

## **The impact of social realism in French and Russian literature on social law in Europe: Dostoyevsky and Hugo.**

**What is the impact of Dostoyevsky's and Hugo's works of social realism on social laws in Europe?**

**Dr. Eva Medina**

*Researcher in Comparative Literature and Communication  
School of Communication and Psychology  
University of Alicante  
Carretera San Vicente Raspeig, s-n, 03690 Alicante, Spain*

**Prof. Toni Pacanowski**

*Professor in Communication  
School of Communication and Psychology  
University of Alicante  
Carretera San Vicente Raspeig, s-n, 03690 Alicante, Spain*

**Prof. Pablo Medina Aguerrebere**

*Professor in Communication  
School of Arts and Communication  
Canadian University of Dubai  
City Walk, Downtown Dubai, UAE  
Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4463-4721>*

---

**Abstract:** Through the Karamavoz Brothers (1880), a clan of morally monstrous characters, the murder of the father appears as a salvation. Salvation or damnation? The imminently immoral murder of Oedipus the King in the ancient tradition becomes moral by deviance and pleasurable under the corrosive writing of Dostoyevsky. The parricide in the village of Skotoprigonievsk, a chilling universe of conservatism with an added layer of sordidness, is suddenly the subject of national interest. All the Russian media take hold of the event; the public opinion rejoices to judge so quickly and easily the apparently perfect odious crime which will allow them to give themselves a moral and a conscience. In this powerful work, Dostoyevsky shows, through the lack of values in Russian society, the impact of the lack of responsibility on the social condition. Written in 1862, the work *The Miserables* by Hugo denounces with so much vigor the hypocrisy and the lack of values of the French society, that it imposes itself unconsciously as a principle of national responsibility, whose labor laws will change in the following years. What is the impact of Dostoyevsky's and Hugo's works of social realism on the social laws in Europe?

**Keywords:** Russian classical literature - French classical literature - social realism - Dostoyevsky - Hugo.

---

### **1. Introduction**

The creative process of the literary work of the social realism movement is based on the persuasive notions of universalism. Fyodor Dostoyevsky was born in 1821 in Moscow into a working-class family. He had a difficult childhood and a lost teenage years before being deported to a *gulag* in Siberia for having claimed social ideals. The injustices he suffered during his forced labor left a lasting impression on him, and he no longer openly presented his social and political principles. He began to write dark works about the social reality in which the vast majority of the Russian people are immersed. His works *The Poor People* (1844), *Crime and Punishment* (1866), *The Idiot* (1869), *The Demons* (1871) and *The Brothers Karamazov* (1880), written one year before his death in St. Petersburg, became classified monuments of Russian culture. Victor Hugo was born in 1802 in Besançon, Burgundy, in a noble intellectual environment, where nothing predestined him to become one of the greatest authors of the social realism movement. He married his best friend, Adèle Fouchet, but Adèle was unfaithful. When Victor Hugo learns of this, he drowns his sorrow in a profound writing where the protagonists are honest beings whose feelings are intact, unable to hurt the other in puerile love games. From this love wound, Hugo transcends the literary genre until being consecrated as one of the greatest romantic poets. In 1843, he experienced a tragedy that shook him, the death of his daughter Leopoldine by drowning, at the age of 19. The images haunt him day and night. It's at this moment that Hugo begins a reflection on fatality.

The social circles destined to be the pulpit of others revolts him. His works Odes and Ballads (1826), Notre-Dame of Paris (1831), The Contemplations (1856), The Punishments (1853), The Miserables (1862), The legend of centuries (1883), written two years before his death in Paris, become classified monuments of French culture. The literary monuments of Dostoyevsky and Hugo have in common that they carry the knowledge of the human condition and integrity. This universalism of social realism is the existential, historical and empirical condition of linking the self to a norm: the principle of responsibility. This symbolism of the universal rallying founds the aesthetic subjectivity and develops it during all the current of the XIXth century. Indeed, the discourse in the form of plausible narrative engages the causality of the plot and becomes intelligible by singular facts from which the universal emerges. Throwing out the notion of responsibility and its holder, vulnerability, the literary method of the aesthetic subjectivity allows to reinvent the drama from the novelistic drama. Will the novelistic drama allow to limit to endorse real facts about poverty? For in the 19th century, the Romanov Czarist and French Bonapartist Empires led dictatorships that reduced the population to silence and exploitation. In the first years of Bonapartist imperialism, the Begging Committee attached to the government, alarmed about the situation of the French who could no longer feed themselves in every region. Gradually, Corsica and Paris are censored, then the Begging Committee disappears, its statistics are censored by the government, in particular during the debacles making hundreds of thousands of deaths from hunger. The facts are real but the oppression is such that not only are the poor ignored, but above all, they are despised. The psychologization of the feelings of the most oppressed, the poor, during the Tsarist and Bonapartist empires, has the effect of revealing the axiology of the reader, developing his or her capacity for empathy and the first elements of responsibility. Powerful pleas, the works *The Brothers Karamazov* by Dostoyevsky and *The Miserables* by Hugo will become the future legal and political testimonies of the social laws to come in France and in Russia.

In order to carry out this analysis on the contribution of Dostoyevsky and Hugo's social realism on social laws, a bibliographic review (90 references) have been carried out on four main areas:

Law, French Literature, Russian Literature and Psychology. In this review, it'll be analyzed from a legal, historical, sociological, in French and Russian classical literature and psychological point of view the evolution of this topic during the 2 last centuries in 2 European countries. This analysis demonstrates the power of the narrative through a similar methodology: the aesthetic subjectivity of the works reveals the notion of universalism, first by linking the psychology of the reader to those of the characters, then by affirming the principle of responsibility as an emergency of human integrity.

*"My friends, remember this  
There are no bad seeds or bad men  
There are only bad farmers " Victor Hugo*

## **2. Litterature review**

### **2.1 Axiological impact of universalism**

Universalism is one of the oldest and best known philosophical, artistic and literary currents in the world. This current gives back to the beings as a unit all the dimension of the universal humanity: the humans ask themselves the same questions everywhere in the world, they are not different. Bergson had reaffirmed the notion of universalism through the art used by *homo sapiens*. All the paleontological archeological sites in the different regions of the world had art in common; *homo sapiens* questioned themselves by using color on the walls about death, life, the intensity of our feelings.

Any cultural difference is dangerous, it creates the first ethnic and social discriminations. It justifies the sentimental stinginess and the contempt of a social condition. Because to touch the culture of the other is to touch his unconscious dignity and to disengage progressively from any responsibility towards the other. Throughout history, nothing has been more destructive than cutting off territories, inventing flags, creating ethnic and social differences. Why do human beings love clans? Archaic fears bury us and it's easier to hate without understanding than to love by trying to understand the other.

When Voltaire denounces through *Candide* "the abominations of slavery", he makes a slave speak. The latter talks to *Candide* about his fears and his mother, he tells him about his misfortunes and *Candide* is empathetic. The human feelings are put at equality between Blacks and Whites, it's a universalist rhetoric. Voltaire evokes the Black Code, a kind of civil code that had been enacted for the use of slaves in the French Empire. The Black Code is based on the idea that whites are fair because they even give blacks a chance to complain if they are mistreated. This is what *Candide* thinks. *Candide* represents the naivety of the non-disadvantaged, out of touch with reality. This lack of experience of great suffering has made them lose their humanity. It is the prowess of Voltaire, to try at all costs to make aware, just like Plato and his allegory of the cave, by a universalization of the feelings, the circles which could act, but which will not. By selfishness, by ignorance, by cruelty, by facility, by interest, by laziness. In literature, the axiological dimension is at the heart of the process of the current of literary social realism. There is no writing about the current of social realism

without an axiological dimension, that is, without showing the reality of social environments where fatalism is experienced as war.

