader, he demystifies his activity and his purpose to the reader. Using elements from his discourse, he builds a paradigm of that discourse; so he does with the opposing discourse. By comparing and contrasting the two paradigms, the reader of his manifesto can be persuaded as to which is the better way of behavior.

Breton builds paradigms in the Manifeste du surréalisme as well. For the purposes of this examination, the examples will be drawn from the first section of the Manifeste (pages 11-42), in which Breton introduces the fundamental elements of surrealism.

This method of argumentation can be based on the third mode of persuasion described by Aristotle (see Chapter I, page 27) in which the proof is achieved by the words of the speech itself. The passions of the audience are stimulated by these arguments, as suggested by Terrasse (Chapter I, page 27): "Les passions doivent résulter des arguments avancés par l'orateur et de leur agencement dans le discours." (133)

The paradigms built by Breton deal with the surrealist mode of creation versus rational methods of artistic creation. He believes that rational control solves only a very narrow range of problems. Now that Freud has discovered the existence of other levels of the mind, man must devise ways in which to reach those levels. According to Breton, it is through surrealism that one can find and use those areas.

Liberty of imagination is a main theme of this manifesto (contrary to the assertions of Balakian, that the

Manifestes have no uniform theme); it is contrasted with the existence of logical control over imaginative processes:

(Liberty)

Reduire l'imagination à l'esclavage... c'est se dérober à tout ce qu'on trouve... de justice suprême. (13)

... les traits d'esprit et autres bonnes manières nous dérobent à qui mieux mieux la véritable pensée qui se cherche elle-même, au lieu de s'occuper à se faire des réussites. (18)

L'imagination est peut-être sur le point de reprendre ses droits. (19)

(versus Logic)

... les procédés logiques, de nos jours, ne s'appliquent plus qu'à la résolution de problèmes d'intérêt secondaire. Le rationalisme absolu qui reste de mode ne permet de considérer que des faits relevant étroitement de notre expérience. (18-19)

Sous couleur de civilisation, sous prétexte de progrès, on est parvenu à bannir de l'esprit tout ce qui se peut taxer à tort ou à raison de superstition, de chimère, à proscrire tout mode de recherche de la vérité qui n'est pas conforme à l'usage. (19)

As Breton describes, the imagination must be allowed free reign. Any method of investigation must be considered valid and valuable. Logical and rational controls are responsible for the impoverishment and enslavement of the imagination.

The second element in this paradigm is the supremacy (or at least the importance of the acknowledgement) of the dream state, due to the discoveries of Freud:

C'est par le plus grand hasard, en apparence, qu'à été récemment rendue à la lumière une partie du monde intellectuel, et à mon sens de beaucoup la plus importante, dont on affectait de ne plus se soucier. Il faut en rendre grâce aux découvertes de Freud... (19)

It is shocking to Breton to note the disregard accorded to this state:

l'extrême différence d'importance, de gravité, que présentent pour l'observateur ordinaire les événements de la veille et ceux du sommeil, a toujours été pour m'étonner. (20)

Why, asks Breton, cannot dream be considered in the same light as waking consciousness?

... pourquoi n'accorderais-je pas au rêve ce que je refuse parfois à la réalité, soit cette valeur de certitude en elle-même, qui, dans son temps, n'est point exposée à mon désaveu? (21)

Surrealism itself arises out of the presupposition of the equality of these two states:

Je crois à la résolution future de ces deux états, en apparence si contradictoire, que sont le rêve et la réalité, en une sorte de réalité absolu, de surréalité, si l'on peut ainsi dire. (24)

Another element in the surrealist paradigm is the theme of the marvellous:

le merveilleux est toujours beau, n'importe quel merveilleux est beau, il n'y a même que le merveilleux qui soit beau. (24)

The marvellous can be described as a kind of awareness and utilization of the surrealist state. Breton gives Le Moine by Lewis as an example of surrealism in novel form. This novel contains elements which are in his manifesto. He considers realism in novel as nothing more than the "superpositions d'image de catalogue," (15) which produce "ces livres ridicules, ces pièces insultantes." (14) Lewis's novel, on the other hand, is an example of the marvellous:

Dans le domaine littéraire, le merveilleux seul est capable de féconder des oeuvres ressortissant à un genre inférieur tel que le roman.... (24)

The practical, or functional, product of surrealism is poetry (la poésie, or creation of a free imagination).

