

Cambridge University Press
052155117X - Reflections on Violence
Georges Sorel
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Sorel: Reflections on Violence

Georges Sorel's *Reflections on Violence* is one of the most controversial books of the twentieth century: J. B. Priestley argued that if one could grasp why a retired civil servant had written such a book then the modern age could be understood. It heralded the political turmoil of the decades that were to follow its publication and provided inspiration for Marxists and Fascists alike. Developing the ideas of violence, myth and the general strike, Sorel celebrates the heroic action of the proletariat as a means of saving the modern world from decadence and of reinvigorating the capitalist spirit of a timid bourgeoisie. This new edition of Sorel's classic text is accompanied by an editor's introduction by Jeremy Jennings, a leading scholar in political thought, both setting the work in its context and explaining its major themes. A chronology of Sorel's life and a list of further reading are included.

JEREMY JENNINGS is professor of political theory at the University of Birmingham. He is the author or editor of numerous books and articles, including *Georges Sorel: The Character and Development of his Thought* (1985), *Syndicalism in France: A Study of Ideas* (1990) and *Intellectuals in Politics* (1997).

Cambridge University Press
052155117X - Reflections on Violence
Georges Sorel
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

CAMBRIDGE TEXTS IN THE
HISTORY OF POLITICAL THOUGHT

Series editors

RAYMOND GEUSS

Reader in Philosophy, University of Cambridge

QUENTIN SKINNER

Regius Professor of Modern History, University of Cambridge

Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought is now firmly established as the major student textbook series in political theory. It aims to make available to students all the most important texts in the history of Western political thought, from ancient Greece to the early twentieth century. All the familiar classic texts will be included but the series seeks at the same time to enlarge the conventional canon by incorporating an extensive range of less well-known works, many of them never before available in a modern English edition. Wherever possible, texts are published in complete and unabridged form, and translations are specially commissioned for the series. Each volume contains a critical introduction together with chronologies, biographical sketches, a guide to further reading and any necessary glossaries and textual apparatus. When completed, the series will aim to offer an outline of the entire evolution of Western political thought.

For a list of titles published in the series, please see end of book.

Cambridge University Press
052155117X - Reflections on Violence
Georges Sorel
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

GEORGES SOREL

*Reflections on
Violence*

EDITED BY
JEREMY JENNINGS
University of Birmingham



Cambridge University Press
 052155117X - Reflections on Violence
 Georges Sorel
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
 The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
 The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge, CB2 2RU, UK
 40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA
 477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia
 Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain
 Dock House, The Waterfront, Cape Town 8001, South Africa

<http://www.cambridge.org>

© in the introduction and editorial matter
 Cambridge University Press 1999

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 1999
 Reprinted 2002

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

Typeset in Ehrhardt 9.5pt [wv]

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data

Sorel, Georges, 1847–1922.

[Réflexions sur la violence. English]

Sorel, reflections on violence / edited by Jeremy Jennings.

p. cm. – (Cambridge texts in the history of political thought)

ISBN 0 521 55117 X (hardback) – 0 521 55910 3 (paperback)

1. Syndicalism. 2. Strikes and lockouts. 3. Social conflict. 4. Violence. I. Jennings, Jeremy, 1952– . II. Title. III. Series.

HD6477.S523 1999 335'.82 – dc21 98-55975 CIP

ISBN 0 521 55117 X hardback

ISBN 0 521 55910 3 paperback

Contents

| | <i>page</i> |
|---|-------------|
| <i>Acknowledgements</i> | vi |
| <i>Introduction by Jeremy Jennings</i> | vii |
| <i>Select bibliography</i> | xxii |
| <i>Chronology</i> | xxv |
| <i>Biographical synopses</i> | xxviii |
| <i>Note on the text</i> | xxxv |
| <i>Note on the translation</i> | xxxix |
| | |
| Reflections on violence | I |
| Introduction: Letter to Daniel Halévy | 3 |
| Introduction to the first publication | 39 |
| I. Class struggle and violence | 47 |
| II. The decadence of the bourgeoisie and violence | 65 |
| III. Prejudices against violence | 87 |
| IV. The proletarian strike | 109 |
| V. The political general strike | 143 |
| VI. The ethics of violence | 175 |
| VII. The ethics of the producers | 215 |
| Appendix I. Unity and multiplicity | 253 |
| Appendix II. Apology for violence | 279 |
| Appendix III. In defence of Lenin | 283 |
| | |
| <i>Index</i> | 295 |

Acknowledgements

It is a pleasure to acknowledge my debt to my friends in the Société d'Etudes Soréliennes. To Christophe Prochasson and Sophie Coeuré (and, latterly, Aurélien) go my thanks (and much more) for being there. I also record my deep affection and appreciation for the late John L. Stanley: no one has done more than he to make Sorel available and intelligible to an English-reading audience. David Boucher provided typically helpful advice about the presentation of the manuscript, whilst Katy Cooper provided excellent and invaluable copy-editing. I thank my colleagues at the University of Birmingham for providing such a convivial and stimulating environment in which to work.

Finally, I thank Michel Prat for sharing with me his immense knowledge of Sorel's life and work. It is to him that I dedicate my Introduction.

Introduction

Sorel's early writings

Born in 1847, Georges Sorel came late to writing about politics. A provincial and bourgeois upbringing was completed by an education in Paris and then by over twenty years working as a civil engineer for the French State. Most of that time was spent in the southern town of Perpignan, far from the intellectual and political excitement of Paris. Yet it was here that Sorel began to write.

Sorel's first articles appeared in the mid-1880s. For the most part these were concerned with obscure scientific subjects, but many were devoted to studying the impact of the French Revolution upon the Pyrénées-Orientales region where he worked. Then, in 1889, came the publication of two books: *Contribution à l'étude profane de la Bible* and *Le Procès de Socrate*. Both dealt only indirectly with politics, but where they did so they conveyed a message of moral conservatism. The France of the Third Republic was thought to be in a state of moral decline. To reverse this process, Sorel recommended the values of hard work, the family and those of a rural society.

