The Difference between a Shooting and an Armed Woman

Representations of Louise Michel's Militancy in Contemporary French Biographical Portraits

Teresa Hiergeist

1. Faces of the Paris Commune

The year is 1871. In the aftermath of Paris' occupation through Prussian troops, the French government has surrendered into signing its own capitulation; resulting in a significant loss of territory and high reparation payments (Merriman 2014: 32). Demilitarization had just begun, when on 18th March radical left groupings took it upon themselves to pillage some cannons deployed within the city; attacking the army and forcing Napoleon III and his advisors to retreat to Versailles (Münchhausen 2002: 149). A Vigilance Committee is established for the purpose of restructuring public life in accordance to radical democratic principles: Political participation shall be possible for everybody, which is why public affairs are discussed in general assemblies, class boundaries shall disappear, and owners ought to be expropriated and factories collectivized (Grams 2014: 40). This alternative form of society lasts 72 days, before being overthrown by Versailles troops in a one-week bloody civil war; leading to the proclamation of the 3rd Republic (Sageman 2017: 149).

For a long time there was barely any room for this revolutionary intermezzo within the French collective memory: After its suppression the Commune is rather demonized and tabooed in the official discourse, it is ostracized as collective madness due to the context of war – an atrocity of degenerated extremists that must not be repeated (Godineau 2015: 126);[1] only communist, socialist and anarchist groups planning a similar subversion (e.g. Lenin organizing the Russian October Revolution in 1917, the seamen of Kronstadt in the Ukraine revolting against Bolshevism, the leftist Spaniards seeing the civil war 1936–39 as opportunity for a political turn)

1 This discursive marginalization is on the one hand due to the skepticism towards leftist projects of society, on the other hand to the experience of collective trauma provoked by the very visible massive killing that took place in the immediate proximity (Brown 2018: 216).

refer affirmatively to it (Grams 2014: 82–88; Winock 1971: 974). It is only since the fall of the Iron Curtain, since the specter of a ›communist (world) revolution‹ has waned, that the alterization of Paris' Commune within political and media debates has somewhat subsided (Fournier 2013: 13). Paradoxically, the longer it lies back, the more present it is in journals, TV, and the Internet and recently even its instrumentalization for commemorative intentions can be observed. By the 1960s it was not remembered officially with an anniversary, archived material about the period was destroyed and it was rarely mentioned in history schoolbooks (Varley 2021: 240). Today it has become a site of memory: On its 150th anniversary in 2021, many reports and special issues dedicated to the Commune appear in the media, sometimes acquiring a nostalgic tone. Numerous historical novels and comics are released and even T-shirts and souvenirs are sold (Huppe/Saint-Amand 2021: 3). Measures such as the introduction of free, compulsory, secular school or the opening of crèches; controversial achievements of the 3rd Republic, are now steadily attributed to it (Ross 2016: 395). The Commune has arrived at the center of society (Hiergeist/Loy 2021: 9).

A person that embodies this discursive shift impressively, is Louise Michel, a Parisian primary school teacher, voluntary social worker, feminist and key figure of anarchist clubs of the time (Aubrun 2017: 50–53). She supports the Commune from the very beginning, is elected member of its administrative organization, the Vigilance Committee, takes part in the medical care of wounded soldiers (Stone 2020: 58–59), fights armed on the barricades (Gullickson 2014: 843) and is sent into exile in New Caledonia after the suppression, where she is subjected to forced labor until the amnesty in 1880 (Winock 2001: 535). In the period following 1871 she is often denounced in public debate as a dangerous terrorist and hysterical criminal; the bill of indictment, for instance, calls her a demagogue and warmonger, a »wolf greedy for blood« whose »infernal machinations« are to blame for the death of many persons (Michel 2014: 415).[2] However, in the context of the recent boom of memory she has become a sort-of role model, is celebrated in media (optionally as republican, feminist, humanist, federalist or anti-colonialist hero) and was even pantheonized by François Hollande in 2013 (Verhaeghe 2016: 7, 592, 598). This article traces the transformation of Louise Michel from public enemy to a representative figure of French history, it carves the discursive constructions of this process and in particular deals with her active role as a soldier in combat. Therefore, it begins with the reconstruction of the stereotype of Louise Michel as shooting woman; in order to then subsequently contrast it with different representations of her within three recently published biographical works.[3] The aim is to gain an insight into the specificities of the commemoration of women's violence.

