







Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2008 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation





JEAN JAURÈS

34020

F 5 21

THE WILLIAM MORRIS PRESS LTD.  
FORTY-TWO ALBERT STREET  
MANCHESTER  
ENGLAND



# JEAN JAURÈS

SOCIALIST  
AND  
HUMANITARIAN

By  
MARGARET PEASE

WITH INTRODUCTION BY  
J. RAMSAY MACDONALD, M.P.



NEW YORK  
B. W. HUEBSCH  
MCMXVII

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

DC  
E4  
34

## P R E F A C E

IN course of time the friends and comrades of Jean Jaurès will publish his biography and a new edition of his works; some of these were written with a certain amount of haste, and need careful revision. As, however, the complete biography has not yet been accomplished, I have had to seek other sources of information.

I am much indebted to M. Charles Rappoport's detailed and sympathetic analysis of Jaurès' ideas, contained in his book: *Jean Jaurès; L'Homme, Le Penseur, Le Socialiste*. M. Rappoport claims that his book is "Jaurès explained by himself." A great part of it is, in fact, in Jaurès' own words, and the rest is a penetrating exposition of his mind.

From M. Levy-Bruhl's charming brochure, *Quelques pages sur Jean Jaurès*, I have gathered most of the details of Jaurès' youth contained in Chapter I. My other sources have been his own

works: *Etudes Socialistes* (of which I have used for quotation the English translation by Mrs. Minturn), *Les Preuves*, *L'Armée Nouvelle* and numerous pamphlets containing his speeches.

Of some of the subjects on which Jaurès thought and spoke and wrote, such as Education and the French Revolution, no mention has been made in this book. His was a most varied, eager and all-embracing mind, and this short study naturally makes no pretension to be exhaustive. Its object is merely to give English readers some acquaintance with that force, at once harmonising and progressive, that was in Jaurès, and so to help to preserve his influence from being lost.

MARGARET PEASE.

## CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
INTRODUCTION BY J. RAMSAY MACDONALD, M.P. . . . .	II
I. A SHORT SKETCH OF THE MAN AND HIS CAREER . . . . .	19
II. SOCIALISM . . . . .	41
III. JAURÈS AND THE DREYFUS CASE .	57
IV. SOCIALIST METHODS . . . . .	81
V. THE NEW ARMY . . . . .	109
VI. INTERNATIONAL PEACE . . . . .	123



## INTRODUCTION

JUST as Europe crossed the threshold of war two men whose influence on the future would have been great and beneficial fell. The one was Jaurès, the other Frank. Frank with his whole future before him, the Revisionist protagonist of Bebel himself, volunteered when the war broke out, and in a miserable little skirmish almost at the very outset gave his life for Germany. Jaurès, happily with much of his life's work done, but on the verge of a new world which sadly required his help, for there was no other with his influence and but very few with his sagacity and uncorruptible mind, was shot by a "patriotic" youth in a restaurant. It is a strange doom that these two friends who, had they lived, would have had more to do with the settlement after the war than kings, emperors or foreign ministers, should have been killed at its very outset. Frank will live in the memories of those

who knew him as a promise that was unfulfilled, a power growing into authority, suddenly crushed out. But Jaurès belongs to the world.

In this little book, Mrs. Pease has given us some idea of the man and his mind; she has explained the fascination of his personality and the authority of his intellect. He was the greatest democratic personal force in Europe—even in the world. We have popular politicians who make speeches, who fashion toys from ideas, and with the fickleness of children pass from cause to cause, and from emotion to emotion in response to the swaying of mass opinion. Jaurès was none of these. Jaurès could say "I know in what I believe." Whether as editor and in great part writer of the monumental *History of Socialism in France*, or as author of *L'Armée Nouvelle*; as the orator swaying crowds, or as the Parliamentary leader facing a hostile Chamber, he fought his life-long battle for the attainment of a goal set steadily and immovably in front of him. He fought. He sought favours from no enemy. Every great campaign in which he engaged roused bitter enmity amongst opponents. When he championed Dreyfus, France howled;



when he stood for the sacredness of treaties in the Morocco time, the Chamber tried to shout him down; when he sought to turn Europe from war, Nationalist and Clerical joined their voices to besmirch his reputation and to bury him deep under popular prejudice; he threw his constituency away because he would not desert the soul of his France—the France of the Revolution, the France of human liberty, the France he loved and which he saw misled and betrayed by those in authority. All this is written in this book. But the end is not written here, and cannot yet be written. What secret did he take to the grave with him? What would he have done had he lived? Of that we can but conjecture.

There are many rumours about regarding his death. It is said that his assassin cannot be brought to trial because inconvenient revelations would then have to be made; it is said that papers which the authorities tried to seize after his death are in safe keeping in Switzerland; Rappoport has given an account of a conversation Jaurès had with journalists on the day of his murder which if true (and that has been in a measure disputed) will require investigating. We

must wait for the time when light can be thrown upon all this, and until then the final touches cannot be put to Jaurès' life.

Jaurès was a great servant of the people—great because he was single-minded. In France, where it is so common to find politicians gain a footing on the lower rungs of the ladder of success as Socialists, mounting upwards and changing their colours as they go, Jaurès was an inspiring example of rectitude and devotion. He was the greatest of them all, his mind was richest, his sagacity was clearest, his power was the most firmly founded. The places they filled could most easily have been his. But no, that was not Jaurès. He was no believer in the German doctrine of aloofness. As Mrs. Pease says so truly, he was too much interested in real life to spend his days apart and give utterance to mere dogmatic formulæ, whilst society was striving to give expression to the best that was in it, struggling to emancipate itself from the bondage of capitalism. All his instincts prompted him to aid it. Every movement towards more liberty enlisted his support, because he knew each was necessary for the attainment of the

completed whole. Thus in order to separate the State from the Church and defend the Republic, he declared for the Radical-Socialist *bloc* which supported the Waldeck-Rousseau and the Combes Ministries. But he took none of the spoils of the *bloc*. He himself did not serve in Cabinets. He could defend his friends who seemed to sacrifice Socialism in order to serve the nation, but he chose the humbler but more effective way of standing by and keeping the spirit of liberty alive and vital. The poison of power gripped them one after another. Millerand went; Briand went; Viviani went; Jaurès remained.

I saw him at Copenhagen when our own Ulster trouble was threatening and he and Vaillant drew me aside into a corner of a room and discussed coalitions. His own experiences had made him doubt their wisdom. Times might come he thought when they might be necessary in defence of liberty, but on the whole his view was that it was better for a Socialist Party to maintain a government in office without accepting responsibility for acts which it really could not control, because it could not be properly represented in Cabinets, and wait until it was strong

enough to decide the policy of Ministries before it entered them. But he still clung to the position he took up at Amsterdam, that a time must come when Socialists, safeguarding themselves by a sufficiency of numbers, will have to make themselves responsible for the government of countries which though not yet Socialist are nevertheless moving towards Socialism. His Socialist method explained in this book, remained his Socialist method to the end, but he saw its dangers both to the movement and the men who led it. When the moment had come for him to face anew the old problem of a *bloc* under the conditions of war, he was struck down before he could speak and he lies in his grave like a Sphinx whose unspoken wisdom each man must discover for himself.

The life and the thought of Jaurès have enriched the new democracy. They have lifted it up so that no man of honesty and intelligence can think of it as a mere thing of the appetites and the cupidities, of the cravings of hungry men and the ignorance of untutored ones. Cultured, in every good sense of the term, was Jaurès. He never took up or defended a cause except on

broad and liberal grounds. Let readers note for instance what he wrote when attacked for allowing his daughter to join the Church. He always fought with his opponents in a wide field and in the open air. There were men far more learned than he, but none with minds which retained their inquisitive and acquisitive freshness more than his, and no man in public life to-day could enrich his ordinary political opinions with a greater wealth of knowledge, philosophical, historical, administrative. There are men better endowed with the graceful arts of oratory, but none who can better than he, because of their own sincerity and clearness of vision, make the minds of their listeners glow with enthusiasm and gleam under the revelation of great policies and fine ideals. With the memory of Jaurès in its possession, the movement of international democracy and Socialism can lift up its head with confident pride and open its heart to assured hope.

J. RAMSAY MACDONALD.



## CHAPTER I

### THE MAN AND HIS CAREER

THE French Socialist leader Jean Jaurès was assassinated on the 31st of July, 1914. This cruel act was therefore one of the last things that happened while the world was still at peace. Before August, 1914, was many days old, the world was at war. On the last day of July there was still hope, though the hope was waning, that the terrible crisis might pass. And on that day, Jaurès, brave and far-sighted as he was, had bent his vigorous energies to influence French ministers to try to prevent war. . . . The day was over and in one moment the evil hand struck him down and darkness fell, fell on everyone who knew for what Jaurès stood. It was realised with something like despair, that the man who could have helped France best had been, with a mad cleverness, removed. There were thousands all over Europe who knew that Jaurès was the leader who might have shown the way through the dark mazes in which we are now

wandering. He would at least have encouraged us, and have been the first to find the path onward out of the pitiless night to the new day. If such a path is to be found, Jaurès might have been trusted to find it. He loved France passionately, and loved Humanity too, and he was so disinterested that he saw the truth of things more clearly than those who have their own aims to serve. But he was torn away, and the rain fell, and the floods came, and the fall of the European house was so great that the death of Jaurès was for the time almost forgotten—not in his own country, but certainly here.

But it should not be forgotten. If in one sense the assassination of Jaurès is the closing scene in the life we lived before the war, when humanitarians could still believe that the world was moving in their direction, it is perhaps more truly to be described as the tragic opening scene in the great struggle now going on, not merely the struggle between the Allies and the Central Powers, but also that far deeper struggle that lies beneath it, which has begun in every country and will develop more and more—the struggle between Force and Freedom; between "*l'homme animal*," as Jaurès would have described it, and "*l'homme mécanique*." For Jaurès beyond and above most men stood for Freedom, the Freedom of the unprivileged, the Freedom of all men. He stood for the whole nation against a class, and for



the whole of humanity against predominating nations. He wanted a living society, each man in it sacred, free, all banded together for social ends, making up free nations also banded together for social ends, each respecting the other, each secure from tyranny. Is it indeed to be a world such as Jaurès conceived it, or a world of drill-sergeants and of well-drilled slaves that is to come forth from the storm? The death of Jaurès was the first effort of the brute, blind force. It crushed out the most vigorous son of man that it could find, the most living, loving, ardent soul, the clearest brain, the warmest heart, the one most conscious of the whole trend of things. It only needed two small balls, mechanical forces, unmeaning, foolish, and that life was gone, lost to France here and now, though not really lost for evermore. It was a fitting prelude to the great calamity that has followed, with its frightful toll by dead mechanical means of the lives of living, loving men; though no one single life so precious, so ill to be spared, has been taken again. . . . He fell first.

Jean Jaurès was nearly fifty-five years old at the time of his death. He was born at Castres in Languedoc on the 3rd of September, 1859. It is easy to feel in his vivid and ardent nature a child of the South. "How many centuries had been necessary," said Romain Rolland in *Au dessus de la Mêlée*, "what rich civilizations of the North and

the South, of the Present, of the Past, spread abroad and ripened in the good soil of France, under the western sun, to produce such a life! And when will the mysterious chance which combines elements and forces bring forth a second example of this good genius?"

Castres is the industrial centre of the department of the Tarn and is a busy town of more than 20,000 inhabitants. Endless spinning and weaving of woollens and of sheets goes on there, and there are dyeworks and tanneries and other factories. It has a certain seriousness of character, its houses are grey, its temperament business-like. It is overlooked by the Montagne Noire, a sombre blue mountain. But the country round is bathed in southern sunshine; vines, plum trees and peach trees abound, and Jaurès describes the maize growing higher than his head so that, <sup>1</sup> "when I cross the fields it seems as if I were in a real forest. In the evening when the moon rises, and there is a light breeze, a strong and health-giving odour, very enjoyable to breathe, streams forth from it. . . ."

During part of the time that Jean and his brother Louis were attending the college or boys' school of Castres, their parents lived at a distance of five kilometres out of the town and the boys had to walk backwards and forwards every day. These walks were delightful to Jean, who even

<sup>1</sup> *Quelques pages sur J. Jaurès*, by L. Levy-Bruhl.

then felt that passion for Nature which he retained through life.

Jaurès' parents were of the middle class, and possessed no wealth. His father is described as a man of intelligence and of strong physique, but wanting in stability of character. He tried his hand at several ways of earning a living, and was not very successful at any of them. As is so often the case with Frenchmen, Jaurès was devoted to his mother, who was a large-hearted and tolerant woman. When between 1889 and 1893 he and his mother were both living in Toulouse, but not in the same house, he used to meet her every day in a certain road and would, if talking with friends when he caught sight of her, run away and leave them, going off with her arm in arm. Madame Jaurès deplored her son's decision to enter on a political life and leave the more studious career in which he had seemed so successful, but the relative whom she consulted declared that "Jean is drawn to politics as a duck to water," and that it was useless to attempt to stop him.<sup>1</sup>

At school Jean and his brother Louis both showed great capabilities. Jean was always at the head of his class and was very docile. He was gifted in languages and early learnt much Latin, and Greek, and some German. Much later he learnt English, and Spanish, and Portuguese. All

<sup>1</sup> See *Quelques pages sur J. Jaurès*, by L. Levy-Bruhl.

his life he had a passion for the Greek writers, especially Homer and Plato. Jaurès' youth was very studious and he had to be restrained at times from reading even at meals. Owing however to the circumstances in which his parents were placed, he would not have been able to continue his education without the help of M. Felix Deltour, an Inspector of Schools, who "discovered" the young Jaurès in the college at Castres, and took him under his protection. M. Deltour's views were reactionary and he would probably have been far from satisfied if he could have foreseen the development of the boy in whom he was so interested. This, however, being mercifully hidden from him, he enabled Jaurès, with true kindness, not only to go to Paris to spend two years at the Lycée Louis-le-Grand, but also to follow up his studies at the Ecole Normale Supérieure. The Ecole Normale Supérieure is a training school for teachers in State Secondary Schools, and the students follow the classes at the Sorbonne.

During his boyhood in the country, Jaurès had always loved talking with the peasants and sharing in their work. On the Thursday half-holiday which is customary in France, or after he had finished preparing his lessons in the evenings, he loved to help load the hay, and later in the year to join in the vintage and even to guide a plough. It has been remarked more than once

that Jaurès always kept something rustic about him even when in the full swing of a Parisian journalist's life. When he first went up to Paris he was considered by his comrades to be <sup>1</sup>“very much of a Southerner, rather rustic, rather hirsute,” but also “intelligent and gifted with an extraordinary facility.” He worked rapidly, and exhausted by the sudden change from the country to the airlessness of Paris, he slept much and long, a habit which was quite scandalous in the eyes of the boys' superintendent. His many questions and his hearty laugh were rather trying to the feelings of some of the older professors, who were used to respectful silence in their classes. He seems however to have won their hearts by his transparent simplicity and goodness.

When he had to write a paper, or give a lesson at the training school, his method was not to take many notes, but to think much and to use his wonderful memory. When he had read what was necessary about the subject in hand, he balanced himself on a chair and ruminated. Then if he had to write a paper he seized a pen and wrote page after page with great rapidity in a large hand. If he were preparing a lesson he wrote nothing, but thought for a long time and, when the moment came, gave forth with ease.

<sup>1</sup> *Quelques pages sur J. Jaurès*, by L. Levy-Bruhl.

Speaking of him as he was at college at about twenty years of age, one of his comrades has told us<sup>1</sup> "Jaurès was without any sense of the value of money: to tell the truth, he lived happy as a king without a halfpenny in his pocket, often not having enough to take an omnibus—withal very generous when it happened that he had a few silver coins. Moreover, as little practical as possible, . . . he kept no accounts and easily got into a mess over any calculation. Very neglectful in dress, but without the slightest affectation about it. The question of the toilette did not exist for him, and in the same way he ignored in his innocence many worldly proprieties, and one may say all exterior elegance. This disdain amused us, ravished us, and was the occasion of many jokes. Some verses long preserved the memory of 'one of Jaurès' hats.' But we had a profound esteem for him, we venerated this naïveté, this truly childlike simplicity of heart."

Jaurès passed through all his examinations with great success. At the final Agrégation, taken at the end of his career at the Ecole Normale, he was evidently expected to do well, and his eloquence being already recognized, the amphitheatre where the oral tests took place was filled when it came to Jaurès' turn to speak. It emptied immediately afterwards for the next student, Lesbazeilles, leaving only the examiners

<sup>1</sup> *Quelques pages sur J. Jaurès*, by L. Levy-Bruhl.

in their places. The lists however showed Lesbazeilles first, Bergson (who was taking the examination at the same time) second, and Jaurès third.

A letter to a college chum gives a charming account of the way he passed his holidays. . . .

<sup>1</sup>“A few days ago I was running from market to market at Castres, and from restaurant to restaurant, to sell our oats. I cut short all the wiles and artifices of the tradesmen. ‘You know that I know nothing about it: tell me my oats are bad, that’s all the same to me, this is the price I want.’ They bought them at the price I asked; it is true it was a very modest one. . . . I have done some digging in the garden . . . I promise myself to trace a few furrows. Something will come out of me, wheat, oats or maize; I should like it best to be wheat! I shall be one of the nourishers of the human race.

. . . . I rise at seven, breathe the fresh air, go round my estate, and at nine I sit down to breakfast on the terrace in the shade of two acacias. I stay there and talk with Papa and Mamma, or I go and play billiards with a neighbour. In the heat of the day I take an umbrella and my botany book, and I go and sit in the shade in a cool valley. I study a little, or I look at the clouds, and I come home at supper time through woods and vines studying, as I pass, roots and flowers, to verify what I have read.

<sup>1</sup> From *Quelques pages sur J. Jaurès*, by L. Levy-Bruhl.

. . . . After supper I go into the garden where we water the plants, or I watch over the cows in a field, in Mamma's company, or I go and talk to M. Julien. Most often the whole family sit in front of the door and scarcely is the sun set when thousands of grasshoppers do the same; they come out of their holes . . . . and are so happy that they make unending music. . . . I sleep near the barn and there is always some grasshopper lost in the dry fodder who lulls me to sleep with the monotonous noise of his song."