There are 800 million people who die of hunger and one billion people who live in slums every year in the world (UNHR, 2021). Despite their appalling living conditions and immediate risk of death, the poor are judged on their inability to make good decisions, their risk of harm, and their lack of judgment. Humanity still lacks gentleness towards them. They are Hugo's *Miserables*, their fate is harsh and the judgments they suffer are a double punishment. These judgments are those of the Brothers Karamazov by Dostoyevsky. They are the mirror of our brutal behaviors and our banal attitudes. Hugo shows the effects of material and sentimental avarice on the miserable, while Dostoyevsky presses on our own dark areas, finally the poorest are the stingy.

The principle of responsibility is established as a sign of respect for the dignity of people as an absolute norm. The metamorphosis of the political literary works of Dostoyevsky and Hugo into social laws characterizes the recognition of the vulnerability and dignity of people. In powerfully conservative imperialist worlds, it was difficult to conjure up the very idea of an empathetic axiom towards the vulnerable. Consideration for even the weak is questionable, whether it be the poor, women, foreigners or non-Christians.

## **2.2 Freud's psychoanalytical work reinforces the idea of a desire to denounce the sordid**

Dmitri is the Karamazov's son. He has a good heart but he can be dishonest, he does not follow moral constancy. Dostoyevsky describes him as a person "*sincerely noble and sincerely vile*" lost between vice and virtue. His brother Ivan is a pessimistic and morose atheist. He has developed a taciturn and cynical personality. His other brother Alyosha is mystical and spiritual, preparing to become a monk. His third brother, Smerdiakov, is the fourth child of the family, whose mother is the victim of the crime of rape committed by her father, Feodor Karamazov. His mother was employed on his land when he abused her, even though she is illiterate and without cognitive functions. She gave birth alone in a barn, but the delivery lasted for days and tortured her until she died in childbirth. The father Feodor Karamazov takes the child in without any guilt, thinking that later he will be able to replace his dead mother for the work in the fields. Dmitri is engaged to Katia, a devoted woman who is in love with him. He betrays her by stealing money from her to buy the favors of an escort, Grushchenka.

Father Feodor Karamazov is a deeply affable being. He has no moral values, no remorse. His perverse unconscious has taken over his conscious. His personality has become vicious and twisted. His soul has been buried under heaps of vice-ridden thoughts. As a child or as an old woman, his imminently sexual vices have no awareness of the crime of rape, and mingle with his vices for lying, gambling, stealing and cruelty. Feodor steals his son's money to get the favors of Grushchenka and at the same time is found murdered in his house. The three sons and the courtesan are suspected.

Fyodor Dostoyevsky's father, Mikhail Dostoyevsky, is a stubborn and stingy alcoholic civil servant, he's violent towards his mother, the gentle Maria Netshayev Dostoyevskaia, who, as a woman in the 19th century, is legally nothing and has no choice but to be silent. Fyodor Dostoyevsky will not say anything about his childhood traumas and what he saw, but he writes with such a literary surgery the soul of each of his characters, that Freud understands that the Russian writer is operating a psychoanalytical transfer by effect of sublimation. Dostoyevsky is talking about his own family, and this is what makes the work on social realism more disturbing. The despot who serves as his father, Mikhail Dostoyevsky, will be found murdered in his home. Was Maria so sweet? Yet, isn't there more justice than the death of a cruel heart that lived to oppress the weak? Justice and responsibility are principles that were reversed early in Dostoyevsky's life, even in his home. In his life, Dostoyevsky explored human baseness and cruel wickedness. Here lies the philosophical and moral question and the only one that can really change our behavior: Why painful experiences in our lives? Destiny or chance, the question takes on a new dimension: how can these painful experiences make us more responsible?

In 1913, his monumental work "*Totem und tabu*" expresses to the world the social significance of psychoanalysis and the possibility of transcending *the that* (unconscious) and *the superego* (subconscious) for a better *self* (consciousness), the human soul. In 1929, in his monumental masterpiece "*Uneasiness in Civilization*", Freud expresses the power of culture to make the self-think and reflect. Through culture, in front of a painting, a book, a film, a sculpture, a spectacle, the self-exults in consciousness, it exists, breathes, without permanent pressure between the *unconscious* and the *ego*. It becomes full *consciousness* and frees itself to exalt the beauty of the soul. The idea that culture can allow humans to know themselves, to surpass themselves is at the heart of psychoanalysis, psychology, and philosophy. It has become a central axis of access to the moral values that move the soul, and that reveal who we are. The death of Dostoyevsky's son from epilepsy and the death of Hugo's daughter by drowning are events in the lives of writers that will leave a deep disturbance and questioning of the fatalism caused by suffering and the desire to empower the world towards more gentleness towards the weak.

The character of Feodor Karamazov is so despicably abject, that it becomes enjoyable, because it allows the reader to judge him and not to distrust him. Already, in the book *Crime and Punishment*, the family is poor,

with problems of alcoholism and prostitution, the anti-hero has become a horrible person, and his niece is badly treated, not intelligent, and sexually used, the world of Dostoyevsky is really dark. Feodor Karamazov is the worst person in the world, and through this person, Dostoevsky shows how someone can become emotionally, psychologically, and mentally a criminal because of their social environment. By thinking about deception, emotion, and suffering, Dostoevsky allows the reader to empathize with the underprivileged in Russia.

*"He wanted to take revenge on everyone for his own vileness. To the question: Why do you hate so-and-so? He answered: he didn't do anything to me, it's true, but on the other hand, I did him an abominable filth, and immediately afterwards, I hated him".*

What interests Dostoyevsky, as well as Hugo, is the analysis of meanness; at the bend of anodyne sentences or avoidance behaviors, the lack of generosity and responsibility are hidden: the neuroses of judgment according to Freud in Totem and Tabu. The low and petty attitudes of the Karamazov father and sons are lessons throughout the novel, until the anthological scene of the Grand Inquisitor in Seville. Dostoyevsky imagines the return of Jesus to Earth, who comes to speak to the Grand Inquisitor in Seville, through Alyosha, the pious and luminous brother, who discusses with Ivan, the atheistic and negative brother. Jesus tells the Grand Inquisitor that "nothing is more important than the freedom of choice between good and evil". The Grand Inquisitor replies that his system of sins and absolutions shows what is good and what is evil. This spiritual debate between the two brothers comes up again when Alyosha tries to help his brother Dmitri to have more human values. Alyosha is inherently good, he is spiritual and wants to help others. He carries Dostoyevsky's message of responsibility. He says that happiness is now and on Earth:

*"Only one day on Earth allows man to know all happiness. Let's just go to the garden and have a walk and a romp".*

Alyosha also says that the solution to responsibility is collective:

*"As long as we have not become each other's brother, there will be no brotherhood".*

Finally, Alyosha expresses that we must recognize the evil in us, the mediocrity and the pettiness. Ivan feeds the debate on the existence of evil as a reflection on the absence of responsibility:

*"Nothing is sacred, everything is allowed!"*

Alyosha responds with one of the greatest rhetoric of the work concerning the necessity of guilt, so that the principle of responsibility can appear:

*"The sensation of the baseness of their degradation is as indispensable to them as the sensation of the highest moral nobility".*

By opposing baseness and decay to moral nobility, Dostoyevsky highlights the banal man turned in on himself compared to the noble man and his virtuous actions. Beyond the responsibility of the father's murder, it's the question of the murder by society of poor people that is raised. The sordidness of the indifference of the Brothers Karamazov is the sordidness of a social situation that does not change because nobody cares.