2 »louve avide de sang«, »machinations infernales« (translation T.H.).

3 The biographical portrait is chosen, because it is a popular genre that ideally interlinks social and individual events in an objective and coherent way and is therefore predestined to satisfy

2. The Stereotype of Louise Michel as »a Shooting Woman«

Louise Michel is known in France as the woman, who fought on the barricades during the Paris Commune. This topos makes it difficult to determine the factual degree of her armed engagement, as almost all historical documents about her are ideologically motivated and distorted in one way or another or turn out to be retroactive constructions. It is indisputable that Louise Michel was a highly active anarchist. She joined political debates almost every day (Casey 2015: 163), wrote numerous propagandistic texts and poems (Verhaeghe 2021: 4), took part in demonstrations against the government (Gullickson 2014: 837–852), called for strikes and at times has even been said to have had an assassination attempt in mind surrounding Napoleon III (Aubrun 2017: 57). During the occupation and the Commune, she was not only involved in humanitarian efforts (she accepted the children of refugees in her school, provided their families with food and clothes and cared for the wounded), but also in military operations; presiding over the Women's Vigilance Committee, that – among other things – debated combat strategy. She was sometimes seen wearing the uniform of the National Guard[4] and joined in in street battles (Kilian 2008: 152).

Imposing a radical democracy through violence seems to have been a matter of course for her. When she thematizes the years around 1871 in her *Mémoires*, her militant language pervaded by battle songs (Michel 2015: 109) and war metaphors (she speaks about »the supreme fight« and cries for »vengeance« (Michel 1981: 142, 87) and idealizing a fundamental subversion (Hart 2004: 170; Zékian 2015: 1112) (»my north, where my compass finally pointed, was the Revolution«, »I was consecrated to the Revolution, and it was true. All of us were its fanatics« (Michel 1981: 9)[5]) is striking. There is no bad conscience and no shame linked with the explicit promise to intransigently get conservative and bourgeois opponents out of the way, quite the contrary: »Don't make me out to be better than I am – or than you are. I am capable of anything, love, or hate, as you are« (ibid.: 197).[6] Precisely because she is a woman, this is stressed elsewhere, Louise Michel considers herself particularly appropriate for an uncompromising armed battle:

> A supposedly weak woman knows better than any man how to say: »It must be done.« She may feel ripped open to her very womb, but she remains unmoved.

---

the demand for the confrontation with the own history, that is characteristic for the heritage-boom since the 2000s in a productive way (Korte/Paletschek 2009: 10–14).

4 According to her autobiography, she used different soldier uniforms in order to bypass the roadblocks flexibly (Michel 2015: 107).

5 »[L]e nord, c'était la Révolution«, »j'étais dévote de la Révolution. C'était vrai! n'en étions-nous pas tous fanatiques?« (Michel 2015: 55).

6 »Vous le voyez bien, amis, je suis capable de tout, amour ou haine; ne me faites pas meilleure que je ne suis, et que vous ne l'êtes!« (Michel 2015: 109).

> Without hate, without anger, without pity for herself or others, whether her heart bleeds or not, she can say, »It must be done.« such were the women of the Commune (ibid.: 67).[7]

Two things may have influenced Louise Michel in her self-representation as a radical fighter: Firstly, the fact that she had already become a leftist legend in lifetime and wanted to motivate her companions through her determined example, and secondly, the fact that the struggle for gender equality was a lifelong central concern for her (Aubrun 2017: 57). By showcasing her intrepidity on the barricades she hoped to offer unmistakable proof of the aptitude of women for politics and, thereby, blow up the limitations of the patriarchal society – also with a view to the imminent new form of society.[8] Her description concerning the cooperation of the two Vigilance Committees is, accordingly, utopian:

> I was always at the men's [committee], because its members included some Russian revolutionaries. […] I belonged to both committees, and the leanings of the two groups were the same. Sometime in the future the women's committee should have its own history told. Or perhaps the two should be mingled, because people didn't worry about which sex they were before they did their duty. (Michel 1981: 58)[9]

The smooth cooperation between men and women evoked here is questioned by the existence of two separate committees and by the historical testimonies of male soldiers of the Commune who were perplexed to find women massively rising to speak in political debates and claiming to take part in the combats (Geber 2013: 120).[10] In their opinion, they should take care of the wounded, supply them with water, food

---

7 »La femme, cette prétendue faible de cœur, sait plus que l'homme dire: Il le faut! Elle se sent déchirer jusqu'aux entrailles, mais elle reste impassible. Sans haine, sans colère, sans pitié pour elle-même ni pour les autres, il le faut, que le cœur saigne ou non. Ainsi furent les femmes de la Commune« (Michel 2015: 107).

8 Accordingly, she uses a militant rhetoric to bring up the hierarchy between men and women calling out the lack of women's education with strategical disarmament: »Jamais je n'ai compris qu'il y eût un sexe pour lequel on cherchât a atrophier l'intelligence comme s'il y en avait trop dans la race. Les filles, élevées dans la niaiserie, sont *désarmées* tout exprès pour être mieux trompées: c'est cela qu'on veut. C'est absolument comme si on vous jetait à l'eau après vous avoir *défendu* d'apprendre à nager, ou même lié les membres« (Michel 2015: 69, emphasis added).

9 »[J]'étais toujours à celui des hommes, parce que ceux-là tenaient des révolutionnaires russes. […] [J]e continuais d'appartenir aux deux comités dont les tendances étaient les mêmes. Celui des femmes aussi aura son histoire, peut-être seront-elles mêlées, car on ne s'inquiétait guère à quel sexe on appartenait pour faire son devoir« (Michel 2015: 102).

10 Some of them were even against the voting right or other forms of political participation for women (Boime 1995: 165).

and munition, but preferably not carry and use weapons (Hart 2004). Women should be allowed to participate in the new society, but that was not to say that all male domains should be right open for them. Regarding this background, Louise Michel's self-representation as a soldier is part of her feminist concerns.

Aside from herself, French media and politics at that time were also very interested in the accentuation of her militancy. Following the Commune's passing, elites sought out to set themselves distinctly apart from it and the violence priorly exercised by communards was scandalized systematically (Merriman 2014: 60–63). Thus, Louise Michel's portrait appears in Cesare Lombroso's studies about revolutionary and political criminals, whereby a complete lack of morals is attested to her physiognomy (Verhaeghe 2018: 12–15). Others proclaim her mentally ill, arguing from a psychoanalytical viewpoint that her frustration about her unmarried and childless state had veered into political radicalism (Gullickson 2014: 845). It is inherently her sex that makes Louise Michel a predestined example of the undesirable Other, because it permits to kill two birds with one stone: Since back then, the conception of a female's tendency to moral weakness, criminality and psychopathology was widely spread, her stylization as an icon of the Commune permitted both to devaluate left-wing radicalism as erroneous and illogical and to stoke fears of the entry of women into the political field (Krakovitch 1997: 521–523).[11] It was particularly this discursive link with political and social power interests that has promoted Louise Michel's stereotyping as an armed fighter within collective imagination.