Sorel's retirement from government service in 1892 and move to the suburbs of Paris coincided with his first interest in Marxism. Upon the basis of a limited acquaintance with the texts of Marx, Sorel initially saw Marxism as a science. This, however, was quickly to change as he perceived the inadequacies of the economic determinism associated with Marxist orthodoxy. Accordingly, Sorel undertook a fundamental reinterpretation of Marxism, calling for a

Cambridge University Press
 052155117X - Reflections on Violence
 Georges Sorel
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Introduction

return to what he described as ‘the Marxism of Marx’. Denying the veracity of the so-called ‘laws of capitalist development’, he deprived Marxism of the certitude of ultimate victory, replacing the idea of an economic catastrophe facing capitalism with that of a moral catastrophe facing bourgeois society. ‘Socialism’, Sorel wrote, ‘is a moral question, in the sense that it brings to the world a new way of judging human actions and, to use a celebrated expression of Nietzsche, a new evaluation of all values.’ This momentarily brought him close to an endorsement of political democracy and reformism, only for his allegiances to shift again with the new century.

The context of Sorel’s *Reflections*

Two movements serve to explain this new stance and form the immediate backdrop to the argument of *Reflections on Violence*. The first is the rise of the French syndicalist movement, committed to the tactics of direct action by the working class. Sorel had been following these developments since the late 1890s, producing a series of texts that sketch out the potential of the *syndicats* or trade unions,¹ and he had been especially impressed by the efforts of his friend Fernand Pelloutier to forge the *bourses du travail*² into organizations of proletarian self-emancipation; but it was after 1902, when the Confédération Générale du Travail (CGT) launched a series of spectacular strikes, that syndicalism came to the forefront of Sorel’s attention. In 1906 the CGT adopted the ‘Charter of Amiens’, announcing that it ‘brings together, outside every political school of thought, all those workers conscious of the struggle necessary to obtain the disappearance of wage-earners and employers’. As such, syndicalism was ‘le parti du travail’; it scorned politics, the Republic and patriotism, and, in its regular clashes with employers and the State, denounced what it termed the

¹ See especially ‘L’Avenir socialiste des syndicats’, *L’Humanité nouvelle* 2 (1898), pp. 294–307, 432–45; ‘L’histoire du trade-unionisme anglais’, *L’Ouvrier des deux mondes* 2 (1898), pp. 337–40; ‘Les grèves’, *La Science sociale* 30 (1900), pp. 311–32, 417–36; ‘Les grèves de Montceau-les-mines et leur signification’, *Pages libres* 9 (1901), pp. 169–73.

² The *bourses du travail* were originally conceived as labour exchanges but in Pelloutier’s scheme figured as centres of working-class life and education.

Cambridge University Press
052155117X - Reflections on Violence
Georges Sorel
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Introduction

‘government of assassins’. Through strikes it intended to bring capitalism to an end, replacing it not by State socialism but by a society of producers. Sorel did not create or even inspire the syndicalist movement, nor was he ever fully in agreement with its ideas (he never endorsed its use of industrial sabotage, for example), but he did believe that it embodied what was ‘truly true’ in Marxism, giving substance to its central tenet of class struggle leading to a ‘catastrophic’ revolution. Moreover, observation of its activities revealed to Sorel that ‘the normal development of strikes has included a significant number of acts of violence’ (p. 39) and it was this that led him to conclude that ‘if we wish to discuss socialism seriously, we must first of all investigate the functions of violence in present social conditions’ (p. 39).

The Dreyfusard movement provides the second context for these reflections. In 1898 Sorel had rallied to the cause of the Jewish army officer Alfred Dreyfus, wrongly imprisoned for treason. In this he shared the conviction of many that more was at stake than the fate of Dreyfus himself. For Sorel, the defence of Dreyfus followed from what he regarded as the ethical impulse that defined socialism, an impulse that meant that the notions of ‘morality and justice’ informed socialist conduct. Sorel, like many of his friends who frequented the bookshop of Charles Péguy, was to feel deeply betrayed by the outcome of Dreyfusard agitation. On this view, with the victory of the Bloc des Gauches in 1902 the slogan of ‘republican defence’ was turned into an excuse for careerism and political advancement by politicians only too ready to abandon their principles and to adorn themselves with the privileges of power. Yet this alone cannot explain the sheer venom that is directed by Sorel against these Third Republic politicians, most of whom have been long since forgotten. From 1901, with the ‘law of associations’, the government passed a series of anticlerical laws, culminating in the separation of Church and State in 1905. These laws, to Sorel’s disgust, were applied vindictively against the religious orders of the Catholic Church. This, however, was not all. Under Prime Minister Combes, the government began the process of purging the higher ranks of the army and in doing so used the Masonic Lodges to provide information about the religious and political loyalties of its officers. When the scandal broke, it provided damning evidence of an intricate system of spying and delation. For Sorel, this was final

Cambridge University Press
052155117X - Reflections on Violence
Georges Sorel
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Introduction

proof of the corruption of the Republic and of its politicians. This disgust is evident throughout Sorel's text.

Philosophical influences

If syndicalism and the Dreyfus affair provide the immediate political context for *Reflections on Violence*, then it is Sorel's immersion in the broader intellectual environment of his day that gives the text its vibrancy and its originality. Sorel received one of the best educations that the French State could offer, yet he regarded himself as self-educated. This was true to the extent that he was a voracious reader, consuming books on a daily basis, usually for review. He was, however, also a great listener (regularly attending Bergson's lectures in Paris), conversationalist (especially before his many young admirers) and letter writer (with correspondents all over Europe). No subject was out of bounds, and all were dissected by Sorel's penetrating intelligence. The footnotes of *Reflections on Violence* alone make for fascinating reading. What they show is the mind of a man who was equally at home with science, history, politics, philosophy and theology, who could move easily from discussing the early history of the Christian Church to contemporary tracts on psychology. In *Reflections on Violence*, references to the virtually unknown Giambattista Vico are found alongside those to Blaise Pascal, Ernest Renan, Friedrich Nietzsche, Eduard von Hartmann, Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, John Henry Newman, Karl Marx, Alexis de Tocqueville and countless other intellectual luminaries of the Third Republic, as part of an argument designed to focus our attention upon the possibility of attaining an 'ethics of sublimity'.

