

Loughborough University Institutional Repository

“Un contradicteur permanent”: the ideological and political itinerary of Daniel Guérin

This item was submitted to Loughborough University's Institutional Repository by the/an author.

Citation: BERRY, D., 2004. “Un contradicteur permanent”: the ideological and political itinerary of Daniel Guérin. IN: Bourg, J. (ed.). *After the Deluge. New Perspectives on the Intellectual and Cultural History of Postwar France*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, pp. 120-154.

Additional Information:

- This material is still protected by copyright. All rights reserved. Please contact the publisher for permission to copy, distribute or reprint.

Metadata Record: <https://dspace.lboro.ac.uk/2134/6638>

Version: Accepted for publication

Publisher: © Lexington Books

Please cite the published version.

This item was submitted to Loughborough's Institutional Repository (<https://dspace.lboro.ac.uk/>) by the author and is made available under the following Creative Commons Licence conditions.



CC creative commons
COMMONS DEED

Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 2.5

You are free:

- to copy, distribute, display, and perform the work

Under the following conditions:

BY: **Attribution.** You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author or licensor.

Noncommercial. You may not use this work for commercial purposes.

No Derivative Works. You may not alter, transform, or build upon this work.

- For any reuse or distribution, you must make clear to others the license terms of this work.
- Any of these conditions can be waived if you get permission from the copyright holder.

Your fair use and other rights are in no way affected by the above.

This is a human-readable summary of the [Legal Code \(the full license\)](#).

[Disclaimer](#) 

For the full text of this licence, please go to:
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/2.5/>

**“Un ContradictEUR permanent”:
The Ideological and Political Itinerary of Daniel Guérin**

David Berry

As he once wrote of the fate suffered by anarchism, Daniel Guérin (1904-88) has himself been the victim of unwarranted neglect and, in some circles at least, of undeserved discredit.¹ Guérin’s extensive archives (held at the Bibliothèque de Documentation Internationale Contemporaine in Nanterre) have been mined by many researchers over the years, but most of these have been interested in only one particular aspect of Guérin’s work or activism. For although many people know of Guérin, relatively few seem aware of the breadth of his contribution. His writings cover a vast range of subjects, from fascism and the French Revolution to the history of the European and American labor movements; from Marxist and anarchist theory to homosexual liberation; from French colonialism to the Black Panthers; from Paul Gauguin to French nuclear tests in the Pacific—not to mention several autobiographical volumes.² Similarly, Guérin was involved in various movements and campaigns: anticolonialism, antiracism, antimilitarism, and homosexual liberation. This is a man who counted François Mauriac, Simone Weil, C.L.R. James, and Richard Wright—to name but a few of the famous names which litter his autobiographies—among his personal friends. His youthful literary efforts provoked a letter of congratulation from Colette; he met and corresponded with Leon Trotsky; and he had dinner “en tête à tête” with Ho Chi Minh. Jean-Paul Sartre judged his reinterpretation of the French Revolution to be “one of the only contributions by contemporary Marxists to have *enriched* historical studies.”³ The gay liberation activist Pierre Hahn believed his own generation of homosexuals owed more to Guérin than to any other person, and the Martinican poet Aimé Césaire paid tribute to his work on decolonization.⁴ Noam Chomsky

considers Guérin's writings on anarchism to be of great importance to the development of contemporary socialist thought.⁵

Yet despite such assessments, and although there is widespread and enduring interest in Guérin among activists, he has been badly neglected by academic researchers in France and elsewhere. This is doubtless due to a combination of factors: Guérin never held an academic post nor any leadership position (except briefly as director of the *Commission du Livre* at the Liberation); he was consistently anti-Stalinist during a period when the influence of the French Communist Party, both among intellectuals and within the labor movement, was overwhelming; he never fit easily into ideological or political pigeonholes and was often misunderstood and/or misrepresented; and in France in the 1960s and 1970s, his bisexuality was shocking even for many on the Left. Guérin was, in a word, a “trouble-maker” [*trouble-fête*].⁶

The aim of this paper—part of a longer-term project which is a biography of Guérin—is to help rectify this neglect by outlining Guérin's ideological and political evolution after the Second World War. It focuses on his transition from not uncritical Trotskyist in the 1940s to figurehead of resurgent anarchism in the 1960s, and his attempt in the 1970s and 1980s to theorize and promote a synthesis of anarchism and Marxism. I would argue that despite the apparently protean nature of his commitments, Guérin in fact demonstrated a certain ideological and political consistency. He remained a historical materialist all his life, and although it was many years before he found an organization that lived up to his expectations, he was always at heart a libertarian communist, developing an increasingly strong belief in the importance of a “total revolution” which would attach as much importance to issues of race, gender, and sexuality as to workplace-based conflict. Hence his attempts to incorporate these issues into an

overarching historical materialist analysis and revolutionary socialist strategy. In several respects, Guérin was ahead of his time.

Given the fact that Guérin's contribution to the rejuvenation of socialist thought and praxis in postwar France was founded initially on his analysis of the state of the Left and the labor movement in the 1930s and 1940s, it will be useful to start with a brief look at his formative years as an activist.

The 1930s: The Bankruptcy of Stalinism and Social Democracy

Heir to the Hachette publishing and book-selling empire, Guérin nevertheless “inherited” antiracist and antimilitaristic attitudes from his liberal, Dreyfusard family. On a theoretical level, at least, and in the context of the increasingly polarized debates of the period between the far-right and far-left (“Maurras versus Marx”), he identified with the “Marxist extreme left” from an early age.⁷ His “discovery” of the Parisian working class and of the concrete realities of their everyday existence (to a large extent through his homosexual relationships with young workers) reinforced a profound “workerism” which would stay with him for the rest of his life.⁸ This workerism would lead him in 1930-31 to join the syndicalists grouped around the veteran revolutionary Pierre Monatte. It was also responsible for a strong attraction towards the proletarian constituency of the *Parti communiste français* [PCF], despite his “visceral anti-Stalinism” and what he saw as the Party's “crass ideological excesses, its inability to win over the majority of workers, and its mechanical submission to the Kremlin's orders.”⁹ Yet Guérin was no more impressed with the existing social-democratic alternative, the *Section Française de l'Internationale Ouvrière* [SFIO], which he found petty-bourgeois, narrow-minded, dogmatically anticommunist, and obsessed with electioneering:

The tragedy for many militants of our generation was our repugnance at having to opt for one or the other of the two main organizations which claimed, wrongly, to represent the working class. Stalinism and social democracy both repelled us, each in its own way. Yet those workers who were active politically were in one of these two parties. The smaller, intermediate groups and the extremist sects seemed to us to be doomed to impotence and marginalization. The SFIO, despite the social conformism of its leadership, at least had the advantage over the Communist Party of enjoying a certain degree of internal democracy, and to some extent allowed revolutionaries to express themselves; whereas the monolithic automatism of Stalinism forbade any critics from opening their mouths and made it very difficult for them even to stay in the party.¹⁰

Hence his decision to rejoin the SFIO in 1935, shortly before the creation by Marceau Pivert of the *Gauche révolutionnaire* [GR] tendency within the party, of which he would become a leading member. Guérin was attracted by Pivert's "Luxemburgist," libertarian and syndicalist tendencies, and was consistently on the revolutionary wing of the *Gauche révolutionnaire* and of its successor the *Parti socialiste ouvrier et paysan*, created when the GR was expelled from the SFIO in 1938. He drew a clear distinction between what he called the "Popular Front no. 1"—an electoral alliance between social democracy, Stalinism, and bourgeois liberalism—and the "Popular Front no. 2"—a powerful, extra-parliamentary, working-class movement, which came into conflict with the more moderate (and more bourgeois) Popular Front government.¹¹ He viewed the "entryism" of the French Trotskyists in these years as a welcome counterbalance to the reformism of the majority of the SFIO.