3. Contemporary Representations of Louise Michel as »an Armed Woman«

During the transformation of the commemoration of the Paris Commune within French contemporary culture – mentioned in the beginning; a significant contrast to this stereotype can be observed, as Louise Michel's armed engagement is increasingly tabooed. This will be exemplified by the analysis of three biographical portraits published since the year 2000, *George et Louise* (2000/2002), *Le temps des cerises* (2006)

11 Likewise, women having fought during the Commune, were brought to court more rarely than their male combatants and the tribunals judged them relatively mildly on the grounds that they were not fully responsible. Only the most revolutionary and active among them were condemned, invisibilizing their political engagement (Krakovitch 1997: 523). This also applies for Louise Michel who is sentenced to deportation, although she required her execution in court several times, because she wants to give her life for the revolution like her mal companions (Verhaeghe 2016: 194–195).

and *Louise Michel. Non à l'exploitation* (2014).[12] The first text is a commemorative novel for adults, both other two narrations are addressed to juvenile readers and their history teachers.[13]

3.1 Louise Michel's Republicanization in *Georges et Louise*

Michel Ragon's *Georges et Louise* outlines Louise Michel's complete life story, her participation in the labor movement, her fight during the Paris Commune, her captivity in the New Caledonian penal colony, her return to France and her exile to London. The basic idea of the text is – as its title indicates – to show her life in intellectual and emotional relation to the prime minister of the 3rd Republic, Georges Clemenceau, putting her into direct moral conflict regarding the republican value system. She is portrayed in an exclusively positive, and sometimes even heroic manner; as a responsible citizen standing up for workers' rights and speaking out against impartial tribunals. When she passes out bread to the poor, helps marginalized women to become emancipated, when she is wrongfully[14] arrested and condemned because of unjust laws;[15] she embodies – so to speak – equality and fraternity and appeals to the representative democratic readers' sympathies. This culminates at the end of the text showing her funeral: The 2000 guests, the present politicians and the police escort do not present her as member of a destructive splinter group but rather make her out to being a national hero situated at the center of society.[16]

Regarding the representation of violence, *Georges et Louise* opts for a trivializing strategy. Louise's executions of reactionaries during the Commune are mentioned very briefly and stylized as acts of mercy à la Robin Hood. It is commented: »To prevent the killing, she killed…« (Ragon 2002: 27). Also, it is stressed that she supposedly rushed to help anyone she had wounded and provided medical care (Ragon 2002: 27).

---

12 Since the effects of the changes in the commemorative culture on the representation of female violence are examined here, texts having a determined memorial intention have been chosen for the analysis.

13 Both narrations are followed by an annex that gives an overview about the historical facts, biographical references, and other auxiliary material.

14 According to the text, Louise Michel is innocently accused, because she has supported the robbery of bread in a bakery and is sent to jail for five years after a not very objective investigation and a tendentious process (Ragon 2002: 100).

15 It is said that the *lois scélérates*, the laws adopted in 1893 and 1894 in reaction to a serie of anarchist assassinations are »laws to suppress the anarchist and labor activity« or that »the London congress made an anarchist out of me« (»lois pour reprimer l'agitation anarchiste et syndicale« (Ragon 2002: 156), »le congrès parlementaire de Londres m'aurait fait anarchiste« (ibid.: 176).

16 It is underlined several times that socialists and anarchists of that time have not been so different, having followed the same intentions and having suffered the same repressions (Ragon 2002: 129, 176).

The fact that Louise sympathizes with anarchist terrorists is mentioned, but directly relativized: »She idealizes the French anarchists, but at the same time she admits to adoring Queen Victoria of England« (Ragon 2002: 162), making her extremist attitudes appear rather accidental and less serious.[17] The intention of republicanization is so central, that it replaces her militancy completely.

3.2 Louise Michel's Goes Bourgeois in *Le temps des cerises*

Le temps des cerises. Journal de Mathilde (1870–1871), written by Christine Féret-Fleury, is part of the Gallimard collection *folio junior: mon histoire*, which presents biographies of both real and fictitious famous women at different points in world history. When Louise Michel is given a place next to canonical personalities such as Catherine de Medici, Catherine II of Russia, Empress Elisabeth of Austria and the wife of Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, this is only accurate; primarily appearing in the charitable role of a teacher and children's nurse. Her life story is told in diary form from the perspective of the orphan child Mathilde, who is beaten, robbed, exploited, and disdained by her environment, before Louise gets her off the street, gives her shelter, food and clothes, and jollies and alphabetizes her. This act of kindness has resolute priority over Michel's political engagement. She, for example, puts off a planned revolutionary attempt, when Mathilde – who is significantly a little bit agoraphobic – faints during a demonstration (Féret-Fleury 2021: 11–12). Other moments also show her in no hurry to overturn the system with her maintaining: »There will be other occasions« (ibid.: 83).[18]