There are at least three of Sorel's conclusions or perspectives that need to be highlighted. To begin, Sorel was amongst the first in France to read Marx seriously. The interpretation that underpins much of the economic argument of *Reflections on Violence* is that Marxism is a form of 'Manchesterianism' (i.e. classical liberal economics). Marxism believed, therefore, that the capitalist economy should be allowed to operate unhindered, without interference from the State and without concern for the welfare of the workers. In this way not only would capitalism surmount all the obstacles before it but the workers would prepare themselves for the final

Cambridge University Press
 052155117X - Reflections on Violence
 Georges Sorel
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Introduction

struggle for emancipation. When capitalism did not follow this path – due, for example, to a concern to foster ‘social peace’ or class ‘solidarity’ – the result was ‘economic decadence’ and, as a consequence, the non-attainment of the intellectual, moral and technical education of the proletariat. This is why Sorel believed that the workers should respond with ‘black ingratitude’ to the benevolence of the employers and to the propagators of what he contemptuously refers to as ‘civilized socialism’.

Secondly, as an assiduous reader of the works of Max Nordau, Théodule Ribot and Gustave le Bon, as well as Henri Bergson, Sorel became acutely aware of the non-rational sources of human motivation. This was a major preoccupation at the end of the nineteenth century. Human beings, Sorel tells us, ‘do nothing great without the help of warmly coloured images which absorb the whole of our attention’ (p. 140). It is this that informs Sorel’s rejection of what he dubs the ‘intellectualist philosophy’ and which he associates most of all in this text with the great nineteenth-century critic and Biblical scholar, Ernest Renan. A sceptic such as Renan, like all those who believed that ‘eventually everything will be explained rationally’, could not understand why an individual, be it a Napoleonic soldier or a striking worker, would perform a selfless and heroic act.

Thirdly, Sorel dismissed the nineteenth-century ‘illusion of progress’, scorning its optimism in favour of an undisguised pessimism. This is a theme that can be found in Sorel’s very earliest writings (where, like Nietzsche, he castigates the ‘optimism’ of Socrates), but in this text it owes much to his reading of Eduard von Hartmann and the seventeenth-century religious philosopher, Pascal. It is from the latter that he takes the idea that the ‘march towards deliverance’ is narrowly conditioned both by the immense obstacles that we face and by ‘a profound conviction of our natural weakness’ (p. 11). On this view, happiness will not be produced automatically for everybody; rather deliverance – if it is ever obtained – will be the outcome of heroic acts, secured with the help of ‘a whole band of companions’. It is this emphasis upon the difficulties to be encountered on the journey ahead that allows Sorel to regard the wandering Jew, ‘condemned to march forever without knowing rest’, as ‘the symbol of the highest aspiration of mankind’. Similarly,

Introduction

it encouraged him to believe that the pessimist is not 'subject to the bloodthirsty follies of the optimist driven mad by the unforeseen obstacles that his projects meet' (p. 11).

Style and methodology

If Sorel regarded himself as self-educated, so too he was acutely aware that the way he presented his argument in *Reflections on Violence* did not conform to 'the rules of the art of writing'. As the introductory 'Letter to Daniel Halévy' reveals, he was unapologetic about this, informing his readers that 'I write notebooks in which I set down my thoughts as they arise' (p. 5). Into those notebooks went only those things that he had not met elsewhere. There was, however, more to this than stylistic idiosyncrasy. As a methodology, it was suited to what Sorel described in one of his essays on syndicalism as 'the fluid character of reality' and, indeed, Sorel was appalled at the idea of producing a perfectly symmetrical and coherent body of knowledge. To do so would be to pander to those content with 'the impersonal, the socialized, the *ready-made*' and it is to avoid this that Sorel, in the appendix entitled 'Unity and multiplicity', outlines his concept of *diremption* as a method of investigation providing 'a symbolic knowledge' of what he characterizes as 'the chaos of social phenomena'.³ The explanations disclosed by this process would be at best partial and incomplete.

Similarly, Sorel had no desire to provide a closed philosophical system that could readily be put to use by any disciples. Rather, he saw philosophy as 'only the recognition of the abysses which lie on each side of the path that the vulgar follow with the serenity of sleepwalkers' (p. 7). His aim, therefore, was to awaken 'within every man a metaphysical fire'. This commitment to 'the spirit of invention' impacts upon the argument of *Reflections on Violence* in a whole series of ways. If Sorel shared Bergson's hostility towards the prevailing scientism of their day, it is important to realize that Sorel believed that he himself was 'proceeding scientifically'. It was the opponents of syndicalism who were out of touch with the discoveries of modern science and philosophy. Thus, for example, it

³ See G[eorges] Sorel, *Matériaux d'une théorie du prolétariat* (Paris, Rivière, 1921), pp. 6–7.

Introduction

is central to Sorel's argument that he should dismiss the 'bourgeois conception of science' that sees the latter as 'a mill which produces solutions to all the problems we are faced with' (p. 132). In the same way he constantly disparages the purveyors of the 'little science' who believed that the 'aim of science was to forecast the future with accuracy'. All confuse science with clarity of exposition.

Amongst those purveyors were the Intellectuals (a noun Sorel always capitalizes). These, Sorel tells us, 'are not, as is so often said, men who think: they are people who have adopted the profession of thinking' (p. 156). They have done so for an 'aristocratic salary' and also because they intend to exploit the proletariat. To that end they sketch out a utopia, an 'intellectual product' that as 'the work of theorists' directs 'men's minds towards reforms which can be brought about by patching up the system' (pp. 28–9).

Myths

This leads to the development of one of Sorel's most controversial ideas: the importance of myths. Myths, as 'expressions of a will to act', are the very antithesis of utopias. Again Sorel addresses this issue in his introductory 'Letter to Daniel Halévy', precisely because it informs so much of his subsequent argument. 'The mind of man', Sorel tells us, is so constituted that it cannot remain content with the mere observations of facts but wishes to understand the inner reason of things' (pp. 24–5). Moreover, it is Bergson's philosophy that helps us to understand this. Bergson, Sorel tells us, asks us to consider 'the inner depths of the mind and what happens during a creative moment' (p. 26). Acting freely, we recover ourselves, attaining the level of pure 'duration' that Bergson equates with 'integral knowledge'. This new form of comprehension was identified as 'intuition', a form of internal and empathetic understanding, and it was precisely this form of intuitive understanding that Sorel believed was encompassed by his category of myth. Sorel had been working towards this conclusion for sometime, concluding in his essay *La Décomposition du marxisme* (1908) that Marx had 'always described revolution in mythical form', but in the main body of *Reflections on Violence* it is the general strike that features as a myth, precisely because it provides an 'intuitive' understanding and 'picture' of the essence of socialism. More than this, those who

Introduction

live in the world of myths are ‘secure from all refutation’ and cannot be discouraged. It is therefore through myths that we understand ‘the activity, the sentiments and the ideas of the masses as they prepare themselves to enter on a decisive struggle’ (p. 28).