Indeed, in the 1930s, Guérin agreed with Trotsky's position on many issues: on the nature of fascism and how to stop it, on war and revolutionary proletarian internationalism, on opposition to the collusion between "social-patriotism" and "national-communism" as well as to any pact with the bourgeois Radicals, and on the need to fight actively for the liberation of Europe's colonies. As Guérin comments after recounting in glowing terms his sole meeting with

Trotsky in 1933: “On a theoretical level as well as on the level of political practice, Trotsky would remain, for many of us, both a stimulus to action and a teacher.”¹²

Ultimately, Guérin’s experience of the labor movement and the Left in the 1930s—as well as his research on the nature and origins of fascism and Nazism¹³—led him to reject both social democracy and Stalinism as effective strategies for defeating fascism and preventing war. Indeed, the Left—“divided, ossified, negative, and narrow-minded” in Guérin’s words—bore its share of responsibility and had made tragic errors.¹⁴ The SFIO was criticized by Guérin for its electoralism and for allowing its hands to be tied by the *Parti radical-socialiste*, “a bourgeois party whose corruption and bankruptcy were in large part responsible for the fascist explosion”; for its incomprehension of the nature of the capitalist state, which led to the impotence of Léon Blum’s government; for its failure to take fascism seriously (and to aid the Spanish Republicans), despite the warnings, until it was too late; and for its obsessive rivalry with the PCF. Guérin criticized the PCF for its blind obedience to the Comintern and the criminal stupidity of the latter’s “third period,” and for its counter-revolutionary strategy both in Spain and France.¹⁵

As for Trotsky, Guérin disagreed with him over the creation of the Fourth International in 1938, which, for the reasons we have seen above, seemed to him premature and divisive. More generally, Guérin was critical of what he saw as Trotsky’s tendency continually to transpose the experiences of the Russian Bolsheviks onto contemporary events in the West, and of his “authoritarian rigidity.” Trotskyism, Guérin argued, represented “the ideology of the infallible leader who, in an authoritarian fashion, directs the policy of a fraction or of a party.”¹⁶ What Guérin wanted to see was “the full development of the spontaneity of the working class.”¹⁷ Writing in 1963, he would conclude with regard to such disputes over revolutionary tactics:

The revolutionary organization which was lacking in June 1936 was not, in my opinion, an authoritarian leadership emanating from a small group or sect, but an organ for the coordination of the workers' councils, growing directly out of the occupied workplaces. The mistake of the *Gauche Révolutionnaire* was not so much that it was unable, because of its lack of preparation, to transform itself into a revolutionary party on the Leninist or Trotskyist model, but that it was unable ... to help the working class to find for itself its own form of power structure to confront the fraud that was the Popular Front no. 1.¹⁸

So as Guérin summarized the state of the Left in the 1930s: “Everything made the renewal of the concepts and methods of struggle employed by the French Left both indispensable and urgent.”¹⁹ These debates on the Left regarding tactics—working-class autonomy or “Popular Frontism”—and the role of the “avant-garde”—in syndicalist terms, the “activist minority” [*minorité agissante*]²⁰—would recur in the postwar years, and Guérin’s position would vary little.

The 1940s: Guérin and Trotskyism

Despite Guérin’s reservations about Trotskyism, his relations with the movement became closer in the 1940s, as he became involved in clandestine political activities with his old friend, Yvan Craipeau, a leading member of the Trotskyist *Parti ouvrier internationaliste* [POI].²⁰ The Trotskyists in the French Resistance, in Guérin’s eyes, demonstrated “tremendous courage and intelligence,” not least because they remained true to their internationalism and to their class politics.²¹ They rejected, for instance, the PCF’s demagogic nationalism. To Guérin, who was fluent in German, ordinary German conscripts were “the sons of workers and of peasants, who hated the war and Hitler’s dictatorship. ... It is to the honor of the French Trotskyists ... that they sought to fraternize with the German soldiers, while others simply attacked them from behind.”²² Guérin was thus closely involved with the Trotskyists’ attempts to organize extremely dangerous anti-militarist and anti-Nazi propaganda among German soldiers. He also contributed to the

activities of a group of Trotskyist workers producing newsletters carrying reports of workplace struggles against both French employers and the German authorities. Invited, on the other hand, to contribute to a clandestine Gaullist paper, Guérin declined: “I intended to remain true to revolutionary internationalism and, since the appeal of 18 June 1940, none of my reservations about the general had been diminished. I would never ally myself with the chauvinists of my country in order to resist Hitler. Their means were not ours.”²³ For Guérin, de Gaulle represented “the militarist, imperialist bourgeois Resistance.”²⁴ Indeed, in a letter of February 1945 to Dwight MacDonald, Guérin would write of the persistence of the Pétainism of the bourgeoisie, of their fear of the urban working classes, and of the concessions repeatedly made to the Right by de Gaulle’s provisional government: “So there has been no discontinuity in the political direction of the bourgeoisie. Two successive military governments have kept the working class in their place during this critical period. The poor naïve things in the Resistance thought de Gaulle was the opposite of Pétain. They are now beginning to understand that de Gaulle is Pétain’s heir.”²⁵ Guérin’s profound distrust of de Gaulle’s Bonapartist tendencies would persist undiminished into the 1950s and 1960s.

Guérin’s undoubted commitment to the Trotskyist movement continued to be tempered by his critique both of its tendency towards dogmatism and its mode of organization. His extended tour of the United States in 1946-49 seems to have been structured to some extent around visits to branches or prominent militants of the Socialist Workers’ Party and the breakaway Workers’ Party. Although not all of his experiences of the American Trotskyists were negative—his meetings with his friend C.L.R. James and with Joan London, daughter of Jack, were enjoyable—many were, and the trip represented a turning point in Guérin’s “Trotskyism.” In a 1948 letter to Marceau Pivert, he commented on his unhappiness with the Trotskyists’

tendency to “repeat mechanically old formulae without rethinking them, relying lazily and uncritically on the (undeniably admirable) writings of Trotsky.”²⁶ Looking back thirty years later, he would conclude: “It was thanks to the American Trotskyists, despite their undeniable commitment, that I ceased forever believing in the virtues of revolutionary parties built on authoritarian, Leninist lines.”²⁷

Cold War: Neither Washington nor Moscow

On his return to Paris from his visit to the United States, Guérin found his political position further complicated by the onset of the Cold War, and he became involved in a number of initiatives, some of which were directed at Stalin and some at the imperialist pretensions of American capital. In October 1949, during the final phase of the Stalinization of Eastern Europe and after Tito’s break from the Soviet bloc, he was one of the signatories of an appeal addressed to the Hungarian government regarding the trial of the ex-minister Laszlo Rajk, accused of conspiring with Tito to overthrow the Stalinist Hungarian regime.²⁸

In February 1950, on the other hand, he addressed a letter to the editor of *Le Monde*, accusing the French government of being tied to the apron strings of American bellicists.²⁹ In July 1950, he joined Claude Bourdet in helping to produce and collect signatures for an “Appel des Français indépendants,” published in *Le Monde*, which argued that the best way to promote peace in the Far East would be for China to be admitted to the UN.³⁰ Signed by about thirty individuals, including Sartre and André Gide, this manifesto caused an uproar, given the fact that the Korean War had recently begun, and it brought Guérin into conflict with his old friend and one-time mentor, the “Atlanticist” François Mauriac.³¹

It was also in 1950 that Guérin met and befriended the black American writer, Richard Wright, and attended the constitutive meeting of Wright's "Franco-American Fellowship," the aim of which was to encourage links between the progressive French intelligentsia and black Americans living in Paris. Through Guérin, Wright was invited to give a talk to the editorial group of *L'Observateur*, launched by Bourdet, with Guérin's support, earlier that year. Unfortunately, the fact that Wright had contributed to *The God that Failed* (published in French in 1949) did not go down well with the many "crypto-Stalinists" in the group.³² Wright was automatically labeled by them as an "anticommunist," similarly to the way in which Guérin tended to be seen as "anti-American."