Louise is characterized as »good, generous, formed« (ibid.: 138),[19] she could have had a ›fulfilled life as a woman‹ if not for her most striking quality, her tendency to self-sacrifice – which she proves in many direct speeches: »Tidy myself up? Take care of myself? Sew a braid to my hat? While the people are suffering, hungry and groan under the oppression? […] I do not have time for that« (ibid.: 13).[20] These attributions and declarations may make clear that Louise is adapted to a bourgeois value system, whereby she is dissociated from the economic middle-class presented as superficial and egotistical, gravitating towards the more humane, informed and educated middle-class.[21] At this, she acts in concert with the members of the Bernard family, that out of charity gives free singing lessons to Mathilde, before they flee Paris during its

17 In the text, Louise is not a doer, but rather the static embodiment of republican values, particularly as her portrait is more a report than a narration.

18 »Il y aura d'autres occasions«.

19 »bonne, généreuse, instruite«.

20 »M'arranger? Prendre soin de moi? Coudre une garniture à mon chapeau? Alors que le peuple souffre, qu'il a faim, qu'il gémit sous l'oppression? […] [J]e n'ai pas le temps«.

21 This bourgeoisification matches with the diary form, which is a genre of the bourgeois culture, the plot, which tells the salvation of a destitute working-class girl by education and so-

occupation, and even offer to adopt her. Thus, the narration instrumentalizes Louise Michel – following the tradition of the social novels of the 19th century –[22] to celebrate the virtues of the bourgeoisie.

But what about the compatibility between this representation and her stereotype of the armed soldier? The fact that Louise carries a gun during the occupation and the Commune, is explained by the novel as to being a requirement during the war situation at that time and a part of nationalist civic duties, after all, Paris is encircled by hostile Prussians (Féret-Fleury 2021: 99), and Louise stresses: »I will only use it to defend myself« (ibid.: 126).[23] She carries a weapon, without using it.[24] Consequently, there is no moral problem, when Mathilde begins to follow her example: giving soup to the soldiers (ibid.: 127), transporting the wounded to medical facilities, handing the gun of a killed soldier over to a fit one. These altruistic activities form the humanistic opposite pole to martial killing, which is presented as an unwanted exterior fatality. The battles of the Commune are only mentioned figuratively, when – in a letter to her friend Clara Bernhard – Mathilde states:

> I have discovered how elevating it can be to fight so that the children who will be born tomorrow will not suffer what I have suffered, hunger, cold, ignorance, dirt, shame… I have discovered the generosity of the people of this district, I have found friends. I have the impression to be useful – a little bit. (ibid.: 125–126)[25]

In this light, it comes as no surprise that Louise's arrest and banishment appear extremely unfair to Mathilde.[26] She sees her as victim of a malicious system, that tramples over the value of the philanthropic self-sacrifice. This simple dichotomy between good and bad obviously leads to the fact that the reflexive figure – and with

---

cial advancement and with the accentuation of the regular contact that Louise maintained with Victor Hugo and George Sand, representants of the bourgeois literary canon.

22 Among the characteristics of the social novel rank the representation of the living circumstances of the poorer sections of the population from a bourgeois perspective, whereby the ›poor‹ are determined in their actions by adverse circumstances and middle-class heroes happen to appear, who free them from these adversities in a spirit of charity (Wolfzettel 1981: 4–12).

23 »Je ne m'en servirai que pour me défendre«.

24 Louise Michel is presented on the cover of the book according to the stereotype with a gun. However it is more an aesthetic accessory but a practical tool. Moreover Louise is placed in the background, while Mathilde in the foreground is shown with a hand put on her cardiac region.