Class struggle and violence

What is the purpose of this decisive struggle? In the final chapter of his text Sorel describes what will be ‘the ethic of the producers of the future’ and in doing so he confirms that the ‘great preoccupation’ of his entire life was ‘the historical genesis of morality’.⁴ The particular morality described is an austere one, owing much to the severe moralism of Proudhon and not diverging substantially from that set out in Sorel’s early pre-socialist writings. It is also a description couched in terms of Sorel’s only extended discussion of the ideas of Nietzsche. Sexual fidelity, grounded upon the institution of the family, is at its heart. Having earlier told us that the world will become more ‘just’ to the extent that it becomes more ‘chaste’, Sorel now argues in this text that ‘Love, by the enthusiasm it begets, can produce that sublimity without which there would be no effective morality’ (p. 236).⁵ But, at another level, it is to be a morality that rejects ‘an ethics adapted to consumers’, an ethics that devalued work and overvalued pleasure, an ethics that gave pride of place to the parasitic activities of the politician and the intellectual. In its place was to be a morality that turned ‘the men of today into the free producers of tomorrow, working in workshops where there are no masters’ (p. 238). A new morality of selfless dedication to one’s work and one’s colleagues would, in other words, be attained through participation in what amounted to a new set of self-governing industrial institutions. Yet there was more to this ‘secret virtue’ than a distinct proletarian morality. Work in the modern factory, Sorel believed, demanded constant innovation and improvement in the quantity and quality of production, and it was through this that ‘indefinite progress’ was achieved. This striving for perfection ensured not only that industrial work attained the

⁴ ‘Lettere di Georges Sorel a B. Croce’, *La Critica* 26 (1928), p. 100.

⁵ On this important theme, see F[rançoise] Blum, ‘Images de “la Femme” chez Georges Sorel’, *Cahiers Georges Sorel* 4 (1986), pp. 5–25.

Cambridge University Press
 052155117X - Reflections on Violence
 Georges Sorel
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Introduction

status of art but also that the factory would become the site of an 'economic epic' to rival the Homeric epic of the battlefield.

Sorel also makes it clear that this new morality will emerge at the expense of the 'total elimination' of the bourgeoisie. It will, moreover, be brought about by a class working 'subterraneously' within society, 'separating itself' from the modern world. Sorel locates the entire argument of *Reflections of Violence* in the context of a situation where the possibility and nearness of decline is ever present, thus again continuing a theme found in his earliest essays. The bourgeoisie, as the title of one chapter makes clear, are seen as being decadent, 'destined henceforth to live without morals'.⁶ Their decadence, however, is also economic: no longer are they willing to function as the bold captains of industry, driving the economy forward to greater heights. Here, Sorel believed, history presented us with a clear historical precedent. By locating his argument within the framework of Vico's ideal history of *corsi* and *ricorsi* (see pp. xxxiii–xxxiv, below), he felt himself able to demonstrate the consequences of a social transformation carried out in a period of moral and economic decadence: the victory of Christianity over the Roman Empire showed that 'at least four centuries of barbarism had to be gone through before a progressive movement showed itself; society was compelled to descend to a state not far removed from its origins' (pp. 83–4). The same descent into barbarism would occur if the proletariat, itself corrupted, secured its ends by dispossessing a humanitarian and timorous bourgeoisie of its possession of a degenerate capitalism.

Sorel's conclusion was unambiguous: the workers must maintain divisions within society, distancing themselves from the corrupting processes of bourgeois democracy and forsaking social peace in favour of class struggle and confrontation: 'everything may be saved if the proletariat, by their use of violence, manage to re-establish the division into classes and so restore to the bourgeoisie something of its energy' (p. 85). This followed from Sorel's account of Marxism as a version of 'Manchesterianism': violence, 'carried on as a pure and simple manifestation of the sentiment of class struggle', would disabuse philanthropic employers of their paternal concern for their employees, teaching them to devote themselves to securing

⁶ See also 'La Crise morale et religieuse', *Le Mouvement socialiste* 22 (1907), p. 35.

Introduction

the progress of production and nothing more. This, in turn, would restore the *fatalité* of capitalist development, thereby allowing capitalism to attain its ‘historical perfection’ and to establish the material foundations of a future socialist society. On this account, proletarian violence appears ‘a very fine and heroic thing’, serving ‘the immemorial interests of civilization’.

The revolutionary tradition

This, then, was Sorel’s shocking conclusion: violence would save the world from barbarism. But what sort of violence was it to be? Here we come to the heart of so much of the subsequent misunderstanding (as well as misuse) of his ideas, for Sorel was adamant that a distinction had to be drawn between the violence of the revolutionary proletariat and the force deployed in the name of the State by politicians and intellectuals.

As Sorel made clear in his essay ‘*Mes raisons du syndicalisme*’,⁷ he did not come to syndicalism via Jacobinism, nor did he share the ‘veneration’ for the men who made the French Revolution. Moreover, this distaste for the ‘terrorists of 1793’ can be traced back to his very earliest writings. A letter of 1872, for example, highlights his aversion to ‘*la jésuitière rouge*’,⁸ whilst his writings prior to his conversion to Marxism in 1892 likewise detail his hatred of the Jacobin tradition, its bourgeois adherents and their passion for dictatorial State power.

In his mature writings – and especially in *Reflections on Violence* – his criticisms of the Revolution and its supporters can be distilled into three specific claims. Firstly, if Sorel recognized that Rousseau was not responsible for the Terror and the actions of Robespierre, he did believe that certain key Rousseauian notions had been passed on into democratic theory. Specifically, Sorel considered that the concept of the general will had been used to justify the idea of ‘government by all the citizens’, despite the fact that the whole thing was nothing but a ‘fiction’. The reality had been that during the Revolution every *salon*, and then every Jacobin club, believed

⁷ ‘*Mes raisons du syndicalisme*’, in *Matériaux d’une théorie du prolétariat*, p. 248.