Unfortunately for Guérin, the first volume of his critical study of the United States appeared shortly after the outbreak of the Korean War.³³ In the hysterical, Cold War atmosphere of the time, Guérin was widely attacked as anti-American and an enemy of democracy, even—most upsettingly for him—by "some ex-comrades whose support would have meant the most to me."³⁴ In fact Guérin was one of the small number of left-wing intellectuals (mostly associated with *Esprit*, *Le Monde*, and *L'Observateur*) consistently opposed to both Washington and Moscow:

I felt it necessary, in my book [*Où va le peuple américain?*], to claim the right to attack big business, while remaining, as ever, a declared enemy of Stalin's regime and of Russian foreign policy. ... I demanded the right to criticize the Marshall Plan without being accused of collusion with the Kremlin and its agents or of hostility towards the American people.³⁵

But this declaration of intent, unequivocal though it was, would prove to be a waste of effort, and in July 1950 Guérin was refused a visa to visit his wife and daughter in the United States, officially informed by the embassy that he was believed to be a Trotskyist and an anarchist.

Despite a letter-writing campaign and support from Eleanor Roosevelt, and notwithstanding an appeal organized by Clara Malraux and signed by, among others, Sartre, de Beauvoir, Camus, and Wright, he would remain excluded from the United States until 1957.³⁶

The Contemporary Relevance of the French Revolution

Unlike many on the Left associated with postwar ideological renewal, most of whom would focus on a revision or reinterpretation of Marxism, often at a philosophical level (for example, Sartre, Althusser, or Henri Lefebvre), Guérin the historian began with a return to what he saw as the source of revolutionary theory and praxis: in 1946, he published his study of class struggle in the First French Republic (1793-97).³⁷ His aim, he later recalled, was to “draw lessons from the greatest, longest, and deepest revolutionary experience France has ever known, lessons which would help regenerate the revolutionary, libertarian socialism of today,” and to “extract some ideas which would be applicable to our time and of direct use to the contemporary reader who has yet to fully digest the lessons of another revolution: the Russian Revolution.”³⁸ Applying the concepts of permanent revolution and combined and uneven development, inspired by Trotsky’s *History of the Russian Revolution* (1930), Guérin argued that the beginnings of a conflict of class interest could already be detected within the revolutionary camp between an “embryonic” proletariat—the manual workers [*bras nus*], represented by the *Enragés*—and the bourgeoisie—represented by Robespierre and Jacobinism. For Guérin, the French Revolution thus represented not only the birth of bourgeois parliamentary democracy, but also the emergence of “a new type of democracy,” a form of working-class direct democracy as seen, however imperfectly, in the “local popular assemblies” [*sections*], precursors of the Commune of

1871 and the Soviets of 1905 and 1917. In a later edition of the work he would add “the Commune of May 1968” to that genealogy.

Similarly, this interpretation tended to emphasize the political ambivalence of the bourgeois Jacobin leadership which “hesitated continually between the solidarity uniting it with the popular classes against the aristocracy and that uniting all the wealthy, property-owning classes against those who owned little or nothing.”³⁹ For Guérin, the essential lesson to be drawn from the French Revolution was thus the conflict of class interest between the bourgeoisie and the working classes. Bourgeois, social democratic, and Stalinist interpretations of the Revolution, which tended—like those of Jean Jaurès, Albert Mathiez, and so many others—to maintain the “cult of Robespierre,” to reinforce the labor movement’s dependence on bourgeois democracy, were thus to be rejected.⁴⁰

La Lutte de classes sous la Pemière République, 1793-1797 not only shocked many academic historians of the Revolution—especially those with more or less close links to the PCF: Georges Lefebvre, and especially Albert Soboul, and Georges Rudé—but also those “politicians who have been responsible for perverting and undermining true proletarian socialism.”⁴¹ The fallout was intense and the debate which ensued lasted for many years; indeed, Guérin is still today regarded with distrust by many historians influenced by the Republican and mainstream Marxist interpretations of the Revolution as a bourgeois revolution. Guérin brought that whole historiographical tradition into question. The political significance was that the Revolutionary Terror had been used as a parallel to justify Bolshevik repression of democratic freedoms and repression of more leftist movements. Stalin had been compared to Robespierre. The Jacobin tradition of patriotism and national unity in defense of the bourgeois democratic Republic has been one of the characteristics of the dominant tendencies within the French Left, and therefore

central to the political mythologies of the Popular Front and the Resistance. Guérin, as Ian Birchall has put it, “was polemicizing against the notion of a Resistance uniting all classes against the foreign invader.”⁴²

Since 1945, the PCF had been campaigning for unity at the top with the SFIO and in the 1956 elections called for the re-establishment of a Popular Front government. Guérin, as we have seen, argued that alliance with the supposedly “progressive” bourgeoisie in the struggle against fascism was a contradiction at the heart of the Popular Front strategy. His conception of the way forward for the Left was very different. At a time when fascism in the form of Poujadism looked as if it might once more be a real threat, Guérin argued that the “New Left” [*Nouvelle Gauche*] (of which he was a member) should try to create a “genuine” Popular Front, that is, a grassroots social movement rather than a governmental alliance, a truly popular movement centered on the working classes that would bring together the labor movement and all socialists who rejected both the pro-American SFIO and the pro-Soviet PCF:

And if we succeed in building this new Popular Front, let us not repeat the mistakes of the 1936 Popular Front, which because of its timidity and impotence ended up driving the middle classes towards fascism, rather than turning them away from it as had been its aim. Only a combative Popular Front, which dares to attack big business, will be able to halt our middle classes on the slope which leads to fascism and to their destruction.⁴³

The Developing Critique of Leninism

Guérin’s friend and translator, C.L.R. James, wrote in 1958 of the political significance of Guérin’s revisiting the history of the French Revolution:

Such a book had never yet been produced and could not have been produced in any epoch other than our own. It is impregnated with the experience and study of the greatest event of our time: the development and then degeneration of the Russian Revolution, and is animated implicitly by one central concern: how can

the revolutionary masses avoid the dreadful pitfalls of bureaucratization and the resurgence of a new oppressive state power, and instead establish a system of direct democracy?⁴⁴

It was in very similar terms that Guérin expressed the central question facing the Left in a 1959 essay, “La Révolution déjacobinisée.”⁴⁵ This is an important text in Guérin’s ideological itinerary, continuing the political analysis he began in *La Lutte de classes sous la Première République* and developed in *La Révolution française et nous* (written in 1944 but not published until 1969) and “Quand le fascisme nous devançait” (1955).⁴⁶

In “La Révolution déjacobinisée,” Guérin argued on the basis of extensive readings of Marx and Engels in the original German that the “Jacobin” traits in Marxism and particularly in Leninism were the result of an incomplete understanding on Marx and Engels’ part of the class nature of Jacobinism and the Jacobin dictatorship, to be distinguished according to Guérin from the democratically controlled “revolutionary coercion” [*contrainte révolutionnaire*] exercised by the popular *sections*. Thus by applying a historical materialist analysis to the experiences of the French revolutionary movement, Guérin came to argue, essentially, that “authentic” socialism (*contra* Louis-Auguste Blanqui or Lenin) arose spontaneously out of working-class struggle and that it was fundamentally libertarian. Authoritarian conceptions of party organization and revolutionary strategy had their origins in bourgeois or even aristocratic modes of thought.

