This item was submitted to [Loughborough's Research Repository](#) by the author.
Items in Figshare are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved, unless otherwise indicated.

Rejecting 'all the faces of subjugation': Daniel Guerin on direct democracy, self-management and individual autonomy

PLEASE CITE THE PUBLISHED VERSION

<https://doi.org/10.1080/13569317.2019.1633102>

PUBLISHER

© Taylor & Francis

VERSION

AM (Accepted Manuscript)

PUBLISHER STATEMENT

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in Journal of Political Ideologies on 4 July 2019, available online: <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/13569317.2019.1633102>.

LICENCE

CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

REPOSITORY RECORD

Berry, David. 2019. "Rejecting 'all the Faces of Subjugation': Daniel Guerin on Direct Democracy, Self-management and Individual Autonomy". figshare. <https://hdl.handle.net/2134/27694>.

Rejecting ‘all the faces of subjugation’:

Daniel Guérin on direct democracy, self-management and individual autonomy

David Berry

Abstract

This article examines the ideas of French writer and revolutionary Daniel Guérin (1904-88), focussing on his conception of democracy. It argues that Guérin’s thinking developed from the ‘macro-social’ to the ‘micro-social’ as his ideological perspective changed. In the 1940s and 50s, Guérin’s unorthodox Marxist approach to the historiography of the French Revolution and his adoption of a Kropotkinian emphasis on the grassroots democracy of the *sans-culotte* movement led him to see the Revolution as representing the birth of a ‘new type of democracy’. Some form of direct democracy was the only structure which was compatible with what he saw as true, essentially libertarian socialism. In the 1950s and 60s, these conclusions led him to shift the focus of his research onto the history of anarchism and of worker self-management, anarchism’s most important contribution to socialist and democratic thought. Democracy in the workplace, he argued, was the essential corollary of the abolition of private property and the socialisation of the economy. Finally, in the 1960s and 70s, partly because of his own struggles with heteronormativity and having discovered Stirner, he focussed on disalienation and personal autonomy. Each of these three levels of liberation was seen as a precondition of an authentic socialist democracy.

As long as rights to self-determination only apply to the sphere of government, democracy will not only be restricted in meaning to the occasional periodic vote, as Schumpeter understood it, but will also count for little in the determination of the quality of life of many people's lives.

- David Held¹

If [...] a new society should emerge from the revolution, it can be constituted only on the power of the population's autonomous organizations, extended to all spheres of collective activity and existence: not only 'politics' in the narrow sense, but production and the economy, daily life, etc. Therefore, self-government and self-management [*autogestion*] [...] resting on the self-organization of the collectivities concerned. [...] It is a matter of comprehending the solidarity of all the elements of social life and drawing therefrom the following conclusion: Nothing can, in principle, be excluded from the instituting activity of an autonomous society.

- Cornelius Castoriadis²

Introduction

The purpose of this article is to examine the ideas of the French writer, historian and revolutionary activist Daniel Guérin (1904-88) regarding democracy, particularly as they developed from 1944 through to the 1970s.³ An important and unique figure in France's 'first new left',⁴ the central concern of his contribution to the broader post-war efforts to renew socialism was to attempt a synthesis of Marxism and anarchism in an effort to reconcile socialism and freedom. I will argue that for Guérin, an 'authentic' democracy could only rest on the maximum of human freedom on three interconnected levels: direct, decentralized democracy at societal level; worker self-management in the context of a democratically controlled economy; and personal, individual autonomy or disalienation. In other words, in his many and varied writings – whether on the *sans-culottes* in the French revolution, or on workers' co-operatives and *autogestion*, or on the need for cultural mores to be revolutionised as much as social relations – Guérin was trying to find out 'what social forms are consistent with the fullest realization of personal and social freedom', to use Murray Bookchin's words.⁵ In the process, I want to see whether Guérin—ahead of his time in several respects, and despite being in his own words a historian and activist rather than a theorist—can be said to have made an original contribution with regard to socially progressive conceptions of democracy.