When he left the Ecole Normale Supérieure, Jaurès returned to the South and for two years taught in the lycée at Albi so as to be near his parents, whom he was able to see every week. In 1883 he was given a lectureship at the University of Toulouse. He soon began to take an active part in politics and it was not till 1891, during an interval when he was not in the Chamber of Deputies, that he presented his "thèses"—the final step for a young Frenchman before having fully graduated. He was now *docteur-es-lettres*. The "thèse" represents a piece of original work which in Jaurès' case appears to have been of value. His French thesis was philosophical and was called "De la réalité du monde sensible," and his Latin essay was "On the origins of German Socialism." It is of interest that in both writings the ideas expressed are prophetic of what Jaurès' later mental out-



look was to be. Although not yet a Socialist, he is already sufficiently interested in Socialism to make its origins in Germany the subject of his work. In this historical examination he refers German Socialism back to the teachings of Luther, Kant, Fichte, and Hegel, and refuses the idea that modern Socialism is a result of purely economic developments. This was characteristic of Jaurès, for though he believed in the reality of the world of sense, it was always the underlying spiritual idea which interested him and seemed to him important. The spirit was that which united all things, and in his philosophical essay he developed this great idea of Unity. Unity and the Interpenetrability of things, were the mental keynotes from which resulted all his ideas and acts, for Jaurès had a most harmonious nature and mind. In his philosophy Life was a whole, and the course of history a real development, so that he did not believe in cataclysms, and Socialism became to him simply a necessary result of all that had gone before. So, too, we find him always seeking the point of contact, even with those opposed to him in many things, for he believed in contact, in comprehension of others, even in submitting to them at times. He believed in the power all things have of penetrating each other and of deriving good from this communion — man penetrating and being penetrated by Nature, and human beings under-

standing each other, uniting with each other in larger and larger units.

Thought and action were harmoniously blended in Jaurès; it seemed easy to him to transform his philosophical thoughts into the details of his daily activities. And it was the same with his moral convictions. When he came back from taking a first public part in the "Affaire Dreyfus," Jules Guesde said to him in words which he always remembered with pleasure: "Je vous aime, Jaurès, parceque chez vous l'acte suit toujours la pensée."

In 1885 Jaurès stood as a candidate for Albi and was elected to the Chamber of Deputies. He was then only twenty-six years of age. It was not long after this that he was married.

Jaurès was not re-elected in 1889; but he stood for Carmaux in 1893 and represented the miners there for the rest of his life, with the exception of four years from 1898 to 1902. After the first few years, besides speaking much in public, he spoke constantly in the Chamber, and was a most industrious member, being present even in the mornings when details of laws are discussed. He was also constantly in the lobbies, questioning and discussing with men of all parties.

Jaurès had also become a journalist, and he managed during his afternoons of varied conversation to compose his daily article in his head. He was thinking of it all the time, and in the

evening he had nothing to do but write it down. This he did in the editor's room of *La Petite République* in earlier years and later in that of *L'Humanité*, amid a great deal of noise.

Even from the first Jaurès' sympathies were clearly on the side of the people, and when in 1893 he definitely joined the Socialists, this was no real change, but merely that he had come to see the Socialist point of view quite clearly. At first he was, as he tells us, so much under the influence of the older Socialist leaders that he may have appeared to accept that type of revolutionary Socialism which he afterwards opposed.

But Jaurès' mind was too practical, his grip on human life was too keen for him to remain long with those who confine their energies to propaganda. He was an idealist, but he was a realist too. He believed, if anyone ever believed, in a new earth in which all men would be free and equal, but he wanted to set about realizing this by adapting all the forces for progress that were to hand. Above all it was clear to him that the great majority of the nation must become sympathetic to Socialism before Socialism could come about, and he was ready to hold out his hand to anyone—Socialist-Radical, Radical, or even moderate Republican—who gave signs of honestly working for progress. A difference of opinion arose amongst French Socialists over the part which Jaurès took, in conjunction with men

like Zola, and with other mere Liberals, in the Dreyfus case. Afterwards the split became wider when, with the co-operation and leadership of Jaurès, the French Socialists in the Chamber of Deputies helped to form the *bloc* which, composed of men of advanced views of various shades, fought the Church and the reactionary forces and, under M. Waldeck-Rousseau and M. Combes, succeeded in passing the Law of Associations by which the Catholic teaching orders were destroyed, and ultimately brought about the complete separation of Church and State.

It cannot be said that the course which Jaurès took with regard to the *bloc* was without danger, nor that the expostulations and fears of Jules Guesde, who led the idealistic party, were without weight. What should exonerate Jaurès even in the eyes of the most idealistic was his disinterestedness. While backing his friends in taking office under Republican leaders, from the conviction that this was the right way to further the progress of Socialism, he himself remained outside the ministry. And when the Socialist Congress at Rheims, and the International Socialist Congress at Amsterdam, decided against the policy of Socialist participation in progressive ministries, and urged on French Socialists the necessity of reconciliation, Jaurès loyally agreed to the termination of the *bloc* and joined the

United Socialists, out of whom the new party was formed. From that time to his death he worked for the whole party. It was a life of unceasing activity, for he was not only writing daily for *L'Humanité*, and speaking in the Chamber, but speaking also in public, drafting motions for Conferences, working without intermission for Internationalism and Peace.

Jaurès was a man of very great gifts which were never used for his own advancement but devoted to the service of the people. In a nation where the power to speak well is quite common he was recognized as the greatest orator. It is curious that in spite of being already so accomplished a speaker, when he first entered the Chamber of Deputies the mere thought of having to get up and speak caused him a terror which he found it very difficult to overcome. He soon had the ear of the Chamber, which not only realized his wonderful powers, but also the care with which he studied all the questions on which he spoke. Although his voice was not in itself attractive—Rappoport calls it “monotonous” and Macdonald speaks of it as “harsh”—yet he always won the sympathy of his audience. For the power of Jaurès' words sprang above all from the mind and heart of the man. “Even when he improvised,” says M. Rappoport, “he only spoke of things which he had studied deeply. He addressed himself at the same time to the reason, the

feelings and the ear. He was at once an artist, a savant, and a statesman. Full of vigour and of passion, he yet had himself in full control. He said nothing but what he wished to say and what was necessary to say. . . . He was a veritable athlete of the platform. He cried, he thundered, he stormed, he clasped his hands, he carried away the listener, but he did not cease at the same time from instructing and enlightening him. . . . One felt the sincerity, the solidity, the truth of all he said. . . . Clear and keen thoughts alternated with sumptuous images. Interesting facts accumulated and came in crowds to the help of the ideas developed by the orator, with a vehemence and a passion which communicated itself to the audience. . . . In the midst of fiery and yet well-ordered periods, a stroke of delicious irony and of charming gaiety broke forth, like a flash of lightning in the midst of the storm. A gentle warmth of real kindness and good humour penetrated through all the words of the orator. . . . All the cords of the listener's heart were set vibrating in unison by the words, at once passionate and exact, vehement and measured, of the orator. One felt the physical need of applauding, of extolling the great tribune. One felt oneself in the presence of an extraordinary force, of a superior force, a force of goodness and light. . . . A current of friendship, of cordiality established

itself between the orator and his audience. And one went out better from the hall where Jaurès had been spreading forth the sonorous and limpid floods of his vigorous and healthy eloquence."

M. Romain Rolland has also described delightfully the impression that Jaurès made on him when he spoke: <sup>1</sup>"I have listened to him often in the Chamber, at socialist congresses, at meetings held on behalf of oppressed nations. . . . Again I see his full face calm and happy, like that of a kindly bearded ogre; his small eyes bright and smiling; eyes as quick to follow the flight of ideas as to observe human nature. I see him pacing up and down the platform, walking with heavy steps like a bear, his arms crossed behind his back, turning sharply to hurl at the crowd, in his monotonous, metallic voice, words like the call of a trumpet, which reached the farthest seats in the vast amphitheatre, and went straight to the heart, making the soul of the whole multitude leap in one united emotion" . . . .

Partly no doubt because of this wonderful gift of speech, Jaurès became very widely known. Camille Huysmans, the Secretary of the International Socialist Bureau, speaking in its name at the funeral of Jaurès, said: "We are, throughout the world, ten millions of organized workmen for whom the name of Jaurès incarnated the most

<sup>1</sup> *Au dessus de la Mêlée, par Romain Rolland.*

noble, eloquent, and complete socialist aspirations. . . . Jaurès did not belong only to France. He belonged to all the nationalities . . . . I remember what he was for workmen of other countries. I still see foreign delegates waiting till he had spoken to fix their decisive opinion; and even when they were not in agreement with him they liked to come as near as they could to his conception. He was more than an artist. He was more than the Word. . . . He was the Conscience. He was a moral value. He knew how to give the example of discipline. He was like those oaks of Finland, which, high as masts, and powerfully attached to the soil know how to bend their heads without uprooting themselves, and whose elasticity redoubles their force."

In *Quelques pages sur Jean Jaurès*, M. L. Levy-Bruhl says: "The religious sentiment wells up in Jaurès from two sources which never dried up. The first is the love of Nature which revealed itself so strongly in Jaurès when he was quite a child, that sort of intimate blending of his being with the earth, the sky, the forest, the fields, the grasshoppers, the bees, with all the palpitating and humming life of his beloved South; from thence came the genuine hymns with which his *thèse* is strewn, a hymn to light, to night, to the earth, to the stars, etc. The other is the profound need of justice, the presentiment of, and the demand for, a social order which would be



harmonious and truly human, from which the present reality is still far off, but which is bound to realize itself. This faith, which doubt never touched, is in essence truly religious."

It is this deep undercurrent in the life of the ardent and vigorous politician which is so surprising. His was a nature at once deep and wide, readily responsive and yet having in its own inner life the capability for those finer experiences which seem generally to come only to poets and to those who live much alone. In illustration of his idea of the interpenetrability of Man and Nature Jaurès wrote: " . . . In the same measure that we act upon the exterior world it acts upon us. There are hours when we feel in treading the ground a joy as tranquil and profound as the earth herself . . . . How many times, walking in the paths across fields, I have said to myself suddenly that it was the Earth that I was treading, that I was hers and she mine, and without thinking of it I slackened my pace because it was not worth while to hasten on her surface, because I felt her in each step and possessed her wholly, and my soul, if I may so express it, walked in her depths. How many times also, lying on the top of a ditch, turned, at the decline of day, towards the soft blue East, I thought suddenly that the earth was journeying, that flying the weariness of day and the limited horizons of the sun, she was going

<sup>1</sup> From *La réalité du Monde sensible*.

with a tremendous impetus towards the serene night and the illimitable horizons, and that she was carrying me with her: and I felt in my flesh as well as in my soul, and in the earth as in my flesh the shudder of this rush, and I found a strange sweetness in these spaces which opened out in front of us without a clash, without a fold, without a murmur."

Jaurès had a subtle and powerful brain. His mind seized on the fundamental meaning of things and was not disturbed by the non-essentials. He could be very passionate, even unfair in excitement, but he had a fundamental sanity and an almost unique wide-mindedness and the humility of the truly great. He had besides, and that was his charm, a warm heart. A little incident, told by M. Rappoport, belonging to the very last moments of his life, reveals his simple kindness. Jaurès had been labouring hard that last day, urging the Minister, it would seem, to put more pressure upon Russia to act so as if possible to save Europe from the horror of war. He returned to the office of *L'Humanité* very late. Much had still to be done.

"They came down to the restaurant of the Croissant," says M. Rappoport, "two steps from the office of *L'Humanité*, where Jaurès and his friends took their places at the long table at the left of the entrance. The seriousness of the time

J. Jaurès, *L'Homme, Le Penseur, Le Socialiste*, par Ch. Rappoport

had thrown them all into a state of deep emotion. Jaurès spoke in his beautiful grave voice . . . . He was giving some instructions to his political collaborators. They finished dinner. At this moment Citizen Dolié of the Bonnet Rouge, who was dining with his young wife at another table, rose and came across with a photograph in his hand and held it out to one of Jaurès' companions, saying: 'Look, it's my little girl.' 'Can I see?' said Jaurès with a kind smile. He took the photograph, examined it a moment, asked the young father the age of the child, and congratulated him" . . . A little act of gentleness done at a moment when a man might well be excused for preoccupation, even for haughtiness or *brusquerie*. It was just then that the assassin's bullet struck him behind the ear. He fell forward and did not recover consciousness. A doctor was fetched, but nothing could be done, and a few moments later he died.



## CHAPTER II

### SOCIALISM

IT was natural that the Socialism of the men who brought about the Revolution of 1848 in France, and of Marx himself, should have suffered from the disadvantages which beset the work of pioneers. Those who came later owed them a great debt. Jaurès heartily acknowledged this debt, while his free and living spirit encouraged him to move beyond the stage which they had reached. He came into the movement years after it had established itself even in England, and a generation after Marx had done his work. He was at first much under the influence of Socialists whose point of view appears to have been similar to that held in England by the early members of the Social Democratic Federation. The Socialist of this type was distinguished by an immense fervour, an unbending idealism, and a curious remoteness from human life and the way men actually think and act. Jaurès was not that type of man. He was very mobile, very unconventional, and he had little of that rigidity in rebellion which sometimes seems like the reverse side

of conventionality itself. His unconventionality was innate. J. R. Macdonald has given us in his appreciation of Jaurès published in the *Contemporary Review* for September, 1914, a delightful picture of his careless ease. "I was once walking," he says, "through the streets of Stuttgart and saw a strange figure in front of me. It belonged to an order all by itself. Jauntily set upon its head was a straw hat, somewhat the worse for wear, its clothes were baggy and pitchforked upon its back, below its trouser-legs were folds of collapsed white stockings, under its arm it carried, or rather dragged an overcoat. It sauntered along looking at the shops and houses as it went, unconscious of everything except its own interest, like a youth looking upon a new world, or a strolling player who had mastered fate and had discovered how to fill the moments with happy unconcern. It was the happy-go-lucky Jaurès."

Add to this cheerful disregard for the smaller proprieties of dress and manner that Jaurès was unusual enough to live simply, and to die poor, and it becomes evident that in personal matters as well as in all else he was by no means one of the herd.

But with a nature so responsive, so sympathetic, so truly representative as his, and a mind so interested in the world around him, he could not be for long a voice crying in the wilderness.

Most of his gifts and his drawbacks alike arose from this, that his nature compelled him to want keenly to see others adopt and work out in practice the great ideas which some men seem to wish only to share with a few, and to hold forever enshrined in a sort of theoretical sacredness.

It was therefore some modification of the older methods of socialistic activity that he was bound to desire. But though Jaurès' methods were those of the reformer, though he was ready to build brick by brick, his vision of the future, his desire and intention for the future were revolutionary in the strongest sense, nothing less than that new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness and joy, that has been the aim of the prophets in all ages. Jaurès was not then an opportunist, but a man with a creative mind. He was an artist craftsman in social matters, he wanted to build the new Jerusalem, not to talk of it for ever. His practical point of view merely served to heighten the reality of the ideal to him. It was not only a vision, but one that must be, that would be realized.

M. Levy-Bruhl says of him: "Jaurès lived for an ideal of social justice and Humanity set free. He did not accept as an immutable fact, as a natural necessity, that the condition of the greater part of mankind should remain what it is now. He believed that it would be from now onwards ameliorated, and with time transformed. It is this ideal that he had before his eyes when

he spoke of "the sublime joy of bringing all men into the fullness of humanity."

In 1903 he published a book called *Etudes Socialistes*. In it he deals with considerations of the method of bringing Socialism about, but it is in part a criticism of present day society from the socialist point of view and suggests the fundamental changes which will be necessary.

<sup>1</sup> "The main idea of Socialism," says Jaurès, "is simple and noble. Socialists believe that the present form of property-holding divides society into two great classes. One of these classes, the wage-earning Proletariat, is obliged to pay to the other, the Capitalist, a sort of tax in order to be able to live at all, and exercise its faculties to any degree. Here is a multitude of human beings, citizens; they possess nothing, they can live only by their work. But in order to work they need an expensive equipment which they do not possess, and raw materials and capital which they do not possess. Another class owns the means of production, the land, the factories, the machines, the raw materials, and accumulated capital in the form of money: and naturally this capitalist and possessing class, taking advantage of its power, makes the working and non-owning class pay a large forfeit. It does not rest content after it has been reimbursed for the advances it made and has repaired the wear and tear of the machinery. It

<sup>1</sup> From *Studies in Socialism*. Trans. by M. Minturn.



lays in addition every year and indefinitely a considerable tax on the product of the workman and farmer in the form of rent for farms, ground rent, rent of land in the cities, taxes for the payment of the public debt, industrial profit, commercial profit, and interest on stocks and bonds.

“Therefore in our present society, the work of the workers is not their exclusive property . . . the proletarian does not own his own body absolutely. . . . He has hardly left the factory, the mine, or the yard, where part of his effort has been expended in the creation of dividends and profits for the benefit of Capital, he has hardly gone back to the poor tenement where his family is huddled together, when he is face to face with another tax, with other dues in the shape of rent. And besides this, State taxation . . . pares down his already twice diminished wage, and this not only to provide for the legitimate running expenses of a civilized society and for the advantage of all its members, but to guarantee the crushing payment of interest on the public debt, for the profit of the same capitalist class or for the maintenance of armaments at once formidable and useless. . . . When finally the proletarian tries to buy, with the remnant of wages left to him after these inroads, the commodities which are necessities of daily life, he has two courses open to him. If he lacks time or money

he will turn to a retail dealer, and will then have to bear the expense of a cumbrous and unnecessary organization of intermediary agents; or else he may go to a great store, where over and above the direct expenses of management and distribution he has to provide for the profit of ten or twelve per cent. on the capital invested. . . . He can neither work nor eat, clothe nor shelter himself, without paying a sort of ransom to the owning and capitalist class."

It was always present to Jaurès' mind that this inequality of wealth resulted in something worse than the physical deprivation of the workers. <sup>1</sup>"The domination of one class," he says, "is an attempt to degrade humanity. . . . Justice . . . has come to signify that in every man, in every individual, humanity ought to be fully respected and exalted to its full stature." But it is of no use to talk of this unless we are ready to alter the structure of society. <sup>2</sup>"Now, true humanity can only exist where there is independence, active exercise of the will, free and joyous adaptation of the individual to the whole. Where men are dependent on the favour of others, where individual wills do not co-operate freely in the work of society, where the individual submits to the law of the whole under compulsion or by force of habit, and not from reason alone, there humanity is degraded and mutilated."

<sup>1 2</sup> From *Studies in Socialism*. Trans. by M. Minturn.

Again he says, <sup>1</sup>“Not one (human being) should be deprived of the sure means of labouring freely without servile dependence on any other individual” and, <sup>2</sup>“As the community can only ensure the rights of the individual by putting the means of production at his disposal, the community itself must have the sovereign right of ownership over all the means of production.”

Jaurès made an onslaught in *Etudes Socialistes* against those Radicals who, while agreeing to a certain number of reforms in the position of the workers, describe themselves as the firm upholders of “private property,” using this term as if it expressed something which was absolutely permanent and which ought to be held sacred, and implying that its present form is the only right one. Jaurès shows how property has changed in character from time to time, first meaning slavery or the entire right of one man over another. <sup>3</sup>“Individuals owned them, disposed of them, forced them to labour, gave them away as presents, sold them or left them to their heirs.” Then came the change to serfdom, which meant a more complex relation. The right over the serf’s labour still existed, but the serf could not be disposed of so easily. He had a little more power over himself. Even now, however, every element of servitude has not disappeared in the position of the worker; the capitalist system

<sup>1 2 3</sup> From *Studies in Socialism*. Trans. by M. Minturn.

