

Jacquerie 2.0 (Peasant Revolt 2.0)

Alain Bauer

Professor of criminology at the Conservatoire National des Arts et Métiers (National Conservatory for Arts and Crafts) and in New York and Shanghai

ABSTRACT

France has had a long history of revolts and insurrections. The emergence of social networks has multiplied their capacity for action. *Jacquerie* is now version 2.0. And populism around the world has benefited directly from it.

Keywords: Revolt, insurrection, *jacquerie*, social networks, web, populism

Jacquerie 2.0 (rebelión campesina)

RESUMEN

Francia ha tenido una larga historia de revueltas e insurrecciones. El surgimiento de las redes sociales ha multiplicado su capacidad de acción. *Jacquerie* es ahora la versión 2.0. Y el populismo en todo el mundo se ha beneficiado directamente de él.

Palabras clave: revuelta, insurrección, *Jacquerie*, redes sociales, web, populismo.

札克雷暴动2.0（农民叛乱2.0）

摘要

法国的叛乱和暴动历史由来已久。社交网络的出现已让暴动行为数量成倍增加。现在已出现札克雷暴动2.0版。并且全球民粹主义已从中直接获益。

关键词：叛乱，暴动，札克雷暴动，社交网络，网站，民粹主义

France has had a long history of revolts caused by the ignorance or disdain of the aristocracy, whether it be a monarchy or a government. The trigger of resentment was always taxation. The *taille* land tax, the *gabelle* salt tax, the assembly of the Estates General of 1789 to increase the revenue of the kingdom, but also the Poujadist movement of 1953 and the *bonnets rouges* against ecotaxes, all lead up to the *gilets jaunes* (yellow vests).

As always, the gathering of angry crowds is mechanically translated into symbolic destruction. Fishermen, farmers, and truck drivers have never failed to destroy street furniture, the railings of police stations, speed cameras, porticos ... even the Parliament of Brittany, albeit through clumsiness. Gustave Le Bon explained as early as 1895 that: "Little adapted to reasoning, crowds, on the contrary, are quick to act." While the first part of this dictum could be revisited, the second part is easily and regularly demonstrated.

Festive, organized, or chaotic crowd movements adore symbolic and redemptive fires, from pyramids of tires to the stationary, but flaming, barricades erected on the Champs Élysées when the goal was to march on the presidential palace.

Of course, some instigators are more organized than others (it is not that easy to un-pave a street by hand, and equipment is needed to prevent immediate burns and the long-term effects of tear gas ...). There is no need for the ultra-left or ultra-right in order to bring together thousands of yellow vests who are not, or not yet, a Yellow Bloc, the diesel version of the Black Bloc.

In this group of frustrated retirees, stifled low-wage earners, and the peripheral "left behind," confirming the hypotheses of Guilly, there was certainly a place for the professionals of violent protest and confrontation. Yet much less than on May 1 or during the demonstrations against the labor law. And many more prime-protesters who are in the process of building a new political generation, like in 1968, 1986, ... but not in 2005, when the riots that required a state of emergency did not lead to a structured movement. And it is regrettable, since this disorganizational disorder causes damage and victims in unexpected proportions.

However, it is probably the episode in 1995 that saw Alain Juppé get swept away by a coldly rational and hotly contested retirement reform that we must focus on in order to try to understand the irresistible impulse of most governments to pass by force what previous governments failed to accomplish.

After all, was it not to an extent symbolic posturing that drove a political heir to show that he could succeed where his predecessors had twice failed?

What should we think of this truly incendiary desire to add a heavy goods vehicle tax here, a toll for entering the city there, an increase in student registration fees (just foreign students, to start), without forgetting the justice reforms that eliminated juries for the most part, and therefore jurors, or the attempt to organize mining reforms?

What can be said, finally, of the curious obsession with reforming the law of 1905, mobilizing at once both ultras and moderates, secular combatants and ultras?

In other words, to press all at once on everything that irritates, harms, aggravates, or provokes. By not dealing with the essential issue: “Responding to the problems of the end of the month, not the end of the world,” as cleverly stated by some “moderate” yellow vests.

And this aspect may be the most important element to appear in the background of this mobilization: A poor understanding of the process created by the destruction of intermediary bodies of which the election of Emmanuel Macron and the parliamentary raid of En Marche were thought to be the culmination. In fact, it was only the beginning of a deeper and even more uprooting movement, since it took away the last bastion of local representation: mayors, who decided to leave their positions in large numbers at, or sometimes before, the next reelection cycle, even when they did not anticipate losing the election.

These processes do not leave much between the streets and chaos: No state can resort to defending itself with just its CRS and *gardes mobiles*, even if their skills and effectiveness have prevented large numbers of victims (and much less in any case than those caused by road rage in recent weeks, which has been shockingly overlooked by the media).

Violence is always constructed in a coherent process of violence of the institution, in the institution, and against the institution. This process often causes a reaction and a demand for Order, Authority, Justice, and Equality. And when this demand is ignored or scorned, it boils over. For at least thirty years, the political sphere has avoided facing difficult questions. And the question of insecurity, of insecurities, builds a democratic frustration that taxation ignites.

Hungary, Slovakia, Poland, the Czech Republic, Italy, Australia, the United States, and Quebec showed that electoral disdain could cause a reaction by the working classes (much more than a populist reaction). What happens next is being written today.

Thinking of its tragic aspects, people say that history never repeats itself. But it does sometimes stutter.

It is not clear whether this adage will last much longer.