I: The French Revolution and the birth of a ‘new type of democracy’

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, Guérin the historian began with a return to what he, like Kropotkin, saw as the source of revolutionary theory and praxis⁶: in 1946, he published his study of class struggle in the First French Republic (1793-1797).⁷ The aim of the book 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.’⁸ Applying the concepts of permanent revolution and combined and uneven development, inspired by Trotsky’s *History of the Russian Revolution*, Guérin argued that the beginnings of a conflict of class interest could already be detected within the revolutionary camp between an ‘embryonic’ proletariat—the *bras nus* (manual workers), represented by the *Enragés*—and the bourgeoisie—represented by Robespierre and the Jacobin leadership. The influence of Kropotkin may also be detected in Guérin’s argument that 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 ‘*sections*’ (local popular assemblies), which were for Guérin precursors of the Commune of 1871 and of the Soviets of 1905 and 1917.⁹ In the second edition of the work (1968) he would add to that genealogy ‘the Commune of May 1968’ – which on the bicentenary of the 1789 revolution would be described by philosopher Victor Leduc, as ‘the first sketch of a permanent democracy, fusing and transcending both political democracy and economic democracy.’¹⁰

Guérin’s interpretation emphasised 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’.¹¹ 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. The dominant historiography—whether bourgeois, social democratic or Stalinist in Guérin’s eyes—tended to maintain the ‘cult of Robespierre’ and thus reinforce the labour movement’s dependence on bourgeois democracy, and were thus to be rejected.¹²

This interpretation unsurprisingly proved controversial.¹³ Its political significance was that the Revolutionary Terror had been used as a parallel to justify Bolshevik repression of democratic freedoms and of more leftist movements. Stalin was seen by Communists as the reincarnation of Robespierre.¹⁴ The Jacobin tradition of patriotism and national unity in defence of the bourgeois democratic Republic has been one of the characteristics of the dominant tendencies within the French left.

Guérin accepted the classic interpretation of the Revolution as a bourgeois revolution, albeit one which was ‘bourgeois only in its results’.¹⁵ But following Kropotkin, he was keen to

emphasise that without the constant pressure from the *sans-culottes*, the most audacious steps within the revolution would not have been taken, from the taking of the Bastille to the adoption of the Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen to the campaign for dechristianisation. Guérin's analysis was described by Eric Hobsbawm as 'a curious combination of libertarian and trotskyst ideas—not without a dash of Rosa Luxemburg'.¹⁶

The first half of Guérin's interpretive introduction to his history of the revolution—not included in the abridged English translation¹⁷—is concerned with his central argument that the French revolution was not only a bourgeois revolution which led to the creation of a parliamentary representative democracy; it was also characterised by the spontaneous preference of the more plebeian and more radical *sans-culottes* for more direct and more decentralised forms of democracy, notably in the shape of the municipal councils (*communes*) and the local 'sections'.

This emphasis on the 'forms of popular power' created by the *sans-culotte* is something which Guérin insisted had too often been ignored or downplayed by 'republican historians' who had been content to portray the revolution as 'the cradle of parliamentary democracy'.¹⁸ But it also represented 'an embryonic proletarian revolution' and consequently carried within it the 'seed of a new form of revolutionary power whose features would become clearer during the proletarian revolutions of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.'¹⁹ As the American anarchist Murray Bookchin would put it:

The sections provide us with a rough model of assembly organization in a large city and during a period of transition from a centralized political state to a potentially decentralized one. [...] The word 'model' is used deliberately. The [...] sections were lived experiences, not theoretical visions. But precisely because of this they validate in practice many anarchic theoretical speculations that have often been dismissed as 'visionary' and 'unrealistic'.²⁰

The critique of representative, 'bourgeois' democracy

Guérin's revisionist analysis provided an analysis of the historical and ideological origins of 'bourgeois parliamentarism', parliament being in his eyes an institution 'forged by the bourgeoisie against both royal absolutism and the popular masses.'²¹