25 »J'ai découvert combien il peut être exaltant de lutter pour que les enfants qui vont naître demain ne souffrent pas ce que j'ai souffert, la faim, le froid, l'ignorance, la crasse, la honte… J'ai découvert la générosité des gens de ce quartier, j'y ai trouvé des amis. J'ai l'impression d'être utile – un peu«.

26 Though the narrator is a child, there are no further hints in the texts that suggest an unreliable narration.

her possibly also the readers – praises Louise and decides to entirely assume the mission had begun by her determination to improve the living conditions of the poor. The novel ends emphatically with the diary entry of December 24: »Miss Louise will come back – I want to believe it. One day, I will be an elementary teacher« (ibid.: 143).[27] Altogether, *Le temps des cerises* confines Louise Michel being, to nothing more than a middle-class moral code and a Christian salvation discourse; defusing her actual postures in many ways.

3.3 Louise Michel's Privatization in *Louise Michel. Non à l'exploitation*

Also Gérard Dhôtel's *Louise Michel. Non à l'exploitation*, a portrait published by *Actes Sud junior* in the collection *Ceux qui ont dit non*, where life stories of politicians, artists and freedom fighters committed to civil society are told, shifts away from the image of the armed soldier. The biography of Louise Michel is narrated from journalist Eugène Berton's point of view, who encounters her, while reporting for the conservative journal *L'instransigeant* – a process against her in 1883, condemning her to perennial imprisonment for having incited several persons to steal bread from a bakery. The text focusses on the personal contact with Louise, in attempt to disavow existing clichés. Contrary to her public image as a »dangerous agitator and ringleader« he perceives her – as he states on the first pages – as »in the first place, a pleasant woman, with a soft voice and eyes that sparkle with intelligence. I was under the spell. The so much feared violent anarchist had seduced me« (Dhôtel 2014, 13).[28] The amorous discourse (presented by the description of her physique and character and the isotopy of eroticism) refutes the atrocity of Louise and even transforms it into a vehicle of passion, since love draws her strength from the integration of spectacular contradictions – in this case the conservative bourgeois and the rebellious radical.[29] This enamored, fascinated gaze of the contemporary, is continued throughout the text. Eugène is not able to free himself from Louise, he follows her activities, arranges certainly sporadic but nonetheless intentional meetings with her at public speeches or in cafés, always presenting her with wordy excuses for not having contacted her more often without there being any signs that she would even have noticed it. Despite their ostensible naivety, both male gaze and male narration form gestures of control objectivizing Louise.

27 »Mlle Louise reviendra – je veux le croire. Un jour, je serai institutrice«.

28 »dangeureuse agitatrice et meneuse«, »femme à l'abord sympathique, à la voix douce, aux yeux pétillants d'intelligence. J'étais sous le charme. La violente anarchiste tant redoutée m'avait séduit«.

29 According to Niklas Luhmann, the incompatibility promotes the cohesive potential of love since the epoch of romanticism (Luhmann 1994: 172–188).

This correlates to the fact that the qualities that Eugène highlights in his portrait belong to a set of common female attributions within patriarchal societies: he explains her constant rebellion against social inequality based on her exorbitant empathy, which in a way forces her to stand up for the marginalized (Dhôtel 2014: 28–29, 60). Her decision making comes from the heart and not the head; giving them an individual and momentary dimension and making them appear less social and universal. Furthermore, it is insinuated that Louise's love for anarchist Théophile Ferré had been crucial for her participation in the battles of the Commune,[30] whereby it is set out at large, how much she misses him after his death while in New Caledonian exile (ibid.: 44–46). This superiority of the sentimental over the political is also expressed by the framing of the meetings with Louise: They are confidential conversations tête-à-tête conducted in cafés (ibid.: 67).