The notion of guilt, the possibility of love, this is the incredible human work of Dostoyevsky. The conclusion is a very complex reflection on the need for recognition.

### **3. Methodology**

The first step was to create a literature review of 90 references gathering the literary tools of analysis of the auctorial discourse. When the writer wants to make his voice heard through a drama, the auctorial discourse allows the subjectivization of the experience. The degree of psychologization of the characters leads the reader to empathize with these painful experiences. This transfer of axiological experience mobilizes the notion of universalism. This notion will play a key role in the immanence of external change. The power of literature is to plant roots of humanism where the ground was porous due to dictatorial governments. From then on, censorship or the risk of torture are no longer brakes to a deep change of social laws because they have been circumvented by means of subjective rhetoric.

The second step, after the construction of a literature review based on the analysis of the auctorial discourse, was to gather the historical, legal and sociological elements that allow to analyze the field of action of the works of The Brothers Karamazov and The Miserables on the effective social laws in Russia and in France compared. The 19th century in Europe is a pot of social demands ready to explode. The old French aristocratic ruling class

was replaced by the bourgeoisie at the beginning of the 19th century, which is governed and defined according to the Napoleonic civil code. From this "feudal wreck" of aristocracy, fought for centuries by great thinkers, belonging to the bourgeois social class, such as Voltaire, the new democracy of the early nineteenth century was supposed to be based on the merit of success. In vain, since the life annuity system of the aristocrats was quickly followed by a system of dowries in marriage and inheritances thus supplanting a new oligarchy. The essence of the bourgeois class, its mental functioning based on the fable of merit, the humanism of the French Revolution and duty, collapsed before it even existed. As the French literature professor Valery Larbaud points out: *"Duty was the name that the bourgeoisie had given to its moral cowardice"*. There remains a disenchanting young bourgeoisie, obsessed by the appearances inherited from a thousand-year-old aristocracy that it can never be, since precisely, only birth and marriage allowed it. From this original complex, this "persistence of the Old Regime", the bourgeois will never stop trying in vain to resemble a fantasized class. For Emile Montégut: *"The Revolution made "bankruptcy": there is not only one of its promises that the Revolution was not impotent to hold, it is not only one of its principles which did not generate the opposite of itself"*. Finally, the debacle of 1870 demonstrated *"the absolute predominance of the material interests"* of the bourgeoisie over the principle of fatherland in democracy. The failure of the French Revolution had however an interest, that to show to the crowned heads of Europe that theirs could waver at any moment. However, in the imperial family of the Romanovs in Russia, the echo of the French revolutionaries did not disturb the splendor of one of the most powerful dynasties in the world, the third largest economic power in the world in the 19th century. Censorship and torture are the most used means during the Napoleonic and Tsarist dictatorships to silence the rebellion.

In Paul Ricoeur's "Time and Narrative", the transcendental limits of aesthetic subjectivity allow us to understand in fine how the human narrative is an opportunity to confer meaning on reality. Allowing an accelerated awareness of the historicity, and thus the effect of sociality of literature, this field of action opens the way to a sociology of literature. The writer engages more and more, through the development of prefaces of manifesto type, we observe a phenomenon of "vast critical dialogue". The preface in the XIXth century is a new polemical form that makes the public aware of a new idea. Politics would thus be intrinsically and fundamentally linked to literature? For Paul Ricoeur, politics is not a separate domain from literature, in the realist and ethical sense, but is rather "the nerve center" of it: *"the tragedy of action is the very place where the universal and the historical intersect and recross"*.

The study of the indirect writing of Dostoyevsky and Hugo, through the prism of a subjectivization of their feelings. The work *The Miserables* questions the place of the working class in France and the social alienation suffered.

#### **4. Results and discussion**

The main results obtained with this analysis can be grouped into two main blocks: a) observation periods and empirical studies in France in 1814 (1.), and in Russia in 1861 (2.).

##### **1. Impact of the social law in 1814 in Paris**

The iconic character of *The Miserables* by Hugo, Jean Valjean is in prison in 1815, the year of the Battle of Waterloo, he escapes and robs a priest who forgives him. This forgiveness will have a strong impact on Jean Valjean, who becomes a good person and never again commits theft or lies. He saves the orphan Cosette, who was adopted as a child from the family of the unscrupulous and lawless innkeepers the Thénardiens who used Cosette as their slave. Jean Valjean is arrested by the public authorities and sent back to the penal colony. Cosette grows up to be a beautiful woman. The poet Marius is in love with her, while the Thénardiens hope to get her to marry a young bourgeois who will offer them a dowry. In desperation, Marius joins the anti-Bonapartist riots with Gavroche, a colorful child, the son of the Thénardiens; raised without scruples or moral values, he is nevertheless endowed with a good heart and emotional generosity. Gavroche plays with the street children without paying the slightest attention to the difference in social status. During a particularly violent rebellion against the Bonapartist regime, Marius risks his life for the Republic, and close to arrest, Jean Valjean, who has escaped from the prison, finds him and saves him by taking him through the sewers of Paris. Hugo sublimates the popular rebellion to restore the French identity of the debacle of the Revolution of 1789:

*"The faubourg Saint-Antoine is a reservoir of people. The revolutionary shaking makes cracks there by which the popular sovereignty flows"*.

In the 19th century, there was a literary need to bear witness to a "moral history". Dostoyevsky, based on the epic dramas of Gogol, develops a new form of historical novel that invents its collective heroes, condenses and dramatizes: the study of manners. Hugo and Dostoyevsky denounce the influence of bourgeois violence on the suffering it causes in society: *"Compassion is the principal and perhaps the only law of human existence"* (*The Idiot*). Writers write in reaction to the mores of their times. In 1826, the preface to Hugo's *Odes et Balades*

breaks with the approach of classifying the epideictic, judicial or deliberative genres in literature, with almost exclusive reference to rhetoric. The genre becomes associated with prejudice and constraint, condemned by Hugo, not so much for the borrowed form, but for the supposedly unsurpassable tradition that has been forged around it. In 1827, the preface of "Cromwell" allows Hugo to denounce the rigid rules which cloister "all the poetry of a nation in a genre, in a school, in a hermetically closed century". It is this heritage of the conception of "the writer of the militant Enlightenment" that opens the field to literature to claim the right to speak in the name of the human universal. For Hugo, this is necessarily similar to a decompartmentalization of the new genre. Realism in literature will consecrate the novel and will elevate the writer as a source of decisive influence on political claims. For Michel Foucault: « *the turning point is 1775-1825 for this awareness that sees the emergence of a new society, a new knowledge, a new conception of human life* ». The debacle of 1870 demonstrated "the absolute predominance of the material interests" of the bourgeoisie over the principle of fatherland in democracy. It is a real political and literary revolution, through the claim of the aesthetic realism of the work, sought more for its essence than its form.