“permits a minority of privileged individuals to dispose of the work, the strength and the health of the working classes and to levy on them a perpetual tribute.” When Radicals talk of the sacredness of private property as against the attacks of Socialists and speak as if to do away with private property were to take away a very important human right, what they really mean is *capitalist property*, that is, the property of a class, the right of the few over the many. But the future will not necessarily be a continuance of this. Rather the evolution will go on. <sup>1</sup> “Far from being immovable, the conception of property has been modified in the course of centuries, and there is no doubt that it will be further modified in the future . . . and it is certain that it is now going to evolve in the direction of greater complication, to richer complexity. A new force has to be reckoned with; a force which is going to complicate and transform all social relations, the whole property system. This new force is the human individual. For the first time since the beginning of history man claims his rights as a man, all his rights. The workman, the proletarian, the man who owns nothing is affirming his own individuality. He claims everything that belongs properly to a man: the right to life, the right to work, the right to the complex development of his faculties, to the continuous exercise

<sup>1</sup> From *Studies in Socialism*. Trans. by M. Minturn.

of his free will and of his reason. Under the double action of democratic life, which has wakened or strengthened in him the pride of a man, and of modern industry, which has given to united labour a consciousness of its power, the workman is becoming a person, and insists on being treated as such, everywhere and always. Well, society cannot guarantee him the right to work or the right to life, it cannot promote him from the condition of a passive wage-earner to that of a free co-operator, without itself entering into the domain of property. Social property has to be created to guarantee private property in its real sense, that is, the property that the human individual has and ought to have in his own person." Jaurès thus shows that individuals need this vast increase of common property to secure their personal liberty. This common property will, he says, be found in all sorts of different units, not in one hard and fast form: it will be national, communal, or co-operative. <sup>1</sup>"In place of the relatively simple and brutal capitalistic form of property, there will be substituted then an infinitely complex form, where the social right of the nation will serve to guarantee, by the intermediary of many local or professional groups, the essential rights of every human being—the free play of all activities."

For freedom was dear to him. Just as he loved

<sup>1</sup> *Studies in Socialism*. Trans. by M. Minturn.

the idea of free nationalities and objected to any one nation attempting to dominate and crush out the individuality of another, so he longed for the free life within each nation which would enable each human being to develop the spontaneous life giving force within.

Jaurès' real love of liberty, even when the liberty of another crossed his own desires, is demonstrated in one of the few personal explanations he made in public. It was not Jaurès' custom to answer the personal attacks to which he was so constantly exposed. But when he was attacked both by friends and foes on the occasion of his daughter's first communion, he wrote in *La Petite République* the following words: "For three months, since the clerical press announced with a marvellous harmony . . . that I had let my daughter make her first communion, I have endured outrages and triumphant raillery from some, sad astonishment from some others. To the fact itself our enemies gave the most slanderous interpretation. . . . They say that this religious act was the expression of my personal wish, of my personal conviction, and that I have played in the Party a rôle of incredible duplicity. It is a lie. . . . I have been from my youth freed from all religion and all dogma. . . . But really what is all this about? It is not I alone that am concerned; it is the immense majority of militant Socialists. How then does the question stand?"

“In the greater part of the families of the Republican bourgeoisie and of the Socialist proletariat, the young girls are neither clericals nor free-thinkers . . . They have a disdain for bigotry and a horror of intolerance . . . . They would not accept for their children a systematised and stifling education; they desire that they should remain in contact with all modern life. They are not then clericals. But with the exception of a very small number, all of them, workers or middle classes, they have remained attached by a part at least of their thoughts and of their hearts to the Christian faith, to the Catholic tradition. They have not said ‘No’ to religious belief. They have not created for themselves by science and philosophy another conception of the universe; they have not, outside Christianity, the whole support for the moral life. . . . That is the state of mind of a great many Catholic women in France. They are not at the mercy of the watchwords of the Church. But no more have they freed themselves from its dogmas.

“Well, I imagine that one of us, of the middle class or the workers, may have married ten years ago, fifteen years ago, twenty years ago, a young girl thus brought up. . . . Let us suppose that at the moment when he was married he was not engaged in political and social warfare, or that he belonged to one of those moderate and middle parties who accept compromises in

private as in political and social life. Although a free-thinker, he made no difficulty about being married in a church. . . . But if the same man evolves personally towards a more hardy, more revolutionary conception of society, of the world, and of life, if he is revolted by injustice, and if he is led by study, by the passionate search for truth, into the party of the Social Revolution, if, from thenceforth, he is, in the great crises of the national life, more violently and more directly at war with the Church: has he the right to impose by force on all his family his own evolution? . . . That is the problem that is set by life, not only for me, but for nine militants out of ten. And I know that as a matter of fact the greater part have replied as I have. . . . .

“ But I have never said (and that is the clerical ruse and an abominable lie) that it is by violence in the family or in the State that one should abolish old beliefs, never have I said that individual Socialists should in the family use violence against the conscience of the wife, the mother. . . . Never have I said that the Socialist Party, when master of the State, would use violence to abolish the traditional religion. I have never appealed to anything but the gradual organization of liberty, to the intimate force of science and reason.”

Jaurès believed in the continuity of history. It



was his belief that man had been marching forward from the first towards liberty, which was another way for him of saying democracy. Every time that a fresh conquest was made anywhere by larger and larger masses of men, the day of emancipation for all was brought nearer. Finally came about the French Revolution. Great changes of that kind, he points out, cannot be the work of minorities—the immense majority of the nation willed the Revolution and it came. This was a great moment in the history of humanity. Why? Because it affirmed democracy as never before. Jaurès wrote: “It is a splendid idea to have proclaimed that in the political and social order of to-day, no one is turned out, no one is disavowed, every human person has his rights.”

The Revolution, though it too came out of the past, was a great step forward.

French writers often speak of “the Revolution,” not confining this term to the Revolution of 1789, but meaning by it all that came out of that Revolution, all that followed as a natural sequence. In this sense Jaurès was a revolutionist and he himself often used the term. As used by him the Revolution meant the whole body of thought which accepts every man and woman as in themselves of worth, and not as existing for the comfort and convenience of a small superior class. This was the very heart and centre of

Jaurès' faith. And it was because he believed that this idea was implicit in the theory of a Republic that he considered the Republic so invaluable for France, and that he was further always willing to ally himself with Republicans if they gave signs of believing in their own formulas. The Republic involves the abolition of privilege and it can be only a matter of time before this is fully worked out. It is true that the Republic has as yet only conquered political inequalities—social inequalities, economic inequalities remain, but in a Republic these cannot be morally defended, and no sincere Republican can fight for them with conviction. Speaking of members of his own party, he says: "Because they are republicans, democrats, anti-clericals the Socialists have great interests in common with the non-socialist parties, who want to maintain the Republic, develop the democracy and combat the privileges of the Church. And they necessarily make a difference between the parties who uphold and the parties who combat the Republic, democracy and freedom of discussion."

Jaurès' ideas with regard to the political action which ought to be taken by Socialists resulted from this sense of historical evolution. He believed that as the Republic had grown out of the Revolution so Socialism would grow out of the

<sup>1</sup> See J. Jaurès, *L'Homme, Le Penseur, Le Socialiste*, par Ch. Rappoport, p. 410.

Republic. He was always reminding the Socialists that Republicans had much in common with them, and striving to increase the numbers of those who would be willing to help in some degree the Social Revolution. In his view all who felt the weight and oppression of the capitalist system, the poorer middle classes and the peasants, as well as the proletariat of the towns, should come together, and by a programme of legislative reform, the Socialist Party should prove the aptitude of Socialism to serve the common interests and thus dispel the prejudice felt against it. In a fine passage he says: "I believe that if the Socialist Party did not leave these great thoughts in the state of general formulæ, but realised them in an exact programme of just and wide evolution towards a well defined communism, if it gave the impression that it is at once generous and practical, ardent for the struggle, and the friend of peace, very firm against iniquitous institutions and decided to cast them down methodically, but also very conciliatory toward persons, it would advance by half a century the true Social Revolution, that which will come about in things, in laws, and in the heart, not in formulæ and words, and it would save the great work of the proletarian Revolution from the sickening and cruel odour of blood, of murder and of hatred which has remained attached to the bourgeois Revolution."

Thus Socialism was in Jaurès' conception of it to be built on the widest and most humane ideas. He was a Humanitarian Socialist, one of those men who, like Tolstoy, are prophetic of a future world for which we long, but for which we scarcely dare to hope.

## CHAPTER III

### JAURÈS AND THE DREYFUS CASE

IT was not long after Jaurès had definitely joined the Socialist Party that France became harassed and rent with the Dreyfus case. The critical years during which the controversy raged were from the end of 1895 to 1899. After that the "Affaire" died down, though it was not really finished with till later. M. Rappoport calls it: "at once a moral epic, a national drama, a political tragedy, and on certain sides a popular melodrama . . . Some secondary figures threatened to turn it into a tragi-comic farce. But the atrocious sufferings of an innocent man, and the ideological and political passions aroused, preserved for it, to the end, its serious character. It called into movement a whole world of ideas, passions, interests."

The "Affaire" seems to have arisen out of a wave of Anti-Semitism, which, resulting from the emancipation of the Jews in the middle of the nineteenth century and the jealousy felt at their consequent increase of power, had visited other countries and passed at that time over

## JEAN JAURÈS

France. The condition of mind which expresses itself as Anti-Semitism always seems connected with motives and emotions of a sinister sort, but it tries to appear as if it sprang from natural, and even noble indignation. Many Jews in France were rich, they had their hands on high finance, they were powerful, and, it was said, of course unscrupulous, at once the enemies of religion, of patriotism, and of the poor. The clerical journal, the *Libre Parole*, made common cause against them with "Nationalist" and "advanced" newspapers. So far as the Socialists were interested at all, they were at first prejudiced against the rich Jew who was made the victim of this propaganda. The clerical and aristocratic hatred for the bourgeois Republic in which it was said the Jews had grown so powerful was especially strong in the army, where, says Jaurès, in the preface to his book, *Les Preuves*, "the clerical party, having lost, during the Republican period, . . . the direction of public administration, of the Civil Service, had found a refuge. . . . There the old directing classes . . . grouped themselves into a proud, exclusive clique. There the influence of the Jesuits, patient and subtle recruiting officers among the higher command, was exercised in a sovereign fashion." This aristocratic and clerical feeling was naturally antagonistic to the Jewish officers, of whom there were five hundred.

“And now, behold a Jew penetrates, the first of his race,” he continues, “into the Staff, to the very heart of the stronghold. . . . Quick! this scandal must be cut short. First vague rumours, then general theories are propagated: by what imprudence has the French nation taken into the centre of her military system the accursed race, the treasonable people who, no longer being able to crucify God, hidden above the clouds, wishes to crucify the country? And immediately that the leakage of documents is announced to the General Staff, it is towards the Jew that eyes are secretly turned. Ah! what luck if it should be he!”

Drumont had founded the *Anti-Semitic Libre Parole* in 1892. This newspaper seems to have been in some way in the confidence of those who had the Dreyfus prosecution in hand, for it was through its means that the first hint of what was going on became public, and the *Libre Parole* began a regular campaign with the object of making it difficult for the Minister of War to support Dreyfus. When it first became known that Dreyfus had been charged with treason, it seemed indeed as if his enemies had all France at their backs, and though the whole trial was secret and no one had any idea of the evidence on which he had been condemned, the country decided against him. Amid a storm of furious denunciation he was degraded and condemned to be confined

in a fortress for life, and no voice was raised on his behalf. Apparently no one but his own friends believed in his innocence. Five years later, when he was brought back from the Ile du Diable a great change had taken place, and although his enemies were still strong enough to secure his condemnation a second time, yet the verdict spoke of "extenuating circumstances" and the sentence of ten years was a mere form.

For a long time Jaurès looked on at this mysterious drama as an outsider, and was chiefly concerned with the indications it gave of the unrest and anarchy brought about by unscrupulous capitalism and finance on the one hand, and the workings of clericalism and militarism on the other. "Across the incidents of the Dreyfus-Esterhazy affair," he wrote, "across its successive periods of sharp crises or of calm, Socialists have noted, like attentive surgeons, the play of profound forces which have entered into the struggle."

"Enemies of the power of cosmopolitan finance, as of military and of clerical power, they denounce the organic convulsions by which the social body is shaken. But we turn hopeful eyes towards the other power, great and good, which grows and increases every day, and which tomorrow will be the chief and all-powerful force—the power of the workers."

See Rappoport, p. 38



But from 1896 to 1898 a series of events had taken place, and, through the press, revelations, and half-revelations, and insinuations had poured forth, and the eyes of honest men had been opened more and more.

After Dreyfus was sent to French Guiana in 1895 there was silence for over a year. He had begged in the most impassioned manner for further investigation, and his family were all this time at work, but nothing happened, and no doubt his enemies thought they had rid themselves of him for ever.

Then a very curious thing came about. In May, 1896, a *carte telegramme* was brought from the German Embassy, by the secret agent of the French Government who had brought from the same place the document which was supposed to incriminate Dreyfus. This *carte telegramme* was delivered into the hands of Colonel Picquart, at that time head of the Intelligence Department, and as it happened, an honest and honourable man. The card, always afterwards called the *petit bleu*, which he now received, was addressed to Monsieur le Commandant Esterhazy, at this officer's address in Paris. This led Colonel Picquart to make some inquiries about Esterhazy, in the course of which it became clear that Esterhazy was a depraved and reckless man. But this was not all, for Colonel Picquart, whose suspicions were aroused by

Esterhazy's manifest relationships with the German Embassy, compared his handwriting with that of the famous *bordereau* attributed to Dreyfus, and became convinced that they were the same.

But when he intimated to his superiors of the General Staff, who had at first encouraged him, that he was ready to proceed against Esterhazy, he was told to be cautious, and in the autumn of 1896 he was sent on a dangerous mission in Tunisia, and Esterhazy was not tried for another year. While away, Colonel Picquart received letters and telegrams of a compromising nature, which were obviously sent to discredit him.

Meanwhile, a facsimile of the *bordereau* had been published in the *Matin* to reassure the Anti-Dreyfusards, who were becoming somewhat uneasy. It was a mistaken step, however, for almost at once it was seen not to have been written by Dreyfus, so that it was not reassuring at all. Meanwhile, the Anti-Dreyfusard paper, *L'Eclair*, actually had the folly to state that Dreyfus had not been condemned because of the *bordereau*, but upon a letter which had never been shown either to him or to his lawyer. This fact, so damning to his judges, came out in other ways.

Esterhazy, in fact, knew that the net was drawing closer round him. On the 14th November, 1897, it was stated in the *Figaro* that a

senator, M. Scheurer-Kestner, had convincing proofs of the innocence of Dreyfus. To discount such evidence beforehand, Esterhazy published the next day an article in *L'Eclair* under the name of Dixi, in which he stated that the plan of the "Dreyfus Syndicate" was to throw the blame of the *bordereau* on another officer whose handwriting resembled that of this document, the truth being that Dreyfus had obtained quantities of this officer's handwriting and had traced it and incorporated it into the *bordereau*. Esterhazy thus himself admitted the likeness between his own handwriting and that of the *bordereau*.

When Picquart returned shortly afterwards, Esterhazy was court-martialled. But the trial was with closed doors, and the bias of the Staff was so greatly in his favour and its determination that the Dreyfus case should not be reopened was so strong, that he was acquitted, while Colonel Picquart himself was imprisoned on a charge of espionage.

It was plain that none of the facts that had so far leaked out had moved the authorities at all. On the contrary they had shielded the real traitor, and had refused to listen to the plea for revision made by Matthieu Dreyfus and others. It seemed that nothing less than a direct appeal to the public would avail, and Emile Zola, the novelist, stepped bravely into the breach. On the 13th of January, 1898, he published in *L'Aurore* the famous

“open letter” to the President of the Republic, each paragraph of which began “J'accuse . . .” and in which he accused by name, a number of Generals of the Staff, who by weakness or wickedness were partners in the crime of condemning an innocent man, the Commandant Paty du Clam for being the “ouvrier diabolique de l'erreur judiciaire,” the experts in handwriting, the Council of War, and the bureaux of War for the campaign which it had inspired in the Press.

His object, of course, was to secure a trial for libel, which he was duly accorded in February, and at which many more incriminating facts against the persecutors of Dreyfus were disclosed. But the highest chiefs of the army, so many of whom were by this time implicated, put forth all their powers to prevent the truth from coming to light, and Zola was accordingly condemned. He appealed, and two months later the Cour de Cassation reversed the judgment. Means were found, however, to institute a fresh trial in July. For some reason Zola thought it the best policy to disappear, and he came to England, where he remained in hiding till June, 1899. Then, hearing that Dreyfus had at last been accorded a revision, he went back to Paris.

“J'accuse” produced an immense sensation, and for many honest men it became the occasion of a “veritable liberation of conscience.” For a long time Jaurès had been more and more unable

to restrain his indignation. From this moment he threw himself with all his powers into the struggle. "At the tribune of the Chamber" he tells us, "on the 24th of January, 1898, I put the question plainly, 'Yes or No? Was a document which might have formed or fortified the conviction of the judges, communicated to them and not to the accused? Yes or No?'" One seems to see Jaurès, his eyes gleaming, asking this straight question and one realises that he was a formidable opponent. "I waited for a reply for some minutes. M. Méline (the Prime Minister) hesitating, troubled, finished by stammering 'You will be answered in another place.' But it was just in the Chamber, that is before the country, that he should have answered me. It is not the business of Parliament to apply the laws, but its first duty is to watch over, by means of the responsible government, the observation of the law, the maintenance of legal guarantees, without which a prosecution is only a trap.

"And when Parliament abdicates this essential duty, when through fear of the army chiefs who have criminally violated the law, it dares not even get information, when it permits the government by a miserable shuffle to evade a definite question, there is no more surety of liberty in a country; what remains of it is yielded us on sufferance only.

<sup>1</sup> "*Les Preuves*," p. 3

“But if it was false that the law had been violated . . . what prevented M. Méline from rising and saying ‘No!’?”

“With a single word he would have calmed honest minds. This word he did not say, and his silence was a decisive avowal.”

And this same answer was *not* given “elsewhere.” It was refused at Zola’s trial by General Mercier, who had been Minister of War at the time of the Dreyfus trial. Nevertheless all came gradually to light.

Reinach refers to Jaurès’ wonderful physical energy in speaking, when he describes his first interference on this subject in the French Chamber. Tumult arose from the beginning of his speech, and the interruptions were frequent, while <sup>1</sup>“he boldly made his profession of faith, the same as that of all those who had been crying for months for justice.

“‘Do you know from what we are all suffering,’ he said, ‘from what we are all dying? I say it on my own responsibility. We are all dying since this affair began from half measures, from keeping things back, from equivocations, from lies, from cowardice. Yes, equivocations, lies, cowardice.’