Guérin believed that when Marx and Engels referred—rather vaguely—to a “dictatorship of the proletariat” they envisaged it as a dictatorship exercised by the working class as a whole, rather than by an avant-garde detached from the class. But, he continued, Marx and Engels did not adequately differentiate their interpretation from that of the Blanquists, advocates of a revolutionary vanguard. This made possible Lenin’s later authoritarian conceptions: “Lenin, who saw himself as both a ‘Jacobin’ and a ‘Marxist,’ invented the idea of the dictatorship of a party

substituting itself for the working class and acting by proxy in its name.”⁴⁷ This, for Guérin, was where it all started to go badly wrong:

The double experience of the French and Russian Revolutions has taught us that this is where we touch upon the central mechanism whereby direct democracy, the self-government of the people, is transformed, gradually, by the introduction of the revolutionary “dictatorship,” into the reconstitution of an apparatus for the oppression of the people.⁴⁸

Guérin’s leftist, class-based critique of Jacobinism thus had three related implications for contemporary debates about political tactics and strategy. First, it implied a rejection of class collaboration and therefore of any type of alliance with the bourgeois Left (Popular Frontism). Second, it implied that the revolutionary movement should be more uncompromising, that it should push for more radical social change and not stop halfway (which, as Saint-Just famously remarked, was to dig one’s own grave), rejecting the Stalinist emphasis on the unavoidability of separate historical “stages” in the long-term revolutionary process. Third, it implied a rejection both of the Leninist model of a centralized, hierarchical party dominating the labour movement and of the “substitutism” (substitution of the party for the proletariat) which had come to characterize the Bolshevik dictatorship.

This critique clearly had its sources both in Guérin’s reinterpretation of the French Revolution and in the social and political conditions of the time. *La Révolution française et nous* was informed by Guérin’s critique of social-democratic and Stalinist strategies before, during, and after the war. “La révolution déjacobinisée” was written after the artificial national unity of the immediate postwar years had given way to profound social and political conflict, as Guy Mollet’s SFIO became increasingly identified with the defense of the bourgeois status quo and the Western camp in the Cold War, as the immensely powerful postwar PCF reeled under the

effects of Hungary and the Khrushchev revelations, and as the unpopular and politically unstable Fourth Republic collapsed in the face of a threatened military coup. It was this situation which made renewal of the Left so necessary. In 1959, Guérin also picked up on the results of a survey of the attitudes of French youth towards politics, which indicated to him two facts: first, that what alienated the younger generation from “socialism” was “bureaucrats and purges,” and second, that, as one respondent put it, “French youth are becoming more and more anarchist.”⁴⁹ Ever the optimist, Guérin declared:

Far from allowing ourselves to sink into doubt, inaction, and despair, the time has come for the French Left to begin again from zero, to rethink its problems from their very foundations. ... The necessary synthesis of the ideas of equality and liberty ... cannot and must not be attempted, in my opinion, in the framework and to the profit of a bankrupt bourgeois democracy. It can and must only be done in the framework of socialist thought, which remains, despite everything, the only reliable value of our times. The failure of both reformism and Stalinism imposes on us the urgent duty to find a way of reconciling (proletarian) democracy with socialism, freedom with Revolution.⁵⁰

Anticolonialism

Periodically in French history, moments of social and political crisis have arisen which have challenged the existing political forces, dividing one-time allies, throwing together former enemies and producing new ideological currents. The Algerian war of independence was one such crisis and on the far-left anticolonialism was the catalyst for change. Guérin had already been a committed anticolonial campaigner since his twenties. In 1927, he had embarked on a life-changing journey when he was sent by his family to run the Syrian branch of Hachette. Meetings with Emir Khaled, grandson of Abd el-Kader (the Algerian independence pioneer), and Ibrahim bey Hanano (the Syrian politician and patriot) converted him to Arab nationalism. Subsequent visits to Djibouti (1928) and then French Indochina (1929-30), where he met with

the nationalist leader Huynh-Thuc-Khang, provided Guérin with further first-hand experience of the hypocrisy of the West's "civilizing mission" and the double standards of so-called socialists and members of the *Ligue des droits de l'homme* [Human Rights League] when living in the colonies. By the time he returned to Marseille in 1930, he had made the decision to devote his life to "the struggle for the abolition of this social and colonial scandal"—the social and the colonial always being inextricably linked in Guérin's Marxist perspective.⁵¹ Resolving to abandon all the "superfluous" pastimes of his privileged youth, he burned his unpublished writings and consigned to silence his published poems and novels, ashamed of their very existence.

On his return to France, he contributed articles on the colonies to Henri Barbusse's weekly paper, *Monde*, was an active member of Francis Jourdain's *Comité d'Amnistie aux Indochinois*, and would argue for the Popular Front government to grant Algeria independence. In 1952, he undertook a three-month fact-finding trip around North Africa and established connections with nationalists and trade unionists. In 1953, he joined the *Comité France-Maghreb*, chaired by François Mauriac, but left it in 1955, exasperated by the committee's passivity. In 1954, Guérin published *Au service des colonisés*, the first of several books on colonialism which would appear through the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s.⁵² He was involved in a series of activities in support of the Algerian nationalists and had particularly close links with Messali Hadj, the Marxist and anticolonialist founder of the *Mouvement national algérien* [MNA]. He also met and became friends with the leading Algerian nationalist and historian, Mohamed Harbi.⁵³

In France, it was the Trotskyist PCI and the *Fédération communiste libertaire* [FCL] who were the first to support—in theory and practice—the uprising initiated by the Algerian *Front de*

libération nationale [FLN] in 1954. The far-left—anarchists, Trotskyists, and other revolutionary groups—had been both weak and divided until this point. But through the campaign of opposition to the war against Algerian independence, for the first time in some years and over an extended period, a space was created to the left of the PCF in which the far-left was able to reassert itself as a significant political force. Their campaigns included not only support for the Algerian nationalists, but also support for French military deserters and those refusing to answer conscription, antifascist actions directed at the *Organisation Armée Secrète*, mass demonstrations, and petitions involving prominent intellectuals. These campaigns and the new profile of the far-left would be important preludes for developments in 1968.

This was a period during which Guérin—building on the work he had done on the French Revolutionary period—had been studying the history of the political conflicts within the First International and, more generally, the relations between anarchism and Marxism. The FCL’s ideological stance (libertarian Marxism) and its position on the Algerian war (“critical support” for the nationalist movement in the context of the struggle against French bourgeois imperialism: “Every victory of the proletariat of the colonies is a victory of the French proletariat against its exploiters”⁵⁴) thus proved doubly attractive to Guérin. He also appreciated their refusal to duplicate the sectarian conflict between the MNA and the FLN. In part for these reasons, 1954 represented the beginning of a relationship, notably with Georges Fontenis (leading light of the FCL), which would ultimately take Guérin into the ranks of the “libertarian communist” movement (of which more later). Guérin publicly supported the FCL when its paper, *Le Libertaire*, was seized in November 1954 on the orders of the Minister of the Interior, François Mitterrand. When Mitterrand also prohibited a planned public meeting (organized jointly by the FCL and the PCI) to protest repression in Algeria, Guérin, who was to have chaired the meeting,

led a delegation to protest to the Minister in person. To Mitterrand's quip that, "Algeria is France" [*L'Algérie, c'est la France*], Guérin replied at a meeting organized by the *Comité d'action des intellectuels contre la poursuite de la guerre en Afrique du Nord* that "Algeria has never been France" [*L'Algérie n'a jamais été la France*].⁵⁵

Guérin was also was one of the first to sign the so-called "Manifesto of the 121" in 1960. More than an appeal calling for the right to refuse military service in Algeria, this petition marked a watershed in the campaign against the war. The text's conclusion declared:

We respect and regard as justified the refusal to take up arms against the Algerian people. We respect and regard as justified the actions of those French citizens who feel it their duty to offer help and protection to Algerians oppressed in the name of the French people. The cause of the Algerian people, who are making a decisive contribution to the destruction of the colonial system, is the cause of all free men.⁵⁶

Guérin himself hid young Frenchmen escaping conscription as well as Algerian militants sought by the police.