Breton describes the power of this product as almost magical:

"Elle porte en elle la compensation parfait des misères que nous endurons." (28) The first indications of social or political uses of surrealism are connected with the appearance of poetry, albeit in an almost Utopian manner:

Le temps vienne où elle décrète la fin de l'argent et rompe seule le pain de ciel pour la terre! Il y aura encore des assemblées sur les places publiques, et des mouvements auxquels vous n'avez pas espéré prendre part.... Qu'on se donne seulement la peine de pratiquer la poésie. (28)

To summarize the paradigms built by Breton:

I

II

Liberty of imagination.....Logical control

Dream State.....Waking State

The marvellous.....Banal reality

Poésie.....Prose (=conscious
reconstruction of
reality) *

Surrealism (I) serves to uncover greater areas of human consciousness. By means of its method of psychic automatism, not only do creative problems find their solutions, but there is the suggestion of social and political uses of surrealism as well.

*see Gershman, page 170.

Faithful to the elements of Manifesto, Breton notes the importance of process. He does not attempt to describe in its entirety the face of the surrealism future, rather, he stresses the methods by which one can reach this future:

Toujours est-il qu'une flèche indique maintenant la direction de ces pays et que l'atteinte du but véritable ne dépend plus que de l'endurance du voyageur. (29)

III. EXEMPLA: The process explained

In the section entitled "Secrets de l'art magique surréaliste," Breton indeed practices what he preaches. His examples are not narratives designed to allow the reader to draw conclusions concerning surrealism. Rather, they are functional descriptions of the method of the surrealist technique. They can be described as belonging to a class of illocutionary acts which undertake to describe a particular situation (see above, Chapter I, page 31).

The technique is described simply:

Faites-vous apporter de quoi écrire...placez-vous dans l'état le plus passif, ou réceptif, que vous pourrez.... Ecrivez vite sans sujet préconçu.... La première phrase viendra toute seule.... (42-43)

How much clearer can Breton be in his description of the process? It seems that certain critics have overlooked this passage, which may be the central core of the first Manifeste. Is not the purpose of this manifesto to convince the reader of the existence of the surrealist state and to show that reader how to attain it, in the simplest way possible?

This manifesto is indeed the lyric and provocative one. It is in the Second manifeste that Breton expands the purpose of surrealism into the political realm.

IV. Language as action: Toward meta-speech act

Speech Act Theory describes the functioning of certain types of utterances as performing an action, by virtue of the fact that they are spoken. It has already been described above (Chapter 1, pages 33-36) that Manifesto uses certain of these types of speech acts in order to function. "To make manifest" can be described as the sum of many of these speech acts.

The Manifestes du surréalisme are peculiar in the genre. They demand that language be used in new ways. Their first object of change is the way in which language is used, unlike that of The Communist Manifesto, whose first object concerns a concrete entity, property. Therefore, language takes on a convoluted nature in these texts.

Breton said, "Le langage a été donné à l'homme pour qu'il en fasse un usage surréaliste." (46) Language in this (and other) manifestoes is used to cause action; Breton explains, clarifies and persuades. However, language, according to this manifesto, will be the instrument of change. Language will cause a revolution in language. It is in this way that surrealism becomes a meta-speech act. It uses language in order to cause action (change) in language, then,

as a consequence, in all human activity. Surrealism, then, is a movement which affects all aspects of life:

Non seulement ce langage sans réserve que je cherche à rendre toujours valable, qui me paraît s'adapter à toutes les circonstances de la vie, non seulement ce langage ne me prive d'aucun de mes moyens, mais encore il me prête une extraordinaire lucidité et cela dans le domaine où de lui j'en attendais le moins. (47)

The language of this manifesto operates on (at least) three levels: a level on which one can analyse different types of illocutionary acts; a level on which one can discern the functioning of the act: "To make manifest," which is a sum of acts in the first level; and finally, a level on which the object of the manifesto, in this case, language, is operated upon by itself (see below, page 97-98).

The Manifeste du surréalisme ends on a note which is elaborated in the Second Manifeste. Breton claims, "Autrement graves me paraissent être, les applications du surréalisme à l'action." (61) It is from a marginal position that Breton speaks, and he himself recognizes that marginality:

Ce qui est vrai de la publication d'un livre le deviendra de mille autres actes le jour où les méthodes surréalistes commenceront à jouir de quelque faveur. Il faudra bien alors qu'une morale nouvelle se substitue à la morale en cours, cause de tous nos maux. (60, n. 1)

Through surrealist applications to action, from a marginal position, change will happen. Breton claims optimistically: "Le surréalisme est le 'rayon invisible' qui nous permettra un jour de l'emporter sur nos adversaires." (64)

V. The Second manifeste: Toward politics

There are many studies whose express purpose is to examine and describe the relationship between the surrealist group and other political groups, notably the Communists.⁷ The purpose of this investigation is not, therefore, to summarize and reiterate the findings of those studies, but to show how, in the Second manifeste, Breton expands the aims of the surrealists to include, not only aesthetic, but social and political issues as well.