“He no longer spoke, he thundered with a purple face, his arms stretched out towards the Ministers who protested, toward the Right who

<sup>1</sup> Rappoport, p. 41

bellowed. But the more the clamour became furious, the higher his voice rose, like the cry of a sea-bird in a tempest."

Jaurès was a journalist of great powers. He now began a press campaign in *La Petite République*, for which at that time he was writing. In the autumn of the same year 1898 his articles were published as a book called *Les Preuves*. It is a brilliant piece of work.

Jaurès began with the two propositions, "(1) That Dreyfus had been condemned illegally without guarantees essential to the accused; and (2) That he had been condemned by error. He is an innocent man who suffers afar for the crimes of another. It is to prolong the martyrdom of an innocent man that to-day all the powers of reaction and of lying have coalesced."

And then he proceeded day by day and bit by bit to prove his assertions. He unravelled this tortuous web of lies, spread by the enemies of Dreyfus; he followed with endless patience the ramifications of these mysteries, and all with a mastery of touch, a power of getting right at the essential underlying truth, a restrained passion, which only occasionally bursts into flame when he can bear the atmosphere of falsehood no longer.

Jaurès first examined the charge with which the enemies of Dreyfus (including the Minister of War) had attempted to stop all further effort

on the part of those who were trying to bring about revision, when at last it began to be clear that both the evidence on which he had been ostensibly and that on which he had really been condemned were alike coming to grief. Jaurès tells us that M. Cavaignac, the War Minister, actually declared in the Chamber as late as July, 1898, that nothing else really mattered since there was, after all, an avowal of his guilt by Dreyfus himself, and Rochefort, the editor of *L'Intransigent* merely said, "Why insist on other proofs? Dreyfus has confessed."

Never was a deeply injured and helpless man more finely defended than Dreyfus was in this matter by Jaurès. To rouse in his readers a full sense of the impossibility of this pretended confession, he tells us how Dreyfus had repeatedly, unwearingly, and passionately declared his innocence. He describes how the Commandant Paty du Clam, into whose hands the conduct of this case had been given, had several times visited him in prison, both before and after his condemnation, urging him, even tempting him by the offer of a personal interview with the Minister of War, to confess, and how Dreyfus (as was mentioned in the act of accusation) had obstinately refused to allow that he had even committed a slight indiscretion. Next Jaurès quoted a long description, from a newspaper of the time, of the terrible day of his public degradation, when it



was noticed how "straight the *canaille* held himself." Upon his sentence being pronounced this account declared that he threw up his arms and shouted "I am innocent! I swear that I am innocent! Vive la France!" and directly they touched him to tear off his decorations he shouted again "I swear it on the heads of my wife and children, I am innocent!" Three times more he declared it, urging on the journalists, who met him with insults, to tell France of his innocence, and again he avowed it upon his return to prison. Then in letters written that very night, in the greatest agony of mind, he repeated it, and on every possible occasion since, Dreyfus never swerved from this position.

"Thus Dreyfus had never confessed. Always with indefatigable energy he affirmed his innocence." How then did this legend arise? The story, Jaurès tells us, comes from a certain Lebrun-Renaud who had a conversation with him on the morning of his degradation, and who stated the next day to the Minister that Dreyfus had made "half-avowals." Will it be believed that for three years Lebrun-Renaud was not asked to make a definite report, but that he was then called upon to do so, and his report quoted as if it had been given at the moment? Jaurès explains that the Commandant Paty du Clam had gone to Dreyfus four days before the degradation and had suggested to him that the Minister

was not inclined to believe so badly of him, but that if he would confess that he had sent "documents of no importance to the foreign power to get documents of more importance," this might be accepted as saving at least his honour. To this Dreyfus had firmly replied that he had done nothing of the sort. But in his long conversation, or rather "monologue," with Lebrun-Renaud, he no doubt said: "The Minister knows that I am innocent. He believes that if I sent documents it was so as to get other (more important) ones. But I did not do even that." . . . And Lebrun-Renaud, not attending carefully to these words, turned them afterwards into: "The Minister knows that if I sent documents it was with the purpose, etc." . . . These were in fact the words used in Lebrun-Renaud's report. Such is Jaurès' explanation, and in reading it one feels it is the truth.

With like art Jaurès unravelled the tortuous history of the *bordereau*. Five experts were called in to study the handwriting of Dreyfus, three of whom held that it was the same as that of the *bordereau*, two thought not. Of the three who believed that Dreyfus had written it, one Bertillon distinguished himself from the others by his "system," which he said was psychological, not merely graphological. Jaurès holds up his system to ridicule, and he shows how this same Bertillon who was so absolutely certain

that his system could not err, was no sooner confronted by Colonel Picquart two years later with some of Esterhazy's letters than he cried out: "It is the writing of the *bordereau*," and yet, having once decided that the *bordereau* had been written by Dreyfus, would not alter his opinion that Dreyfus was its author, even when he was told that these letters were Esterhazy's.

Jaurès was tireless in the pursuit of evidence. He shows us three new experts at Esterhazy's trial, forced to account for the writing of the *bordereau* by a new theory, the theory that Dreyfus traced some of Esterhazy's handwriting and introduced it into the *bordereau*, and he tells how they supported this idea with the most roundabout and untenable suggestions, while he refers to the fact that at Zola's trial no less than seven savants whose work is amongst manuscripts, and who are experts of a high order in writing, had all without exception agreed that the handwriting was that of Esterhazy. And following his blows home with an almost terrible determination, he shows Esterhazy himself put to the most pitiable shifts to explain the matter, himself owning the resemblance and trying to explain it with elaborate stories of the way in which Dreyfus had obtained by fraud a long document in his handwriting. Jaurès leaves nothing to chance, he unmasks first one and then another subterfuge. He shows how the enemies of

Dreyfus change their ground, and remarks particularly how, in July, 1898, when Cavaignac, the War Minister, again speaks in the Chamber on this subject, he no longer dares even to mention the *bordereau*, but reads the three secret documents on which Dreyfus had really been convicted. Two of these documents merely referred to someone called D., and Jaurès had no difficulty in showing that it was quite impossible to say that this referred to Dreyfus; there was no evidence of any kind that it did. Then there was a third document in which the name of Dreyfus occurs in full, but which, as M. Cavaignac owned, had not fallen into their hands till two years after the trial. It was not difficult for Jaurès to prove that this last had been a forgery. He declared openly that it was so: "In October 1898 . . . Esterhazy, Paty du Clam and the Staff knew that Colonel Picquart had gathered together against Esterhazy the most crushing charges. They knew that the *bordereau* was Esterhazy's, that the secret documents contained nothing serious against Dreyfus, that evidence which would probably establish the innocence of the unhappy condemned man was about to appear and that the Staff would be compromised . . . Esterhazy and his accomplices on the Staff decided to fabricate a false letter which should prove at last the culpability of Dreyfus." Jaurès brought internal evidence against them to prove this

accusation. And events soon showed that he was right. But with biting ridicule he describes how M. Cavaignac had said it was certain that this letter must come from the same source as the two other letters which had fallen into their hands two years previously, because it was written on the same sort of paper and once more with a blue pencil. What is the value of evidence to M. Cavaignac? A blue pencil, messieurs, the test is certain.

Thus day by day Jaurès continued to unravel the sordid and miserable tale.

A serious blow fell on the enemies of Dreyfus when Colonel Henry, who had followed Colonel Picquart at the Intelligence Department, confessed that he had fabricated the third "secret document," and being arrested, committed suicide. But still the authorities held out, and even in September, 1898, revision had not been conceded, although Jaurès calls for it at the end of his articles with confidence that it cannot long be denied.

"No closed doors, no mysteries."

"Justice in full daylight. Revision in full daylight for the deliverance of the innocent, for the punishment of the guilty, for the instruction of the people, for the honour of the country."

Revision was in fact near at hand. A great change had come over the people. Led away at

first by the newspaper declarations and denunciations, the people of France had been gradually affected by the revelations, and by the work of men like Jaurès, Zola, and Scheurer-Kestner. It was the Conscience of France speaking to her, and she listened. It is one of the glories of that great nation that she knows how to repent.

The question had indeed become a far larger one than when first an anti-Jewish prejudice saw a possible victim in Dreyfus. During the campaign every force of reaction and darkness had joined together on one side, especially Nationalism, always a danger for Republican France, and Clericalism. These exploited the idea of the Army and of Patriotism to the fullest extent. On the other side were now grouped not only all the best intellectual forces, like Zola and Anatole France, not only Socialist leaders of the people like Jaurès, not only Radicals like Clemenceau, but even all those moderate men who wished honestly to see the Republic upheld. Political war was openly declared and plots to overturn the Republic itself came to light. The Socialists by joining with the Republicans secured power for the defence of the Republic, and under the Radical Ministry of Brisson, the Cabinet at last remitted to the Cour de Cassation an application for the revision of the Dreyfus trial. The Court held an elaborate inquiry and ended by quashing the old trial and ordering a new military trial at

Rennes. Dreyfus therefore, after nearly five years in prison, was brought back to France in 1899. His old enemies, the generals, made every effort against him, and such was the excitement that his counsel, M. Labori, was actually shot at, and wounded, on the eve of the cross-examination of the witnesses.

His condemnation was however a farce. In ten days the President of the Republic, M. Loubet, sent him, by the advice of the Government, a pardon. Dreyfus was once more free, but naturally neither he nor his friends were satisfied with this very partial measure of justice. Even Jaurès, however, felt that the matter must be allowed to rest till some of the excitement and bitter feeling aroused should have passed away, although he did not abandon the cause till he had brought about the complete reinstatement of Dreyfus.

For when in 1905 Dreyfus demanded a new trial, Jaurès obtained the agreement of the Chamber. "Faits nouveaux" were accordingly found and the new Minister of War transmitted them to the Cour de Cassation, which with all its chambers sitting, recorded in 1906 its verdict that the whole accusation against Dreyfus was disproved, and the second trial at Rennes was in its turn quashed.

Dreyfus now re-entered the army. Like Colonel Picquart, he was promoted and received

the Legion of Honour in the Artillery Pavilion of the Military School.

Some of the Socialists complained of the amount of energy which Jaurès threw into the "Affaire," although as a matter of fact it was only during 1898 and 1899 that he gave it much of his time. But there were those who said that the work had diverted him from the propaganda of Socialism, that it was a quarrel amongst the enemies of Socialism which they should be left to settle amongst themselves, since it had nothing to do with the workers. One writer averred that if Dreyfus had been a worker he would long since have been forgotten. While the matter was still in the balance Jaurès made a splendid appeal to his Socialist comrades in one of his articles in *La Petite République*.

When it becomes certain, he says, that Dreyfus was condemned on evidence which he himself was not shown, then "On that day we Socialists shall have a right to set ourselves up against all the leaders who have fought against us in the name of the principles of the French Revolution. What have you done, we shall cry to them, with the Rights of Man and the liberty of the individual? You have despised it. You have yielded it all up to the insolence of military power. You are renegades of the bourgeois revolution.

"Oh, I am not mistaken and I understand the



sophism of our enemies. 'What,' says the *Libre Parole* softly, 'these are Socialists, revolutionaries, who are troubled about legality!'

"I have but one word to answer. There are two sides to capitalist and bourgeois legality. There is a whole mass of laws destined to protect the fundamental iniquity of our society; there are laws which consecrate the privileges of capitalist property, the exploitation of the wage-earner by the possessors. These laws we wish to change, even by Revolution if it is necessary, to abolish capitalist legality so that another order may arise. But by the side of these laws of privilege and of rapine made by a class for itself, there are others which sum up the meagre progress of humanity, modest guarantees that it has little by little acquired by the long effort of centuries and the long series of revolutions.

"Well, among these laws the one which does not permit a man, whoever he may be, to be condemned without debating the charge with him, is perhaps the most essential of all. Unlike the Nationalists who want to keep all that part of the bourgeois legality which protects Capital, and give up to the generals all that which protects man, we revolutionary Socialists wish to abolish the capitalist part of the legality of today and save the human part. We defend the legal guarantees against the decorated judges who throw them away, as we would defend the

Republic if necessary against the generals of a *coup d'état*.

“Oh, I know what is said, and these are friends who speak: ‘It has nothing to do with the poor,’ they say, ‘leave the bourgeois to occupy themselves with the bourgeois.’ And one of them added this phrase, which I own pained me: ‘If a workman had been in question, a long time ago they would have given up bothering about him.’

“I might reply that Dreyfus has been illegally condemned, and that if in truth, as I will soon show, he is innocent, he is no longer an officer nor a bourgeois. He is stript by the very excess of his misfortune of all the character of a man of a certain class; he is no longer anything but humanity itself, and at the highest degree of misery and despair that one can imagine.

“If he has been condemned against all law, if he has been wrongly condemned, what a farce it is to count him still amongst the privileged! No, he no longer belongs to that army, which by a criminal error has degraded him. He no longer belongs to those governing classes which by cowardly ambition hesitate to re-establish legality and truth for him. He is only an example of human suffering in its most poignant degree. He is the living witness of military deceit, of political cowardice, of the crimes of authority.

“Certainly, we can, without contradicting our principles and without failing in the class war, listen to the cry of our pity; in the revolutionary struggle we can keep our human compassion: to remain Socialists, we are not obliged to flee away from Humanity.

“And Dreyfus himself, condemned falsely and criminally, becomes, whatever was his origin and whatever may be his fate, a sharp protest against the social order. By the fault of the society which insists on using violence, deceit and crime against him, he becomes an element of revolution. . . .

“That is what I might reply; but I add that Socialists who wish to get to the very bottom of the secrets of shame and of crime contained in this affair, if not occupied with a workman, are occupied with the whole working class.

“Who is most menaced to-day by the arbitrary action of the generals, by the always glorified violence of military repression? Who? The People. It has therefore an interest of the first order in punishing and in discouraging the illegalities and violence of the Councils of War before they become a sort of habit. . . .”

In these words Jaurès surely gave his comrades more than a justification for all he did for Dreyfus. It was a great service in the cause of Humanity, and an honour to the cause of Socialism.



## CHAPTER IV

### SOCIALIST METHODS

ALTHOUGH the underlying unity of his thought was remarkable, Jaurès was always growing and developing, and re-examining his ideas. He said of himself:<sup>1</sup> "I do not make the puerile pretension of never having changed in twenty years of experience, of study and of struggle, or rather I will not so far calumniate myself as to say that Life has taught me nothing." No nature could have been more open to the teachings of Life. As a very young man he was chiefly a student and he speaks of the separation of the life of the University from that of the practical world. Of Socialism, especially of German Socialist thinkers, he knew a great deal from books, while as yet he was absolutely unaware of the fact that socialist groups existed in France, that propaganda was going on, that there were even rival sects! When at last he came into contact with life and with the Socialist movement, and abandoned the student's world in which he had hitherto lived, the men and the facts with which he was now in relation influenced him almost too

<sup>1</sup> Rappoport, p. 203

violently—the impression was so vivid that he could not for some time assert his own personality.

But whatever the developments and changes of his ideas as life went on, he declares that from the time he first entered public life, “the essential direction of my thoughts and of my efforts has always been the same. I have always been a Republican Socialist; it is always the Social Republic, the Republic of organized and sovereign work which has been my ideal. And it is for this that from the first day, with my in-experiences and my ignorances, I have fought.”

Even while he sat during the first years of his Parliamentary life in the centre, this image of the Social Republic, where work would hold the place of highest honour was already in his mind.

Jaurès was a democrat, a Republican and an anti-clericalist as well as a Socialist. In other words he believed in freedom of thought and action for everyone, and hated tyranny, and he believed in the People. And those words of his, “I have always been a Republican and always been a Socialist,” express his ardent belief in the continuous history of his country. “For Jaurès,” says Rappoport, “Socialism carried on and realised the democratic Republic.” Democracy, the Republic, implied equality in the political spheres; the social and economic sphere had

† Rappoport, p. 205

still to be conquered. This fundamental thought of Jaurès must be borne in mind in considering how he differed from some of the other French Socialists over the questions of how Socialism could be brought about. To those Socialists who did not feel this continuity of history, so present to the mind of Jaurès, a Republican was no more of a friend than any other upholder of Capitalism; to Jaurès it seemed that the man who upheld the Republic was really working, without knowing it, for Socialism, since Socialism was implicit in Republicanism, and was its natural result.

With this faith in the meaning of the Republic, Jaurès could not, when he became a convinced Socialist, long agree to sit down and wait for a Revolution, for a social cataclysm. Nor could he believe that the proletariat, totally unprepared and untrained up to that moment, would suddenly find the force to upset our present-day society, with its million complications, and at the same time institute a wholly new order. Jaurès saw the falsity of all this, and after a few years he began to show unmistakable boredom and even indignation with these dogmatic formulæ, out of which it seemed to him that the life had fled. He was not perhaps wholly right, and the policy of allowing Socialists to participate in Radical Governments certainly needed to be acted on with caution if it were not to lead Socialists into positions of compromise

and weakness. But it must be said that Jaurès never knocked down one dry formula just to put another in its place. He held no theory in a hard, narrow way; and if he wanted Socialists to be engaged in other work besides propaganda, it was not that he despised propaganda or neglected it. But his nature was large and full: he desired Life and to have it more abundantly. He could not stand by and let the whole life of France go on without taking part in it, influencing and being influenced by it. Rappoport says finely of him: "Jaurès was a vigorous labourer, full of gaiety and ardour, who never sulked over his work. He was a hard toiler who put all his flaming soul into his toil, which never stood idle. He had a veritable passion for work, for creation. He loved life and he was always trying to make it spring up round him. It was as if he were consumed by an immense need of infinite, of multiple and varied action."

Towards the end of the century the Socialist movement in France was seriously menaced by differences of opinion about method, which caused it to split into warring factions. The avoidance of such splits was of the very utmost importance to Jaurès. He was always working for unity, and he always longed to understand and be understood by others. He set himself therefore to make this matter of Socialist method as clear as possible. He felt that the divergence



of opinion had arisen out of the desire of some Socialists to adapt themselves as they thought to modern conditions, while others, even at the end of the nineteenth century, still held fast to methods conceived fifty years before. So he went back to Marx and Engels, and noted that they, writing when the power of the worker was as yet much less developed than it is now, saw hope for the future in the idea that the lot of the workers was becoming worse and worse, and that this would go on until they were driven to a revolutionary rising by which power would pass into their hands. Jaurès saw this to have been a complete mistake. <sup>1</sup>“It was not from absolute destitution that absolute liberation could come.” If it were so the Socialists at the beginning of the twentieth century would have cause to feel hopeless indeed. For to Jaurès the “one undoubted fact which transcends all others” is the growth in numbers, in solidarity, in self-consciousness of the workers. They have gained the vote, they are organised in trade unions, and in co-operative societies, they have shorter hours and better pay, they are immensely better educated and have more weight than ever before. Many of them now have an ideal of a new social order founded on a different principle altogether from the present one. Whereas in the first third of the nineteenth century Labour struggled and

<sup>1</sup> *Studies in Socialism*. Trans. by M. Minturn.

fought against the crushing power of Capital, but was not conscious toward what end it was straining, it has now a definite aim. Jaurès gives the honour to Marx of having brought Socialism and the workers together. <sup>1</sup>“From that time on, Socialism and the proletariat became inseparable.”

