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1. Introduction

If Camus had survived the automobile accident to witness Algeria’s independence and its aftermath, the collapse of the Soviet Union, or the proliferation of terrorism, culminating in the 9.11 attack in New York, would he have remained silent as he did in the late fifties concerning the Algerian conflict? This, we are confirmed, is a question requiring an urgent answer which would present a possible key to our dealing with the twin contemporary problems – justice and terrorism. David Schalk refers to Camus as ‘the wrong model for American antiwar activists during the Vietnam era...’ Emily Apter argues that “The failure of Camus’s cosmopolitical hybrid – a vision of French Algeria...offers a kind of object lesson for the future of globalization theory or transnational identity-formation.” Accordingly, we are convinced that it would not be futile, rather very rewarding and significant, to re-read and re-interpret his artistic achievements to have an overview of the present world crisis and gain a deeper insight into the reality of the contemporary political situation. We are living in the age of terrorism as was Camus half a century ago.

Albert Camus (1913-1960) was an Algerian born French, a pied-noir, and his concern for his homeland never left him throughout his life. At the outbreak of the Algerian conflict, he was torn between faith and motherhood, justice and freedom. He abhorred violence and denounced the brutal handling of the strife. Camus was on neither sides, the oppressed Arabs or the suppressing French colonists.

No other Parisian knew the plight of the Arabs better than Camus. He once made a minute report on their miserable and humiliating condition in the local newspaper, which is still regarded as the most
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realistic as well as compassionate article dealt with the colonized Arabs\textsuperscript{7} With the explosion of the Algerian war of independence in 1956, he soon made himself actively and directly involved in the struggle as an intellectual with first-hand experience of the poverty stricken Algerians. He attempted at making a compromise between the French colonists and the Algerian activists. He hoped to realize a mixed country where the French and the Arabs could cooperate with each other to enhance the social and economical development – a Camus’s euphoria of cohabitation, a cosmopolitan hybrid,\textsuperscript{8} never to be attained. As the conflict was aggravated when both the French administration and the Arabian protesters resorted to severe violence - torture, terror, assassination - , Camus withdrew from the stage of the political battlefield except making sporadic comments and providing financial aids to refugees.\textsuperscript{9}

The silence he kept on the Algerian struggle was fiercely attacked by both the leftist and the rightist in Paris. J-P. Sartre denounced his ambiguous stance and condemned him as an accomplice to the bourgeoisie. Camus later declared his attitude in the famous interview given on the occasion of being awarded the Nobel Prize saying that mother counted more than justice.\textsuperscript{10}

This paper analyzes the relationship between Camus’s political absence from the Algerian conflict and his literary achievements –\textit{L’Homme révolté} (The Rebel) and \textit{Les Justes} (The Just). The twin books share the same themes related with violence: justice and freedom. His philosophical works with the dual themes are where his love of theatre and his faith merge. The essay (\textit{The Rebel}) echoes the drama (\textit{The Just}), visualizing his concept of the revolt on the stage, just as his philosophical note (\textit{The Myth of Sisyphus}) will help to clarify what he depicts in his novel (\textit{The Stranger}).

2. Camus and Algiers

In 1830, Algeria was conquered by France which proclaimed the land her territory in 1848, twenty years before the Meiji Restoration of Japan. The French occupying Algiers thought of themselves as saviors liberating the country from innocence and poverty. They assumed that there had been no civilization in Algiers, before they settled. After the conquest, therefore, the colonists’ policy of assimilation into French culture and dependence on French economy was accelerated; the Arabs were deprived of their language and forced to work under the French masters as low-waged factory workers or peasants on plantations. The rigid assimilating policy provoked riots against the colonizing government. But every Algerians’ uprising was ruthlessly suppressed, leading into the escalation of colonizing policy. Thus Algeria faced the increasing tension between the colonizers and the colonized. The Arabs were constantly under threat of starvation and unemployment.