After Algerian independence was declared in 1962, Guérin sought actively to persuade the new government formed by the FLN leader Ahmed Ben Bella to ensure the transformation of the struggle for national independence into the struggle for socialism. Towards the end of 1963, he traveled around Algeria studying socialized factories and farms. Guérin argued strongly that these must be systematized and centrally coordinated, and he personally handed a report of his findings to President Ben Bella. He attended the first Congress on Worker Self-Management in Algeria in 1964 and published his *L'Algérie qui se cherche* the same year. After Houari Boumedienne's military coup of 1965, Guérin took part in the defense committee established to support Ben Bella and other victims of the subsequent repression.

1965 would also see the abduction of the leading Moroccan militant, El Mehdi Ben Barka. Having persuaded François Mauriac to resurrect the old *Comité France-Maghreb*, Guérin played a prominent part in the campaign to establish the truth around Ben Barka's disappearance. The conclusion of his research would be that the abduction was the result of collusion between the CIA, the Moroccan monarchy, and the French authorities.⁵⁷

From New Left to Anarchism

In the mid-to-late 1950s, like other ex- or “critical” Trotskyists as well as ex-militants of the FCL (banned in 1956), Guérin belonged—though “without much conviction”—to a series of left-socialist organizations: the *Nouvelle Gauche*, the *Union de la Gauche Socialiste*, and, briefly, the *Parti Socialiste Unifié*.⁵⁸ But it was also around 1956 that Guérin discovered anarchism. Looking back on his 1929 boat trip to Vietnam and the small library he had taken with him, Guérin commented that of all the authors he had studied—Marx, Proudhon, Georges Sorel, Hubert Lagardelle, Fernand Pelloutier, Lenin, Trotsky, Gandhi, and others—“Marx had, without a doubt, been preponderant.”⁵⁹ But having become increasingly critical of Leninism during the 1950s, Guérin discovered the collected works of Mikhail Bakunin, a revelation which rendered him forever “allergic to all versions of authoritarian socialism, whether Jacobin, Marxist, Leninist, or Trotskyist.”⁶⁰ Guérin would describe the following ten years or so—which saw the publication notably of the popular anthology *Ni Dieu ni Maître* and of *L'Anarchisme*, which sold like hot cakes at the Sorbonne in May 1968 and which still today is seen by many as the best short book on anarchism—as his “classical anarchist phase.”⁶¹ He became especially interested in Proudhon, whom he admired as the first theorist of *autogestion*, or worker self-management; Bakunin, representative of revolutionary, working-class anarchism, close to

Marxism yet remarkably prescient about the dangers of statist communism; and Max Stirner, appreciated as a precursor of 1968 because of his determination to attack bourgeois prejudice and puritanism.

The discovery of Bakunin coincided with the appearance of the Hungarian workers' committees and the Soviet suppression of the Hungarian uprising in 1956. These events provoked him into studying the councilist tradition, which, since 1918-20 and its theorization by Gramsci and others, had come to be seen by many as representing revolutionary socialist direct democracy in contrast to the Bolshevik-controlled *soviets*.

1968 and Libertarian Communism

Early on during the student revolt of 1968, at a time when PCF students were complaining about the disruption to their exams, Guérin, Sartre, de Beauvoir, Michel Leiris, and Colette Audry issued a statement calling on “all workers and intellectuals to give moral and material support to the movement of struggle begun by the students and lecturers.”⁶² This was one of the first public recognitions of the importance of the student movement.

Ten years before, early in 1958, Guérin had declared during a radio debate on youth that “socialism is still alive in the consciousness of the young, but, in order for it to be attractive to them, it would have to be dissociated from the monstrosities of Stalinism, it would have to appear more libertarian.”⁶³ In 1968, Guérin believed that events now bore out this earlier assessment, and that “this unexpected explosion was in large measure anarchistic.”⁶⁴ 1968 had its origins, for Guérin, in the critique not only of bourgeois society but also of the influence of “post-Stalinist communism” in the universities. The whole experience represented “a whirlwind apprenticeship in direct democracy.”⁶⁵ Guérin was keen to pick out the renewed popularity of

anarchism, and the unusual (if still relative) degree of “fraternization” between anarchists and Marxists and among different Marxist groups. He was impressed by Daniel and Gabriel Cohn-Bendit’s book on *gauchisme*. Since he shared their concern to formulate a new “leftism” transcending both anarchism and Marxism, he no doubt appreciated their unwillingness to dwell on the old conflict between Bakunin and Marx.⁶⁶

Guérin was critical of the way in which virtually all commentators emphasized the originality of May ‘68. For Guérin, despite the originality of the role of the student movement in the early phase of the events, the second, more radical phase involving strikes and occupations by the working class was far more significant. It was entirely comparable with other general strikes and revolutionary movements in France’s history: 1793, 1840, 1848, 1871, 1919, and 1936. The reason so many people were taken aback by 1968, and why so many overestimated—in Guérin’s view—the movement’s originality, was that the events occurred in “a phase of history in which the idea of Revolution, in France, has been emptied of all meaning, in which it has been betrayed, distorted, wiped off the map by two powerful political steamrollers, two machines for crushing all critical thought: Stalinism and Gaullism.” This was why 1968 had seemed so audacious, why it had seemed to question everything: “because Stalinism for the last forty years, and Gaullism for the last ten have made the French people lose the habit of radical dissent and the taste for libertarian protest—a habit, a taste, a tradition which had been theirs for nearly one-hundred-and-fifty years.”⁶⁷ Even the resurgence of anarchism was nothing radically new: it was simply the traditional “anarcho-syndicalism” of the French working class, the “old syndicalist ferment in the consciousness of the workers,” bubbling irrepressibly to the surface again, despite the anger of the “bureaucratic liquidators” such as Georges Séguy, communist General Secretary of the CGT at the time.⁶⁸

For a Synthesis of Marxism and Anarchism

Having called himself a “libertarian socialist” in the late 1950s before going through an “anarchist” phase in the 1960s, by 1968 Guérin was advocating “libertarian Marxism,” a term he would later change to “libertarian communism” in order not to alienate some of his anarchist friends. In May 1969, with Georges Fontenis and others Guérin launched the *Mouvement communiste libertaire* [MCL], which attempted to bring together various groups such as ex-supporters of Denis Berger’s *Voie communiste*, former members of the FCL, and individuals such as Gabriel Cohn-Bendit associated with *Socialisme ou Barbarie*.⁶⁹ Guérin was responsible for the group’s paper, *Guerre de classes*. In 1971, the MCL merged with another group to become the *Organisation communiste libertaire* [OCL]. In 1980, after complex debates notably over the question of trade union activity, Guérin—who rejected ultra-left forms of “*spontanéisme*” which condemned trade unionism as counter-revolutionary—would ultimately join the *Union des travailleurs communistes libertaires* [UTCL], created in 1978. He would remain a member of this group until his death in 1988.⁷⁰

The attempt to formulate a libertarian communism, both theoretically and practically, was the conclusion of a process of rethinking the Left which Guérin had begun during the Second World War. In a letter of 1947 to Marceau Pivert, Guérin had described his reinterpretation of the French Revolution as “an introduction to a synthesis of anarchism and Marxism-Leninism I would like to write one day.”⁷¹ It is important to note that Guérin talked of a “synthesis.” As Georges Fontenis would write: “For us [the FCL], as for Guérin, ‘libertarian Marxism’ was never to be seen as a fusion or a marriage, but as a living synthesis very different from the sum of its parts.”⁷²