So, to the question of how Socialism is to be brought about Jaurès makes first the general answer: <sup>2</sup>“By the growth of the proletariat . . . This is the first and essential answer, and whoever does not accept it wholly and in its true sense necessarily places himself outside Socialist life and thought. . . . But what is certain is that the evolution is hastened, the forward movement vivified, enlarged and deepened by everything that increases the intellectual, economic, and political power of the proletariat.”

So that when Jaurès again asks what will be the definite means by which the workers will push forward to Socialism, it is already obvious that he is not going to answer this question as Marx did. Marx had the thought of the great French Revolution and of those that followed it before his eyes, and it seemed to him that the change to a Socialist order was not possible without a revolutionary upheaval.

But Jaurès saw very clearly that if a democracy were not ready for the movement towards

<sup>1 2</sup> *Studies in Socialism.* Trans. by M. Minturn.

Socialism, it would reject the changes which a minority of the workers might have been able temporarily to bring about. While if it were ready—that is, if the majority of the people were in favour of Socialism—why should they not bring it about by legal means?

<sup>1</sup>“Every other method, I repeat, is nothing but the expedient of a weak and ill-prepared class . . . It is not by an unexpected counter-stroke of political agitation that the proletariat will gain supreme power, but by the methodical and legal organization of its own forces under the law of the democracy and universal suffrage.”

Jaurès leads us thus by a very simple argument to his main contention, the essential point in which he differed from the party of Jules Guesde, that the change to the new order will come gradually and by way of so-called Reform, and not by way of Revolution. It irritated Jaurès that Jules Guesde, the older Socialist leader, not content with advocating the method of propaganda as the only work for Socialists, and the catastrophic revolution as the daystar of their hopes, should also criticise with much bitterness each attempt to ameliorate the lot of the workers as it came within sight and was discussed in Parliament, although he was not opposed to the use of the vote.

<sup>1</sup> *Studies in Socialism.* Trans. by M. Minturn.

Under the capitalist system, Guesde had said, all rights granted to the workers must remain a dead letter. Thus, medical assistance by the communes, compulsory insurance against accidents, workers' pensions, insurance against unemployment, would be all in vain. Nor did the partial or entire nationalization of the mines, the railways, refineries, weaving shops, blast-furnaces, etc., find any more favour in his eyes. He considered the nationalization of the postal and telegraphic services to have been a failure. The State under capitalism is no better than the private capitalist.

<sup>1</sup> Why then, Jaurès asks, do Guesde and the *Parti Ouvrier* ask for the protection of the State against the private capitalist? Why, if State employment is so bad, is there such a demand for it? Obviously, answers Jaurès, because the State is not composed of capitalistic elements alone. It is not true that our present regime, bad as it is, exists wholly and entirely for the benefit of the privileged. The State, such a State as France at any rate, though it bears the vivid imprint of capitalism, also bears within itself the germ of the future, and by trying to influence it we are using the only certain means of influencing the future. Jaurès did not stop there. It is possible that if he had done so he would have gradually carried most of the Socialists along with him, for evidently to

<sup>1</sup> Rappoport, p. 368

accept reforms, while pressing forward to greater ones, is a more attractive and hopeful way of working than always to be standing aside. But Jaurès was led on, partly through the political condition of the time, to the further position that members of the Socialist party should, if possible, enter the government if invited to do so, and this was the wedge which at the end of the century split the French Socialist party into two.

The Dreyfus affair had let in a flood of light on certain dangers that threatened France. During the thirty years which had passed since the foundation of the Republic, Frenchmen as a whole had grown to love this form of government more and more. But a large number of those who really cared for the Republic had been asleep, or at any rate had forgotten that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance. The "Affaire" awoke them, not at once, but gradually, as the sordid tale unfolded. Then it was seen that the clerical plotters were imperilling the foundations of the Republic. It came to the point when the President could be publicly insulted by a section of the French people. It was certain that the air was thick with plots, that the opposition in the French Chamber would really have liked to overthrow the Republic and re-establish monarchy, that the work of the Revolution was not secure, but was in constant danger from the secret

machinations of the priests. Clericalism in fact was seen to be the great enemy.

The common danger united advanced Republicans and caused them to seek an alliance with the Radical-Socialists, and with the Socialists of whom Jaurès was the leader. Millerand, one of the Socialists, was offered a post in the coalition cabinet under Waldeck-Rousseau, and he took office as Minister of Commerce and Industry in 1899. In the preface to the English edition of Jaurès' *Studies in Socialism*, we are told that Millerand succeeded in getting a law passed which limited the working day in factories, when men, women, and children are all employed, to ten hours, and in his own department he instituted an eight-hours day. He established certain good minimum conditions for all labour on contracts for national public works. He encouraged organized labour and created labour councils, the members of which were elected by the workers and by the masters. These councils form permanent boards of arbitration, which may be consulted in any dispute with a private employer, and must be consulted by the State as employer. They fix the standard rate of wages and hours for every district. Millerand made other efforts for the workers, but he sometimes voted against his own party, and as a member of the Government he had to take part in the reception of the Tzar.

With some of the Socialists supporting a Minister in the Government and many others opposed to a working agreement of any kind with other parties, the unity of the Socialist party in France could not be maintained. The absorption of members in matters outside the actual Socialist sphere, such as the Dreyfus case, had been considered a doubtful benefit. But over this, the Socialists, with Guesde amongst them, had hesitated—Guesde even spoke of the action of Zola in publishing *J'Accuse* as “the greatest revolutionary act of the century.” Later on, however, they called a halt, and Socialists on both sides, Guesdists and the moderate men like Millerand, begged Jaurès to stop just when his renewed and passionate efforts were instrumental in bringing to light the forgery to which Colonel Henry confessed, and so finally in assuring a successful end to the campaign.

As Jaurès saw and declared, it was one of the results of these efforts that Millerand was asked to enter the Ministry.

Guesde replied that it was true. This collaboration had certainly arisen out of Jaurès' collaboration over the Dreyfus case, as Jaurès had boasted, but this only showed how wrong he had been to enter into that work. Jaurès thought it a victory that Millerand should have penetrated into the Ministry, but in reality he was nothing but a prisoner, nothing but a hostage,

whom Waldeck-Rousseau had taken as a shield behind whom he could hide from the attacks of the workers. What could the solitary Minister do? He is bound to depend on the Ministry in which he finds himself. This was the result of joining with the enemy over a question of justice to an individual.

Guesde examined with a good deal of shrewdness Jaurès' contention that the entrance into the Ministry was the same thing as the entrance of Socialists into the Chamber and on to local bodies. Guesde, who was not against the workers entering into the Chamber, showed that this was a very different thing. The entrance of representatives of the workers into Parliament and into other public bodies meant that the workers had sent them there, but the entrance of one or two Socialists into a Radical Ministry meant nothing of the sort, and did not come from the people at all. It meant in Guesde's eyes a capture, an attempt to silence the Socialists' party by engaging some of their cleverest members in what was really the support of capitalism. One wonders what Guesde thinks about it now, and whether war is for him the great exception.

It was the old and difficult problem of how far the children of light can work with the children of this world, and Jaurès' large and warm nature, the farthest possible removed from pharisaism,



made him revolt from all narrowness; while the activity of his mind, his great energy, made him long to enter into the fight, sword in hand, constructing the new world day by day, instead of looking on and criticising.

"I tell you," he said, "that all great revolutions have been made in the world because the new society before opening out fully had penetrated through all the cracks by means of its tiniest rootlets into the old society. Besides," he added, "it is essential for the Social Revolution to have the support of the nation. Great changes are not to-day brought about by minorities, the will of the nation must be converted . . . we must carry the immense mass of the people with us."

It was his essentially historical and philosophical way of looking at things that makes it plain that Jaurès was not an opportunist. And if in this policy he was wrong, it was from a disinterested motive that he acted. It was the Socialist cause that he wished to see in power; he was not thinking of his own advancement. For although Jaurès came to be the mainspring of the Republican "Bloc" which was formed in the French Chamber, composed of Radicals, Radical-Socialists, and Socialists, he never took power himself, either during the time the *bloc* was in existence or afterwards.

The want of unity in the Socialist camp could now no longer be concealed. The dissatisfaction

grew, and in 1900, a split occurred at the Conference of Lyons when a large part of the Guesdists broke away. In 1901 the party called the Socialistes Revolutionnaires followed them and these two sections formed "Le Parti Socialiste de France." Another body called "Le Parti Socialiste Français" was formed under the leadership of Jaurès, Briand, Viviani and others.

It was during this time that Jaurès and his friends were joining in the attack on the Romish Church with which the 20th century opened. It has been said that this attack was made and carried forward to a successful issue by a small group of determined men and that there was at no time any widespread demand for it in the country. Yet it is certain that the struggle, liable as it was to excite the deepest emotions and to rouse the bitterest feelings, could not have ended in such a complete defeat for the Church if the general atmosphere had not been sympathetic to its aims.

It is true that the Church, and particularly the Head of the Church, made every possible mistake. The Pope gave his foes all the openings they required, and the loyalty of some French Catholics to him must at times have been strained to breaking point. It had become evident as a result of the revelations that had followed the Dreyfus case that the power of the Catholic orders, and especially that of the Jesuits had

been quite extraordinary in the Haute Armée. It was known that another Catholic order, the Assumptionists, had gained great influence by means of their cheap newspapers, in which they did not scruple to attack the Republic with violence. That the enormous power of these orders was a real danger to the democratic Republic became plain as soon as the matter was discussed.

The individualism of the French Revolution, and very likely the necessities of that time, had caused it to object to the existence of all societies and associations of whatever kind, and right up to the end of the nineteenth century no society of more than twenty persons could exist in France without government permission. This permission was not in practice refused to ordinary associations, but very few of the religious orders had been able to obtain authorization, That did not, however, check them. They existed in an unauthorized state, liable in theory to be suppressed at any time, but nevertheless ever growing in membership and in the number of orders. They owned property to the value of £40,000,000, and the catalogue of their possessions filled two White Books of 2000 pages, which were presented to the Chamber in December, 1900.

The Waldeck-Rousseau cabinet passed a bill making all associations quite free except "illicit" associations. The religious congregations, however, were excepted and could not be formed

without a special statute in each case, which it was quite plain would not be easily granted.

M. Waldeck-Rousseau took a very moderate line, but he accepted a Socialist amendment which prevented any member of any unauthorized order from teaching in a school.

It was no violent and tyrannical temper that caused men like Jaurès to join in the assault upon the Church. Jaurès was the most tolerant of men, but he knew that here, as France had many times learnt to her cost, tolerance meant playing into the hands of the everlasting foe of liberty. The Church was never content merely to dominate and enslave the minds of its pupils. It was always determined to be a political power as well, and in France it had shown itself the avowed enemy of the Republic. Recent events had made this more than ever clear.

It is certain that the current was setting more and more strongly in France at this time towards democratic, socialistic, and humanitarian ideas. Gustave Hervé was tried in 1901 at Auxerre for writing anti-military literature, but many of his fellow teachers came forward to state their agreement with him and he was acquitted. The trend of public feeling was also shown by the want of enthusiasm in the reception of the Tzar on his visit to France in September, 1901—it contrasted very unfavourably with the welcome he had received in 1896.

A general election was held in May, 1902, and Jaurès was returned to the Chamber. The atmosphere was more than ever favourable to a renewed attack on the Church. Waldeck-Rousseau had resigned, and M. Combes, the new Prime Minister, was a much more ardent enemy of Rome. He speedily set to work to close the schools conducted by members of unauthorized Congregations, and finally succeeded in passing another bill to prevent all members of religious bodies from teaching, whether authorized or unauthorized.

The Vatican meanwhile followed one tactless step with another. President Loubet had been invited to visit the King of Italy, and the Pope objected on the ground that the head of a Catholic power like France ought to visit him and not the King, or should refrain from coming at all. Jaurès obtained the text of this protest, addressed to the powers having relations with the Vatican, and published the document in his journal, *L'Humanité*, on the 17th of May, 1904. He had founded *L'Humanité* with Briand and other friends about a month before. This document was very offensive to both France and Italy, and the French ambassador to the Vatican was withdrawn.

Pius X., as if determined not to be conciliatory, took the opportunity to dismiss two French bishops on grounds of immoral conduct. As the

two prelates were known to be friends of the Republic, and to have reactionary enemies in their dioceses, their cases aroused sympathy. Moreover, under the Concordat these dismissals could not take place except by the intervention of the French Government. But as upon expostulation the Pope declined to give any satisfaction, the French Chargé d'Affaires was told to leave Rome, the Papal Nuncio being asked to quit Paris.

It was in this way that the Concordat came to an end, and when Parliament met in the autumn it was felt that the separation of Church and State was inevitable. Jaurès was associated with Briand in drawing up a report, and Combes prepared a Bill, although he was not actually in power at the time it was passed. When the Bill for the Separation of Church and State was being brought into the Chamber the Government was generous in providing pensions and allowing the use of buildings. The Bill passed in 1905 and became law in the following year.

There had followed upon the split among the Socialists a period of many quarrels. After a while, however, the Parti Socialiste de France (the Guesdists), feeling the weakness of the position and unwilling that the disunion should continue, resolved at the Congress of Rheims in 1904 that they would carry the matter before the International at the Congress which was to

be held in Amsterdam in August of the same year.

The German Social Democrats had been discussing this very matter of participation, in their own Congress at Dresden in the previous year and it was their Dresden resolution which was discussed at Amsterdam.

“I was one of the British representatives on the Commission which discussed the Dresden resolution,” says J. R. Macdonald, “before it came up for debate in the full Congress and I saw much of Jaurès at that time. Among the members were Adler of Austria, Vandevælde of Belgium, Bebel of Germany, Ferri of Italy, Branting of Sweden, and every day brought its great duel, for the Commission was sharply divided. I sat next to Jaurès and when the time drew near for him to reply he became as lively as a cricket. He interjected spear-point remarks whilst others were speaking and his whispered comments were like the playful good nature of an accomplished swordsman making fun of a novice. Then he rose himself without a note. The room crowded up. People filled the windows and some were helped to a precarious sitting on a mantelpiece. He singled out Bebel and the Germans for special attack. One moment he laughed at them, the next he belaboured them. He was mischievous and he enjoyed himself. Then he plunged into

<sup>1</sup> *Contemporary Review*, September, 1914

the great controversies of policy and of Socialist relationships with Governments. He surveyed tactics and their results. History, philosophy, common sense, the achievements and failures of the different national movements were marshalled in his support. He played with opponents, he tickled them under the chin, he reasoned with them, he expostulated with them, he knocked them on the head. The room had become stifling; people crushed hard against each other. A space had to be cleared round him, for he had been bringing his fists down upon the heads of his neighbours. His perspiration literally dripped on the floor. Broad purple streaks spread from his tie to his collar and shirt front, and a handkerchief which he kept in his trouser pocket and rubbed across his face with the happy valour of a school-boy, was sodden. Ejaculations came from the listeners; a woman fell from the mantelpiece; one moment there was great din and hubbub, the next you could hear a pin fall. The day faded, dusk glided into darkness; the lights from outside patched the walls with red glow and dark shadow. Still Jaurès went on. Like a brave and lithe man keeping beasts at bay, alert at every point, goading, soothing, killing, he fought. When it ended and he was beaten on a vote, we awoke as from a spell; we looked at the time and saw it was dark and we became aware that hunger was gnawing within



us. But he, irrepressible and inexhaustible, keen and good-humoured, came out into the night with us, still laughing, arguing, explaining, revelling in the finished fight, as mischievous as when he opened his attack on his German assailants hours before."

At the Congress itself Jaurès stood almost alone, for the majority of the French delegates followed Guesde in this matter and not Jaurès, and the German Social Democrats took the same line. This was enough to make an overwhelming vote against Jaurès' policy. He was not, however, dismayed by the host arrayed against him, but attacking the German Social Democrats he accused them of powerlessness. He pointed out that under the undemocratic constitution of the German Empire, even a majority in the Reichstag did not give power into the hands of the Socialists. If a political and democratic revolution had previously taken place in Germany as in France the German Socialists would not have to fight at such a disadvantage. Propaganda, organization, a splendid array of Socialist newspapers, none of these efforts secured such results as might be expected while power remained in the hands of an autocracy. Jaurès laid great stress on this weakness of German Social Democracy. German Socialists could not go forward. "And so," Jaurès told them, "you concealed your powerlessness of action by taking refuge in the

implacability of the theoretic formulæ, with which our eminent comrade, Kautsky, will supply you to the point of vital exhaustion." "And then," he added, "the adoption in this International Congress of the Dresden resolution signifies that international Socialism associates itself in all countries, in all its parts, in all its force with the momentary but formidable, with the provisionary but forced inaction of the German democracy."

This was very straight speaking, and more recent events have emphasised the weakness which Jaurès saw in the position of the German Social Democrats.

But all Jaurès' eloquence failed to overcome the natural conservatism of men who had spent years of their lives in spreading abroad Socialism from the Marxian point of view, and who regarded with apprehension the real danger of absorption in the older political parties. There were not many men who felt within them the strength that Jaurès had, not many who were born to lead and had no need to fear the power of others. And so the vote went against him.

When Jaurès found himself beaten by the majority of the Socialists he decided to leave the *bloc*. This was the less difficult because the special combination of parties which had worked under M. Combes was at this time falling to pieces. The idea of separation from

the party was inconceivable to Jaurès, and he had no ambition to take advantage of his own talents and the position he had gained so as to be taken into future governments on his own merits. He was far too great, too sincere a man. As one of the "Socialistes Militants" he desired to represent the demands of the Socialist party to the world. He knew that the members of the Socialist party were not all equally capable of expressing themselves. He knew that he had this power of expression in the supreme degree. He wished to identify himself with the Socialist party, and as regards tactics he was willing to give way to the majority for the sake of unity. For unity was in Jaurès' case no mere word, it was the greatest need of his nature, and he was willing to make great sacrifices to attain it.

But why then, it may be asked, if union with the workers in their struggle towards Socialism was really more precious to Jaurès than anything else, did he feel it worth while to spend so much time himself on this agitation against the Church, and why did he encourage other Socialists to do so? Could not the overthrow of clerical influence in the French State and more particularly in the schools have been left to Radicals like Waldeck-Rousseau and Combes, while Socialists concentrated their efforts on economic change?

The answer to this lies in the unique quality of Jaurès' mind, which combined a wide outlook with an intensity of conviction in one direction. The intensity of his conviction made him always an ardent Socialist, and for Socialist unity he abandoned the policy of the *bloc* system. But his unique breadth of vision made him keenly aware of those powerful enemies of Socialism which must be cleared out of its way before one could hope for any real triumph for Socialistic ideas. He saw that one of the strongest of these enemies was the Church of Rome, which stood right across the path of progress. The Church was all the more powerful a foe in that, unlike Militarism, the other great enemy of the people with which Jaurès energetically strove, it was in underground and secret ways that its influence was the most blighting to the hopes of Social Democratic advance. Jaurès had long seen this, and he welcomed the fact that the Republicans of France were so largely implicit enemies of the Church without always seeing why, or how far their enmity would lead them.