Under these tense circumstances between the Arabs and the French, Camus was born to a colonist in Mondovi, a village in the Algerian interior surrounded by vineyards. His father, Lucien Auguste Camus, was a French descendant of those who had settled in Algeria after the 1830 conquest, and his mother, Catherine Hélène Sintés, of a family coming from the Spanish island of Minorca.

The Nobel laureate led a lonely and miserable life in a tiny apartment house in the working–class area in Belcourt, located near the Arab quarter of Algiers. His family were stricken by poverty; his father was
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killed in the war in France less than a year after his birth, and his mother was absent from home working assiduously all day long. His somewhat eccentric grandmother dominated the house taking charge of her grandsons’ rearing. She persecuted Camus and his younger brother with violence. The widow watched her mother’s harsh treatment sadly and silently without protesting.

Thus Camus did not have a happy domestic life, living in poverty, with his illiterate mother and strict and selfish grandmother. Instead, he was blessed with physical and cerebral power. He was good at swimming and playing soccer, and did well at school. Camus was so excellent a student that he could finish the Algerian university with distinction. He was provided with the assistance of compassionate relatives and teachers who found hidden intellectual brilliance in him, and dedicated their lives to the promising young man: Gustave Acault (his maternal uncle), Louis Germain, Jean Grenier, to name but a few.

Acault was a butcher and self-taught man, discussing every subject with his customers, diffusing the young nephew a sense of joking. Germain, an elementary school teacher, found in Camus a lot of good quality. Being a hard-worker in study and physical exercise was one of them. The student expressed a deep sense of gratitude for his meticulous assistance in the Nobel Prize address. Grenier, a teacher, philosopher, and writer, exerted the strongest influence upon Camus in that his talk infused the youth’s mind with moral values. Camus called him ‘my master’ and dedicated his first book *L’Envers et l’endroit* to the teacher. Outside home, Camus was surrounded with a quasi-paternal atmosphere where his inherent ability came to bud.\(^{11}\)

Camus gradually awakened to the reality of the colonized Algeria when he was in the lycée, having a political debate on the Algerian problems with his bright colleagues. He joined the Communist Party in 1935, but his alignment with communism did not last long. Aronson assesses his understanding of and interest in Marxism as superficial.\(^{12}\)

Soon after receiving master degree in philosophy from the University of Algiers in 1936, he began to work for the *Algerian Republican*, a left-wing newspaper, and was in charge of literary criticism: he reviewed Sartre’s *Nausea* in it. Camus’s famous report on the misery of the Kabylians (*Misère de la Kabylie*) was published on this paper.\(^{13}\) The inhabitants of the high country south of Algeria were attacked by a severe famine which was caused, as Camus reported, by the injustice as well as misconduct of the French authorities. He vividly disclosed the vestiges of the devastation brought about by colonialism. His article, serving to make his name known, aroused the governmental support for the victims. But the political stance of the paper invited a constant surveillance from the French administration, and the paper was banned in 1938. Camus, therefore, was forced to leave Algeria and settled in Paris where he spent the wartime. He worked as a journalist at *Paris Soir, Combat*, and a reader and editor at Gallimard publisher.\(^{14}\)

Camus had continued his career as a journalist until he got fame with the publication of the twin works of absurdity — *The Stranger* and *The Myth of Sisyphus*, in 1943. In Paris, he concerned himself with the reality and the future of Algeria. After the end of World War II, a new phase of a conflict began
to emerge in Algeria; the Arabs protested against the French, calling for independence. The upheaval demanded the Algerian born Camus to decide which side he would stand by, the Arabs or the French. He dreamt of the cohabitation among Algerian natives and French settlers, a French Algerian hybrid. The na"ive view was heavily criticized from both parties. One of the critics was Sartre, an existentialist and close friend with Camus, accusing his ambiguous attitude on the Algerian conflict and urging him to make a clear declaration of his faith. The two artists began to debate concerning justice and violence.