The considerable influence and sensitizing effects of the masterful work of *The Miserables*, published in 1862, on the politics of the government of the time, is one of the most flagrant models. Beyond its dazzling reception throughout Europe, the entire press rushed to praise "the absolute master" of "the work of the century". Although his total break with the classical genre was castigated by several of his contemporaries, a triumphant welcome was given to him in every European country. During a study at the Senate on French political history in the nineteenth century, Sylvie Guillaume, Professor of nineteenth-century political history, observed the distinction between the perception of the "dangerous poor" set aside from the population, before 1830, and the "social work" that was carried out after 1860 in order to develop social political demands towards the poor. At the end of the century, during 1880 and 1890, the French Senate put in place bills aiming at the creation of a Ministry of Labor to regulate the work of "poor populations and miners". Denouncing "*Legislators, misery is the most implacable of laws*" Victor Hugo led one of the greatest political and literary revolutions of the century.

## **2. The influence of a message on a century of social demands in Russia**

From 1850 to 1854, Dostoyevsky was sentenced to hard labor in the Omsk *gulag* for his revolutionary social writings and his comments on social reality, which were discussed at Petrachevsky's Circle of Thinkers. Dostoyevsky discovered in the *gulag* a social reality much more violent than the injustices he had observed in the city:

*"The prison took a lot from me and inculcated a lot. I met there the most richly gifted and strongest men of all our people."* Dostoyevsky, *Memories of the House of the Dead*.

In 1850, the anti-elite, anti-domination, anti-alienation ideas of the German-Jewish lawyer Karl Marx, deeply penetrate Slavic minds and give a real wave of hope for all the countries besieged for centuries. He married his best friend, Jenny Von Westphalen; she became a sociologist and analyzed the social environment. She is of noble origin from the Kingdom of Prussia, but like Marx, she believes in a world without social classes. She is touched by the hell of the pogroms in the Jewish world. Their writings are more and more virulent, the censorship and the risk of imprisonment makes them leave Germany for Paris. They met Friedrich Engels, a German philosophy professor in Paris, and a strong friendship was born between Marx, Jenny and Engels. They shared the same vision of an anti-elite world. At that time, Tsar Nicholas II of the Romanov dynasty, King of Poland and Tsar of all the Russias, reigned as absolute master over the Tsarist Empire, the third largest power in the world. Since the beginning of the 20th century, Russia has been in a state of permanent revolt.

In 1861, the Russian philosopher Pyotr Kropotkin published "The Emancipation of the Serfs", a humanist work that directly enjoins the imperial family to allow the serfs to become free. At that time, the world was practicing slavery and colonialism; the status of a serf, enslaved to a land for life, was not shocking for anyone. From the moment Kropotkin openly denounced this social inequality, he was censored by the royal press. At that time, Christian orthodoxy was the Empire. Religious intolerance is particularly marked in Russia, where pogroms of abominable cruelty are practiced against Jewish communities with impunity. Kropotkin's writings were very successful among the Russian intelligentsia. They were the beginnings of the slingshot that was to seize the Romanov family without warning. Pyotr Alexeyevitch Kropotkin was a Moscow prince, philosopher and anarchist. He was born in 1842 into one of the most illustrious aristocratic princely families of the Russian Empire. At the age of 12 he became a prince of the Imperial Tsarist Army, and at 14 he joined the princely military division with 150 other princes in Siberia. It was during his years in the Siberian princely military base that Kropotkin discovered a staggering social realism that touched him deeply. The families of the working class have no means of heating in Siberia, many die of hunger and cold. He decides to write to Tsar Nicholas II,

whose family he belongs to by direct noble branch. At that time, Kropotkin had great admiration for the Romanovs, he had no doubt that the Tsar was simply unaware of this. He describes in his letters a "*parallel universe, unworthy of the Great Imperial Russia*". The Tsar's chilling answers will morally destroy Kropotkin. He discovers that the Romanovs are aware of the way the vast majority of Russians live. Kropotkin, like many young nobles raised in a great culture and strong moral values, remains perfectly hermetic and naive in relation to the underprivileged. This reality breaks him and transforms him. His metamorphosis is done in a few months and without any possible return, he joins Tchaikovsky's Circle of Thinkers. He was sentenced to hard labor but his family allowed him to be pardoned and he was released. A rebellion rages and the peasants begin to hope for social equality. Thousands of people gathered at the gates of the imperial palace to demand reform. Tsar Alexander II promulgated the reform of the status of serfs. But this was not enough, Kropotkin had awakened their dignity which had been dormant for centuries.

Kropotkin wrote in his Memoirs what will become one of the most famous social philosophical thoughts in Russia. To be a Slavophile is to develop a social conscience. In the 19th century, there is no more universalist vision than what Russian philosophy offers to the world. Socialism advocates the political and social equality of men. It is subdivided into two distinct branches: authoritarian socialism, which gives the State full latitude in the management of affairs (Marxism), and libertarian socialism, which reinforces the notions of justice and equality (anarchism). Kropotkin considers that morality is a science which dictates to the free individual his duty. It serves him to perfect himself and the environment in which he lives by respecting the animals as his equals. For Kropotkin, the conceptions of good and evil are identical in man and in animals: « *The ant, the bird, the marmot and the wild Chukchi have read neither Kant nor the Holy Fathers, nor even Moses. And yet, they all have the same idea of good and evil. And if you reflect for a moment on what is at the bottom of this idea, you will see at once that what is considered good among ants, marmots and Christian or atheist moralists, is what is useful for the preservation of the race and what is considered bad, is what is harmful to it* ». Kropotkin understands by race the man and the animal. He demonstrates that the animal protects its young and is capable of suffering and distress as much as man. His positivist thought is filled with morality and humanism. It is in a context powerfully marked by the philosophy of Kropotkin and the politics of Marx on social equality that Dostoyevsky completes to unearth the old demons, the meanness and the human baseness, which he raises to the rank of the indispensable search for moral nobility.

Dostoyevsky died in 1881 of a pulmonary hemorrhage, one year after writing his last novel *The Brothers Karamazov*. At this point in his life, Dostoyevsky had lived in Western Europe and was critical of bourgeois individualistic behavior. He became a Slavophile and entered a mystical phase. For him, the radical change towards compassion can only come from Russia. His eloquent speech in 1880 on the national poet Alexander Pushkin crowned him as the most profound and accomplished writer in the world. Dostoyevsky's "*Discourse on Pushkin*", concerning the necessity of passion because only passion contains compassion, becomes prophetic words. From 1902 onwards, peasant unrest was rampant. Vladimir Ulyanov, known as Lenin, a young Russian lawyer, appears as the savior of Eastern Europe. He openly advocated the Red Revolution, similar to the French Revolution, and promised an equal world for all, a radical change. The revolts intensified with the assassinations of the nobles by the people; Tsar Nicolas II was forced to abdicate in 1917. In 1918, the Bolsheviks kill in a bloody night the whole Romanov family and establish the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: the USSR. Russia became one of the Union's republics (Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic) with a single party, the Communist Party, on December 30, 1922. This event, which is crucial for the history of social equality in the world, upsets Sigmund Freud, who decides to write "*Die Urgestalt der Brüder Karamazov – The Sources of the Brothers Karamazov*" in 1928. In the introduction "*Dostoyevsky and the patertotung*", Freud exposes his analysis of Dostoyevsky's neuroses and the effect of sublimation necessary for the transfer of the superego.