⁸ P[ierre] Andreu, ‘Une lettre de Sorel en 1872’, *Cahiers Georges Sorel* 2 (1894), pp. 93–107.

Cambridge University Press
 052155117X - Reflections on Violence
 Georges Sorel
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Introduction

that it possessed the secret of the general will, thereby justifying their limitless authority; passed down to the democrats of contemporary France, this conceit was now entertained by a class of intellectuals who had turned themselves into the people's masters.⁹

Secondly, Sorel believed that contemporary socialism had embraced a whole set of the Revolution's most reprehensible attitudes. First among these was the idea of 'Parisian dictatorship'. 'Even today', Sorel wrote, 'many socialists believe that if power were to fall into their hands it would be easy to impose their programme, their new morals and new ideas upon France.' More damning still was Sorel's contention that the Revolution was fundamentally inegalitarian in inspiration. Thus, Sorel wrote, it was clear that those socialist politicians 'imbued with the spirit of the Revolution' wished to preserve 'the principle of hierarchy'. So we find that in *Reflections on Violence*, not only does Sorel endorse Tocqueville's conclusion that there was no radical break between the political structures of pre- and post-revolutionary France but he also contends that, for contemporary socialists, revolution can be reduced to a change of government personnel.¹⁰

It is the theme of continuity between the *ancien régime*, the Revolution and contemporary socialism that underpins Sorel's third major criticism of the ideology and practice of 1789–93. 'One of the fundamental ideas of the *ancien régime*'. Sorel writes in what is arguably the key chapter of *Reflections on Violence* (chapter III, 'Prejudices against violence'), 'had been the employment of the penal procedure to ruin any power which was an obstacle to the monarchy' (p. 96). The aim had been not to maintain justice but to enhance the strength of the State and thus 'negligence, ill-will and carelessness became revolt against authority, crime or treason'. The Revolution, Sorel argued, 'piously inherited this tradition', giving immense importance to imaginary crimes, guillotining those who could not satisfy the expectations aroused by public opinion, and producing in the classic piece of 'Robespierre's legislation', the law of 22nd Prairial, a law whose definitions of 'political crime' were so vague as to ensure that no 'enemy of the Revolution' could escape.

⁹ See 'L'Avenir socialiste des syndicats', in *Matériaux d'une théorie du prolétariat*, p. 118 and *Les Illusions du progrès* (Paris, Rivière, 1921), p. 106.

¹⁰ See especially 'Le Socialisme et la Révolution française', *Le Pays de France* 1 (1899), pp. 220–8.

Cambridge University Press
 052155117X - Reflections on Violence
 Georges Sorel
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Introduction

Here, raised to pre-eminence, was the ‘doctrine of the State’. Stripped of its prestige, therefore, all that remained of the Revolution were ‘police operations, proscriptions and the sittings of servile courts of law’.

Little, Sorel indicates, has changed. ‘By cruel experience’, he tells us, ‘we know now, alas! that the State still had its high priests and its fervent advocates among the Dreyfusards’ (p. 101). No sooner was the Dreyfus case over than Combes and the government of ‘republican defence’ began another ‘political prosecution’. Jaurès and his friends could not bring themselves to condemn the system of spying introduced into the army. Ultimately, however, one is led to conclude that for Sorel the key piece of evidence was provided by Jaurès’ equivocation in his *Histoire socialiste de la Révolution française* when faced with the need to account for the Jacobins. Such people, Sorel tells us, ‘are worthy successors of Robespierre’, they ‘preserve the old cult of the State; they are therefore prepared to commit all the misdeeds of the *ancien régime* and of the Revolution’.

The general strike

The point of all this is to establish that ‘the abuses of the revolutionary bourgeois force of [17]93’ should not be confused with ‘the violence of our revolutionary syndicalists’. Syndicalism conceived the transmission of power not in terms of the replacement of one intellectual elite by another but as a process diffusing authority down into the workers’ own organizations. Those organizations, unlike a system of political democracy replete with Rousseauian baggage, provided a pattern of genuine and effective representation. Most importantly, the violence employed by the proletariat in the course of the general strike bore no relationship to the ferocious and bloodthirsty acts of jealousy and revenge that characterized the massacres of the French Revolution.

Here, therefore, Sorel goes to great pains to define what he means by violence. If the object of State force was to impose a social order based upon inequality and exploitation, the purpose of proletarian violence was ‘the destruction of that order’. Secondly, such violence would be inspired by a conception of war drawn from the ancient Greeks: it would be unselfish, heroic, disciplined, devoid of all material considerations. It would be informed by ethical values

Introduction

engendering ‘an entirely epic state of mind’. The proletariat, Sorel writes, ‘longs for the final conquest in which it will give proof of the whole measure of its valour. Pursuing no conquest, it has no need to make plans for utilizing its victories’ (p. 161).

Sorel, in fact, pays little attention to the details of the general strike, preferring to emphasize that it will be ‘a revolt pure and simple’ in which the proletariat engages upon ‘serious, formidable and sublime work’. On one point, however, he is clear: ‘It may be conceded to those in favour of mild methods that violence may hamper economic progress and even, when it goes beyond a certain limit, that it may be a danger to morality’ (pp. 177–8). Too much violence would be a threat to civilization. There is, though, little danger of this from the proletariat. Drawing again upon historical parallels, Sorel points out that although there were few Christians martyrs their martyrdom served to prove the absolute truth of the new religion; in the same way, for syndicalism there would in reality be ‘conflicts that are short and few in number’, yet these would be sufficient to evoke the idea of the general strike as being ‘perfectly revolutionary’. It would be accomplished ‘by means of incidents which would appear to bourgeois historians as of small importance’. ‘We have the right to hope’, Sorel therefore concludes, ‘that a socialist revolution carried out by pure syndicalists would not be defiled by the abominations which sullied the bourgeois revolutions’ (p. 108).