3. The Sartre-Camus Quarrel

Four years before the sudden surge of Algerian conflict, Camus and Sartre had crossed swords over the theme of violence, which compelled them to disrupt their friendship lasting for a decade. Camus and Sartre had reviewed favorably each other’s book: Camus wrote a favorable review of La Nausée in 1938, Sartre of The Stranger in 1942. The two French novelists met for the first time at the premiere of Sartre’s play, The Flies, in 1943. After the initial encounter, the twin formed a friendship sharing the same existentialists’ world view. Sartre once proffered Camus the opportunity to direct his new play, No Exit, for a touring production. Some financial problem did not satisfy the playwright’s wish, but their fraternal bond was deepened by this small episode.

Their quarrel started when Camus published The Rebel (L’Homme révolté) in 1951. The central theme of the philosophical essay is laid in tracing the history of human violence, mass murder. Camus resumed the idea of revolution from Ugo down to Marx via Nietzsche, Hegel, and Sade, and reached the conclusion that political revolution and moral revolt should be made distinction. The former, though aiming at the benefit of oppressed people, resorted to brutal violence leading to the sacrifices of common persons. “The political revolution,” Camus argues, “is a false one because expressed at the expense of other people.” The latter, on the other hand, connotes moralist’s concept of freedom in that it values moderation above extremism, solidarity above dictatorship. In short, Camus’s revolt is human-centered, dialogical, co-habitative, which reveals his ideological shift from nihilism to humanism valuing justice and human integrity. Camus thus transcended his earlier negative and ambiguous view of human condition.

As a political activist, Sartre had great faith in historical inevitability- a Marxist doctrine. The belief was firmly related with the idea of transcendence of history in that he placed history above human beings. Sartre, accordingly, advocated the terrorists’ maxim arguing that the end justifies the means. In this way, Sartre’s existentialism yields to anarchic extremism. Camus, on the other hand, is renowned for denouncing the key role of history. “Camus has often been criticized for rejecting history,” not because “he did not accept it exclusively,” but “refers us to something which underlies history and without which history could not exist.” Camus located human values over history. The twin artists, thus, stood in the polar opposites in terms of moral and violence along with the concept and role of history.

On the publication of The Rebel, both the leftist and the rightist condemned the Camus’s idea as an anti-Marxist view. One of the most acute critics was Francis Jeanson, Sartre’s disciple and editor of Les
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*Temps modernes*, a leading news magazine in Paris. (23) Jeanson took the part of Sartre who had been a devotee of Communistic ideology after WW II and finally entered the Communist Party in 1952. Sartre’s propensity for advocating violence for the purpose of making a better world suggests that he is for the idea that the end justifies the means, any means. Sartre embraced violence. As Aronso insists, Sartre knew very well about the ugly side of the Russian Communism, gulagu, secret police, assassination, but he clung to his sympathy with Marxism, sticking to his ideology of ‘flowing with history.’(24)

Camus, on the other hand, felt it disgrace for humans to acknowledge the existence of something with absolute value, transcendence – Christ, Capitalism, and History. The basic difference in the concept of History leads to a fight, a famous quarrel between the two dominant French philosophers. But Sartre hesitated to refute Camus, his former close friend, and let his disciple, Francis Jeanson, attack Camus.

Jeanson strongly condemned Camus as an advocate for the interest of the bourgeoisie, which sounded trenchant, satirical, scathingly “attacking both author and book.”(25) The reviewer demanded the author of The Rebel to disengage himself from the current politics. Jeanson’s review was hostile replete with humiliating, degrading words.

Sartre shared the criticism against Camus with Jeanson, and answered to Camus’s protest with a scornful letter. In this way, the old fraternity and companionship were broken. Sartre began to plunge into the political arena, communism, while Camus withdrew from the political world into silence. The divergence in terms of political commitment widened with the sudden outbreak of the Algerian conflict in 1954.