In 1920, Sigmund Freud had revolutionized the world with the discovery of the human psyche in his monumental work "*Second Topical*". The map of the human psyche concerns *the that* (unconscious), *the superego* (the ego-subconscious) and *the self* (consciousness). *The that* is the impulse reservoir, an unleashing of force that seeks to express itself beyond against all odds. *The that* fights permanently against *the superego*, and *the self*. *The self* perceives the subconscious better than the unconscious. *The that* is symbolized by the cellar, the allegory of the confrontation with our deepest fears. *The that* acts in us, we are pushed and at the same time in constant conflict with it. Dostoyevsky hated his violent and alcoholic father; and when he contracts a lung disease, Dostoyevsky expresses the need to metaphorically make his father die by writing, in a strange patricide. At the same time, Dostoyevsky's father was found murdered in curious circumstances; these facts upset Freud, who expressed the need to understand the depth of the work *The Brothers Karamazov*. For Freud, Karamazov's patricide is without any possible comparison with Oedipus Rex and Hamlet. In both cases, from the ancient Greek tradition and English Romanticism, they are immoral parricides whose common themes are guilt leading to death and the idea of redemption. Guilt enables redemption, and it is because the murderers are filled with an all-consuming guilt that they achieve redemption. The weight of the murder is much worse than the worst of the

prisons, it is located in their psyche, it's the torture of the spirit to feel guilty. Whereas, in Karamazov's Parricide, Dostoyevsky leads the reader to nuance, even to appreciate the death of a monster. The description of the father is so abominable, that each reader will be surprised by his own paradoxical emotions, between the quick morality that dictates to judge the patricide, but the unconscious that enjoins not to do it in this case of the ignoble father. For Freud, it's the symbol of the norms of social control that imposes itself on us, *the superego* (subconscious). Driven to intense reflection, the reader finds himself in the midst of an inner conflict between *the that* : the unconscious that breaks the most unexpected taboos; and *the superego*, the normative subconscious that produces shame and judgment. This eye of the grave that looks at Cain, the eye of the internalization of the law that we impose on ourselves until it terrorizes us, we do not question it, and we end up calling it values. A narrow mind that never calms its ego gets locked into rigid values, this is one of the key messages of Dostoyevsky: the meanness are our false values.

In reality, no one forbids us to do many things that we impose on ourselves. Civilizational pressure is not limited to laws, we are the worst judges of ourselves. Neuroses and crazy impulses come from blocking ourselves for too long. The ego is full of judgments, it prevents from freeing itself from the straitjacket, and from thinking beyond the social norms inflicted. We are in a process of permanent limitation of our desires: "*At the beginning of time, there was no difference between men and animals. The men are animals*". The unconsciousness is a zone, an instance of the psychic apparatus that does not manifest itself to the conscience: "*It is about the repressions, the desires not satisfied, the frustrations not elucidated and the missed acts*". The unconscious does not assume itself, which makes it even more powerful. It manifests itself even more because it has no place in the conscious life. The unconscious contradicts what is authorized, the censorship of the mind incompatible with social life and its prohibitions. The unconscious exists because there is a civilization that must repress its impulses to coexist. It's a question of the sacrifice on oneself, of what one must repress of our animal instincts. The society puts up barriers in order not to endanger itself. But the man contains an animal part which undergoes each day what the society prevents him from making, that creates a conflict, the neurosis. The repressed desires are the buried neuroses of "*our haunted houses*": our tortured minds and our crushed dreams. Freud develops in his analysis of *The Brothers Karamazov* the idea of the transfer of responsibility. The abject father is a brute without balance between *the that, the self and the superego*. He represents the banal man capable of the worst. The norms of *the superego* have disappeared in a deep inner conflict passed from the neuroses that have made his unconscious tortured. The violence that he exerts is gradual to that which he lives. This being of vices is also a being of sufferings. But far from moralizing the character, Dostoyevsky does not make excuses for him, on the contrary, he finishes him off with a pleasurable patricide. During the Oedipus complex (emotional deficiency due to the lack of unconditional parental love), Freud demonstrates the absence of responsibility of the father, which will lead to the absence of responsibility of the Karamazov sons. The brothers were not loved, they did not know their mothers and the father they have in common crushed the father's love from childhood. The Oedipus complex described by Freud in his fundamental work "*Totem and Tabu*" is when the affective deficiency appears, in the case of the abandoned child or the unloved child, the carnal stage could not be realized, and the adult develops neuroses that can transform him in extreme cases into a psychotic and narcissistic being because he is unable to love. This being, composed of unlove and hurtful thorns, will not be the most able to love from the start. Thus, Freud's "*cycle of offenses*" will repeat itself. This perpetual lack of recognition is the enigma of Dostoyevsky. His own abject father was murdered and Dostoyevsky kept growing up as an idolized writer. For Dostoyevsky to grow, the father had to shrink. Each of us bears the responsibility of developing infinitely more love in our generation than in the previous one. If recognition does not come by antecedent, it will come by descent. The principle of responsibility at the collective stage will only appear when the people themselves have metaphorically killed the parent who abandoned and unloved them.

## 5. Conclusions

*"Find your offenses sweet.  
For you will not have the greater misfortune to love the one who has offended you"  
Dostoyevsky.*

The form of the social drama allows us to draw lessons. First, the responsibility to stop the cycle of offenses. The offense, even the most criminal, can humiliate, but cannot dissolve human dignity. The individual responsibility to stop the cycle of offenses suffered is an intimate act, and as painful as the decision to stop a human bond may be, it will always amplify the human dignity. However, because of an implicit or explicit power relationship, of direct or indirect intimidation, of financial or moral restraint, consent quickly become an exercise of power by someone who makes their will prevail over that of the other (Coste, Costey, Tangy, 2008). The Protocol signed in Palermo in 2000 to "*prevent, suppress and punish trafficking in persons, especially*



women and children" states that a person's consent is "irrelevant". The UN has understood that in many cases a consent is simply the result of underlying coercion. Before freedom of consent comes the question of desire. Consent can be registered or proven through marks and signs, gestures and words, an irrefutable argument from those around her who know that it will be difficult to prove otherwise. Nothing is falsier than the deceptive liability of an appearance of consent. In the family setting, the child is constantly subjected to murderous words, belittling glances, discouraging gestures, in a universe of uncontrollable implicit, not all vulnerable beings are responsible or consenting.

Second, the linguistic vulnerability. For the sociologist Alain Bentolila (2012), the linguistic vulnerability of the working classes prevents them from offering intellectual resistance to discourse; this social ghettoization generates linguistic insecurity, which determines intellectual vulnerability. Nothing is falsier than a recognition without autonomy of the work of people from modest backgrounds. Their efforts are felt to be condemned by a lack of recognition allowing them to access a real direct autonomy or at least, concerning the autonomy of their children. When the parricide appears in *Brothers Karamazov*, or Cosette's escape in *The Miserables*, it is the taking of autonomy that gives back the recognition of their acts.