Surrealism itself as a movement can be considered to have qualities of Manifesto. In other words, it is a type of discours-manifeste (see Chapter I, page 8) which aims to subvert the hegemonic ideology. Surrealism is a continuing manifesto, one which can be flexible and can change according to the appearance of new needs and conditions.

The Second manifeste du surréalisme is not merely a reiteration of the first. It includes the basic tenets of its predecessor, but expands them to fit political aims. Surrealism was always a revolutionary movement, however, it was one without any clear system of political thought. Matthews (1969) elaborates:

The truth is that, from the first, the urgent need to oppose a reasonable society in which bourgeois values flourished led the surrealists in France to promote revolutionary ideals by every means available to them. At the beginning, to be sure, these ideals were not clearly formulated in terms directly applicable to politics. Yet, although they remained vague, surrealist aspirations were openly

and aggressively antagonistic to the existing social and political order. (2)

In 1930, the Second Manifeste appeared, ostensibly to deal with the problem of the political interests of surrealism.

Lewis describes the Second Manifeste as

a very polemical document in which Breton settled a lot of old quarrels and in which he re-evaluated some of the original ideas of surrealism. The goals remained basically unchanged but were more clearly formulated and, of course, the concept of surrealism had been enlarged to include Marxist ideology. (131)

Even the tone of this text seems more determined than that of the first Manifeste. Breton opens by describing the vast new goals of surrealism:

... le surréalisme ne tendit à rien qu'à provoquer, au point de vue intellectuel et moral, une crise de conscience de l'espèce la plus générale et la plus grave.... (76)

The use of any means to reach this goal is advocated:

... Il s'agit encore d'éprouver par tous les moyens... le caractère factice des vieilles antinomies destinées hypocritement à prévenir toute agitation insolite de la part de l'homme.... (76)

Surrealism extends to cover the destruction of existing social institutions:

Tout est à faire, tous les moyens doivent être bons à employer pour ruiner les idées de famille, de patrie, de religion.... (82)

Breton sees this as a reasonable extension of surrealist activities:

... je pense qu'on ne s'étonnera pas de voir le surréalisme, chemin faisant, s'appliquer à autre chose qu'à la résolution d'un problème psychologique.... C'est au nom de la reconnaissance impérieuse de cette nécessité que j'estime que nous ne pouvons pas éviter de nous poser de la

façon la plus brulante la question du régime social sous lequel nous vivons, je veux dire de l'acceptation ou de la non-acceptation de ce régime. (94)

Revolt is stressed:

Breton répète que cette activité suppose d'abord une rupture radicale avec le monde tel qu'il nous est donné, par l'exercice d'une violence constante et universelle. Si le surréalisme repose sur un dogme, c'est bien sur celui de "la révolte absolue, de l'insoumission totale, du sabotage en règle." 8

This manifesto makes a break not only with the predecessors of surrealism, but with certain colleagues of Breton as well (see above, pages 75, 76). Surrealism, in Breton's view, is a totally modern movement:

Cette disposition d'esprit que nous nommons surréaliste et qu'on voit ainsi occupée d'elle-même, il paraît moins en moins nécessaire de lui chercher des antécédents et, en ce qui me concerne, je ne m'oppose pas à ce que les chroniqueurs, judiciaires et autres, la tiennent pour spécifiquement moderne. (79-80)

As mentioned above with regard to the Manifeste du surréalisme, many of Breton's collaborators are mentioned unfavourably in the Second manifeste, among them Antoinin Artaud, André Masson, Philippe Soupault and Robert Desnos.

Lewis explains:

These men had sinned in surrealist eyes because they had either turned to "vulgar journalism" to make money, or had begun to care about their literary reputations, and, ... were immersed in purely commercial artistic endeavors. (133)

Breton explains why he feels the necessity to devote so much time in the Second manifeste to the expression of his feelings toward his former collaborators: he does so as a warning:

Notre intervention, en pareille matière, ne tend qu'à mettre en garde les esprits sérieux contre un petit nombre d'individus que, par expérience, nous savons être des niais, des fumistes ou des intriguants mais, de toute manière, des êtres révolutionnairement malintentionnés. (107)

It is apparent that Breton deals with the problems of social action, of revolution, and of political involvement in this text. However, seen from the surrealist point of view, social action does not imply control or direction from any political party. Social action can be examined in the same terms as language, that is, as being freed from political control:

Le problème de l'action sociale n'est, ... qu'un des formes d'un problème plus général que le surréalisme s'est mis en devoir de soulever et qui est celui de l'expression humaine sous toutes ses formes. Qui dit expression dit, pour commencer, langage. Il ne faut donc pas s'étonner de voir le surréalisme se situer tout d'abord presque uniquement sur le plan du langage et, non plus, ... y revenir.... (108-109)

The surrealists approach political and social problems in the same manner in which they approach aesthetic issues. Matthews (1969) describes this situation:

Political and social oppression, at all events, is regarded in surrealist circles as the equivalent of the limitations imposed on poetic expression by rationally controlled language. Accordingly, liberty in the field of political self-determination is considered an accompaniment to the freedom that is an essential prerequisite for poetry.