Guérin was always keen to emphasize the commonalities in Marxism and anarchism, and underscored the fact that, in his view at least, they shared the same roots and the same objectives. Having said that, his study of Marx led him to suggest that those such as Maximilien Rubel, who saw Marx as a libertarian, were exaggerating and/or being too selective.⁷³ Reviewing the ambivalent but predominantly hostile relations between Marx and Engels, on the one hand, and Stirner, Proudhon, and Bakunin, on the other, Guérin concluded that the disagreements between them were based largely on misunderstanding and exaggeration on both sides. The date of 1872, when the Bakuninists were expelled from the International Working Men's Association Congress at La Haye, was for Guérin "a disastrous event for the working class, because each of the two movements needs the theoretical and practical contribution of the other."⁷⁴

Libertarian communism was an attempt to "revivify everything that was constructive in anarchism's contribution in the past." The very successful 1965 book on anarchism focused on "social, constructive, collectivist, or communist anarchism."⁷⁵ Guérin was more critical of "traditional" anarchism, with its knee-jerk rejection of organization, and particularly its Manichean and simplistic approach to the question of the "state" in modern, industrial, and increasingly internationalized societies. He became interested particularly in militants such as the Spanish anarchist Diego Abad de Santillán, whose ideas on "integrated" economic self-management contrasted with, in Guérin's view, the naïve and backward-looking policy of the Spanish National Labour Confederation [*Confederación nacional del trabajo*] advocated at its 1936 Saragossa conference by Isaac Puente and inspired by Peter Kropotkin.⁷⁶ Such a policy seemed to Guérin to take no account of the nature of modern consumer societies and the need for economic planning and co-ordination at national and transnational level. In this connection,

Guérin also became interested in the ideas of the Belgian collectivist socialist César de Paepe on the national and transnational organization of public services within a libertarian framework.⁷⁷

On the other hand, libertarian communism did not reject those aspects of Marxism which still seemed to Guérin valid and useful: (1) the notion of alienation, which Guérin saw as being in accordance with the anarchist emphasis on individual freedom; (2) the insistence that the workers shall be emancipated by the workers themselves; (3) the analysis of capitalist society; and (4) the historical materialist dialectic, which for Guérin remained,

one of the guiding threads enabling us to understand the past and the present, on condition that the method not be applied rigidly, mechanically, or as an excuse not to fight on the false pretext that the material conditions for a revolution are absent, as the Stalinists claimed was the case in France in 1936, 1945, and 1968. Historical materialism must never be reduced to a determinism; the door must always be open to individual will and to the revolutionary spontaneity of the masses.⁷⁸

In the 1970s Guérin developed a particular interest in Rosa Luxemburg and played a role in the wider resurgence of interest in her ideas. She was for Guérin the only German social democrat who stayed true to what he called “original” Marxism, and in 1971 he published an anthology of her writings on the pre-1914 SFIO, as well as a study of the notion of spontaneity in her work.⁷⁹ The following year he took part in a debate with Gilbert Badia, Michael Löwy, Madeleine Rebérioux, Denis Vidal-Naquet, and others on the contemporary relevance of Luxemburg’s ideas.⁸⁰ Guérin saw no significant difference between her conception of revolutionary working-class spontaneity and the anarchist one, nor between her conception of the “mass strike” and the syndicalist idea of the “general strike.” Her criticisms of Lenin in 1904 and of the Bolshevik Party in the spring of 1918 (regarding the democratic freedoms of the working class) seemed to him very anarchistic, as did her conception of a socialism propelled from below

by workers' councils. She was, he argued, "one of the links between anarchism and authentic Marxism."⁸¹

Guérin was convinced that a libertarian communism which represented a synthesis of the best of Marxism and the best of anarchism would be much more attractive to progressive workers than "degenerate, authoritarian Marxism or old, outdated, and fossilized anarchism."⁸² But he was adamant that he was not a theorist, that libertarian communism was, as yet, only an "approximation," not a fixed dogma. "The only thing of which I am convinced is that the future social revolution will have nothing to do with either Muscovite despotism or social-democratic anemia; that it will not be authoritarian, but libertarian and based on self-management."⁸³

For a Dialectic of Social Revolution and Sexual Revolution

Other, better-known currents in the postwar New Left—existentialists, revisionists around Henri Lefebvre and the journal *Arguments*, and the *Socialisme ou Barbarie* group—were all concerned in different ways with questions of subjectivity, consciousness, authenticity, and alienation. The development of Guérin's concerns paralleled these attempts to develop or reinterpret Marxism, and his motivation in certain respects was very much rooted in direct personal experience. Guérin came out of the closet in 1965 with the publication of his first autobiography, *Un Jeune Homme excentrique*.⁸⁴ He had begun in the 1950s to write about sexuality and sexual liberation, playing an important role in popularizing the work of Alfred Kinsey in France.⁸⁵ In the late 1960s, he published on Charles Fourier and Wilhelm Reich and was attracted by the idea of a synthesis of Marxism and psychoanalysis.⁸⁶ By 1968—a turning point in terms of the visibility of homosexuality—Guérin was already seen as the "grandfather" of the gay liberation movement.⁸⁷ For a short while a member of the high-profile *Front*

homosexuel d'action révolutionnaire, he soon became disillusioned with the apolitical attitude of most gay activists, however. The homophobia of the Left and of the labor movement had been a source of great personal suffering for Guérin ever since the 1930s, and he became determined in his later years to try to find what he termed a “dialectic of revolution and homosexuality,” arguing that “only a true libertarian communism, antiauthoritarian and antistatist, would be capable of promoting the definitive and concomitant emancipation both of the homosexual and of the individual exploited or alienated by capitalism.”⁸⁸ One of the reasons he joined and stayed in the UTCL was its unusually progressive stance on sexuality. As a UTCL pamphlet entitled *Le droit à la caresse* insisted:

There can be no liberation of homosexuality other than on the basis of new social relations, in other words other than in a new society, which is why we are allies with the labor movement in its struggle, the labor movement being the only force capable of bringing about the necessary social change. So, if socialism is not to be a caricature of itself, we, as homosexuals, have a role to play in the class struggle.⁸⁹

For the first time in his life, Guérin had found an organization in which he felt entirely at home.

Conclusion

It is a strange irony that in Arthur Hirsch’s account of the French New Left, half of those individuals discussed as contributors to the rejuvenation of Marxism were ex-Stalinists, whereas Guérin is mentioned only as an example of someone who promoted mechanistic, economic reductionism—criticized by Sartre, someone who only came to revolutionary politics and Marxism relatively late in life.⁹⁰ One cannot help feeling that there is not only a gap in the historical account here, but also an injustice. As Guérin himself wrote regarding Sartre’s conversion to anti-Stalinist Marxism after Khrushchev’s 1956 speech:

There are some of us who have to bite their tongue in order not to give vent to their resentment. They could mention the tragedy of a generation of anti-Stalinist Marxists whose lives have been broken by the dreadful taboo of the tyrant now overthrown, who long found themselves practically alone, gagged, crushed between a bourgeoisie which rejected them and a “communist” orthodoxy which poured down insults on them, and who strove with immense difficulty to resolve that awesome contradiction: denouncing Stalinism without falling into the camp of the enemies of the October Revolution.⁹¹

There were of course overlaps and differences between Guérin and other Marxist “revisionists.” Guérin wrote for *Arguments*. He took part with Cornelius Castoriadis, Claude Lefort, and Edgar Morin in a 1965 forum on “Marxism Today” organized by *Socialisme ou Barbarie* (whose work was described by Morin as representing “an original synthesis of Marxism and anarchism”).⁹² Members of the *Socialisme ou Barbarie* group had taken part in the *Comité de lutte contre la répression colonialiste* established by Guérin in 1954. Ian Birchall has examined the frequent but often problematic relations between Guérin and Sartre, concluding that in the end—and increasingly so as Sartre’s politics evolved to resemble Guérin’s—“what united them was more important than their differences.”⁹³ The libertarian communist group *Noir et Rouge* felt that what distinguished Guérin—apart from the fact that he started from Marxist premises and arrived at conclusions very similar to those of many anarchist communists—was his courage and his honesty, “his concern to really rethink a certain number of problems which virtually all other critics do not dare confront or who do so only superficially; this concern, combined with his intellectual rigor, often led him to confront certain ‘taboos’ ... and gave him the courage to criticize even the masters of Marxism themselves.”⁹⁴ There seems little doubt that Guérin’s contribution was exceptional and that he was one of the most innovative and interesting figures on the Left in postwar France.