Thirdly, the trauma of lack of recognition. The principle of responsibility is the decision to stop the cycle of offenses. The offended person will be able to increase his human dignity. Even in the most humiliating or criminal cases of offenses, the voluntary memory has inexhaustible cycles of reconstruction. Fragile and vulnerable people, who have grown up in an overwhelming social reality, have developed language vulnerabilities that complicate the process of stopping the cycle of offenses. This trauma of lack of recognition appears in childhood. The Karamazov brothers were not loved by their father and Cosette in *The Miserables* is an orphan who was not loved by her adoptive parents. These strong emotional deficiencies are symbolic of the social environments in France and Russia, which live in a profound social inequality. By touching the heart of compassion and the search for love, Hugo and Dostoyevsky achieve the feat of making future social laws immanent thought the principle of universalism. By plunging into worlds of social and emotional misery, the reader himself experiences a heart that is flayed alive by the lack of human dignity. And the human dignity reconquered individually, becomes a principle of collective responsibility.

## 6. References

- [1]. V. Marinov. *Les Frères Karamazov et les frères de la horde originaire*. Chapitre IX, Figures du crime chez Dostoïevski, p. 223 à 229, 1990.
- [2]. S. Freud. *Die Urgestalt der Brüder Karamazov - Les Sources des Frères Karamazov*. Preface, Ed. Gallimard, coll. Folio, Classique, n°2655, 1994.
- [3]. F. Dostoïevski. *Brothers Karamazov*. Ed. Gallimard, coll. Folio, Classique, n°2655, 1994.
- [4]. V. Hugo. *Les Misérables*. éd. Gallimard, coll. Folio, Classique, n°3223, 1999.
- [5]. V. Hugo. *Détruire la misère* (1849). éd. Gallimard, 1972, col. Folio.
- [6]. V. Hugo. *Odes et Ballades*. éd. Gallimard, coll. Poésie, n°141, 1980.
- [7]. R. Baroni. *Genres littéraires et orientation de la lecture. Une lecture modèle de « La mort et la boussole » de J. L. Borges*. Poétique, n° 134-2, 2003, p. 141-157. <https://www.cairn.info/revue-poetique-2003-2-page-141.htm>.
- [8]. M. Lacheny. *Iser Wolfgang. Penser le lecteur dans l'acte d'interprétation*. Archives ouvertes, HAL, 2015. <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-02306218/document>.
- [9]. G. Genette, *Palimpsestes. La littérature au second degré*, Paris, Seuil, 1982. Citée par M. Detrie. *Les études de réception dans le contexte de la mondialisation : questionnements et renouvellements*. Dans *La Littérature chinoise hors de ses frontières. Influences et réceptions croisées*. Sous la direction d'Angel Pino et Isabelle Rabut, Paris, éd. You-Feng, 2014, p. 19-34.
- [10]. U. Eco. *Sémiotique et philosophie du langage*. Presses universitaires de France, Paris. 1988.
- [11]. L. Sabourin. *Préfaces et manifestes du XIXe siècle, textes réunis par José-Luis Diaz*. *Studi Francesi*, n°167, 2012. <http://journals.openedition.org/studifrancesi/4083>.
- [12]. C. Stolz. *Initiation à la stylistique*. éd. Broché, coll. Ellipses. thème Etudes, 2006, p.156.
- [13]. A-W. Halsall. *La rhétorique délibérative dans les oeuvres oratoires et narratives de Victor Hugo*. *Études littéraires*, vol. 33, n° 1, 2001, p. 13-26. <http://id.erudit.org/iderudit/501275ar>.
- [14]. C. Noille. *Les genres du discours dans l'ancienne rhétorique : listes, schémas et mode d'emploi, avec un exemple (le discours de Germanicus)*. *Exercices de rhétorique*, n°3, 2014. <http://journals.openedition.org/rhetorique/337>.

- [15]. J-M. Gleize. *Le lyrisme en question. Victor Hugo*. éd. Le Seuil, Poésie et figuration, Pierres Vives, 1983, p. 47-76. <https://www.cairn.info/poesie-et-figuration--9782020065092-page-47.htm>.
- [16]. S. Macé. *L'amplification, ou l'âme de la rhétorique. Présentation générale. Exercices de rhétorique*, n°4, 2014. <http://journals.openedition.org/rhetorique/364>.
- [17]. A. de Lamartine. *Méditations poétiques*. BNF, Les Essentiels, 1820. <https://gallica.bnf.fr/essentiels/lamartine/meditations-poetiques>.
- [18]. V-M. Hugo. *OEuvres de Victor Hugo. Poésie*. éd. Méline, Cans et compagnie, Bruxelles, vol. 1, 1837, p. 15.
- [19]. J. Southall Wilson. *Poe's Philosophy of Composition*. The North American Review. University of Northern Iowa Press, vol. 223, n° 833, Dec., 1926 - Feb., 1927, p. 675-684. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25110283>.
- [20]. A-W. Halsall. *La rhétorique délibérative dans les œuvres oratoires et narratives de Victor Hugo*. Études littéraires, vol. 33, n° 1, 2001, p. 13-26. <http://id.erudit.org/iderudit/501275ar>.
- [21]. A. Jackiewicz. *Études sur l'évaluation axiologique : présentation*. Langue française, n° 184, 2014, p. 5-16. <https://www.cairn.info/revue-langue-francaise-2014-4-page-5.htm>.
- [22]. C. Zilberberg. *La structure tensive. Note sur la structure des paradigmes et de Sur la dualité de la poétique*. éd. Sigilla, Presses universitaires de Liège, 2012, p. 166. <https://books.openedition.org/pulg/2140>.
- [23]. A. Biglari. *L'espoir dans Les Contemplations de Victor Hugo : « Ce que dit la bouche d'ombre »*. éd. Signata, Littérature et sémiotique, n°5, 2014, p. 217-243. <https://doi.org/10.4000/signata.497>.
- [24]. A. Dubied. *Une définition du récit d'après Paul Ricoeur*. Communication, vol. 19, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.4000/communication.6312>.
- [25]. M. Carcassonne. *La notion de temporalité affective confrontée à différentes approches de la narration en sciences du langage : apports, enjeux, méthodes*. Cahiers de Narratologie, n°32, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.4000/narratologie.7866>.
- [26]. P. Aron, J-P. Bertrand. *Le Sens du social. Présentation*. éd. Armand Colin, coll. Romantisme, n° 175, 2017, p. 5-7. <https://www.cairn.info/revue-romantisme-2017-1-page-5.htm>. <https://serd.hypotheses.org/690>.
- [27]. M. Perret. *L'« avant-propos » de « La Comédie humaine » et le XVIIe siècle littéraire français*. Persée, L'Année balzacienne, n° 14, 2013, p. 285-308. <https://www.cairn.info/revue-l-annee-balzacienne-2013-1-page-285.htm>.
- [28]. P. Sériot. *Vološinov, la philosophie du langage et le marxisme*. Langages, n° 182, 2011, p. 83-96. <https://www.cairn.info/revue-langages-2011-2-page-83.htm>.
- [29]. G. Soubeille. *Campistron : d'amour, de théâtre et de guerre : mémoires d'un gentilhomme gascon*. éd. universitaires du Sud, Université de Toulouse, 2013, p. 205. <https://catalog.princeton.edu/catalog/9571792>.
- [30]. Y-M. Tran-Gervat. *Pour une définition opérationnelle de la parodie littéraire: parcours critique et enjeux d'un corpus spécifique*. Cahiers V. Hugo. Les Contemplations. éd. Le livre de Poche, coll. Classiques, 2002, p.608.
- [31]. L. Hébert. *L'analyse thymique*. éd. Signo, Université de Rimouski, 2006. <http://www.signosemio.com/greimas/analyse-thymique.asp>.
- [32]. C. Bemporad. *Lectures et plaisirs : pour une reconceptualisation des modes et des types de lecture littéraire*. Études de lettres, n°1, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.4000/edl.610>.
- [33]. C. Thomson. *Gérard Genette, Palimpsestes : la littérature au second degré*. Études littéraires, n°19, 1982, p.159-163. <https://doi.org/10.7202/500748ar>.
- [34]. V. Jouve. *L'effet-personnage dans le roman*. Presses Universitaires de France, Quadrige, 1998, p. 272. <https://www.cairn.info/l-effet-personnage-dans-le-roman--9782130442707.htm>.
- [35]. V. Jouve. *Emotion et intérêt dans les études littéraires*. Études de lettres, 2014. <https://doi.org/10.4000/edl.606>.
- [36]. E. et J. de Goncourt. *Journal des Goncourt*. éd. Christiane et Jean-Louis CABANES, t. III, Champion, Paris, 2013, p. 211.