It goes without saying that Louise Michel's militant engagement during the Commune is difficult to connect to this arrangement. Accordingly, the narration of the events of 1871 is kept extremely short: »Louise battles with her comrades of the Vigilance Committee of Montmartre. They see her, a gun in her hand, at the fortification of Issy, at the barricade of Clignancourt street. She takes care of the wounded, because she is also a nurse« (ibid.: 17).[31] In this sentence, Louise is only holding the gun, she does not use it, but still, the credibility of the image of the armed woman is mitigated additionally by »they see her« – quite contrary to her caring for the disabled soldier, who is easily remembered occupying the last position. Insofar the integration of Louise Michel in a heterosexual narration of courtly love puts attention on her sex, privatizes and devaluates her political engagement and marginalizes her armed activity.

4. Conclusion

Over the past years the commemorative practice – with respect to the Paris Commune – has changed, resulting in a tendency becoming perceptible in which Louise Michel is integrated more and more discursively into French national history. Linked to this approximation to the societal center her biography is not only republicanized, rendered bourgeois, and privatized in contemporary biographical portraits (for children), but also adapted to patriarchal gender roles, whereby the contradictions to her anarchist and feminist attitudes, that arise in this context,

30 This sexualization is a constant factor in the representation of Louise Michel (Marmo Mullaney 1990: 307).

31 »Louise se bat avec ses camarades du Comité de vigilance de Montmartre. On la voit, fusil à la main, au fort d'Issy, à la barricade de la chaussée de Clignancourt. Elle soigne les blessés car elle est aussi ambulancière«.

are neglected. The biggest challenge in that respect represents the topos of Louise Michel as an armed soldier during the Paris Commune, highly present in the social imaginary since 1871. By presenting the Commune as a singular episode of her multifaceted life and by downgrading Louise Michel from a shooting to a gun-carrying woman, her radical character is smoothed. Thus, Louise Michel's commemorative rehabilitation mirrors rather nationalist and economic goals and in many ways corresponds to the discursive stigmatization that took place following the Commune. The fact that the analyzed texts predominantly refer to biographies and historical researches about Louise Michel in a more affirmative and less reflexive way, thereby reenacting circulating clichés, furthermore underlines prior statement.

Works Cited

Aubrun, Dominique (2017): »Comment Louise Michel est-elle devenue Louise Michel?«, in: Dominique Bréchemier/Nicole Laval-Turpin (eds.), De George Sand à Louise Michel. Combats politiques, littéraires et féministes (1815–1870), Paris: L'Harmattan, pp. 43–62.

Boime, Albert (1995): Art and the French Commune. Imagining Paris after War and Revolution, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Brown, Howard G. (2018): Mass Violence and the Self. From the French Wars of Religion to the Paris Commune, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Dhôtel, Gérard (2014): Louise Michel. Non à l'exploitation, Arles: Actes Sud.

Féret-Fleury, Christine (2021): Le temps des cerises. Journal de Mathilde (1870–1871), Paris: Gallimard.

Fournier, Éric (2013): La commune n'est pas morte. Les usages politiques du passé de 1871 à nos jours, Paris: Libertalia.

Geber, Eva (2013): »Louise Michel – Bitten wir nicht um unsere Rechte, nehmen wir sie uns«, in: Eva Geber (ed.), Der Typus der kämpfenden Frau. Frauen schreiben über Frauen in der Arbeiterzeitung von 1900–1933, Vienna: Mandelbaum, pp. 119–127.

Godineau, Laure (2015): »Elle n'est pas morte. Quand dire c'est faire. Écrire et continuer la Commune de Paris dans les années 1880«, in: Quentin Deluermoz/Anthony Glinoer (eds.), L'Insurrection entre histoire et littérature (1789–1914), Paris: Éditions de la Sorbonne, pp. 125–137.

Grams, Florian (2014): Die Pariser Kommune, Cologne: Pappy Rosa.

Gullickson, Gay L. (2014): »Militant Women. Representations of Charlotte Corday, Louise Michel and Emmeline Pankhurst«, in: Women's History Review 23.5, pp. 837–852.

Harison, Casey (2015): »Louise Michel, the Paris Commune, and Icaria. Europe's Social Question and the Legacy of French Communalism«, in: Communal Societies 35.2, pp. 159–184.