Notes

¹ On Guérin's view of the historiography of anarchism, see "Un procès en réhabilitation," in Guérin, *À la Recherche d'un communisme libertaire* (Paris: Spartacus, 1984), 22-23. This collection of articles has just been re-published by Spartacus (2003) with a new introduction by Georges Fontenis.

² For a bibliography, see my web page at: <http://www-staff.lboro.ac.uk/~eudgb/DG.htm>.

³ In *Question de méthode*, quoted in Ian Birchall, "Sartre's Encounter with Daniel Guérin," *Sartre Studies International* 2, 1 (1996): 48.

⁴ "Une lettre du regretté Pierre Hahn," in Guérin, *Homosexualité et révolution* (Paris: Le Vent du ch'min, 1983), 43. Aimé Césaire, "Introduction," in Guérin, *Les Antilles décolonisées* (Paris: Présence africaine, 1956), 9-17.

⁵ See Chomsky, "Introduction," in Guérin, *Anarchism: From Theory to Practice*, Preface by Noam Chomsky (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1970).

⁶ See Louis Janover, "Guérin, le trouble-fête," *Débattre* 10 (Spring 2000): 11-15.

⁷ Guérin, *Autobiographie de jeunesse, d'une dissidence sexuelle au socialisme* (Paris: Belfond, 1972), 126-27. Charles Maurras was the leader of the right-wing movement, *Action Française*.

⁸ For more detail, see my "«Prolétaires de tous les pays, caressez-vous!». Daniel Guérin, the labour movement and homosexuality", in Paul Pasteur, Sonja Niederacher & Maria Mesner, eds., *Sexualität, Unterschichtenmilieu und ArbeiterInnenbewegung* (Vienna: ITH & Akademische Verlagsanstalt, 2003), 189-203. See also Peter Sedgwick, "Out of Hiding: The Comradships of Daniel Guérin," *Salmagundi* 58, 9 (June 1982): 197-220.

⁹ Guérin, *À la Recherche*, 9. Guérin, *Front populaire, révolution manquée? Témoignage militant* (Arles: Actes Sud, 1997), 23.

¹⁰ Ibid., 147.

¹¹ Guérin's *Front populaire* is a classic "revolutionist" interpretation of the Popular Front experience.

¹² Guérin, *Front populaire*, 104.

¹³ Guérin, *La Peste brune a passé par là* (Paris: Librairie du Travail, 1933), trans. *The Brown Plague: Travels in Late Weimar and Early Nazi Germany* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1994); *Fascisme et grand capital* (Paris: Gallimard, 1936), trans. *Fascism and Big Business* (New York: Monad Press, 1973). *Fascism* has been criticized by some for tending towards reductionism. See Claude Lefort, "L'analyse Marxiste et le fascisme," *Les Temps modernes* 2 (November 1945): 357-62. Others regard Guérin's methodology as fundamentally correct. See Alain Bihl's introduction to the 1999 edition of *Fascisme et grand capital* (Paris: Syllepse, 1999), 7-14.

¹⁴ Guérin, "Quand le fascisme nous devançait," in *La Peste brune* (Paris: Spartacus, 1996), 21-22.

¹⁵ Ibid., 25.

¹⁶ Guérin, *Front populaire*, 150, 156-57, and 365.

¹⁷ Ibid., 157.

¹⁸ Ibid., 213.

¹⁹ Ibid., 23.

²⁰ See Craipeau's autobiography, *Mémoires d'un dinosaure trotskyste: Secrétaire de Trotsky en 1933* (Paris: L'Harmattan, 1999).

²¹ Interview with Pierre André Boutang in *Guérin*, television documentary by Jean-José Marchandl, FR3 (4 & 11 September 1989), film made in 1985. For more details, see my “‘Like a Wisp of Straw Amidst the Raging Elements’: Daniel Guérin in the Second World War,” in Simon Kitson and Hanna Diamond, eds., *Vichy, Resistance, Liberation: Festschrift in Honour of H. R. Kedward* (Berg, forthcoming).

²² Guérin, *Le Feu du sang, autobiographie politique et charnelle* (Paris: Grasset & Fasquelle, 1979), 100.

²³ Guérin, *Le Feu du sang*, 109.

²⁴ Guérin, *Front populaire*, 414.

²⁵ Guérin, *Le Feu du sang*, 270-72.

²⁶ Letter to Marceau Pivert (2 January 1948), Fonds Guérin, BDIC, F° Δ Rés 688/9/1.

²⁷ Guérin, *Le Feu du Sang*, 149. On Guérin’s tour of the U.S., see *ibid.*, 143-219. Guérin’s researches led to the publication of the two-volume *Où va le peuple américain?* (Paris: Julliard, 1950-51). Sections of this would be published separately as *Décolonisation du Noir américain* (Paris: Minuit, 1963), *Le Mouvement ouvrier aux Etats-Unis* (Paris: Maspero, 1968), and *De l’Oncle Tom aux Panthères: Le drame des Noirs américains* (Paris: UGE, 1973). Translations: *Negroes on the March: A Frenchman’s Report on the American Negro Struggle*, trans. Duncan Ferguson (New York: George L. Weissman, 1956), and *100 Years of Labor in the USA*, trans. Alan Adler (London: Ink Links, 1979).

²⁸ Guérin, *Le Feu du sang*, 221-22.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 223.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 224, 281-84. *Le Monde*, 5 August 1950.

³¹ On Guérin’s relationship with Mauriac, see the *Autobiographie de jeunesse, passim*.

³² The term is Guérin's, in *Le Feu du sang*, 225.

³³ Guérin, *Où va le peuple américain?*

³⁴ Guérin, *Le Feu du sang*, 227. Guérin mentions no names.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 226.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 228-31.

³⁷ Guérin, *La Lutte de classes sous la Première République, 1793-1797*, 2 vols. (Paris: Gallimard, 1946; 1968).

³⁸ Guérin, *La Révolution française et nous* (Paris: Maspero, 1976), 7-8. Note that the reference to "libertarian socialism" is in the preface to *La Révolution française et nous*, written thirty years after the main text and after Guérin had moved closer to anarchism.

³⁹ Guérin, *La Lutte de classes* (1968), I: 31.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 58.

⁴¹ Guérin, *La Révolution française et nous*, 7.

⁴² Birchall, "Sartre's Encounter," 46.

⁴³ Guérin, "Faisons le point," *Le Libérateur politique et social pour la nouvelle gauche* (12 February 1956).

⁴⁴ C.L.R. James, "L'actualité de la Révolution française," *Perspectives socialistes: Revue bimensuelle de l'Union de la Gauche Socialiste* 4 (15 February 1958), 20-21.

⁴⁵ Guérin, "La révolution déjacobinisée," in *Jeunesse du socialisme libertaire* (Paris: Rivière, 1959), 27-63.

⁴⁶ *La Révolution française et nous* was originally intended as the preface to *Lutte de classes*. "Quand le fascisme nous devançait" was originally commissioned for a special issue of *Les Temps modernes* on the state of the Left.

⁴⁷ Guérin, “La Révolution déjacobinisée,” 43.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 43-4.