The end of World War II encouraged the Algerian political leaders to rise against the French administration. The clandestine members of ALN （Armée de Libération Nationale）planned to attack the colonists with arms. (26) On November 1, 1954, FLN （Front de Libération Nationale）voiced objections to French colonialism, calling for the restoration of the Algerian state, and began to attack administrative bureaux. (27)

Camus intervened insisting that French and Arabs were condemned to live together. On 22 January, 1957, Camus was asked to deliver a message at the The Committee for a Civil Ceasefire in Algiers. The participants consisted of French liberals and moderate Muslims, but the meeting hall was covered with tension and strained. (28) There Camus addressed his long-cherished plan of cohabitation, demanding a reconciliation between the Arabs and the French, but of no avail. The meeting was closed under the roar of the audience. (29) After this total failure of compromise, Camus never again expressed his private and political opinion on Algerian war, though secretly made efforts to save the lives of the liberating members in prison. (30)

Five days after the collapse of Camus’s intervention, Sartre was invited as a special guest at the anti-colonialism meeting in Paris, the meeting of the Action Committee of Intellectuals against the War in Algeria. Sartre accused the French colonists, calling for commitment to help Algerians. His address was heartily welcomed and hailed. (31)

Camus was torn between justice and violence, which led him into impass. He knew the severity
of the French administration with brutal oppression of the Arabs, but his ethics did not admit the indiscriminating bloodshed of both sides. He had no other alternative but to remain silent. The wretched figure of Camus suffering from dilemma echoes the protagonist of The Just, a play with a theme of violence versus humanity.

4. The Just

Keen interest in theatre occupied Camus’s whole life. Levi-Valensi refers to Camus as ‘un homme de théatre, au sens le plus complet du mot.’ Tarrow assumes that "His abiding involvement with the theater, as author, actor, and director, underlies his natural affinity to a genre in which the body plays a role equal to that of language." The period of writing fictions alternates with that of acting on the stage in his artistic career.

He was one of the founding members of the Théâtre du Travail whose main purpose was to give to the working population as much opportunity as possible of having theatrical experience. The left-wing dramatic company consisted of youths enthusiastic about realizing social reform and putting dramas with ideological themes on stage. After Camus’s debarment from the Communist Party which he joined in 1934, he and his fellowmen started a new company, Théâtre de L’Équipe. The new one aimed at both awakening the public concern about the environment they found themselves in through plays and performing excellent dramas such as Gide’s Le Retour de l’Enfant Prodigue, Malreaux’s Le Temps du mépris, Pushkin’s The Stone Guests. Camus played an active role in the company as an actor, director, and writer.

Mentioned elsewhere, he was asked to dramatize The Flies, a philosophical play with a theme of existential experience written by Sartre. Unfortunately, Camus could not comply with Sartre’s hope, but the two French intelligentsias established a fraternal bond through this theatrical activity.

As a playwright, Camus wrote four plays; Caligula, Le Malentendu (Cross Purpose), L’État de siege (State of Siege), Les Justes (The Just, The Just Assassins). Among the four plays he composed, The Just is directly related with the twin themes of violence and justice – the two main subjects haunting his later life. He had already made apparent his attitude concerning the topics in The Rebel where he questioned whether it is right to kill in the name of justice; “what is the limit to the violence one can commit in the pursuit of just ends.” He traced the history of terrorism, a mass murder in the name of political revolution. In The Rebel, he made a clear distinction between revolution and revolt; the former related with politics and the latter with individual attempt. Camus insists that we have to strive for revolting, that is, making a fresh start every time. This is a conclusion attained from his assiduous study as a philosophical student and his intrinsic aversion to capital punishment.

Based on this faith in revolt and the notion of violence, Camus incarnates them in The Just. The political as well as ideological play depicts a band of Russian terrorists who try to assassinate the Grand Duke. The drama is based on the real attack in Moscow in 1905, but the detailed historical datum is receded offstage with focus laid on the debates concerning the justification of killing innocent people for
An Artist in the Age of Terrorism

the sake of revolution. Accordingly, The Just is purely didactic, as are the plays in the postwar in France.