As the surrealists see things, conformity to imposed opinion in matters of politics is no less reprehensible than conformity, in poetic practice, to accepted custom with regard to ethical, moral, or aesthetic issues. (3)

Breton's conception of revolutionary involvement did not necessarily coincide with that of the communists, although in his Légitime défense of 1926, he states, "There is not one of us who does not wish power to pass from the hands of the bourgeoisie into those of the proletariat."⁹ There is a proviso, however, to this connection between the two ideologies: Breton insisted that there be no control over experiments in the inner life, not even Marxist control.¹⁰

The relationship between the surrealist and the Marxist ideologies is more complex still. Breton seemed to believe that they have "a unique educational role to play as surrealists in the revolutionary movement."¹¹ Just as the surrealist method can be applied to social issues, the dialectical method could be applied to issues of concern to the surrealists:

Comment admettre que la méthode dialectique ne puisse s'appliquer valablement qu'à la résolution des problèmes sociaux? Toute l'ambition du surréalisme est de lui fournir des possibilités d'application nullement concurrentes dans le domaine conscient le plus immédiat. Je ne vois vraiment pas... pourquoi nous nous abstiendrions de soulever, ... la Révolution: les problèmes de l'amour, du rêve, de la folie, de l'art, et de la religion. Or, je ne crains pas de dire qu'avant le surréalisme, rien de systématique n'avait été fait dans ce sens. (95-96)

On closer examination of the above passage, it seems that surrealism as a discours-manifeste intends not to usurp the central position of power, but, instead, draws other concerns with it out to the margin of social discourse. Surrealism, in order to survive as a revolutionary ideology, in

art, or in political issues, must remain marginal, even elitist. Surrealism, once recuperated into the central position, ceases to exist as a revolutionizing force. By its own definition, it is a movement designed, not to move itself and its ideology into the central position of social discourse, thereby disintegrating itself as discourse, but it is a magnetic movement, drawing central concerns to the edges of social discourse. As a political force, then, it operates in opposition to the aims of the Communists, who desire to overthrow the central position, and institute themselves in that position. Could one hypothesize, then, that the existence of a systematic political program enables (or forces) a group to migrate toward the centre of discourse, whereas a group whose basic precepts include the abolishment of a controlled and systematic program is destined to languish on the edges of social discourse? Would this latter group remain forceful and effective, or only be vocal and diffuse?

If history can be said to "prove" anything, it would seem that the group adhering to a program (taking into account the existence of splinter factions) has a fine chance of instituting itself in a position of power: the acceptance of Marxist ideology is a case in point. Surrealism can be said to have "succeeded" as an aesthetic force; however, this is not the place to discuss its impact on modern art as a whole.

After having disposed of his predecessors, Breton re-acknowledges his debts to Marx and Freud. Marx has designed

the only method of dealing with social issues, Freud, the only manner in which to deal with matters of the mind:

... aussi faux que toute entreprise d'explication sociale autre que celle de Marx est pour moi tout essai de défense et d'illustration d'une littérature et d'un art dits "prolétariens," à une époque où nul ne saurait se réclamer de la culture prolétarienne, pour l'excellente raison que cette culture n'a pu encore être réalisée.... (114)

Certes le surréalisme, que nous avons vu socialement adopter de propos délibéré la formule marxiste, n'entend pas faire bon marché de la critique freudienne des idées: tout au contraire il tient cette critique pour la première et pour la seule vraiment fondée. (118)

VI. The building of levels

On pages 118-119 of the Second manifeste one finds a series of enunciations which serve to illustrate the phenomenon of the different levels of speech acts in Manifesto (see above, page 90). The enunciations can be described as "directives"--those illocutionary acts which request or demand (see above, Chapter I, page 32). They include such statements as "le surréalisme demandé," "il exige que," and others.

These are illocutionary acts of the first level. They can be described according to Speech Act Theory in terms of their illocutionary status and position. Their product can be described in terms of second-level illocutionary acts, that is, by describing the aims of surrealism, Breton "makes manifest" the concepts of surrealism.