Lenin and the Russian Revolution

It was precisely because in the years after 1909 the syndicalist movement appeared to effect a compromise with the forces of parliamentary socialism that Sorel withdrew his support from it, engaging in a series of publishing enterprises with figures drawn from the antiparliamentary Right. The latter act has been seen as an indication of Sorel’s support for the restoration of the monarchy. This was not so, although it is the case that Sorel’s writings in the years immediately prior to the First World War consist almost totally of a series of unforgiving attacks upon virtually every aspect of France’s republican political system: its decaying democracy, corrupt administration, superficial art, poor morals and shallow religion. Controversially, his loathing of politicians and bourgeois intellectuals now

Introduction

focused upon the form of the messianic and rootless Jew as the antithesis of everything that had brought greatness to France.¹¹ Given this shift of emphasis towards an unremitting attack upon the whole culture of the Third Republic, it is important to note that in his 'Foreword to the third edition', written in 1912, Sorel proclaims himself 'more than ever convinced of the value of this philosophy of violence'.

It was this scorn of the bourgeois and democratic Republic that ensured that Sorel could not rally to the *union sacrée* that brought France's political forces together in 1914. He poured scorn on pronouncements calling for the workers as 'citizens' to relive the days of 1793, to organize a 'levée en masse'. In time, he concluded, 'this war will be regarded as execrable above all because of the reawakening of the Jacobin spirit it promoted'. 'All socialist thought', he wrote to Mario Missiroli in August 1914, 'has become Jacobin', the recent dismal events showing that 'the old Jacobin tradition remained alive, a tradition formed of frenzied envy, pride and puerile imaginings'.¹²

There remained for Sorel, however, one final episode which seemed to indicate that socialism might be able to free itself of the State force of Jacobinism: the 'extraordinary events' of the October Revolution and Lenin's seizure of power. Sorel's enthusiasm for the Bolsheviks was such that he added a new section voicing his approval not just to *Reflections on Violence* but also to *Les Illusions du progrès* and *Matériaux d'une théorie du prolétariat*. He also wrote for *La Revue communiste*. What Sorel actually knew of Lenin and the Russian Revolution was slim indeed, but importantly he saw Lenin as the very antithesis of a Russian Jacobin and he believed that the Revolution itself had been carried out on syndicalist lines. Note, too, that Sorel again makes a distinction between different types of violence. If he admits that Lenin is not a candidate for a 'prize for virtue', he will succeed thanks to the 'heroic efforts' of the Russian proletariat rather than through 'a war of cowardice' that

¹¹ 'Quelques prétentions juives', *L'Indépendance* 3 (1912), pp. 217–36, 277–95, 317–36.

¹² 'Lettres à Mario Missiroli', in [Georges Sorel] *Da Proudhon a Lenin e L'Europa sotto la tormenta* [ed. Gabriele de Rosa] (Rome, Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1974), pp. 500–14.

Cambridge University Press
052155117X - Reflections on Violence
Georges Sorel
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Introduction

denies 'the true laws of war'. The workers obey not his political but his 'moral authority'.

For Sorel, therefore, the events in Russia marked the revolt of the producers against politicians, intellectuals and the bourgeoisie, with the *soviets* giving institutional form to a new productivist ethic. His hope was that Lenin's Russia of the *soviets* would provide a new myth capable of inspiring the proletariat across Europe to rise up against 'the arrogant bourgeois democracies, today shamelessly triumphant'. An old man, he summoned up all his moral fervour to call forth the destruction of New Carthages.

Conclusion

Reflections on Violence remains a profoundly disturbing book. This most obviously derives from the fact that Sorel not only takes violence as his subject but, more importantly, is prepared to equate it with life, creativity and virtue. Was this not Sorel's own illusion? And was it not, perhaps, one of the illusions that served most to disfigure the twentieth century? How, it might be asked, could the reality of violence have provided an escape from the 'total ruin of institutions and morals' Sorel described? Yet, whatever might have been made of his ideas by later enthusiasts, the fact remains that the violence endorsed by Sorel was not very violent at all; it amounts to little more than a few heroic gestures. This was so because Sorel was not a Jacobin socialist. Distancing himself from the 'Robespierrean tradition', at the centre of his thought was the distinction between the violence of the proletariat and that deployed by bourgeois politicians and their intellectual ideologues through the State. It was the politicians and ideologues, and not the proletariat, who resorted to wholesale acts of terror and repression in order to secure their own dominance. For his part, Sorel saw himself as nothing more than a 'disinterested servant of the proletariat'.

Select bibliography

A wide selection of Sorel's work is now available in English, mostly translated by the late John L. Stanley: see *The Illusions of Progress* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1969); *From Georges Sorel: Essays in Socialism and Philosophy* (New York, Oxford University Press, 1976); *Social Foundations of Contemporary Economics* (New Brunswick, NJ, Transaction Books, 1984) and *Hermeneutics and the Sciences* (New Brunswick, NJ, Transaction Books, 1990). Selections of Sorel's writings are also available in Richard Vernon, *Commitment and Change: Georges Sorel and the Idea of Revolution* (Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1978).

Most of the early work on Sorel was undertaken by American scholars: see especially Michael Curtis, *Three against the Republic* (Princeton, University of Princeton Press, 1959); James Meisel, *The Genesis of Georges Sorel* (Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1953); Richard Humphrey, *Georges Sorel, Prophet without Honor: A Study in Anti-Intellectualism* (Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 1951) and Irving L. Horowitz, *Radicalism and the Revolt Against Reason* (New York, Humanities Press, 1961). The latter also contains a translation of Sorel's important essay 'The Decomposition of Marxism'.

A revival of interest in Sorel took place from the mid-1970s onwards, broadening the picture of his intellectual output and producing new interpretations of his significance. For two detailed intellectual biographies see Jeremy Jennings, *Georges Sorel: The Character and Development of his Thought* (London, Macmillan, 1985) and John L. Stanley, *The Sociology of Virtue: The Political*

Bibliography

and *Social Theories of Georges Sorel* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1982). The wider intellectual and political context in which Sorel worked is examined in Jack Roth, *The Cult of Violence: Sorel and the Sorelians* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1980) and Jeremy Jennings, *Syndicalism in France: A Study of Ideas* (London, Macmillan, 1990). Of less interest are Arthur L. Greil, *Georges Sorel and the Sociology of Virtue* (Washington DC, University Press of America, 1981) and Larry Portis, *Georges Sorel* (London, Pluto Press, 1980).