Ivan Kaliayev, a protagonist of the play, makes a failure of killing the aristocrat at his first attempt because the Duke is accompanied by small children. He refuses to deprive the Duke’s relatives of their young lives. Returning to the terrorists’ cell, Kaliayev is involved with a harsh quarrel with his fellow members as to the justification of killing for the purpose of revolution – a quarrel concerning whether the end justifies the means. To be precise, the debate centers around limit of violence; "Can one kill in the interests of the revolution." Nearly all of the five-act play is deployed in the room they have rented, highlighting the debate they exchange. The tormented figure of Kaliayev reminds us of that of Camus during the Algerian conflict. The protagonist of the play is Camus's double in that his moral denounces limitless exercise of violence.

Kaliayev is a poet as well as terrorist, which leads him to disagree with Stepan who is a revolutionary itself, escaping from the refugee camp in Siberia and coming to join in the group from the hideout in Switzerland. When the poet confesses his vacillation because of the presence of two infants, Stepan retorts him with harsh voice: "Children! That's all you know. Don't you understand that because Yanek failed to kill these two, thousands of Russian children will die of hunger for many years to come? ...The revolution wants to cure all ill, present and future." Stepan, a ruthless realist, is of the opinion that sacrifice, the small children accompanying the Duke, is inevitable for the sake of the revolution, a better future, while Kaliayev, more of a moralist than a revolutionary, finds his comrade's cold strategy morally intolerable. Stepan is an imaginary character, and Camus's ingenuity as a playwright is deployed in juxtaposing a revolutionary (Stepan) and a rebel (Kaliayev). The play, consequently, focuses on the theme of 'limit of violence.'

While the twin protagonists are engaged with a hot debate about the policy of revolution, Dora, who is a Kaliayev’s accomplice and lover, cuts in on their dispute protesting against the callous mass murder.

Dora: Yanek (Kaliayev) will kill the Grand Duke because his death may help to bring nearer the day when Russian children no longer die of starvation. That by itself is no easy task for him, but killing the Grand Duke’s niece and nephew won’t prevent a single child from starving.

Even destruction has a right and a wring way, and there are limits...

Stepan: [violently] There are no limits! What it really means is that you don’t believe in the revolution!...
stand publicly, fearing the attack of his sick mother at home. His moral and affection compelled him to silence.

The play revolves around hubris – the very great pride and belief in one's own importance, which is represented in the self-sacrificed love of Kaliayev and Dora. Camus's another artistry as a dramatist is displayed in depicting the twin lovers as the victim of hubris. Kaliayev sacrifices himself for the better life: he does not escape from the scene and surrenders himself to the police, finally executed by hanging. Dora offers herself not only for revolution but for love: she suffers the same fate as her lover did, throwing bomb of her own making, arrested, and hanged. The two terrorists do not transcend the limit of rebellion defined by Camus in The Rebel because of their pride and a sense of mission. Camus reflects himself in the Russian lovers torn between moral and duty. Freeman concludes his study of Camus's theatre by saying that "The essential attraction of these terrorists for Camus, therefore, was that they had a strict sense of limit beyond which they would not extend violence." His conclusion seems to be right on the mark, because the playwright himself admits in his essay as follows;

L'homme d'aujourd'hui qui crie sa révolte en sachant que cette révolte a des limites, qui exige la liberté et subit la nécessité, cet homme contradictoire, déchiré, désormais conscient de l'ambiguïté de l'homme et de son histoire, cette homme est l'homme tragique par excellence.

Kaliayev and his lover evoke Camus's ideal rebel depicted in The Rebel, who has normal human conscience: the former is seized by a sudden pang of conscience aiming a bomb at the Duke, the latter cries when she was told the execution of her lover. “We killed him. I'm the one who killed him!” “Whom did we kill?” questions one of her comrades, inferring that she means her lover. “The Grand Duke!” answers Dora tormented by a feeling of remorse. The dual terrorists do not transcend the limit of human conscience, abiding by the rebel's rule: to kill others by killing oneself. The Just envisions and depicts Camus's ideal rebellion: the revolt without destruction of humanistic values and suffering of others. The Just and The Rebel are juxtaposed in terms of the theme of violence, twin works, the latter illustrating Camus's artistic axiom that "(L'écrivain) ne peut plus espérer se tenir à l'écart pour poursuivre les réflexions et les images qui lui sont chères." Camus demands terrorists that they should remain human even at the attempt of making a better future. This request, however, could not be satisfied, compelling him to silence on the eve of the Algerian war.