Jaurès had realised for many years that one of the worst evils against which progress had to contend was that deadening and deadly influence of the Church by which she used all her great spiritual power over what is deepest in man to keep things as they are, not to allow men to think, to revolt, to throw off their chains.

The Church was on the side of the established order, the Church kept the poor in their position of servitude, not merely by brute force as do the more tyrannical State powers, but by a mingled menace and soothing which deprived the people even of the desire to struggle. In a speech which he made in the Chamber as long ago as 1893, he remarked, speaking of the free and unsectarian education which the Republicans supported: "Ah, well, you have interrupted the old song which rocked to sleep human misery," . . . and then, turning on those Republicans who appeared to him so illogical since they wished to go no further than to stir up the minds of the people by means of education, he added: "And suffering Humanity . . . has risen up before you and she asks to-day for her place, her large place, in the sun of the natural world. . . . It is you who have raised the revolutionary temperature of the proletariat; and if you are horrified to-day, you are horrified at your own work."

To Jaurès the whole forward movement was one. He never seems to have felt any antagonism between spiritual and material things. There was no side of human nature which seemed to him uninteresting or valueless. But deepest of all was respect for the human personality and for the spirit which manifests itself in each.

Whatever showed that men were thinking and  
Speech of Jaurès in the Chamber of Deputies, Dec. 21, 1893

striving interested Jaurès. When differences arose between some of the Socialists and the Syndicalists of the Confédération Générale du Travail (the French Trades Unions), Jaurès showed the same sympathetic breadth of view towards the new ideas which were moving in the minds of many workmen. At the Congress of Lyons, February 20, 1912, he urged some of the Socialists, who had severely criticised the Syndicalists, not to treat them as the middle-classes were doing. <sup>1</sup>“For a generation,” he said, “the middle-classes believed that to frighten the country it was only necessary to denounce Socialism. . . . Now it is ‘Sabotage’ everywhere; not a single one of those violent acts, which cannot help arising when the proletariat suffers and rebels, can be done but what they are tragically labelled with the word ‘Sabotage.’ . . . . Once more, comrades, I am in agreement with you in wishing to make an immense effort to discipline these movements, to substitute for the brutal inspirations of violence the power of organization. . . . . But no pharisaism; we shall never get rid of all temptation to violence in the heart and brain of workmen in a time of strife. . . . . When in spite of all that can be done violence breaks out, when the heart of these men is embittered and rises up, do not let us turn against them our indignation and

<sup>1</sup> Jaurès' speech at the Socialist Congress of Lyons, February 20, 1912.

anger, but against the masters who have brought them there. . . . Take care: so that this movement should continue and should come to something it is necessary that Syndicalism should have confidence in us, confidence in itself. . . . The true way to keep it from demagoguery, from systematic and superficial violence, is to open out before it, before its normal and organized action, possibilities of progress, large and vast hopes."

And again: "It is a great strength that in our Trades Unions themselves this hope and this idealism circulates." And he urges all Socialists to encourage this ferment that is going on, to help to organize and calm it, but not to work for its suppression.

And this sympathy towards Syndicalism is all the more interesting that Jaurès' own bias was towards such an orderly method of progress. But he hated "barren and sterile formulæ," and not only, as most men do, the barren and sterile formulæ of those with whom they disagree. He hated to fall into them himself, and he was ready to work with everyone who was sincere, and above all to sympathise and encourage every movement that sprang from the people. Speaking of Jaurès' general relationship with the workers, especially with the organized workers of France, Léon Jouhaux, the Secretary of the Confédération Générale du Travail, said at

his grave: “. . . . Your memory, your image will be present at every instant in these tragic moments to lead us in the blood-stained night that opens in front of us. Before this grave where lies, cold, insensible henceforth our greatest, it is our duty to declare loudly that between him and us, the working class, there was never a barrier. People believed that we were Jaurès' opponents. Oh, how mistaken they were. It is true that between him and us there was some divergence of tactics. But this divergence was only so to speak on the surface. His action and ours completed one another. His intellectual action brought about our physical action. . . . It was with him that we were always in communion. Jaurès was our thought, our living doctrine, it is from his image, his memory that we shall draw our force in the future. Impassioned for the fight which raises humanity and makes it better, he never had any doubts. He rendered to the working class this immense homage that he believed in its mission of regeneration. . . . He lived in the struggle of the working class, he shared its hopes. Never any hard words about the proletariat. He surrounded his advice, his counsel with the best of himself. . . . ”



## CHAPTER V

### THE NEW ARMY

IT was Jaurès' intention to write a vast work under the general title of "The Socialist Organization of France." He believed that Socialism would come about in that democratic country before long, and he wished to help in every way towards this development. His extreme optimism, amounting to a gift of faith, makes one feel as if he would almost have created the new conditions by his ardent belief in them. At the end of his discourse on the results of the International Congress at Stuttgart, which he delivered at the Tivoli-Vaux-Hall in Paris, on the 7th of September, 1907, he said: "Ah, citizens, I have for my part an illimitable confidence in the future. It is with serene certainty that we look at things and that we go forward in the battle. . . . The ideal beauty of social justice, of the proletarian revolution, cannot perish: it is as immortal as work, as imperishable as conscience, and I salute with you, soldiers of the International, the coming of Socialist Humanity."

He was a splendid leader of the people, at once practical and glowing with faith. A soldier lying wounded and depressed in a Breton hospital in the autumn of 1914 said, "If Jaurès were here he would have told us what to do."

Jaurès was anxious that the schemes for future development should be well and clearly understood by the proletariat. He realized the folly of leaving the people without the necessary education for the Social Revolution and of expecting them all at once to take on themselves the task of adapting, altering, and arranging the whole social system. He wished to see the people prepared for this task by taking their share henceforth in municipal and State government, and through the Co-operative movement gaining experience in economic development, in directing, and in owning, and in undertaking responsibility. He wished to see members of the proletariat not only forming, but leading the Army. Again and again we find him insisting that the proletariat must make a great effort, must put forth energy and exercise self-control. It was this call to the heroism of the people which marks him out as the true leader; he both believed that the people could do these things and had no fear of asking the necessary sacrifice of them.

It appeared to Jaurès that for this work of social transformation, of evolution from Capital-

ism to Socialism, it was a vital necessity for France to be safe from attack from without. To be free and undisturbed in the task of working out her own social salvation she must have security and permanence. And by one of life's ironies it came about that he, the great apostle of peace, was only able to finish one volume of his projected work before his death, and that volume was a plea for a thorough reconstruction of the French Army on democratic lines. *L'Armée Nouvelle* appeared in 1910. Since his death a new edition has been published by *L'Humanité*.

The amount of technical detail in this book is amazing and shows with what intensity he worked at any subject which he had taken up.

According to Jaurès all Frenchmen should be in the army from the age of twenty-one to forty-five, and even the children and young lads should be "prepared" for the military life, though their training, at any rate in the years of school life, should be of a general physical kind and not have an obviously military basis. Any slackness of attention among the young should be treated, however, very seriously indeed, and if it were persisted in he even suggests that their future rights as citizens ought to be curtailed. It would not be fair to say that this point of view showed an indifference to liberty on Jaurès' part. He loved liberty and hated the hard formulæ which

reduce men to mechanical lifelessness, but liberty did not, one recognizes, mean to him that individual determination of one's acts which has been held so precious by the Anglo-Saxon race. Jaurès considered that in a country like France freedom was guaranteed by the desire of the whole people for free institutions, and in such a country there appeared to him no danger in the absolute devotion of the individual to the State.

Jaurès believed intensely in the idea of nationality and he writes eloquently of this national sense, this bond of men forming a unity in one geographical area. There are those who ask bitterly, what country has the proletariat? But to Jaurès the sentiment of nationality is not a mere question of possessing a portion of the soil, of having in any sense what is called a stake in the country, *i.e.*, material possessions. It is a far deeper feeling, compounded of common memories and speech, common sentiments, character, and aspirations. <sup>1</sup>“When a revolutionary syndicalist cried out recently at the Congress of Toulouse: ‘Down with fatherlands! Long live the universal fatherland!’ Jaurès says ‘he is not asking by this expression of desire for the disappearance, the extinction of all countries into an immense mediocrity, where characters and minds would lose their clearness and their colour.

<sup>1</sup> *L'Armée Nouvelle*, p. 454

Still less is he calling by this wish for the absorption of nations in a tremendous servitude, for the incorporation of all countries by the most brutal country, and for human unity by means of the unity of a colossal militarism. By calling for the end of nations he is calling for the end of the egoism and antagonism of nations. Down with jingo prejudices and blind hatreds! Down with fratricidal wars! Down with countries of oppression and of destruction. He asks with a full heart for the universal fatherland of free workers, of independent and friendly nations.”

To Jaurès this national unit is intensely precious, and he saw that nearly all men felt it to be so. The yoke of Capitalism is heavy on the neck of the worker, but it is not apparent to the average imagination. Part of the reward of labour is constantly filched away from the labourer, but it is not obvious to him that it is so; he finds himself in a system, but it does not appear to him, any more than it does to the average capitalist, that it ought to be different. But the yoke of foreign domination is as obvious as it is odious to all men, and the worker, crushed down by Capitalism, finds an additional and more galling misery added to his life.

Capitalism, though it must pass away, Jaurès has shown to have been a natural evolution, but foreign domination is always unnatural and impossible to bear. So we find the workers

everywhere ready to leap forward to the defence of the country if she is menaced, and the cry that is raised by some few Socialists that they care nothing whether an alien power rules or whether the workers are kept in chains by native capitalists, is found not to stand the test of experience. Jaurès considered this was as true in the present day as ever, for the nation is in his view a permanent actuality, and as regards the sentiment of nationality he showed an insight not shared by some Socialists who have since recanted their anti-nationalist views.

All war of adventure was in Jaurès' view unutterably disastrous for the people, and every effort ought to be made to avert war of every kind. Nevertheless, the country must be prepared for defensive warfare and be so invincible as to make invasion practically impossible.

Jaurès did not believe this position to have been reached in France; in fact, he considered that the military authorities were wilfully throwing away a large part of the strength of France—madly weakening her when she needed all her force. France has conscription, but by the constitution of her army she is not really relying on universal service. The military authorities, weakly desirous of imitating a military power like Germany, tend to rely too much on the army in barracks and too little on the citizen army outside. The young men of twenty or twenty-

one have to serve for two whole years in barracks, and the army thus constituted is alone called the "active" army. This ought all to be changed.

From many examples, taken from other countries, especially the smaller countries, Jaurès showed that two years is far too long for the young soldier to remain in the unnatural atmosphere of the barracks. In fact even now, he says, the young French soldier acquires all his training in five months, after which he is merely wasting time. According to Jaurès, the young Frenchman should not remain more than six months in barracks, and even this short training might be taken at two different periods within the same year. Even during those periods he would be more in touch with the general life than he now is, since one of the main reforms advocated by Jaurès was that the young soldier should be trained at the local barracks, the nearest possible to his home.

It has been already said that *L'Armée Nouvelle* was published in 1910. In 1905 a law had been passed reducing the period of training to two years. Jaurès was anxious that the reduction should be carried much further. His protest, however, was in vain. Far from decreasing the time spent in the "active" army, France increased the amount of time to three years in 1913. On this occasion Jaurès resisted the proposal with all his strength.

He shows at length by the example of Switzerland what a really democratic army should be; how it should rely, not on the professional soldier separated from, and alien to, the life of the nation, but on the *élan* of the whole people sweeping forward in an irresistible because highly trained mass.

What Jaurès wanted indeed was to see the people taking an interest in the army and controlling it, and for this purpose he advocated all reforms which tended to make soldiers of the citizens and citizens of the soldiers.

To him the armed nation meant the just nation. When the whole nation was organized for defence, war would become unthinkable for any other reason than defence. What he asked was that the nation should organize its military force without any class or caste prejudice, without any other desire or ambition whatever than the national defence.

He saw very clearly that the army, whatever the method of recruiting and of training the soldier, would never be democratic as long as the officers remained a class apart, appointed solely from the wealthier portion of the nation and isolated from the nation far more than the soldiers are. The officers under conscription tend to be the permanent part of the army and form a body which, unlike that joined by the ordinary recruit, never goes back into civilian life. This makes



them out of sympathy with the ordinary currents of human life, and reasons against war which appear valid to the ordinary common sense of a civilian, and especially to the worker, have no weight with them. They live in an unreal world, where to be on active service tends to appear at once the most normal and the most noble condition for mankind—it could in fact hardly be otherwise.

Jaurès, as we know, hated war, but as long as there is an army, he says, “it is a crime against the genius of France and against that of the army itself to separate it from the nation.” He wished to make it possible for the worker to rise in the army as in any other profession if he showed inclination and capacity for it. To make the army outside the barracks more active and efficient he was in favour of increasing the number of officers. But it would be too great a burden on the nation if these were all paid professional soldiers. His plan was that two-thirds of them should live the life of civilians. He also wished to “have done with the régime at once aristocratic and cloistered of the special military school. It is in the universities that the high military teaching will henceforth be given.” Students should attend, with those of other faculties, classes on subjects of common interest—history, science and so on. At the University these young men will find fresh life, the free interchange of

ideas and a wide and varied comradeship. In the regular military schools the professors are officers who command, not merely teachers, and there is no free discussion. The mind becomes mechanical from the first instead of receiving what Jaurès calls "an impulse of science and of liberty and the habit of moving in wide horizons."

*L'Armée Nouvelle* was certainly a very remarkable and unique book, not at all on conventional lines. Among the minute details of the way in which the new army might be formed, Jaurès inserts chapters of military history, and gives his opinion of the strategy of the generals of the French Revolution, and of Napoleon himself. Again there are chapters in which, as if aware that he would never carry out his plan of a complete survey of the social reconstruction of France, he touches on much besides military matters, and we learn many of his ideas on Socialism and philosophy and politics. Jaurès felt strongly that, however much he and other Socialists hated war, France could not be unarmed with armed nations all round her. Once having accepted this idea, it was not enough for him continually to urge on the French Government a sustained effort in the direction of a mutual arrangement with the other governments for disarmament, for arbitration treaties, for a Concert of Europe, and whatever else could be

done to further universal peace. Nor was it enough as a politician to be tireless in criticism of all acts, especially secret acts, which tended to produce unrest among the nations and ultimately war, whether they took the form of capitalist "adventures," of colonial expansion, of secret treaties and alliances or of anything else, and meanwhile to press forward the education of the workers of France and of other nations towards a closer and closer solidarity and understanding of one another. No one was more active than Jaurès in all these ways, but he was too united to France, too much one with everything French, and had too practical a nature to leave the matter there. He believed that the Army was now in the hands of those who do not love the people, but he believed it could be democratized. He wanted a democratic army supporting a Socialist State, though to an onlooker it might seem that the Socialist State must first be brought about before a democratic Army could emerge. For while the Capitalistic State lasts will not the Army be under the influence of the privileged classes? Can the constitution of armies ever be democratic? Jaurès believed that it can, and pointed to Switzerland as an example. Even there, as he owns, it has been used to suppress strikes. That there is some radical divorce between the idea of real democracy and a successful army was surely implied

by Marcel Sembat in his book addressed to the French nation, *Faites un roi si-on faites la paix*. Both Sembat and Jaurès reproach their countrymen for halting between two opinions—Is France to be really democratic and peaceful, or is she to be sacrificed to the interests of a few not aristocratic, but powerfully financial persons? If the latter, she must expect wars and rumours of wars.

But Jaurès did not believe that France could be peaceful under all circumstances. When once he had begun upon the subject of her preparation for defensive warfare, when once he had taken up the idea that the defence of the country must be the work of the whole people, the thought grew upon him, and he threw himself into it with his usual ardent energy and produced an astonishing and prophetic book.

From the point of view of the maintenance of peace, which Jaurès had so much at heart, it is impossible at times in reading this book not to be struck with the feeling that, however innocent the aims of the democratic army might be, the whole-hearted devotion of a great people to the creation of such a massive army of defence as Jaurès wished to see, could hardly help having in it some elements of a provocative nature. How could a neighbouring country be sure of no sudden change of view such as would lead the invincible defensive army over the frontier at one time or other?

Another doubt arises. We all long that the coming of universal peace shall not be far distant. Is it wise to rouse any people by a fresh effort of great magnitude to throw themselves into the work of the reorganization of the army and of self-identification with it? Would not the inevitable result, if the effort were successful, be a fresh outburst of warlike energy and of devotion to the warlike life? And how could Jaurès have expected that having provoked this spirit and set the people to work out these military problems, which involved the overcoming of many difficulties, they would at the same time work for the end of all war, carrying this so far that they would even overturn their Government sooner than enter into a war that could be by any means avoided?

Was Jaurès led by his passionate love of France, and by the insults which had been hurled at him as her enemy into an unreasonable optimism? He himself seemed to feel some doubt about the attitude of the people. No plan for the formation of a democratic army was of any avail if it lacked the people's support, and of this he did not feel sure. To him it was impossible to feel such indifference, but in this matter, so vital in his eyes, would the proletariat follow him?



## CHAPTER VI

### INTERNATIONAL PEACE

SOCIALISM, by its very nature, is opposed irreconcilably to Militarism. In his book on Jaurès, M. Rappoport points out that, after the foundation of the second International in Paris in 1889, Socialism more and more developed an anti-militarist bias. Jaurès, who was above all things a humanitarian, ardently supported the cause of International Peace. Though he believed that France and other countries should defend themselves against aggression, yet he was, after Tolstoy, the strongest individual force for Peace in Europe.

He had no doubt of the need of the people for peace. <sup>1</sup>“It is war above all which will make orderly social evolution impossible,” he says, “while on the contrary, by the guarantee of democracy and peace, the fullness of popular rights and international security, the passage from our bourgeois society to the socialist order can be accomplished by steps, by arranged transitions, without violence and shedding of blood, without waste of economic forces.”

<sup>1</sup> *L'Armée Nouvelle*, p. 463

To Jaurès war was <sup>1</sup>“the horrible crime which forces into a quarrel brothers in work and in poverty all the world over.” But he sees that war is of the essence of capitalism and that it will not be eradicated till capitalism itself has been abolished. <sup>2</sup>“Yes, that is the great Socialist truth. Yes, in the capitalist world there is permanent, eternal, universal war, the war of all against all, of individuals against the individuals in a class, of classes against classes in a nation, of nations against nations, of races against races in humanity. Capitalism is disorder, hatred, coveteousness without check, the rush of a troop which precipitates itself on profit and tramples on the multitude to get it.”