Of the many articles and chapters written in English on Sorel, see especially: Isaiah Berlin, 'Georges Sorel' in Henry Hardy (ed.), *Against the Current: Essays in the History of Ideas* (London, Hogarth Press, 1979), pp. 296–331; Leszek Kolakowski, 'Georges Sorel: A Jansenist Marxist', in his *Main Currents of Marxism* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1981), II, pp. 151–74; and K. Steven Vincent, 'Interpreting Georges Sorel: defender of virtue or apostle of violence', *History of European Ideas* 12 (1990), pp. 239–57. For Sorel's relationship with both the Left and the Right, see Larry Wilde, 'Sorel and the French Right', *History of Political Thought* 7 (1986), pp. 361–74 and Darrow Schechter, 'Two views of revolution: Gramsci and Sorel, 1916–1929', *History of European Ideas* 12 (1990), pp. 637–53. See also the special issue of *The European Legacy* 3(5) (1998), devoted to Sorel, with articles by John L. Stanley, Jeremy Jennings, Shlomo Sand, K. Steven Vincent and Cécile Laborde.

In France there has also been a revival of scholarly interest in Sorel's ideas. Of the early studies see Georges Goriely, *Le Pluralisme dramatique de Georges Sorel* (Paris, Marcel Rivière, 1962) and Pierre Andreu, *Notre Maître, M. Sorel* (Paris, Grasset 1953), reprinted as *Georges Sorel: Entre le noir et le rouge* (Paris, Syros, 1982). As examples of more recent work, see Shlomo Sand, *L'Illusion du politique: Georges Sorel et le débat intellectuel 1900* (Paris, La Découverte, 1985); Michel Charzat (ed.), *Georges Sorel* (Paris, Cahiers de l'Herne, 1986); and Jacques Julliard and Shlomo Sand (eds.), *Georges Sorel en son temps* (Paris, Seuil, 1985). The latter contains the most complete bibliography of Sorel's writings to date.

Mention must be made of the most valuable source of recent Sorel scholarship, the *Cahiers Georges Sorel*, published annually since 1983 and from 1987 onwards under the title *Mil neuf cent: Revue d'histoire intellectuelle*. In addition to numerous articles on

Bibliography

Sorel, these volumes have also made available previously unpublished material, especially Sorel's correspondence. Of greatest interest are Sorel's letters to his closest associate, Edouard Berth (3–6, 1985–8) and to Eduard Bernstein (11, 1993); but see also Sorel's correspondence to Henri Bergson, Roberto Michels, Daniel Halévy and Jean Bourdeau.

Finally, it should be pointed out that some of the very best Sorel scholarship comes from Italy. For a recent example see Marco Gervasoni, *Georges Sorel, una biografia intellettuale* (Milan, Edizioni Unicopli, 1997).

Chronology

- 1847 2 November; Georges Sorel born in Cherbourg, a cousin to Albert-Emile Sorel, one of the great historians of the French Third Republic.
- 1864 Moves to Paris and enters the Collège Rollin.
- 1865–7 Studies at the prestigious Ecole Polytechnique.
- 1867–70 Continues his studies as an engineer with the Ministère des Ponts et Chaussées.
- 1870 Secures first posting as government engineer to Corsica, where he remains during the Franco-Prussian war.
- 1871–3 Posted to Albi, in the south of France.
- 1875 Sorel meets Marie-Euphrasie David in Lyon, who will remain his companion and ‘wife’ until her death in 1897. It is to her that *Réflexions sur la violence* will be dedicated.
- 1876–9 Posted to Mostaganem (Algeria), then considered part of France.
- 1879–92 Posted to Perpignan, where he remains until his resignation from government service.
- 1886 Sorel publishes his first article, ‘Sur les applications de la psychophysique’, in *La Revue philosophique*.
- 1889 Sorel publishes his first two books: *Contribution à l’étude profane de la Bible (A Contribution to a Secular Study of the Bible)* and *Le Procès de Socrate (The Trial of Socrates)*.
- 1891 Sorel made Chevalier of the Légion d’honneur, the

Chronology

- insignia of which he was always to wear on his lapel.
- 1892 Returns to Paris, before settling in the suburb of Boulogne-sur-Seine, where he is to remain until his death.
- 1893 'Science et socialisme', published in *La Revue philosophique*, indicates Sorel's enthusiasm for Marx.
- 1894 Sorel writes for the short-lived *L'Ere nouvelle*, one of the first Marxist journals in France.
- 1895 Sorel writes for *La Jeunesse socialiste*, the Toulouse-based journal of the young Hubert Lagardelle.
- 1895–8 With Paul Lafargue, Gabriel Deville and Alfred Bonnet, Sorel launches *Le Devenir social*.
- 1898 January; Sorel's name appears on the second petition in support of Alfred Dreyfus, calling for the Chamber of Deputies 'to defend the legal guarantees of citizens against arbitrary power'.
- 1898 Sorel publishes *L'Avenir socialiste des syndicats* (*The Socialist Future of the Trade Unions*). He also publishes in *L'Ouvrier des deux mondes*, the journal of Fernand Pelloutier.
- 1899 Sorel publishes his first article in Lagardelle's *Le Mouvement socialiste*.
- 1902 Publication of *La Ruine du monde antique. Conception matérialiste de l'histoire* (*The Downfall of the Ancient World: The Materialist Conception of History*).
- 1903 Publication of *Introduction à l'économie moderne* (*Introduction to the Modern Economy*).
- 1905 Sorel publishes 'Le syndicalisme révolutionnaire' in *Le Mouvement socialiste*.
- 1906 Sorel publishes 'Les illusions du progrès' in *Le Mouvement socialiste*.
- Publication of *Le Système historique de Renan* (*The Historical System of Renan*).
- 1908 Publication of *La Décomposition du marxisme* (*The Decomposition of Marxism*).