5. Conclusion

Camus's vigilant and negative attitude along with his anti-Marxist view, invited relentless criticism from among the left and the right irrespectively because the fifties was the age of politics, requiring every individual, especially the celebrity and the notables like Camus and Sartre, to take a clear stand on political matters. Aronson discloses "the growing influence of the Cold War, with its pressure to take sides," in the contemporary situation. However, Camus kept silent on the Algerian problems.
forced as well as self-imposed silence seemed to have stemmed from triple elements: one is personal, another intrinsic, the other ideological.

First, he remained silent because he worried about his aged and ailing mother living in Algeria. He loved the nearly deaf and illiterate mother so much that he feared if she might be involved with the upheaval because of his political activity. He returned home immediately he knew that her condition had taken a turn for the worse in September 1957. For him, mother weighed more than justice.

Secondly, Camus felt himself inheriting from his father disgust at violence, especially capital punishment, which he intrinsically abhorred. He depicts the figure of the protagonist’s father, vomiting after watching the capital punishment in the open-air in *L'étranger*.

Thirdly, his absence from the battlefield may be explained as follows: he acted according to his ideology along with intrinsic hatred of violence. His faith in humanity did not admit violence. Catherine Camus, his daughter and editor of *The First Man*, indicates that "Camus, for his part, condemned the Gulag, Stalin’s trials, and totalitarianism in the Soviet Union, in the belief that ideology must serve humanity, not the contrary, and that the end did not justify the means."

Camus discloses his intention of writing *The Rebel* in an essay which was published posthumously in 1965 saying that "To put it briefly, I could not understand how men could torture other men and continue to look at them." Revolution, as Camus insists, will lead to mass murder, denying the individual's freedom and humanity. He condemns both protesters' and oppressors' use of violence, which placed him into the hostile criticism from both sides – impasse he became entangled with in the fifties. Some critic infers that there was "no solution to his personal dilemma."

He was torn by seemingly irreconcilable quadrilemma: mother, inheritance, ideology, and morals. As an Algerian born French brought up in an Arabian ambience, he should have stood against the colonists' administration, but the innate ethics prevented him from voicing his objection to the tyranny. He had no alternative but to take an ambiguous attitude.

Now we are living in the age of terrorism, and every newspaper and TV show broadcast chaotic bombing depriving innocent civilians of their lives. London, Tokyo, Baghdad, New Delhi, and New York, every modern city is confronting attacks by organized terrors, so that each one of us is faced with the question as to what extent we can justify the use of violence when we have no other choices for realizing justice and democracy. Camus's defense of justice and claim of human solidarity deployed in *The Exile and the Kingdom* deserve reconsideration.

Though he did not give us practical advice or minute plans, his artistic insight epitomized the danger latent and inherent in our lives. Tarrow concludes his study by arguing that "Camus’s creative work reflects and throws light on the history of his times, but also remains relevant today, not because he had the 'right' answers, but because he persistently asked the right questions." Man has to seek to transform himself rather than remaining what he is. Camus’s concept of limitations, as examined in this paper, tries to convey to the reader that "an affirmation of life must be made which does not end in a complete negation of the world."
REFERENCES


Notes

(1) The Algerian conflict, or the ‘events’ of 1954-1962 “(did) not officially become a war, at least for the French government, until 1999.” Schalk, p. 339. As a historian, Schalk refers to the fact that “For a (sic) analysis of the unanimous vote of the Chamber of Deputies on June 10, 1999, of the Proposition de Loi declaring the ‘events’ of 1954-1962 to be a true war rather than ‘opérations de maintien l’ordre’ [operations for the maintenance of order, the usual bureaucratic term], which was subsequently ratified by the Senate...” Schalk, p. 349, fn. 6. In this paper, therefore, the term, the Algerian conflict, is utilized instead of war to denote the circumstances of Algiers. Loc. cit.