And France? <sup>3</sup>“France does not want war; she needs peace for the immense work of socialistic change, which will demand all her strength. . . . This will for peace is not a wish to humble herself, and no one outside will mistake it for that. But it ought to show itself clearly, distinctly, radiantly. The most decisive sign that France could give to the world of this pacific desire would be, not to give herself up to Germany against England, nor to England against Germany . . . but to believe in the possibility of peace between Germany and England and to work for it ceaselessly, with discretion but with

<sup>1 2</sup> Jaurès' speech at the Tivoli-Vaux-Hall, Sept. 7, 1907

<sup>3</sup> Rappoport, p. 77



sincerity. That is the wise policy. That is the necessary policy. Those who wish for peace, but who by announcing inevitable conflicts create the vertigo of war, enervate and upset by secret contradictions the reason of the country. And they take away from France the benefit of absolute clearness, clearness for others and clearness for herself, which is a safeguard for her and for all the world."

But one thing may be worse, he feels, than war, and that is, the condition of the world under an armed peace—such an armed peace as existed all through the latter part of Jaurès' life. For armed peace combines all the evils of war—hatred, moral uncertainty, the twilight of intrigue and doubt, all the base passions, with none of those redeeming features which Jaurès saw in war. "If we have a horror of war," he says, "it is not from a feeble and enervated sentimentalism. . . . If sufferings are a necessary condition of a great human step in advance, the revolutionary can resign himself to them." And he speaks with admiration of that state of mind which comes from the<sup>1</sup> "great probability of near peril, the certainty of imminent sacrifice, the frequent familiarity with death joyfully accepted." Such fruits of war he did not despise. But he seriously warns those who talk lightly of the good that is bound to spring from war. In 1905

<sup>1</sup> Rappoport p. 76, Jaurès speech published in *Vorwärts*

Jaurès had been asked by the German Social Democrats to go and speak in Berlin itself on the subject of International Peace. Though the German Government refused him permission and Jaurès did not go, the speech was read publicly in Germany and published in *Vorwärts*. In it he says: "But in Europe to-day it is not by the way of international war that the work of Liberty and Justice will be accomplished and that the grievances of one people against another will be redressed. . . . From a European war the Revolution might spring forth; and the governing classes would do well to ponder on that—but there might result also for a long period, crises of counter-revolution, of furious reaction, of exasperated nationalism, of stifling dictatorships, of monstrous militarism, a long chain of retrograde violence, of base hatreds, of reprisals, of slavery. And as for us, we have no wish to play at this game of barbarous chance. . . ."

Jaurès was a patriot in the highest and purest sense of the word. He loved France with the Hebrew prophet's love of Israel, he loved her with an intensity of which the ordinary patriot is incapable. He could easily "scorn delights and live laborious days" for her welfare. He had a vision of her glorious destiny in which he really believed as few men believe in anything, and love of one's country was in his eyes a natural,

a healthy and a fundamental instinct. <sup>1</sup>“There is,” he says, “among the individuals (in a nation) . . . . an invisible ground of common impressions. . . . Forces half instinctive and for that very reason immense and formidable.” And he shows how the prodigious strength of the great common emotions that occasionally arise results from the fact that they have grown up out of the most commonplace ordinary acts of daily life, speaking, walking, talking, by which the life of each man in a group mingles with the common life of all. And thus the great movements of the spirit have a basis in Nature. “Yes, he adds, “they are great and good forces, but also full of peril and trouble.” And “in the international life man is still a wolf towards his fellow man. The country, by absorbing or rather by exalting individual egoism in a great collective egoism, too often covers the most brutal greed with a semblance of generosity. Men are capable of the illusion that they are serving justice when they are devoting themselves for the interests, even the unjust interests of a force, in which they are included but which is infinitely above them. Thence come blind entanglements and brutal maxims. Thence comes the adherence given even by high-minded men to the detestable formula, ‘My country right or wrong.’ In the measure that men progress and become enlightened the neces-

<sup>1</sup> *L'Armée Nouvelle*, pp. 451-452

sity becomes apparent of rescuing each country from classes and castes, so as to make it really, by the sovereignty of work, the possession of everyone. The necessity also appears of abolishing in the international order the state of nature, of submitting the nations in their reciprocal relationships to rules of right, sanctioned by the active consent of all civilized people."

<sup>1</sup> "But this national and international transformation is only possible if each of the men who carry within them the new idea acts in his country and on his country. By hope, by common and harmonious action all the proletariat, all the men of social justice and international peace belong beforehand to the same human country, to the universal country of free work and of reconciled nations. But this high ideal cannot be projected by them in the void. They can only realize it in autonomous countries . . . according to . . . the history of each."

He denounces that patriotism that excludes humanity. <sup>2</sup> "To tell the Frenchman that it is his duty 'passionately to prefer France,' the German that it his duty passionately to prefer Germany, the Englishman to prefer England, the Italian to prefer Italy, the Chinaman to prefer China, is to create amongst the peoples a condition of fixed blindness, infatuation, injustice and violence. He who deliberately prefers him-

<sup>1</sup> *L'Armée Nouvelle*, p. 453.    <sup>2</sup> Rappoport, p. 80.

self to another recognizes in others only inferior rights; this is the principle of all crimes, of all iniquities. It is the formula and doctrine of nationalist barbarism, and teachers who . . . spread this base idea commit the crime of *lèse-humanity* and *lèse-fatherland*. . . . Miserable patriots, who to love and serve France must 'prefer' it, that is, must disparage other peoples, the other great moral forces of humanity. . . . The true formula of patriotism is the equal right of all countries to liberty and justice, and the duty of every citizen to strengthen in his country liberty and justice."

Jaurès was a man of faith, with a glowing vision which he was doing all that a man could do to realize. He was full of ardent hope for the future, a hope which the crushing events of the past two years seem to have proved unwarranted, at any rate as regards so near a future as his words sometimes implied. Yet even in his most optimistic moments he was keenly conscious of the tremendous difficulties to be overcome; they were probably far more apparent to his clear intellect than to the minds of the shallow pessimists who know nothing of the self-sacrificing effort of creation made by the man of faith.

In *L'Armée Nouvelle* he says that the proletariat knows what a difficult task it is at once to struggle against war and to safeguard the

independence of nations, and he adds: <sup>1</sup>“The class which assumes this glorious and formidable responsibility is forced itself to an immense effort of education and organization, of wisdom and heroism. It is not naïve enough to claim to enclose beforehand in a well-arranged formula, tumultuous events. An abstract scheme would not suffice to guide men in these confused and terrible crises.”

And again he says: <sup>2</sup>“The voice of the proletariat everywhere, which begins to rise vibrating and strong above the nations agitated by an eternal anxious rumour of war, cannot repeat all that was said by Schiller’s belfry. It can say ‘I call the living and I weep over the dead.’ It cannot yet say ‘I break the lightning.’ There still remains for us to accomplish,” he repeats, “an immense work of education and organization. But in spite of all, henceforth one may hope, one can act. Neither blind optimism, nor paralyzing pessimism. There is a beginning of working class and socialist organization, there is a beginning of international conscience. Henceforth if we really wish we can re-act against the fatal tendency to war which the capitalist régime contains.

“The present condition of things is ambiguous and mixed. There is no fatality in it, no

<sup>1</sup> *L'Armée Nouvelle*, p. 463.    <sup>2</sup> From a speech by Jaurès published in *Vorwärts*, 1905.

certainty. The proletariat is not sufficiently strong for there to be a certainty of peace, nor is he weak enough for there to be a fatality of war. In this state of indecision and this unstable equilibrium of forces, human action can do much. The formidable part of the unknown is not alarming for us Socialists alone. It is fearful also for those who would rashly let loose wars of which no one to-day can predict the political consequences, the internal rebounds."

Jaurès fully recognized that while the education of the peoples in the direction of peace and of friendly international relationships could only be expected to proceed slowly, the relationships of the Governments of the Great Powers was uneasy and menacing in the highest degree. He had always regarded the alliance of France with Russia with apprehension. France he thought was always controlled by and never controlled Russia; she was led therefore into dangerous actions which she would never have undertaken alone. In the early days of the understanding between the two countries he became afraid that France might be led at the tail of Russia into those wars of "adventure" in the Far East which he regarded as wrong and foolish. And meanwhile <sup>1</sup>"internally Tzarism, exploited by our governors against the revolutionary tradition of France, increased the strength

<sup>1</sup>Speech of Jaurès published in *Vorwärts*, 1905.

of the French reaction with something of Russian servitude."

Jaurès welcomed the *Entente* between France and England, but not as against Germany. He would have wished for an understanding, too, with Germany, but not at the price of weakening the understanding with England.

Above all, Jaurès thought that one of the greatest evils was the supposed necessity of a struggle between Germany and England, with its terrible effect upon the growth of armaments and of militarism.

His words were solemn and prophetic: <sup>1</sup>"Doubtless," he says, "the rivalry of economic interests is acute. But war would be a solution neither for the one people nor the other. It is doubtless impossible to abolish England's great power of expansion, and it is impossible to crush the methodical force of production of the populous and scientific Germany. Striking at one another desperately, the two peoples would bruise and wound one another and splash the world with blood; but neither of them would eliminate the other; and after an exhausting struggle they would still have to reckon with one another."

"Or if, by a peculiar stroke of fortune, one of the two peoples reduced the other to a long powerlessness, the conqueror, become formidable to the rest of the world, would see formed

<sup>1</sup>Speech of Jaurès published in *Vorwärts*, 1905.



against him one of those universal coalitions which broke Louis XIV. and Napoleon. . . .

“Wisdom, the care of their interests counsels England and Germany, then, to negotiate, to come to terms, to seek a settlement at all points of the globe where their activities meet or their ambitions clash. This is the duty of their statesmen. This would be their glory. And it is also about this that the proletariat of the two nations ought to occupy itself without delay and without intermission.”

For France he saw a great mission, whereby she could render to civilization and to peace, to political liberty and to social justice the greatest possible service. This service was “to moderate the Anglo-German conflict.” But to be capable of undertaking this great work, to play the Peacemaker, she must herself be without ideas of aggression, she must have no secret designs of her own, she must be loyal to the nations she desires to help. And Jaurès did not see in the French people the clear and certain intention to pursue peace that he would have wished. France knows she needs peace and yet betrays ideas and designs incompatible with peace. Over and over again he told France that her behaviour with regard to Morocco had tied her hands.

For Jaurès saw that only by the growth of international good faith can lasting peace be assured. When France and Germany came

finally to an agreement over the Morocco question in 1911, he made a powerful speech in the Chamber of Deputies, in which he reviewed the past and exposed the selfishness of the financial interests involved in the struggle over Morocco, which had several times brought Europe close to war. <sup>1</sup>“For years,” he said, in beginning his speech, “with a persistence which bordered on monotony, I have brought before you and before the country, warnings and objections; I have pointed out that the way in which our policy was developing could only end in crises and deceptions. But many citizens accused me of pessimism and bias.”

And yet, as he went on to point out, for eight years there had been “apprehensions, alarms, conflicts,” and as many as three times Europe had been brought by this business to the verge of war. Now at last it had ended in France having to give up a portion of the Congo to Germany, and her power had been weakened to check the designs of other nations.

By the secret articles of the treaties of 1904 and 1905 with England and Spain, France had put it out of her power honestly to carry out the provisions of the treaty of Algeciras. Jaurès spoke of the mistake which had been committed “by destroying, with the Act of Algeciras, the only means of expression of an international opinion.

<sup>1</sup> Speech of Jaurès in the Chamber of Deputies, December 19 and 20, 1911.

. . . . "Now this act is wrecked, this international opinion is dispersed. Each is engaged in its own affairs: Italy painfully devours Tripoli, Russia proceeds to the partition and absorption of Persia, Austria-Hungary, remembering Bosnia-Herzegovina, is not in the least able to recommend disinterestedness and moderation to Spain."

He went on to say: "Though the new settlement has in my eyes and in the eyes of my friends the immense and inestimable merit of getting rid of every immediate cause of conflict and of making possible, if we wish it, a better arrangement of international life, yet this new settlement leaves the world, in spite of everything, in a troubled state, with passions awake and minds excited. . . . The chancelleries put questions to one another with a formidable courtesy, recriminations and controversies are prolonged.

"From whence comes this, gentlemen, and how have we arrived at this menacing chaos? How shall we get out of it?"

We must look back to the past, he says, and see what mistakes have been committed. First there is the want of that patience which would have enabled France to have penetrated Morocco peacefully and legitimately with European civilization—to her own good and that of Morocco. That would have been an effective though quiet policy, but an ostentatious policy was preferred.

It was beneficial, he goes on, to reconcile England and Italy with France, but the problem was to do this without "uselessly and thoughtlessly exciting the susceptibilities of Germany."

Jaurès then gave a description of the rise of Germany, showing how she had always had the misfortune to lag behind the other great nations in her development. He pointed out that for forty years peace had been maintained and that, during that time, Germany had grown immensely in population and in industrial activity. Now she finds herself again too late. Most parts of the world are already occupied. Therefore it is natural, says Jaurès, that she should watch with a particularly scrupulous care that no new distribution of the small markets which remain should be arranged.

"And this is why in 1904 and 1905 when vast diplomatic combinations came into play, and when these diplomatic combinations had for their immediate object the distribution of a new sphere of influence and of power, I say that it was a grave imprudence in French diplomacy not to have occupied itself by real and serious negotiations in taking precautions with reference to the susceptibilities of Germany.

"You have made, eight years later, the bargain by which, eight years ago, you would have saved France a period of crisis and agitation."

Many of the deputies were very much excited

by Jaurès' speech, and when he continued that now "France, with the consciousness of her liberty, and dignity, and force, and with her independence in mind judges that in exchange for the influence which she assumes in Morocco she owes to other nations, she owes especially to Germany, compensation of an economic or at least a territorial order" a member called out: "No, she owes nothing at all," and another told Jaurès that he was using the language of the German Chancellor.

But in spite of the anger which he excited, Jaurès proceeded to denounce the secret treaties.

" . . . They nourish the solitary pride of diplomats. . . They propagate besides everywhere suspicion. People say, 'Are there no others?' . . . And at the same time by an inevitable result they ruin the value of treaties; the public signature that the nations exchange has no longer any value, it has a depreciated title on the diplomatic market since there are, behind and below, secret values, occult values, which run between one diplomatist and another.

" Oh, what an admirable addition to the temptation to perfidy, when there are two series of treaties, public treaties which bind you towards the nation in daylight, and secret treaties containing contrary clauses! One cannot altogether fail to keep one's word. . . .

" And it is a final vice of these treaties that

they do not always remain secret and ignored by those who may have an interest in knowing about them. . . .”

These mistakes of impatience, of imprudence, of deception, were not the only ones. Jaurès declared there had been provocation towards the people of Morocco, unfairness towards the Sultan.

“At the same time faults against the Sultan himself. You told us yesterday . . . that the Sultan was at the end of his resources, that all his resources were hypothetical, that the entire revenue from his customs was absorbed by the payment of loans. Yes, but as the consequence of a deliberate policy. This is what was desired. . . . First 40% was taken from him, then 60%, and it was said: ‘When he has not a penny left, when he cannot maintain himself any more, when he can no longer pay his miserable little army, when he can only live by squeezing the sole tribes that are squeezable, that is, those that hitherto remain faithful to him, then there will be revolt, anarchy, and the Sultan will be reduced to powerlessness and we shall have a pretext to interfere.’ This was the calculation of the Government, this was the calculation of the colonials. . . .

“When one has manœuvred in this way . . . to ruin the Act of Algeciras, one cannot allege that it was condemned to disappear by its own defects. . . .

“ . . . . The Act of Algeciras inaugurated in Europe an admirable method of international organization for the solution of economic and political conflicts ; it was a noble attempt which would have permitted France to develop largely its interests in Morocco in agreement with the international sentiment, with the interests, with the rights of Europe. . . . .

“ It was difficult, perhaps, but it was great, it was noble, it would have spared the world immediate agitations, and it prepared for the future the form according to which other disputes could have been settled. But no, it was desired, so as to devour Morocco, greedily, gluttonously, to snatch it out of the international régime, to drive the Sultan to ruin, and this terrible example, this fatal example has been given of international treaties, affirmed and violated at the very moment when everywhere in Europe public faith seemed lowered.

“ Ah, gentlemen, what a sad spectacle is that at which the consciences of men have looked in the past few years. . . . . A series of violations of public faith, ostensible treaties undermined by secret treaties, international engagements violated or mocked at, Bosnia and Herzegovina confiscated, annexed, in contempt of an international treaty, the Act of Algeciras violated, Italy throwing herself on Tripoli in a time of absolute peace.”

. . . . "And what I deplore for France . . . . great force as she is of moral nobility, what I regret is, that she has supplied her share in initiative, in example, in the detestable responsibility for these universal violations of sworn faith, in this abasement of the international signature and loyalty."

At this point in his speech a great outcry was raised against Jaurès. He was called to order, fists were shaken at him and great confusion reigned. The deputies however seem to have listened to him with greater calmness the next day when he finished his speech, developing in it, in more detail, the dangers of international finance. At the end he reverted gravely to the unsafe condition into which these adventures were continually leading Europe. He spoke of that "atmosphere of storm, of suspicion, from which it seems the lightning of war might be precipitated at any moment." He begged them not to believe the fatalistic doctrine that such a war was inevitable, but to work honestly against it with all their strength. In a terrible and prophetic passage he described what a modern European war would be and then ended on a happier note by recalling the forces that were working even now for peace.

The tremendous danger with which the modern developments of capitalism and finance threaten peace drove a certain number of French Socialists



to sympathise with the extreme position held by Gustave Hervé. The revelations of the Dreyfus case, which had shown that the French army was led by a number of men really opposed to the Republic and ready to plot against her, and the discovery on the other hand that Radical ministries could use the army for the purpose of suppressing strikes, produced a profound disgust, which in Gustave Hervé led to a kind of anti-patriotism. He contended that all forms of patriotism were a delusion for the worker, who had no real fatherland as long as he was deprived of all those benefits which make their country dear to the privileged classes. He argued that the worker would be as well off under one anti-Socialist government as another, and would gain nothing by fighting to preserve the possessions of his present masters. He never really knows which is the aggressor in a war, and for him there is only one duty—to refuse to fight for the capitalist state at all, and to paralyze every war by a general strike and a revolutionary effort. This as we have seen was not Jaurès' point of view, though Hervé interested him, as did all original men, and with much of Hervé's destructive criticism he was in complete sympathy. But to him the nation was a reality of great significance. Moreover, Hervé's repudiation of every means of combating war and the spirit of war but by the one means of refusing to fight, was foreign to

Jaurès' mode of thought. Rather he urged on the workers to use every means available to bring about lasting peace, and he earnestly begged them to make use of the ideas of International Arbitration and the Conferences of the Hague. <sup>1</sup> "For a long time," he says, "Socialism was defiant of International Arbitration. It had its reasons." The royal persons and the diplomatists who smiled upon the Hague Conference did not show their sincerity by their subsequent behaviour. But it may be asked: Why, if it is merely a trick on their part, do they go to the Hague at all? They go because they know that the people really want peace and that by making this show of a "bonne petite paix à leur façon" which "will permit of a certain number of wars," they will save the proletariat from making a reality of the thing. But the right method for the people is not to laugh at all this and despise it, but to force these same diplomatic personages to put into practice their professions. <sup>2</sup> "Messieurs les Ministres, Messieurs les gouvernants, Messieurs les diplomates, chamarrés d'or et revêtus de belles intentions, si vous voulez l'arbitrage international, nous aussi." Since they have been to the Hague they can no longer tell us that arbitration is impossible, and now we mean them to do what they have said. Hervé had said that the workers could never tell whether a war were

<sup>1 2</sup> Jaurès' speech at the Tivoli-Vaux-Hall, September 7, 1907

really offensive or only defensive. Jaurès replied that the test would in future be whether its promoters were willing to submit to arbitration.