- [37]. C. Schapira. *Distinguo, concedo, nego : la réfutation par distingo*. Syntaxe et sémantique, n°13, 2012, p. 87-102.
- [38]. Définition *Ellipse*, Définition en ligne, 2020. <https://www.larousse.fr/dictionnaires/francais/elliptique/28441>.
- [39]. H. Nølke. *La polyphonie : analyses littéraire et linguistique. Le regard du locuteur. Pour une linguistique des traces énonciatives*. éd. Kimé, coll. Linguistique, 2001, p. 59-73. <https://www.cairn.info/le-regard-du-locuteur-2--9782841742326-page-59.htm>.
- [40]. G. Losier. *Les mécanismes énonciatifs de la réfutation*. Revue québécoise de linguistique, n°18, 1989, p. 109-127. <https://doi.org/10.7202/602642ar>.
- [41]. U. Eco. *L'oeuvre ouverte*. éd. Points, coll. Points Essai, 2015.
- [42]. P. Jaccottet. *Une transaction secrète. L'Orient limpide*. éd. Gallimard, 1987, p. 121-131.
- [43]. M. Ozouf. *Les aveux du roman, le dix-neuvième siècle entre Ancien Régime et Révolution*. Littérature, Histoires littéraires, n°124, 2001. p. 126-127; [https://www.persee.fr/doc/litt\\_0047-4800\\_2001\\_num\\_124\\_4\\_1736\\_t1\\_0126\\_0000\\_1](https://www.persee.fr/doc/litt_0047-4800_2001_num_124_4_1736_t1_0126_0000_1).
- [44]. D-O. Evans. *Le romantisme social*. Revue D'histoire Économique Et Sociale, vol. 29, n°3, 1951, p. 280-293. *JSTOR*. [www.jstor.org/stable/24068896](http://www.jstor.org/stable/24068896).
- [45]. R. Ogien. *Sanctions diffuses. Sarcasmes, rires, mépris*. Revue française de sociologie, vol. 31-4, 1990, p. 591-607. [https://www.persee.fr/doc/rfsoc\\_0035-2969\\_1990\\_num\\_31\\_4\\_2713](https://www.persee.fr/doc/rfsoc_0035-2969_1990_num_31_4_2713).
- [46]. L. Hutcheon. *A Theory of Parody: The Teachings of Twentieth Century Art Forms*. éd. Methuen New York et Londres, 1985, p.143.
- [47]. A. Le Draoulec, M-P. Péry-Woodley, J. Rebeyrolle. *Glissements progressifs de " sémantique ". Le discours et la langue*. éd. Modulaires européennes, Cortil-Wodon, n°6, 2014, p.109-126. <https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-01053763/document>.
- [48]. Y-M. Tran-Gervat. *Pour une définition opérationnelle de la parodie littéraire: parcours critique et enjeux d'un corpus spécifique*. Cahiers de Narratologie, n°13, 2006. <https://doi.org/10.4000/narratologie.372>.
- [49]. F. Gadet. M. Pêcheux. *L'ambiguïté comme parodie de l'équivoque*. La Langue introuvable. éd. La Découverte, Paris, Théorie, 1981, p.152-156. <https://www.cairn.info/la-langue-introuvable--9782707112132-page-152.htm>.
- [50]. D. McAdam. *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements : political opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings*. Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- [51]. P-M. de Biasi. *Roman et Histoire : une écriture subliminale. Flaubert*, n°20, 2018. <http://journals.openedition.org/flaubert/3197>.
- [52]. S. Oueslati. *The anti-Abortion Lobby : power and Limits of a Collective Action Strategy*. Presses Universitaires de Rennes, Historical and Contemporary Links, 2011.
- [53]. Y. Leroy. *La notion d'effectivité du droit*. Revue Droit et Société, LGDJ, n°79, 2011.
- [54]. V. Champeil-Desplats, D. Lochak. *A la recherche de l'effectivité des droits de l'homme*. Presses universitaires de Paris Ouest, 2008.
- [55]. P. Amselek. *Perspectives critiques d'une réflexion épistémologique sur la théorie du droit*. Revue Droit et Société, LGDJ, 1964, p. 340.
- [56]. S. Champeau. *Les Goncourt moralistes dans Renée Mauperin*. Persée, Cahiers Edmond et Jules de Goncourt, n°15, 2008, p. 95-121. [https://www.persee.fr/doc/cejdg\\_1243-8170\\_2008\\_num\\_1\\_15\\_1002](https://www.persee.fr/doc/cejdg_1243-8170_2008_num_1_15_1002).
- [57]. H. De Balzac. *Les petits bourgeois. Scènes de la vie parisienne*. Bruxelles et Leipzig, Kiessling, Schnée éditeurs, vol.1, 1855. <https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k62815799.texteImage>.
- [58]. M-A. Voisin-Fougère. *Le sérieux et la feinte. Le bourgeois dans la littérature réaliste*. Persée, Romantisme, coll. Fins de siècle, n°87, 1995, p3-12. [https://www.persee.fr/doc/roman\\_0048-8593\\_1995\\_num\\_25\\_87\\_2970](https://www.persee.fr/doc/roman_0048-8593_1995_num_25_87_2970).
- [59]. F. Dostoïevski. *Le bourgeois de Paris*. éd. Payot, coll. Poche, 2006.
- [60]. G. Blix. *Les Goncourt et l'histoire-résurrection*. Cahiers Edmond et Jules de Goncourt, La biographie - La fantaisie, n°17, 2010, p. 45-61. [https://www.persee.fr/doc/cejdg\\_1243-8170\\_2010\\_num\\_1\\_17\\_1031](https://www.persee.fr/doc/cejdg_1243-8170_2010_num_1_17_1031).
- [61]. G. de Staël. *De l'influence des passions sur le bonheur des individus et des nations*. Lausanne, 1er juillet 1796. [https://ebooks-bnr.com/ebooks/pdf4/stael\\_de\\_linfluence\\_des\\_passions.pdf](https://ebooks-bnr.com/ebooks/pdf4/stael_de_linfluence_des_passions.pdf).
-