(4) Apter, p. 516.

(5) Concerning the origin and the definition of the term pied-noir, Schalk insists that “There is an unresolved debate in the literature over the origins of the term pied-noir... But its referent is clear enough and widely agreed upon. Pied-noirs are those French citizens born in colonial Algeria who are of ethnic European origin.” Schalk, p. 350, fn. 21.

(6) Cohen-Solal, p. 44. Carroll quotes Conor Cruise O’Brien, a severest critic of Camus for erasing Arabness from his fictions, saying that “[Camus] makes the following connection with the war years in trying to understand why the French were not outraged when they learned of the existence of such practices.” Carroll, p. 525. Schalk places O’Brien’s stance as taking a ‘militant anticolonialist perspective.’ Schalk, p. 339. Cohen-Solal regards the silence of Camus on the Algerian conflict as a great paradox compared with his “first-hand experience of the tensions and pains of the working-class neighbourhoods of this Algiers suburb...” Cohen-Solal, p. 44.

(7) Misère de la Kabylie, in Essais, pp. 905-938. Cohen-Solal reckons that “[The newspaper article] remains the most insightful and thoroughly documented testimony of the situation in Algeria at the time.” Cohen-Solal, p. 44.

(8) Apter, pp. 509-510.

(9) Aronson, pp. 173-175.


(11) Autobiographical details are mainly taken from Todd.

(12) Aronson, pp. 25-27

(13) Cohen-Solal, p. 44. See fn. 7.


(15) Apter regards Camus’s notion of French Algeria as “a cosmopolitan hallucination of hybridity hatched in full view of decolonization.” Apter, p. 506.


(17) Aronson, p. 10.

(18) Ibid., p. 116. L’Homme révolté is translated as The Rebel in English, which does not convey the original intension of the author in that the English title wipes off the difference between the ‘man in revolt’, or the rebel, and the revolutionary. Aronson suggests that ‘man in revolt’, though the expression doesn’t exist in English, will more closely designate the French. Aronson, pp. 117-118.

(19) Freeman, p. 99.
Keiji OKAZAKI

(20) Cohen-Solal argues that “Sartre himself, fresh from four years of left-wing activism, was still very much influenced by Marxist ideology which he attempted to apply to the Algerian uprising.” Cohen-Solal, p. 46.

(21) Concerning Sartre’s concept of ethics, Simone de Beauvoir indicates danger inherent in it insisting that “The end justifies the means only if it remains present to us, if it is completely revealed during the enterprise itself.” Quoted from Doubrovsky, p. 79.

(22) Ibid., p. 81.

(23) Carroll, p. 524, fn. 7. He insists that “[Camus’s critics] denied Camus the right to present political resistance in an allegorical form.” Loc. cit.

(24) Aronson, p. 107, p. 171.

(25) Aronson, p. 146, p. 184. Cohen-Solal maintains that “(Camus) had become the perfect ‘bastard’ in the eyes of Sartre, then more virulent than ever.” Cohen-Solal, p. 48.

(26) Ageron, p. 94.

(27) Ibid., pp. 99-105; Aronson, p. 186.

(28) Cohen-Solal, p. 45. Aronson depicts the tension of the audiences as follows: (Outside), a virulent pied-noir crowd protested the meeting, led by Jo Ortiz, an Algiers bistro owner and rabid racist who would play a major role in the anti-government insurrections to come. This furious crowd was surrounded by a silent and highly disciplined mass of Algerians, apparently FLN militants protecting the meeting, as well as French police deployed to keep the peace. Aronson, p. 189.