Surrealism itself can be seen as a third-level act of discovery. By employing surrealist methods, one can make manifest the workings of the inner mind:

... le surréalisme demande essentiellement à ceux-ci d'apporter à l'accomplissement de leur mission une conscience nouvelle, de faire en sorte de suppléer par une auto-observation qui présente une valeur exceptionnelle dans leur cas à ce que laisse d'insuffisant la pénétration des états d'âmes dits "artistiques" par des hommes qui ne sont pas artistes mais pour la plupart médecins. (119)

Surrealism behaves as Manifesto in two directions. On the one, a linguistic direction, it multiplies the levels on which man can explore his psyche. In writing a manifesto, Breton makes the aims of surrealism clear: they are to make the functioning of the mind manifest. In advocating the use of surrealist methods, considered marginal and unorthodox by the central discourse, Breton assures the continued functioning of surrealism as a marginal discourse. For once the methods of this group cease to be marginal, and migrate to the centre of discourse, they cease to be "surrealist." Institutionalization of the ideology advocated in the Manifestes du surréalisme causes not only the disintegration of discourse and meta-discourse, but of the ideology as well. In order to survive as a forceful movement, surrealism would have to remain forever marginal.

Notes to Chapter III

¹See Philippe Audoin, Les Surréalistes (Paris: Seuil, 1973); Anna Balakian, Surrealism, the Road to the Absolute (New York: Dutton, 1970); Michel Carrouges, André Breton et les données fondamentales du surréalisme (Paris: Gallimard, 1950); Serge Fauchereau, Expressionnisme, dada, surréalisme et autre ismes (Paris: Denoel, 1976); Wallace Fowlie, Age of Surrealism (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1950); Herbert S. Gershman, The Surrealist Revolution in France (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press: 1969); Maurice Nadeau, Histoire du surréalisme (Paris: Seuil, 1964); William S. Rubin, Dada, Surrealism and their Heritage (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1968).

²André Breton, Manifestes du surréalisme (Paris: Gallimard, n.d.[1962], p. 19. Subsequent references will be indicated in the text.

³J. H. Matthews, "Fifty Years Later. The Manifesto of Surrealism," Twentieth Century Literature XXI, 1 (Feb. 1975), p. 1.

⁴Robert Champigny, "Une définition du surréalisme," Pour une esthétique de l'essai (Paris: Lettres Modernes, 1967), pp. 7-28.

⁵Anna Balakian, "The Significance of the Surrealist Manifestoes," L'Esprit créateur, Vol. VI, No. 1 (Spring 1966), pp. 3-13.

⁶See Chapter I, n. 19.

⁷See Gershman (1969), pp. 80-116 ; Charles I. Glicksberg, "From Surrealism to Communism," The Literature of Commitment (Lewisberg: Bucknell University Press, 1976), pp. 150-162; Helena Fales Lewis, "The Politics of the French Surrealists, 1919-1945," Diss. NYU, 1972; J. H. Matthews, "Surrealism, politics and poetry," Mosaic, 3, 1 (Fall, 1969), pp. 1-13; Nadeau (1964); André Thirion, Révolutionnaires sans révolution (Paris: Laffont, 1972).

⁸Nadeau (1964), p. 127.

⁹Matthews (1969), p. 4.

¹⁰Matthews (1969), p. 4.

¹¹Lewis, p. 136.

CONCLUSION

Typology as pigeon-holing is a useless activity. However, typology as explication of strategies of writing and contracts of reading is essential for a reader's understanding of a text. The typology of Manifesto proposed in this study is logically preliminary to any other historical approach to The Communist Manifesto as the event which launched Communism, or the Manifestes du surréalisme as those texts which played a major role in the history of modern art. Therefore, this investigation is offered as that essential preliminary step. The different historical approaches to these texts are excluded in this study in order to make way for such a discursive analysis.

This investigation has also attempted to uncover other issues as well: the possibility of a generic model which could account for all potentialities of human communicative activity over social time; academic attention toward all areas of human communication; the recognizing of these areas as suitable objects of academic study.

Could it be argued, then, that all new ideas start out as discours-manifeste, only to migrate slowly to central positions of power in the spectrum of social discourse? As they move toward acceptance, it is their newness, their excitement,

their freshness that fade. Once again, a gap is left at the margins of discourse to be filled by new objects which, then, begin their own migration toward institutionalization.

The manifestoes discussed in this study display several interesting tendencies. In the instance of The Communist Manifesto, one can cite actual political institutions of its ideology, in whatever altered forms. From its marginal position, in the mid-19th century, its rallying cry, "Workers of all countries, unite!" has become in several locations in the world an institutionalized slogan. As I write, in the summer of 1981, the example of Poland comes to mind. This manifesto achieved its objective by means of its own disintegration as discourse and its being put into action.

The Manifestes du surréalisme display more peculiar tendencies. I cannot state, with all certainty, that it is solely the responsibility of surrealism as an aesthetic movement which caused the way in which art is viewed or practiced today. Surrealism was (is) one of many movements in the history of Western art which contributed to the state of modern art. However, as discourse, the Manifestes du surréalisme seem to have taken the route of integration as document; they are interesting phenomena for the researcher to examine. Segments of their ideology and artistic methods seem to have been incorporated into artistic and even literary production. As for surrealism as a method capable of having widespread political influence, that seems to have been a curiosity of Breton's own imagination.