In *L'Armée Nouvelle* he has developed his idea of free nations in a federation of humanity. <sup>1</sup>“It is only by the free federation of autonomous nations which have given up the exercise of military force, and have submitted themselves to the rules of law, that human unity can be realized. But it will not be by the suppression of national life but by its ennoblement. Nations will rise to be part of humanity without losing any of their independence, of their originality, of the liberty of their own genius. . . .

<sup>2</sup>“In the light of the new social order it is from henceforth a joy, a pride and a strength, for all the fighters for international Socialism to make an appeal to all that is most noble in the traditions, in the history and in the genius of the countries.” Of all these acts of courage and efforts of mind he says, “We recall them, we invoke them, we say to men: Why should this movement cease? . . .

“The new humanity will only be rich and living if the originality of each people is retained in the general harmony. . . .

“This is why, in all its congresses, the Socialist and working-class International reminds the proletariat of all countries of the double and

<sup>1 2</sup> *L'Armée Nouvelle*, pp. 454, 456-459.

indivisible duty of maintaining peace by all means in its power, and of safeguarding the independence of all nations. Yes, of maintaining peace by all the means of action open to the proletariat, even by a general international strike, even by revolution. How many misunderstandings, voluntary and involuntary, how much contempt and calumny the adversaries of Socialism have gathered together on this subject.

“They forget, they affect to forget, that even in democratic countries war can be unchained without the consent of the people, without their knowledge, against their will. They forget that in the mystery in which diplomacy is still enveloped, foreign politics too often escape from the control of nations, that an imprudence, a fatuity, a stupid provocation, the infamous greed of some group of financiers may unchain sudden conflicts; that it depends still on a minority, a small circle, or on a system-ridden and infatuated man to engage the nation, and create the irreparable, and that war and peace are still unaffected by the law of democracy.”

Jaurès saw that against this kind of scheming the proletariat had little resource and that it was possible that he might be forced to take desperate means against these evil effects of our present system of diplomacy. He might have to signify that <sup>14</sup>“he would not fight or rather that he would

<sup>1</sup> *L'Armée Nouvelle*, pp 460-461

fight against the criminal plotters, that he would break if he could the forces of war, that he would rise to snatch the country from those who are trying to deceive it."

"Yes, this would be the right and the duty of the workers, . . . by a simultaneous and united effort of its militants in the countries exposed to the horrible catastrophe, to rise, make a desperate appeal to revolutionary force, and break these governments of delirium, and rapine and murder. . . ."

In the International Congress of Stuttgart in 1907 Jaurès took an active part. At a Congress held at Limoges on the 4th of November, 1906, and at another held at Nancy on the 13th of August, 1907, the French Socialist party had passed strong resolutions confirming those of previous earlier International Congresses which recognized the solidarity of the workers of all countries. It called upon the workers to prevent war by all the means in their power, from intervention in Parliament and public agitation to the general strike and insurrection.

The motion on the subject, about which there was some divergence at the French Congresses, was carried unanimously at Stuttgart, where the Congress lasted from the 18th to the 24th of August. The motion was a very long one. It confirmed the ideas of previous congresses, recognized the inseparability of capitalism and

militarism, and pointed out how many modern wars were fomented solely for the purpose of obtaining markets. It showed that the creation of a new social order based on the solidarity of the peoples was in direct conflict with the idea of war. It affirmed that it was the duty of all the workers to make war against the growth of armaments by refusing all money support and by the education of their children in ideas of friendship and solidarity towards the people of every country. It advocated a system of militia, believing this to be a real guarantee of peace. It refused to confine itself to any rigid formula as to what action on the part of the different national parties would be necessary to prevent war but confined itself to stating that the working classes must do everything possible. It contained a long paragraph pointing out what had already been done by the joint action of English and French Trades Unions, by the Socialist parties of France and Germany acting simultaneously in the two Parliaments and by numerous popular manifestations in both countries about Morocco, by Austrian and Italian Socialists to prevent a conflict between the two nations, by the vigorous intervention of Swedish workmen to prevent an attack on Norway, by the noble efforts of the Russian and Polish Socialists to stop war and to make the Japanese war result in liberty for the people.

The motion ended with an appeal for arbitration and general disarmament.

This motion exactly expressed Jaurès' point of view. After the Congress a great meeting was held at the Tivoli-Vaux-Hall in Paris by the French Socialists, and Jaurès gave a report of the Congress, especially in relation to peace. He there explained why the motion had not expressly affirmed the general strike and the possible necessity of insurrection in case of war. This was due to the difficulties of the German comrades, who would undoubtedly have been proceeded against for such an open declaration of the intention to rebel. He declared that the substitution of an account of what had already been done by the Socialists in various countries was his own doing. It was not unusual for Jaurès to draft the resolutions to be passed at Socialist Conferences.

In France a storm of disapproval had followed the passing of these resolutions at the Stuttgart Congress, and the cry of the reactionaries was that of all Socialists the French were the most anti-patriotic. The *Matin*, for example, had written: "All the foreign Socialists are patriots. It is only the French who desert and detest their country." <sup>1</sup> "And," said Jaurès, evidently in good spirits that night among his friends at the Tivoli-Vaux-Hall, "and *Le Radical*, *L'Aurore*, and *Les*

<sup>1</sup> Jaurès' speech at the Tivoli-Vaux-Hall, Sept. 7, 1907.

*Débats* made a chorus. Citizens, however used one may be to these things one feels a moment of surprise, and one asks: Can it be, by chance, that all of us representatives of this proletariat of France, which has always heroically saved the country when it has been deserted by the privileged and the bourgeois. . . . can it be that suddenly we have become traitors and have fallen into the trap of these horrible German Socialists, who, as you know, are playing the game of the Kaiser?

“Citizens, what reassured me was that at the moment when the bourgeois newspapers of France were talking like this of the French Socialists, I, who had remained in Germany for a few days after Stuttgart, and who read all the German newspapers, read in almost all of them that all the other Socialists were good patriots and that the only enemies of their country were the German Socialists. . . . And the *North German Gazette*, the official newspaper of the German Chancellery, wrote these lines, word for word: ‘The Congress of Stuttgart was equivocal and confused. One thing only came out clearly and certainly: that the German Socialists are the least patriotic of all the Socialists in the whole world.’”

But it was in vain that Jaurès and his friends, then and later, denied the implication of anti-patriotism. The enemies of Socialism were determined to believe them to be traitors. On



Jaurès more than on anyone else the curses rained down. That he was "the friend of Germany," that he "always found Germany in the right," were commonplaces. Although, for instance, Hervé had been defeated at Nancy by 304 votes to 41, and although Jaurès had over and over again made his divergence from Hervé abundantly clear, it was labour lost as far as his enemies were concerned. For, as he said at the Tivoli-Vaux-Hall, the argument ran "Hervé is a monster and as for me, I am the lieutenant of Hervé. The Radical-Socialists . . . . are still in a sort of dependence on me. . . . Therefore to vote for these social reforms . . . . would be to play the game of the Socialist-Radicals, who are playing Jaurès' game . . . and Jaurès is playing Hervé's game and Hervé is playing the game of the German Emperor."

From the 14th to the 18th of July, 1914, a Socialist Congress took place in France which was the cause of a fresh outburst of reviling. In the clerical *Action Française* Jaurès was called "a public enemy," "a traitor," his actions were "infamous," "treacherous," and as everyone knows, "M. Jaurès c'est L'Allemagne." The editor, Monsieur Charles Maurras, knew well what passions he was rousing.

It was not long before the madman came forward who translated into action the desire of these enemies of justice.

“Jaurès,” says Rappoport, “made no reply.” There was too much of greater moment to preoccupy him. His spirit, though profound, ardent, and passionate, was naturally gay and serene, but the hour had now come when even his brave heart was appalled at the approaching cloud which had begun to overspread Europe.

On the 28th July, 1914, he went with other comrades—Guesde, Vaillant, Sembat, Longuet—to Brussels to make a final effort by means of the International to save the cause of Peace. There in the Royal Circus of Brussels he made his last speech. He declared that the French Government wanted peace, and set himself to oppose the idea that France should allow herself to be dragged unwillingly into war because of secret treaties. “If appeal is made to secret treaties with Russia,” he cried, “we shall appeal to public treaties with Humanity.”

From the last article which he wrote we can gather the depth of his feeling: “When one sees the panic, the financial disasters, the sinister rumours that the mere thought of this war have unchained, one asks if even the maddest and most wicked of men are capable of bringing about such a crisis.” The greatest danger of all, he feels, is in “the enervation which gains on everyone, the sudden impulses of fear, of prolonged anxiety. . . .” And then he made one more appeal to the sanity of the people.

Jaurès spent his last day, July 31st, in an effort to influence the French Ministers to put such pressure on the Russian Government that war might by chance yet be averted. . . . Then came the end, and the unhappy people were left to plunge forward into the horrible darkness without their great leader. Not only France needed him, but all Europe, and his death remains one of the most cruel blows of this tragic time.

He has not been here to see the fearful new chapter of the world's history which began in August, 1914. One cannot help asking the futile questions: What would he have said? What would he have done? We cannot know, and each will perhaps answer the questions according to his own conception of Jaurès and possibly according to his own bias. Of one thing we may be sure. No wailing voice would have arisen from him. He would not have said: All is lost; we have lived in vain. However bitter his disappointment, whatever agony he had endured at the wreckage of so many of his hopes, we cannot doubt that his ardent, living spirit would have risen above the gloom and despair, and that, whatever had been his position during the war (and it is certain that his presence would have been of great service), *after* the war he would have set to work again with the same tireless energy as before. "An immense work of education lies

before us": those were his words, and perhaps he would have realized that the work was greater than even he had thought. But with his clear conception of the slow evolution, yet certain progress, of mankind, it is impossible to believe that he would have despaired, all the more that he had long recognized that nationality was an old, very old instinct, and internationalism a new growth.

Martyr to his faith in Humanity, murdered because he was ahead, so far ahead, of his time, he stands an heroic figure, pointing out the way and drawing the noble and generous young generations of to-day and to-morrow towards Equality, and Liberty and Peace.

## INDEX

*Subjects not otherwise entered may be found, classified,  
under Jaurès, Jean.*

- Albi, 30.  
Algeciras Treaty, 134, 135, 138.  
Amsterdam Congress, 32.  
Anglo-German relations, 132, 136.  
Anti-Semitism, 57.  
*Armée Nouvelle, L'*, 111; quoted, 112, 123, 127, 128, 129, 130  
143, 144.  
Army, aristocratic and clerical influence in, 58, 95; Three  
Years' Law, 115; Jaurès' New Army, 114-118. *See also*  
Dreyfus Affair.  
Assumptionists, 95.  
Austria-Hungary, 135, 139.  
Bergson, 27.  
Bertillon, 71.  
"Bloc," the, 32, 54, 93; Jaurès leaves, 102.  
*Bordereau*, the, 62, 63, 70, 71, 72.  
Bosnia-Herzegovina, 135, 139.  
Briand, 94, 97, 98.  
Brisson, 74.  
Brussels, Jaurès' last speech at, 150.  
Capitalism described by Jaurès, 124.  
Carmaux, 30.  
Castrès, 22.  
Cavaignac, M., 68, 72, 73.  
Christianity, 51; *see also* Church.  
Church, Jaurès' attitude to, 96, 104; legislation, 32, 95-98.  
Clémenceau, 74.

- Clericalism the enemy, 90; *see also* Army, and Dreyfus Affair.
- Combes, M., 32, 97, 98, 102.
- Concordat, 98.
- Confédération Générale du Travail, 106.
- Congo, 134.
- Co-operative movement, 110.
- Deltour, Felix, 24.
- Dresden Congress, Jaurès' speech at, 99.
- Dreyfus Affair, 30, 57; first condemnation, 60; revision ordered, 74; pardon, 75; Legion of Honour, 76; Socialist attitude, 58, 60, 76-79.
- Drumont, 59.
- Eclair, L'*, 62.
- Engels, 85.
- Entente, the Anglo-French, 132.
- Esterhazy, 61, 71, 72.
- Etudes Socialistes*, 44; quoted, 46, 47, 85, 86, 87.
- Factory legislation, 88, 90.
- Figaro, Le*, 62.
- France, Anatole, 74.
- Frank, 11.
- Freedom, *see* Liberty.
- German Socialists, 28, 81, 99, 101, 126, 147.
- Germany, rise of, 136; rivalry with Britain, 132; "pro-German" taunt, 149.
- Guesde, Jules, 32, 87-92, 101, 150; tribute to Jaurès, 30.
- Hague Conferences, 142.
- Henry, Colonel, 73, 91.
- Hervé, Gustave, 96, 141, 149.
- Humanité, L'*, 31, 97.
- Huysmans, Camille, 35.
- "Interpenetrability," 37.
- Internationalism, 33, 128; the International, 98.
- Italy, 135, 136, 139.
- J'Accuse*, 64.

## JAURÈS, JEAN

BIOGRAPHICAL.—Birth, 21; schooldays, 22; parentage, 23; student days, 24, 81; lectureship, 28; thesis, 28; Chamber of Deputies, 13, 30, 82; marriage, 30; joins Socialists, 31; *Etudes Socialistes*, 44; daughter's first communion, 50; intervenes in Dreyfus Affair, 64; attacks the Church, 96; founds *L'Humanité*, 97; leaves the "Bloc," 102; efforts to avert war, 150; assassination, 11, 13, 19, 39, 151.

CHARACTERISTICS.—Linguistic gifts, 23; love of nature, 23, 25, 36; a Southerner, 25; memory, 25; politics, 12, 23; journalistic methods, 30; oratorical power, 26, 33, 66, 99; religious sentiment, 36; love of justice, 37; unconventionality, 42; not opportunist, 43; co-operation with other parties, 54, 83; development of his ideas, 81; passion for work, 84; love of unity, 103; hatred of formulæ, 107; optimism, 109; love of France, 126; servant of the people, 14.

LEADING IDEAS.—Force *v.* Freedom, 20, 52; Socialism, 29, 41, 44; unity of things, 29; "interpenetrability," 37; property, 47, 49; Radicals, 47-48; liberty, 49; continuity of history, 52, 83; the Revolution, 53, 87; "legality," 77; State and individual, 111-112; nationality, 112, 127; national defence, 111, 114; war and peace, 124; European politics, 131 *et seq.*; secret diplomacy, 137; his Socialist method, 16.

J. R. MACDONALD'S APPRECIATION, 16.

WRITINGS.—*Etudes Socialistes*, 44; *Les Preuves*, 58, 67; *L'Humanité*, 97; "Socialist Organization of France" (projected work), 109; *L'Armée Nouvelle*, 111.

Jesuits, 94, 97.

Jews in the Army, 58.

Jouhaux, Léon, 107.

Labori, attempted assassination of, 75.

Lebrun-Renaud, 69.

- Lesbazeilles, 26.
- Levy-Bruhl, L., quoted, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 36, 43.
- Liberty, Jaurès' love of, 49.
- Libre Parole*, 58, 59, 77.
- Loubet, M., 75, 97.
- Lyons Conference, 94; Jaurès' speech at, 106.
- Macdonald, J. Ramsay, quoted, 33, 42, 99.
- Marx, Carl, 41, 85-86.
- Matin, Le*, 62.
- Millerand, 90.
- Méline, M., 65.
- Minturn, M. *see Etudes Socialistes*.
- Morocco, 133, 135, 137, 138.
- Nature, Jaurès' love of, 36.
- Nationality, sentiment of, 112, 127; basis of internationalism, 143.
- Patriotism, 112, 127, 129; Hervé's view of, 141.
- Paty du Clam, 64, 68, 72.
- Peace, 33, 123 *et seq.*; armed peace, 125. *See also War*.
- Petit bleu*, 61.
- Persia, 135.
- Petite République*, 31, 50, 67, 76.
- Picquart, Colonel, 61, 71, 72.
- Pius X., 97.
- Pope, the, 94.
- Proletarian rights, 48; growth of proletariat, 86.
- Property, private, 47; social or common, 49.
- Radicals, Jaurès' attitude towards, 47.
- Rappoport, Charles, quoted, 33, 38, 54, 57, 60, 81, 82, 88, 123, 125, 150.
- Rennes, Dreyfus trials at, 75.
- Republic, meaning of the, 83; Republicans, 54.
- Revolution, 53-55, 77, 86-87.
- Rheims Congress, 32, 98.
- Rochefort, M., 68.



- Rolland, Romain, quoted, 21, 35.  
Russian alliance, 131, 150.  
Schwerer-Kestner, 63, 74.  
Secret treaties, 137, 139, 144, 150.  
Sembat, Marcel, 120, 150.  
Social Democratic Federation, 41.  
Socialism, 41; main ideas of, 44.  
Socialist Party, and Dreyfus Affair, 58, 60, 76-79; participation in government, 90; the split, 94. *See also* German Socialists.  
Strike, general, 141, 144, 145.  
*Studies in Socialism, see Etudes Socialistes.*  
Stuttgart resolution, 145; Jaurès' report, 109, 147.  
Syndicalists, 106.  
Three Years' Law, 115.  
Tolstoy compared with Jaurès, 56, 123.  
Trades unions, 106, 107.  
Tripoli, 135, 139.  
Tzar's visit, 90, 96.  
Viviani, M., 94.  
*Vorwärts*, 126, 130, 132.  
Waldeck-Rousseau, 32, 90, 92, 95; resigns, 97.  
War, characterised, 124; when necessary, 114; Anglo-German, 132; not inevitable, 140; offensive or defensive? 143; efforts to avert, 150. *See also* Peace.  
Zola, Emile, 32, 63, 71, 74, 91.

*Subjects not otherwise entered may be found, classified,  
under Jaurès, Jean.*









DATE DUE

~~APR 11 '47~~

~~APR 29 '47~~

~~DEC 2 1963~~

~~DEC 15 1963~~

~~NOV 8 '70~~

~~1971~~

~~DEC 14 '71~~

JAN 1 1983

U.S. OFFICE



3 5132 00263 1042  
University of the Pacific Library

DC  
042.8  
J414

Tease, Margaret  
Joan J. Tease