(29) Schalk uses the critical term ‘humiliating failure’ to denote Camus’s effort to negotiate. Schalk, p. 339.

(30) “[Camus’s] efforts to save the lives of imprisoned FLN members are well known. In Algeria the legal system, justice itself, became a weapon, an instrument used in the struggle against the Algerian independence movement.” Ibid., p. 346, p.352, fn. 48.

(31) Aronson, pp. 190-192.

(32) Apter denounces Camus’s “bipartisan rhetoric operating as a diplomacy of give and take….Camus condemns torture on the grounds that it is unjust in absolute ethical terms, and counter-intuitive because it nurtures the next generation of terrorists.” But in the next breath, (Camus), “accuses Apter, “pleads the cause of French Algerians.” Apter, p. 508.

(33) Lévi-Valensi, p. 13; Cruickshank in the Introduction to Albert Camus: Caligula and Other Plays, p. 9.

(34) Ibid., p. 17.

(35) Tarrow, p. 9.

(36) Cruickshank in the Introduction to Albert Camus: Caligula and Other Plays, p. 9.

(37) Freeman, p. 103.

(38) Ibid., p. 114.

(39) Jones (tr.), p. 186.

(40) Ibid., pp. 186-187.

(41) Freeman, p. 103.

(42) Freeman may be the first critic to have used the term hubris in interpreting The Just, arguing that “A play which is based on the premises that there is a limit beyond which human action must not pass can only be tragic to the extent that it portrays a protagonist who, perhaps through some form of hubris (but not essentially), losses sufficient control of himself to move from mesure to démesure.” Ibid., p. 112.

(43) Ibid., p. 110.

(44) Quoted from Freeman, p. 106.
An Artist in the Age of Terrorism

(46) Freeman, pp. 106-107, p. 112.
(47) Camus, Essais, p. 1079. Lamont insists that "The Rebel and The Just Assassins were born simultaneously from the same inspiration." Lamont, p. 131.
(48) Aronson, p. 2.
(49) Lamont, p. 135. See the following footnote.
(50) Camus, L'étranger, p. 1011. Camus dealt with the problems about capital punishment in Réflexions sur la guillotine, Essais, pp. 1021-1064. The work has been transformed into a school text, Réflexion sur la guillotine+Dossier par Marc-Henri Arfeux+Lecture d’image par Ch. Hubert-Rodier.
(51) Camus, The First Man, Preface by his daughter and editor of the book.
(52) Camus, Essais, p. 1702; Tarrow, p. 142.
(53) Schalk, p. 341.
(54) Freeman, p. 106.
(55) The present writer analyzed the wretched figure of a pied-noir depicted in L'Hote. A school master, protagonist, in an isolated mountain side, is compelled to take sides, threatened to death. The ambiguous ending invites various interpretations, but the teacher covets a chance to let the Arabian criminal leave. Cf, Okazaki; Tarrow, pp. 172-193; Caroll, p. 532, p. 538; Schalk, p. 390, fn. 16. Apter insists that “(Camus’s) projection of continental holism in the face of incipient binational antagonism, illustrates the conflict, ever present today, between worldly hybridities and nationalist ethnic and religious particularism.” Apter, p. 506.
(56) Doubrovsky indicates in his article on Camus’s ethics that “[Camus] never claimed that he was playing an exemplary role nor did he ever set himself up as a model.” Doubrovsky, pp.82-83.
(57) Tarrow, p. 200.
(58) Sprintzen, p. 137; Doubrovsky, p. 82.
(59) Ibid., p. 80.
The word terrorism comes from the Reign of Terror instigated by Maxmilien Robespierre in 1793, following the French revolution. Robespierre, one of twelve heads of the new state, had enemies of the revolution killed, and installed a dictatorship to stabilize the country. He justified his methods as necessary in the transformation of the monarchy to a liberal democracy: Subdue by terror the enemies of liberty, and you will be right, as founders of the Republic. Robespierre's sentiment laid the foundations for modern terrorists, who believe violence will usher in a better system. For exampl