Central to this bourgeois ideology was the idea of popular sovereignty, a conceptual tool used to undermine the notion of divine right, as pointed out by Saint-Simon.²² But the idea of popular sovereignty was an '*idée-force*', a powerful, mobilising idea, 'which the people could one day turn against the bourgeoisie'.²³ This was especially the case since antiquity had produced not just an abstract ideal, but also an historical precedent in Athens. Despite the shortcomings of Athenian direct democracy, 'for the first time in human history, the idea had been affirmed and put into practice that all power derives from the people and that the people must exercise that power itself.'²⁴

The bourgeoisie's dilemma was that it had to use the rallying cry of popular sovereignty in order to gain popular support in its struggle against monarchism, but certainly did not believe the lower orders capable of participating in power. Thus the English republicans of the seventeenth century and the French bourgeois thinkers of the eighteenth adopted the idea of representation. As Montesquieu put it in *L'Esprit des lois* (1748):

The great advantage of representatives is that they are capable of discussing affairs. The people are not suited to this, and this is one of the great disadvantages of democracy.²⁵

Thus, as Guérin saw it:

Bourgeois thought had found a convenient means of carrying the people with them in their assault on absolutism: on the one hand, it held up before them the idea that they were 'sovereign'; on the other hand, it denied them the right to exercise that sovereignty on their own behalf.²⁶

Not only were the 'people' relegated to electing representatives, but universal suffrage was ruled out in favour of a property qualification. As for Rousseau, his failure to endorse direct democracy (in anything other than small city-states) after his famously scathing critique of parliamentary representation is condemned by Guérin as a sleight of hand which prepared the way for his disciple, Robespierre. The 1793 constitution, 'the most democratic of France's constitutions', was 'a skilful compromise between the bourgeois conception of a sovereign parliament and the popular aspiration to direct sovereignty'.²⁷ As it happens, the constitution was never implemented, but this was the furthest the 'revolutionary bourgeoisie' was prepared to go, and Robespierre was explicit in his refusal to envisage direct democracy:

'Democracy', Robespierre said, 'is not a State where the people, continually assembled, regulates all public affairs by itself, and even less a State where a hundred thousand fractions of the people, through isolated, precipitate and contradictory measures, decides the fate of society as a whole.'²⁸

The Communes and Sections

Unfortunately for the bourgeoisie, the 'people' took the repeated affirmations of its sovereignty to heart, and on numerous occasions challenged the supposed sovereignty of the parliamentary assembly through its sections, communes and popular societies. On 3 November 1792, for instance, the Parisian Cité *section* presented a document for the approval of the other Paris *sections*:

The citizens of Paris declare [...] that they only recognise as sovereign a majority of the communes of the Republic [...], that they recognise the deputies in the Convention only as the writers of a constitutional proposal and as provisional administrators of the Republic. [...] This proposed constitution must be presented for consideration by the

communes by 1 February at the latest. [...] Beyond that date, the citizens will regain their full rights.²⁹

On 4 May 1793, the spokesperson of a delegation to the National Convention from the Paris outskirts (the Faubourg Saint Antoine) declared that he was followed by 8,000 citizens, 'members of the sovereign which has come to dictate its wishes to its proxies [*mandataires*].'³⁰

There thus existed to a certain extent a situation of dual power in France during the Revolution. This was especially the case after 10 August 1792, with the Parisian *sections* constituting the revolutionary Commune which presented itself as the organ of the people's will. In the words of a deputation from the Commune to the Legislative Assembly:

The people, which has sent us, has charged us with declaring to you that it puts its trust in you, but it has also tasked us with informing you that it could only recognise, in judging the extraordinary measures to which necessity and resistance to oppression have constrained it, the French people, your sovereign and ours, convened in its primary assemblies.³¹

Guérin followed the socialist Jean Jaurès and others in seeing the subsequent struggle between the Convention and the Commune as one between 'the bourgeois power and the power of the masses'³²:

The *sans-culottes* instinctively felt the need to oppose an indirect and abstract parliamentary democracy with much more direct, flexible and transparent forms of representation. The sections, communes and popular societies provided an immediate, day-to-day reflection of the will of the revolutionary vanguard. The feeling of being the most effective instruments and the most authentic interpreters of the Revolution conferred on them the audacity to challenge the power of the sacrosanct Convention.³³

Guérin was also keen to address the criticism that such direct democracy implied fragmentation and disunity. On the contrary, he argued, the Paris Commune sought to create 'an immense federation of revolutionary communes', and in the spring of 1793 established a correspondence committee to maintain contact with all 44,000 municipalities of France: 'All the communes of France must be sisters'.³⁴ Such 'revolutionary federalism' (Guérin's term) was pursued also by the Paris Commune of 1871, whose programme of 19 April 1871 insisted that 'political unity, in the eyes of Paris, is the voluntary association of all local initiatives' and called for the federation of all the communes in France.³⁵ Approvingly quoting Marx's *Civil War in France*, Guérin concluded that the 'bourgeois ideologues' who had declared direct democracy impractical in such a vast and populous country had been proven wrong:

Spontaneously, the Commune [of 1871] had discovered a new form of representation which was more direct and more flexible than the parliamentary system and which,

without being perfect, since any kind of representation has faults, reduces these disadvantages to a minimum.³⁶

This kind of system Guérin referred to as ‘a kind of democracy based on municipal councils or soviets’ [‘démocratie du type communal ou soviétique’].³⁷

The critique of Jacobinism

As we have seen, an important aspect of Guérin’s reinterpretation was to highlight the class and ideological differences within the revolutionary camp between the Jacobin leadership and its *sans-culotte* supporters. This was developed most fully in a text first published in 1959, ‘La révolution déjacobinisée’.³⁸ (Interestingly, it has recently been republished alongside the 1793 constitution by the libertarian communist organisation *Alternative libertaire*.³⁹)

This is an important text in terms of Guérin’s political development, carrying on from another short text, *La Révolution française et nous*, written during the Liberation.⁴⁰ The questioning which both works embodied had their sources both in Guérin’s reinterpretation of the French revolution (researched and written during the second world war) and in the social and political conditions of the time. *La Révolution française et nous* had been written after the collapse of the Popular Front, and was informed by Guérin’s critique of social-democratic and Stalinist strategies in the face of capitalist reaction and fascism. ‘La Révolution déjacobinisée’ was written after the artificial national unity of the immediate post-war years had given way to profound social and political conflict; as Guy Mollet’s Socialist Party became mired in defence of the *status quo*; as the immensely powerful post-war PCF reeled under the effects of the Krushchev revelations and of Hungary (1956); and as the Fourth Republic collapsed in the face of a threatened military coup (1958).

In *La Lutte de classes*, Guérin had devoted a part of his introduction to the notion of the ‘dictatorship of the proletariat’, arguing that it was in the French revolution that Marx and Engels had discovered the concept, but that they had never elaborated it adequately. In fact it was essential, Guérin argued, to distinguish between two types of ‘dictatorship’ present in 1793 which were antithetical: ‘bourgeois ‘dictatorship’ from above, that of the revolutionary government; and popular ‘dictatorship’ from below, that of the *sans-culottes* in arms, organised democratically in their clubs and in the Commune.’⁴¹ In the 1968 edition, Guérin used the expression ‘revolutionary coercion’ [‘*contrainte révolutionnaire*’] to refer to the necessary repression by the working class of counter-revolutionaries, and ‘dictatorship’ when talking about the oppression of the popular avant-garde by the revolutionary bourgeoisie.