Hart, Kathleen (2004): Revolution and Women's Autobiography in Nineteenth-Century France, Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Hiergeist, Teresa/Loy, Benjamin (2021): »Spectres de l'insurrection. Les 150 ans de la Commune de Paris«, in: Lendemains 181, pp. 5–18.

Huppe, Justine/Saint-Amand, Denis (2021): »1871-2021. De la mémoire des barricades aux imaginaires inflammables«, in: Contextes. Revue de sociologie de la littérature 30, online.

Kilian, Michaela (2008): Keine Freiheit ohne Gleichheit! Louise Michel, Anarchistin, Schriftstellerin, Ethnologin, libertäre Pädagogin, Lich: Edition AV.

Korte, Barbara/Paletschek, Sylvia (2009): »Geschichte in populären Medien und Genres. Vom historische Roman zum Computerspiel«, in: Barbara Korte/Sylvia Paletschek (eds.), History Goes Pop. Zur Repräsentation von Geschichte in populären Medien und Genres, Bielefeld: transcript, pp. 9–60.

Krakovitch, Odile (April-June 1997): »Violence des communardes. Une mémoire à réviviter«, in: Revue historique 602, pp. 521–532.

Kristin, Ross (2016): »Die Pariser Kommune – jenseits des »zellenartigen Regimes der Nationalität«, in: Historische Anthropologie 24.3, pp. 376–395.

Lidsky, Paul (1970): Les écrivains contre la Commune, Paris: François Maspero.

Luhmann, Niklas (1994): Liebe als Passion. Zur Codierung von Intimität, Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.

Marmo Mullaney, Marie (1990): »Sexual Politics in the Career and Legend of Louise Michel«, in: Signs. Journal of Women in Culture and Society 15.2, pp. 300–322.

Merriman, John M. (2014): Massacre. The Life and Death of the Paris Commune of 1871, Yale: University Press.

Michel, Louise (1981): The Red Virign. Memoirs of Louise Michel, Alabama: University Press.

Michel, Louise (2015): Mémoires de Louise Michel écrits par elle-même, North Charleston: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform.

Münchhausen, Thankmar von (2002): 72 Tage. Die Pariser Kommune 1871 – die erste »Diktatur des Proletariats«, Munich: DVA.

Ragon, Michel (2002): Georges et Louise, Paris: Livre de poche.

Sageman, Marc (2017): Turning to Political Violence. The Emergence of Terrorism, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Stone, Steve J. (2020): Women of Liberty, Leiden: Brill.

Varley, Karine (2021): »Memories not yet Formed. Commemorating the Franco-Prussian War and the Paris Commune«, in: Journal of War & Culture Studies 14.3, pp. 231–250.

Verhaeghe, Sidonie (2016): De la Commune de Paris au Panthéon (1871–2013). Célébrité, postérité et mémoires de Louise Michel. Dissertation, Lille.

Verhaeghe, Sidonie (2018): »La jeunesse de Louise Michel: enjeux politiques des récits sur les origines d'une révolutionnaire«, in: crimino Corpus 9, online.

Verhaeghe, Sidonie (2021): »Faut-il encore appeler Louise Michel la Vierge rouge?«, in: Cahiers d'Histoire. Revue d'histoire critique 148, online.

Winock, Michael (2001): Les voix de la liberté. Les écrivains engagés au XIX^{e} siècle, Paris: Seuil.

Winock, Michael (December 1971): »La Commune (1871–1971)«, in: Esprit 409.12, pp. 965–1014.

Wolfzettel, Friedrich (1981): »Historischer Abriss und Forschungsgeschichte«, in: Friedrich Wolfzettel (ed.), Der französische Sozialroman im 19. Jahrhundert, Darmstadt: WBG, pp. 1–25.

Zékian, Stéphane (2015): »Roman, oralité, incorrection. Louise Michel et l'écriture de l'insurrection«, in: Quentin Deluermoz/Anthony Glinoer (eds.), L'insurrection entre histoire et littérature (1789–1914), Paris: Éditions de la Sorbonne, pp. 107–124.