Following the theoretical methods set out by Breton, it would seem that the disintegration of the discourse of surrealism (or its institutionalization as a method for action) implies the disintegration of any possibility of talking or writing about it. Surrealism is a doctrine which believes in no rational control over imaginative processes; meta-discursive activity is the manifestation of the critical capacities of the mind. The two activities seem mutually exclusive; they are antagonistic oppositions, if you will.

Another curious feature of surrealism concerns the phenomenon of its non-institutionalization, the transformations which occur when it moves toward central position of power. Surrealism is an ideology which must remain marginal. It must always cause shock and promote the fortuitous. As Breton explains in the Second Manifeste:

Nous la reconnaissons sans peine à cette prise de possession totale de notre esprit qui, de loin en loin, empêche que pour tout problème posé nous soyons le jouet d'une solution rationnelle plutôt que d'une autre solution rationnelle, à cette sorte de court-circuit qu'elle provoque entre une idée donnée et sa répondante (écrit par exemple). Tout comme dans le monde physique, le court-circuit se produit quand les deux "poles" de la machine se trouvent réunis par un conducteur de nulle ou trop faible. En poésie, en peinture, le surréalisme a fait l'impossible pour multiplier ces courts-circuits. (120)

Once surrealism moves toward an institutionalized or hegemonic position, it ceases to be surreal. Its disintegration of discourse causes its disintegration as ideology.

The Communist Manifesto and the Manifestes du surréalisme display several features of the definition suggested on

pages 61-62. Both are polemical; as described, both are marginal. Most importantly, both deal with the future in terms of the process required to attain it. The Communist Manifesto describes the process required for social revolution; the Manifestes du surréalisme explain a new imaginative process.

Much is absent from this study: the question of those manifestoes which have disappeared, having been neither recuperated as document nor institutionalized as ideology; the problem of Poetic Manifesto as such, that is, demonstrations, happenings, social phenomena. Perhaps these gaps will provide positions for further investigation into the edges of this field. As suggested by the title of this study, this is a preliminary model, a first step toward the elucidation of some of the many problems of Manifesto and other genres.

APPENDIX: Chronologies of surrealism

1. 1913-1947

Rubin, William S. Dada, Surrealism, and Their Heritage.
New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1977,
pp. 197-216.

2. 1916-1968

Gershman, Herbert S. The Surrealist Revolution in France.
Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1969,
pp. 138-169.

3. 1919-1969

Audoin, Philippe. Les Surréalistes. Paris: Seuil,
1973, pp. 176-185.

4. 1919-1972

Pierre, José. An Illustrated Dictionary of Surrealism.
Trans. W.-J. Strachan. London: Eyre Methuen,
1974, pp. 7-14.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Andréas, Bert. Le manifeste communiste de Marx et Engels; histoire et bibliographie, 1848-1918. Milano: Feltrinelli, 1963.

Breton, André. Manifestes du surréalisme. Ed. Jean-Jacques Pauvert. Paris: Gallimard, 1963.

_____. Manifestes du surréalisme; Poisson soluble. Paris: Editions Kra, n.d.

_____. Manifestoes of Surrealism. Trans. Richard Seaver and Helen R. Lane. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1977.

Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels. The Communist Manifesto. Penguin Books, 1967.

Laski, Harold Joseph. Harold J. Laski on the Communist Manifesto. An Introduction. New York: Pantheon, 1967.

Struik, Dirk J., ed. Birth of the Communist Manifesto. New York: International Publishers, 1971.

Secondary Sources

a) Theory of genre and of Manifesto

Abastado, Claude. "Introduction à l'analyse des manifestes." Littérature, No. 39 (Oct. 1980), pp. 3-11.

Angenot, Marc. Les champions des femmes: Examen du discours sur la supériorité des femmes 1400-1800. Montréal: Les Presses de l'Université du Québec, 1977.

_____. "La parole pamphlétaire." Etudes littéraires, 11, 2 (Août 1978), pp. 255-264.

_____. "Présumé, topos, idéologème." Etudes françaises, 13, 1-2 (Avril 1977), pp. 11-34.

Austin, J.L. How to Do Things with Words. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962.

Avril, Yves. "Le pamphlet: essai de définition et analyse de quelques-uns de ses procédés." Etudes littéraires, 11, 2 (Août 1978), pp. 265-281.

Bonenfant, Joseph. "La force illocutionnaire dans la situation de discours pamphlétaire." Etudes littéraires, 11, 2 (Août 1978), pp. 299-312.