- [62]. M. Dominicy. *Le genre épictétique : une argumentation sans questionnement ?* Argumentation et questionnement, L'Interrogation philosophique, Presses Universitaires de France, Cité par Corinne Hoogaert, 1996, p. 1-12. <https://www.cairn.info/argumentation-et-questionnement--9782130474814-page-1.htm>.
- [63]. V. Hugo. *Préface de Cromwell*. BNF, Les essentiels, Archives, 1827. <https://gallica.bnf.fr/essentiels/hugo/cromwell-preface>.
- [64]. F. Lotterie. *Madame de Staël. La littérature comme « philosophie sensible »*. Romantisme, n°124, 2004, p. 19-30. <https://www.cairn.info/revue-romantisme-2004-2-page-19.htm>.
- [65]. F. Guillet. *L'honneur en partage. Le duel et les classes bourgeoises en France au XIXe siècle*. Revue d'histoire du XIXe siècle, Société d'histoire de la Révolution de 1848 et des révolutions du XIXe siècle, La bourgeoisie : mythes, identités et pratiques, n°34, 2007, p.55-70. <http://journals.openedition.org/rh19/1302>.
- [66]. G. Tarde. *Etudes pénales et sociales*. éd. Masson, coll. Bibliothèque de criminologie, Paris, 1892, p.460 <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1522/cla.tag.etu>.
- [67]. J. Alter. *Les origines de la satire anti-bourgeoise en France*. éd. Droz, vol.1, 1966, p.77-90.
- [68]. V. Larbaud. (Vichy 1881-Vichy 1957). A. O. Barnabooth, *Journal intime*. éd. Gallimard.
- [69]. E. Montégut. *Flaubert, lettre du 15 novembre 1871*. La revue des deux Mondes, n°9, 23 Juin 2013. <http://journals.openedition.org/flaubert/2049>.
- [70]. V. Hugo. *Les Châtiments*. éd. Le livre de Poche, coll. Classiques, 1973, p. 479.
- [71]. P. Savey-Casard. *Un nouvel affrontement des doctrines la période 1870-1914. Esquisse historique et juridique*. Librairie Droz, Travaux de Sciences Sociales, coll. *La peine de mort*, Genève, 1968, p. 109-127. <https://www.cairn.info/la-peine-de-mort--9782600041492-page-109.htm>.
- [72]. M. Foucault. *Les mots et les choses*. éd. Gallimard, 1966, p. 233.
- [73]. M. Bach. *Critique et Politique: La Réception des Misérables en 1862*. Modern Language Association, Jstor, vol. 77, n°5, Dec., 1962, p. 595-608. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/460408>.
- [74]. Actes du Sénat, Palais du Luxembourg. *Les questions sociales du début du XIXe siècle à la IVe République*. Comité d'Histoire Parlementaire présidée par Sylvie Guillaume, professeur à l'Université de Bordeaux III, et à l'Institut Universitaire de France, 31 mars 2006. [https://www.senat.fr/colloques/actes\\_questions\\_sociales/actes\\_questions\\_sociales2.html](https://www.senat.fr/colloques/actes_questions_sociales/actes_questions_sociales2.html).
- [75]. V. Hugo. *Poète éternel : poésie de l'âme et du coeur*. éd. Souryami Blanchelicorne, 2015, p.316.
- [76]. O. Bertrand. *Le Juste 2, de Paul Ricoeur*. éd. Esprit, Paris, 2001, p.297. <https://www.erudit.org/fr/revues/ps/2002-v21-n3-ps407/000510ar/>.
- [77]. P. Ricoeur. *Temps et récit*. éd. Le Seuil, Paris, t. I, 1983, p. 69.
- [78]. J-L. Diaz. *Préfaces et manifestes du XIXe siècle*. Revue des sciences humaines, Presses Universitaires de Lille 3, n°295, 2009, p. 211. <https://journals.openedition.org/studifrancesi/4083#quotation>.
- [79]. R. Ducoulombier. *De Lénine à Castro : idées reçues sur un siècle de communisme*. éd. Le Cavalier bleu, 2011.
- [80]. K. Marx et Engels. *Manifeste du Parti Communiste*. Publié à Londres en allemand, 1948., éd. Flammarion, 2012.
- [81]. B. de Robien, V. Fédorovski. *Le Roman de la Pologne*. éd. du Rocher, 2007.
- [82]. A. Avdeev, A. Blum, I. Troitskaja. *Histoire de la statistique de l'avortement en Russie et en URSS jusqu'en 1991*. éd. Persée, Populations, 1994.
- [83]. W. Goldman. *Women, the state and Revolution: Soviet family policy and social life, 1917 – 1936*. Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- [84]. N. Werth. *Histoire de l'Union Soviétique. De l'Empire russe à la Communauté des Etats Indépendants 1900-1990*. éd. Themis Histoire, 2008.
- [85]. N. Werth. *Les crimes de masse sous Staline 1930-1953*. Incorporé à l'Encyclopédie des Crimes de masse, éd. Sciences Politiques, 2008.
- [86]. A. Sakharov. *Mon pays et le monde*. éd. Seuil, 1975.
- [87]. B. Lazitch. *Le Rapport Khrouchtchev et son histoire*. coll. Point Histoire, éd. du Seuil, 1976.

- [88]. A. Zinoviev. *Le gorbatchévisme ou les pouvoirs d'une illusion*. Thèse, Université des Sciences Politiques de Lausanne, 1987.
- [89]. A. Vaillant. *Modernité, subjectivation littéraire et figure auctoriale*. *Romantisme*, 2010/2, n° 148, p. 11-25. DOI : 10.3917/rom.148.0011. <https://www.cairn.info/revue-romantisme-2010-2-page-11.htm>.
- [90]. L. Chevallier. *Classes laborieuses, classes dangereuses*. Plon, 1958 ; rééd Le Livre de Poche, 1978, coll. Pluriel.
- [91]. A. Geslin. *Gens pauvres, pauvres gens dans la France du XIXe siècle*. Aubier, Paris 1998.
- [92]. J. Lyon-Caen. *Enquêtes, littérature et savoir sur le monde social en France dans les années 1840*. *Revue d'Histoire des Sciences Humaines* 2007/2 n° 17, p. 98-118.
- [93]. C. Dousset-Seiden. *Statistique et pauvreté sous la Révolution et l'Empire*. *Annales historiques de la Révolution française*, n°280, 1990. pp. 167-186; doi : <https://doi.org/10.3406/ahrf.1990.1321> [https://www.persee.fr/doc/ahrf\\_0003-4436\\_1990\\_num\\_280\\_1\\_1321](https://www.persee.fr/doc/ahrf_0003-4436_1990_num_280_1_1321).
- [94]. I. Sirotkina. *Gogol, les moralistes et la psychiatrie du XIXe siècle*. *Romantisme*, 2008/3 (n° 141), p. 79-101. DOI : 10.3917/rom.141.0079. <https://www.cairn.info/revue-romantisme-2008-3-page-79.htm>.
- [95]. Bentolila, Alain (2012). *Linguistique de la vulnérabilité intellectuelle à l'endoctrinement*. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes.
- [96]. Coste, Florent; Costey, Paul; Tangy, Luci (2008). Consentir: domination, consentement et déni. *Traces. Revue de Sciences Sociales*, 14, 5-27. <https://doi.org/10.4000/traces.365>.