⁴⁹ Guérin, “Preface,” to *Jeunesse du socialisme libertaire*, 7-8.

⁵⁰ Guérin, “La Révolution déjacobinisée,” 30-31.

⁵¹ Guérin, *Autobiographie de jeunesse*, 227.

⁵² Guérin, *Au Service des colonisés: 1930-1953* (Paris: Minuit, 1954); *Les Antilles décolonisées*; *L’Algérie qui se cherche* (Paris: Centre d’étude socialiste, 1964); *Les Assassins de Ben Barka, dix ans d’enquête* (Paris: Guy Authier, 1975); *Quand l’Algérie s’insurgeait, 1954-1962: un anticolonialiste témoigne* (Paris: La Pensée sauvage, 1979).

⁵³ See Mohammed Harbi, *Une vie debout: mémoires politiques, Tome 1: 1945-1962* (Paris: La Découverte, 2002), 109-12.

⁵⁴ *Le Libertaire* (organ of the FCL), 15 July 1954, quoted in Georges Fontenis, “L’insurrection algérienne et les communistes libertaires”, 84, in Sidi Mohammed Barkat, ed., *Des Français contre la terreur d’Etat (Algérie 1954-1962)* (Paris: Editions Reflex, 2002), 81-90.

⁵⁵ Guérin, *L’Algérie n’a jamais été la France* (Paris: Published by the author, 1956). Other speakers at this meeting were Aimé Césaire, Jean-Paul Sartre, and Michel Leiris.

⁵⁶ “Déclaration sur le droit à l’insoumission dans la guerre d’Algérie” (le manifeste des 121), (6 February 1960), in Olivier Wievorka and Christophe Prochasson, eds., *La France du XXe siècle: documents d’histoire* (Paris: Seuil, 1994), 497.

⁵⁷ Guérin, *Les Assassins de Ben Barka*, and *Ben Barka, ses assassins, seize ans d’enquête* (Paris: Plon, 1982).

⁵⁸ Guérin, *Le Feu du sang*, 233.

⁵⁹ Guérin, *À la Recherche*, 9.

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ Ibid., 10. *L'Anarchisme, de la doctrine à la pratique* (Paris: Gallimard, 1965); *Ni dieu ni maître, anthologie de l'anarchisme* (Lausanne: La Cité-Lausanne, 1965). Both have been republished several times since, and *L'Anarchisme* has been translated into more than twenty languages. They have been published in English as *Anarchism: From Theory to Practice*; and *No Gods No Masters: An Anthology of Anarchism* (Edinburgh: AK Press, 1998).

⁶² *Le Monde* (8 May 1968).

⁶³ Guérin, "Mai 1968," in *À la Recherche*, 116.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 117.

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ Daniel Cohn-Bendit and Gabriel Cohn-Bendit, *Le Gauchisme, remède à la maladie sénile du communisme* (Paris: Seuil, 1968).

⁶⁷ Guérin, "Mai, une continuité," in *À la Recherche*, 119-20.

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ See Fontenis, *Changer le monde: histoire du mouvement communiste libertaire, 1945-1997* (Paris: Le Coquelicot/Alternative libertaire, 2000), 161-62, 255-56.

⁷⁰ The UTCL's manifesto, adopted at its Fourth Congress in 1986, has recently been republished (with a dedication to Guérin) by the UTCL's successor organization, Alternative Libertaire: *Un Projet de société communiste libertaire* (Paris: Alternative libertaire, 2002).

⁷¹ Letter to Marceau Pivert (18 November 1947), quoted in *Daniel Guérin*, Special Issue of *Alternative libertaire* (2000), 16.

⁷² Fontenis, *Changer le monde*, 80, n. 1.

⁷³ Guérin, "Anarchisme et Marxisme," in *L'Anarchisme* (1981 edition), 250.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 248.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 237.

⁷⁶ On Abad de Santillan, see the section on “L’Espagne libertaire,” in *Les Anarchistes et l’autogestion*, Special Issue of *Autogestion et socialisme* 18-19 (1972), 81-117, including an introduction by Guérin.

⁷⁷ See Guérin, *Ni dieu ni maître*, I: 268-91.

⁷⁸ Guérin, “Anarchisme et Marxisme,” 252.

⁷⁹ Rosa Luxemburg, *Le Socialisme en France, 1898-1912* (Paris: Belfond, 1971), with an introduction by Guérin, 7-48; *Rosa Luxemburg et la spontanéité révolutionnaire* (Paris: Flammarion, 1971).

⁸⁰ Gilbert Badia et al., “Rosa Luxemburg et nous: Débat,” *Politique aujourd’hui: Recherches et pratiques socialistes dans le monde* (1972): 77-106.

⁸¹ Guérin, “Anarchisme et Marxisme,” 233.

⁸² Ibid., 252.

⁸³ Guérin, *À la Recherche*, 10-11.

⁸⁴ Guérin, *Un Jeune Homme excentrique: essai d’autobiographie* (Paris: Julliard, 1965).

⁸⁵ See Sylvie Chaperon, “Kinsey en France: les sexualités féminine et masculine en débat,” *Mouvement social* 198 (2002): 91-110, and “Le fonds Daniel Guérin et l’histoire de la sexualité,” *Journal de la BDIC* 5 (2002), 10.

⁸⁶ See *Kinsey et la sexualité* (Paris: Julliard, 1955; repub. EDI, 1967); “Le Nouveau monde amoureux de Fourier,” *Arcadie* 168 (1967), 554-560, and *Arcadie* 169 (1968) 16-23; “Hommage à Wilhelm Reich,” in Guérin, Boris Fraenkel, Michel Cattler, Constantin Sinelnikoff, Marc Kravetz and Jacques Delattre, eds., *Société et répression sexuelle: l’œuvre de Wilhelm Reich*

(Bruxelles: Editions Liaisons 20, 1968), 3-5; “Wilhelm Reich aujourd’hui” [Introduction à un débat organisé à Bruxelles le 29 novembre 1968 par ‘Liaison 20’] (1969); *Essai sur la révolution sexuelle après Reich et Kinsey* (Paris: Belfond, 1969). Guérin also produced the anthology, Charles Fourier, *Vers la liberté en amour* (Paris: Gallimard, 1975).

⁸⁷ Frédéric Martel, *Le Rose et le noir: les homosexuels en France depuis 1968* (Paris: Seuil, 2000), 46.

⁸⁸ Guérin, *Homosexualité et Révolution*, 25 and 9.

⁸⁹ Union des Travailleurs Communistes Libertaires, *Le Droit à la caresse: Les homosexualités et le combat homosexuel* (Paris: UTCL, n.d.).

⁹⁰ Arthur Hirsch, *The French New Left: An Intellectual History from Sartre to Gorz* (Boston: South End Press, 1981), 60-61.

⁹¹ Guérin, “Sartre et la chute de l’idole,” *Combat* (5 April 1956).

⁹² Edgar Morin, “L’Anarchisme en 1968,” *Magazine littéraire* 19 (1968), available at www.magazine-litteraire.com/archives/ar_anar.htm (accessed 6 October 2002).

⁹³ Birchall, “Sartre’s Encounter,” 52. On Guérin’s take on 1950s Marxist revisionism, see “Du jeune Marx à Marx,” in *Jeunesse du socialisme libertaire*, 67-87.

⁹⁴ *Noir et Rouge (Cahiers d’études anarchistes révolutionnaires): Anthologie 1956-1970* (Paris: Sartacus, 1982), 140.

• Ideological belief systems -- form the "axiomatic" basis of the more specific beliefs or "social representations" of a group, such as their group knowledge and group opinions (attitudes). • Unlike in most traditional approaches to ideology, ideologies are not necessarily "negative." They have similar structures and functions whether shared by dominant or dominated groups, "bad" groups or "good" groups.