Chouinard, Daniel. "Sur la préhistoire du manifeste littéraire." Etudes françaises, 16, 3-4 (Oct. 1980), pp. 21-30.

Demers, Jeanne. "Entre l'art poétique et le poème: le manifeste poétique ou la mort du père." Etudes françaises, 16, 3-4 (Oct. 1980), pp. 3-20.

Fanto, James A. "Speech Act Theory and its Application to Literature." The Sign: Semiotics Around the World, R. Bailey et al., eds. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications, 1978, pp. 280-304.

Filliolet, Jacques. "Le manifeste comme acte de discours: approches linguistiques." Littérature, No. 39 (Oct. 1980), pp. 23-28.

- Fish, Stanley E. "Normal Circumstances, Literal Language, Direct Speech Acts, the Ordinary, the Everyday, the Obvious, What Goes without Saying, and Other Special Cases." Critical Inquiry, 4 (Spring 1978), pp. 625-644.
- Forster, E.S., trans. Aristotle's Topica. London: William Heinemann, 1960.
- Genette, Gérard. Introduction à l'architexte. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1979.
- Gleize, Jean-Marie. "Manifestes, préfaces: sur quelques aspects du prescriptif." Littérature, No. 39 (Oct. 1980), pp. 12-16.
- Gray, Rockwell. "The Essay Tradition." Book Forum, Vol. 4, No. 3 (1979), pp. 541-545.
- Guillén, Claudio. "Literature as System." Literature as System: Essays toward the theory of literary history. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971, pp. 375-419.
- Hancher, Michael. "Beyond a Speech-Act Theory of Literary Discourse." MLN, Vol. 92, No. 5 (Dec. 1977), pp. 1081-98.
- Leroy, Claude. "La fabrique du lecteur dans les manifestes." Littérature, No. 39 (Oct. 1980), pp. 120-128.
- Meyer, Alain. "Le manifeste politique: modèle pur ou pratique impure?" Littérature, No. 39 (Oct. 1980), pp. 29-38.
- Pelletier, Anne-Marie. "Le paradoxe institutionnel du manifeste." Littérature, No. 39 (Oct. 1980), pp. 17-22.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. Toward a Speech Act Theory of Literary Discourse. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1977.
- Roberts, W. Rhys, trans. Aristotle's Rhetoric. New York: Random House, 1954.
- Searle, John R. Speech Acts. Cambridge University Press, 1969.
- Terrasse, Jean. Rhétorique de l'essai littéraire. Montréal: Les Presses de l'Université du Québec, 1977.
- Todorov, Tzvetan. "L'origine des genres." Les genres du discours. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1978, pp. 44-60.

Tredennick, Hugh, trans. Aristotle's Posterior Analytics.
London: William Heinemann, 1960.

Vignoux, Georges. "L'argumentation pamphléttaire: effets de sens, effets de pouvoir." Etudes littéraires, 11, 2 (Août 1978), pp. 283-297.

Weisstein, Ulrich. Comparative Literature and Literary Theory. William Riggan, trans. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1973.

Wellek, René and Austin Warren. Theory of Literature, 3rd ed. New York: Harcourt, 1962.

Yahalom, Shelly. "Constantes fonctionnelles de discours-manifeste." Littérature, No. 39 (Oct. 1980), pp. 111-119.

Zgorzelski, Andrzej. "Is Science Fiction a Genre of Fantastic Literature?" Science Fiction Studies, Vol. 6, Part 3 (Nov. 1979), pp. 296-303.

b) The Communist Manifesto

Angenot, Marc and Darko Suvin. "L'implicite du manifeste: métaphores et imagerie de la démystification dans le 'manifeste communiste.'" Etudes françaises, 16, 3-4 (Oct. 1980), pp. 43-67.

Hyman, Stanley Edgar. The Tangled Bank: Darwin, Marx and Freud as Imaginative Writers. New York: Atheneum, 1962.

Jenny, Laurent. "La stratégie de la forme." Poétique, 27 (1976), pp. 257-281.

Prawer, S.S. Karl Marx and World Literature. Oxford University Press, 1976.

c) The Manifestes du surréalisme

Balakian, Anna. "The Significance of the Surrealist Manifestoes." L'esprit créateur, 6 (1966), pp. 3-13.

Busi, Fredrick. "Hegel and the origins of Surrealism and the new left." Contemporary French Civilization, II (1977-78), pp. 379-403.

Champigny, Robert. "Une définition du surréalisme." Pour une esthétique de l'essai. Paris: Lettres Modernes, 1967, 7-28.

Décaudin, Michel. "Du symbolisme au surréalisme. Quelques repères." Cahier du XX^e siècle, IV (1975), pp. 65-77.