Chronology

- | | |
|---------|--|
| 1909 | Publication of <i>La Révolution dreyfusienne</i> (<i>The Dreyfusard Revolution</i>). Sorel breaks with Lagardelle and <i>Le Mouvement socialiste</i> , at the same time withdrawing his support from the syndicalist movement as it enters a period of 'crisis'. |
| 1910 | With Edouard Berth and monarchist Georges Valois, Sorel attempts to launch <i>La Cité française</i> . |
| 1911–13 | Along with an assortment of figures drawn from the antidemocratic Right, Sorel publishes in <i>L'Indépendance</i> , established by Jean Valois. |
| 1914–18 | Sorel remains silent during the First World War. |
| 1919 | Publication of <i>Matériaux d'une théorie du prolétariat</i> (<i>Materials for a Theory of the Proletariat</i>). |
| 1920 | Sorel publishes in <i>La Revue communiste</i> . |
| 1921 | Publication of <i>De l'Utilité du pragmatisme</i> (<i>The Utility of Pragmatism</i>), setting out Sorel's interest in the ideas of William James. |
| 1922 | March; Sorel dies and is buried in the same cemetery as Marie-Euphrasie David in Tenay (Ain). |

Biographical synopses

Henri Bergson (1859–1941); philosopher; appointed professor at the Collège de France in 1900; his principal works included *Essai sur les données immédiates de la conscience* (1888), *Matière et mémoire* (1896), *L'Évolution créatrice* (1907) and *Les Deux Sources de la morale et de la religion* (1932).

In his day Bergson was the most well-known philosopher in the Western world, deeply influencing modern thought and literature. Bergson did much to rehabilitate the spiritual or 'inner' life by suggesting that we could go beyond time and space to what he described as 'duration', the pure flow of reality that could only be comprehended through intuition. It was this inner life that was the source of liberty and creativity. In 1907, however, Bergson added the notion of *élan vital*, a vital impulse that 'carried life, by more and more complex forms, to higher and higher destinies', to his philosophy, thereby falling foul of the monism he had done so much to repudiate.

Sorel attended Bergson's lectures every week and made frequent reference to him in his writings. Both shared a hostility to the all-encompassing positivism and scientism of their day, with Sorel using Bergson's concept of intuition to develop his theory of myths. Yet it is a mistake to see Sorel's views as a straightforward application of Bergson's theories. If Sorel believed that Bergson greatly extended our understanding of 'large-scale, popular, modern movements', he always remained extremely doubtful about the validity of Bergson's later vitalist evolutionary theory. Sorel increasingly came to see Bergson's philosophy as a fundamentally religious one,

Biographical synopses

capable of encouraging a spiritual revival. For Sorel's most extended discussion of Bergson see 'L'Evolution créatrice', *Le Mouvement socialiste* 22 (1907), pp. 257–82, 478–94; 23 (1908), pp. 34–52, 184–94, 276–94.

Eduard Bernstein (1850–1932); a leading light in the German Social Democratic Party and the first of the so-called 'revisionists'.

Bernstein's argument that socialists should remove 'cant' from their doctrines and replace it with Kant caused immense controversy and effectively undermined the position of Marxist orthodoxy.

Sorel began corresponding with Bernstein in 1898 and, like him, believed that the official representatives of Marxism adhered to the most peripheral and out-of-date of Marx's doctrines. He therefore had considerable admiration for Bernstein's efforts to revise Marxism and to free it from utopianism. Initially Sorel also sympathised with Bernstein's attempt to formulate a practice of political reformism, but this changed with Sorel's support for revolutionary syndicalism, leaving Sorel to conclude that Bernstein's revisionism represented a 'decomposition' of the original 'Marxism of Marx'. See Sorel's essay 'Les Dissensions de la social-démocratie en Allemagne', *Revue politique et parlementaire* 25 (1900), pp. 35–66 and *La Décomposition du marxisme* (Paris, Rivière, 1908).

Daniel Halévy (1872–1962); essayist and writer, brother of Elie Halévy and a member of one of the great intellectual families of Paris.

Halévy made a rapid entry into the Parisian literary world and was one of the first to rally to the Dreyfusard cause. He was amongst those responsible for collecting the signatures for the 'petition of the intellectuals' in January 1898, the second of which was signed by Sorel.

Sorel and Halévy subsequently saw each other regularly at the office of Charles Péguy's *Cahiers de la Quinzaine* and worked together on two reviews, *Le Mouvement socialiste* and *Pages libres*. Halévy later described Sorel as the 'new Socrates, our Socrates', but the admiration was a mutual one. Both felt betrayed by the outcome of the Dreyfus affair, Sorel publishing his *La Révolution dreyfusienne* (1909) to Halévy's more famous *Apologie pour notre passé* (1910). Most importantly, it was Halévy who had the idea of

Cambridge University Press
 052155117X - Reflections on Violence
 Georges Sorel
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Biographical synopses

publishing *Reflections on Violence* in book form, with the intention of making Sorel's ideas available to a wider readership. See 'Lettres de Georges Sorel à Daniel Halévy (1907–1920)', *Mil neuf cent* 12 (1994), pp. 151–223.

Eduard von Hartmann (1842–1906); German philosopher and author of the *Philosophie des Unbewussten* (1869), translated into English as *The Philosophy of the Unconscious* (1884).

Hartmann continued the tradition of philosophical pessimism associated with Schopenhauer, and did so by combining his ideas with those of Hegel and Schelling. His key idea was that there was an ultimate reality or force which had given rise to the course of world development and that this was 'the Unconscious'. It is a philosophy of pessimism precisely because it postulates as a final end a distant future where existence itself shall cease and where the world will return to its original state of unconsciousness. In the meantime, the process of consciousness is one where human beings believe, incorrectly, that pleasure and satisfaction can be gained from the world, thus producing a series of illusions (including religion) which shield them from an acknowledgement that they have a duty to suffer.

Hartmann's ideas were received with considerable success at the end of the nineteenth century but appealed to Sorel principally because of their unashamed pessimism. Like Sorel, Hartmann believed that Christianity rested upon a pessimistic conception of the world and therefore that liberal Protestantism was fundamentally irreligious. For Sorel, this provided a welcome contrast to the naive optimism of Ernest Renan.

Jean Jaurès (1859–1914); academic and one of the leaders of the French socialist movement.

In 1898 he lent his support to the Dreyfusard cause, playing a central role in convincing his socialist colleagues that they should defend a bourgeois army officer, and then in 1902 was instrumental in securing their support for the Bloc des Gauches in the name of the Republic and the principles of 1789. In 1904 he established the socialist newspaper *L'Humanité*, after which he spent much of his energies campaigning against the likelihood of war. He was assassinated in 1914.