Decottignies, Jean. "L'oeuvre surréaliste et l'idéologie." Les critiques de notre temps et Breton. Marguerite Bonnet, ed. Paris: Garnier, 1974.

Fowlie, Wallace. "Breton: the manifestoes." Age of Surrealism. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1960, pp. 102-119.

Gershman, Herbert S. The Surrealist Revolution in France. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1969.

Glicksberg, Charles I. "From Surrealism to Communism." The Literature of Commitment. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1976, pp. 150-162.

Heistein, Josef. "La pensée littéraire de l'avant-garde: Du futurisme au premier manifeste de Breton." Beitrag zur Romanischen Philologie. Berlin XVI, 1977, pp. 79-82.

Isay, R. "La Guerre de 1914-1918 et le mouvement intellectuel et littéraire." La Revue des Deux Mondes. Paris: Mai-juin, 1965, pp. 390-403.

Kyria, Pierre. "Breton, la révolution et son temps." Magazine littéraire, 121 (Fev. 1977), pp. 71-72.

Lewis, Helena Fales. "The Politics of the French Surrealists, 1919-1945." Diss. NYU, 1972.

Matthews, J.H. "Fifty years later. The manifesto of Surrealism." Twentieth century literature XXI, 1 (Feb. 1975), pp. 1-9.

_____. "Surrealism, politics and poetry." Mosaic 3,1 (Fall, 1969), pp. 1-13.

Nadeau, Maurice. Histoire du surréalisme. Paris: Seuil, 1964.

Navarri, Roger. "Les surréalistes, l'écrivain et la révolution." Europe, 475-476 (Nov.-Dec. 1968), pp. 34-44.

Parenti, Claire. "Relire les manifestes." Magazine littéraire 91-92 (Sept. 1974), p. 19.

Terrasse, Jean. "Les manifestes surréalistes." Rhétorique de l'essai littéraire. Montréal: Les Presses de l'Université du Québec, 1977, pp. 87-101.

Reference Works

a) Communism, Marxism

Althusser, Louis. For Marx. Trans. Ben Brewster. London: Verso, 1977.

_____. Pour Marx. Paris: F. Maspero, 1967.

Baby, Jean. Un monde meilleur: recherche marxiste. Paris: F. Maspero, 1973.

Barjonet, André. Initiation au marxisme. Paris: Etudes Universitaires, 1973.

Bloch, Ernst. On Karl Marx. Trans. John Maxwell. New York: Herder and Herder, 1971.

Burns, Emile. An Introduction to Marxism. New York: International Publishers, 1966.

De Koster, Lester. Vocabulary of Communism. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1964.

Fetscher, Iring. Marx and Marxism. New York: Herder and Herder, 1971.

Laclau, Ernesto. Politics and Ideology in Marxist Theory: capitalism, fascism, populism. London: Verso, 1979.

Lukács, Gyorgy. Histoire et conscience de classe: essais de dialectique marxiste. Trans. Kostas Axelos et Jacqueline Bois. Paris: Les éditions de minuit, 1960.

_____. History and Class Consciousness: studies in Marxist dialectics. Trans. Rodney Livingstone. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1971.

Shadwell, Arthur. The Socialist Movement, 1824-1924: its origin and meaning, progress and prospects. London: P. Allen, 1925.

Stockhammer, Morris. Karl Marx Dictionary. New York: Philosophical Library, 1965.

Swingewood, Alan. Marx and Modern Social Theory. London: Macmillan, 1975.

b) Surrealism

Audoin, Philippe. Les Surréalistes. Paris: Seuil, 1973.

Balakian, Anna. Surrealism, the Road to the Absolute. New York: Dutton, 1970.

Breton, André. Entretiens, 1913-1952. Paris: Gallimard, 1973.

_____. Position politique du surréalisme. Paris: Denoel, 1972.

Carrouges, Michel. André Breton et les données fondamentales du surréalisme. Paris: Gallimard, 1950.

Caws, Mary Ann, ed. Le manifeste et le caché: Langages surréalistes et autres. Paris: Lettres modernes, 1974.

Fauchereau, Serge. Expressionnisme, dada, surréalisme et autres ismes. Paris: Denoel, 1976.

Fowler, Wallace. Age of Surrealism. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1960.

Jean, Marcel. Autobiographie du surréalisme. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1978.

Mitchell, Bonner. Les manifestes littéraires de la Belle Epoque (1886-1914): Anthologie critique. Paris, 1966.

Pierre, José. An Illustrated Dictionary of Surrealism. Trans. W.-J. Strachan. London: Eyre Methuen, 1974.

Rubin, William S. Dada, Surrealism, and Their Heritage. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1977.

Thirion, André. Révolutionnaires sans révolution. Paris: Laffont, 1972.