Guérin came to argue, essentially, that ‘authentic’ socialism (*contra* Blanqui or Lenin) arose spontaneously out of working-class struggle and that it was fundamentally libertarian.⁴² Authoritarian conceptions of party organisation and revolutionary strategy had their origins in bourgeois or even aristocratic modes of thought:

By ‘Jacobin spirit’, I believe we must understand the tradition of the *bourgeois* revolution and of the 1793 ‘dictatorship’ from above, which has been somewhat

idealised and insufficiently differentiated from the 'dictatorship' from below. And by extension, we must also include the conspiratorial tradition of Babouvism and Blanquism, which borrow from the bourgeois revolution the idea of a minority employing dictatorial methods in the service of a new revolution.⁴³

In his critical attitude towards the Jacobins, Guérin was to a large extent following not only Kropotkin but also Karl Kautsky⁴⁴, and he also found support for his argument about bolshevism and Jacobinism in Isaac Deutscher's biography of Trotsky⁴⁵:

Deutscher has seen that there is in Bolshevism a conflict between two spirits, the Marxist spirit and the 'Jacobin' spirit, a conflict which would never be completely resolved, either in Lenin or in Trotsky himself. Indeed in Bolshevism [...] we can see stronger accents of Jacobinism than in original Marxism. But I believe that *Marxism itself has never completely overcome an analogous contradiction*. There is in Marxism both a libertarian turn of mind and a 'Jacobin' or *authoritarian* turn of mind.⁴⁶

The origin of this contradiction or duality was for Guérin in Marx and Engels' interpretation of the French revolution which was too unilateral: broadly speaking, they saw it as a bourgeois revolution, and they overestimated the progress achieved. The permanent revolution, the revolution from below, is perceived by Marx and Engels only imperfectly and intermittently, in Guérin's eyes.

From these reflections, Guérin drew conclusions about the nature of both the French and Russian revolutions and their fates:

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.⁴⁷

Guérin's friend, the Trinidadian Marxist C. L. R. James, was one of those who shared this analysis, writing in 1958 of the political significance of Guérin's reinterpretation 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 bureaucratisation and the resurgence of a new oppressive state power, and instead establish a system of direct democracy?⁴⁸

This was very much how Guérin saw the purpose of all the historical research he undertook in the postwar years in parallel to his political activism:

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 benefit 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.⁴⁹

In 1944 Guérin even wrote to his publisher Gaston Gallimard about his wish to publish the preface ('La Révolution française et nous') and the postface ('Les historiens de la Révolution française') as a separate short book: the French Revolution was the cradle of a new type of democracy and the preface constituted 'a sort of manifesto in favour of this new form of democracy which, to my mind, is the secret of the future'.⁵⁰

II: From self-government to self-management

Noam Chomsky, in his 1970 introduction to the Monthly Review Press translation of Guérin's *Anarchism: From Theory to Practice*, insisted that the 'dominant intellectual issue' of the day ought to be the question of 'how to organize industrial society on truly democratic lines, with democratic control in the work place and in the community.'⁵¹ During the 1950s and 60s, this would be the focus of Guérin's continuing historical research and reflection on the unity of socialism and freedom, with his evolution away from Trotskyism and towards libertarian socialism or anarchism being paralleled by a new focus on the micro- rather than the macro-social.

Other than among anarchists and syndicalists—for whom the Spanish collectivisations of 1936-37 had always been and still are held up as a model of a libertarian social revolution—self-management was a relatively new idea for most. It was Yugoslavia's adoption of it in 1950—after Tito's 1948 split from the Soviet Union and the decision to go back to 'the short period during which bolshevism had identified itself with proletarian democracy from below, with the soviets', as Guérin put it—which raised the idea's profile among Marxists especially.

It was the twenty years or so from the mid-1960s to the mid-1980s which saw the most concerted efforts to elucidate the concept of *autogestion* and to analyse the successes and shortcomings of the various historical and contemporary attempts to implement it. This was the purpose of the journal *Autogestion*, launched in 1966 (and renamed *Autogestion et socialisme* in 1970 and then *Autogestions* in the plural in 1980). During this same period, in France, the idea was adopted in one form or another by a number of political parties and trade union organisations, notably the PSU (Parti socialiste unifié) and the CFDT (Confédération française démocratique du travail), although it was still opposed by the French Communist Party and most of the Trotskyist organisations. Guérin was himself directly involved in this enterprise. The idea for creating the journal was born during a discussion between Guérin, the Proudhon specialist Georges Gurvitch and Jean Bancal on the train back from a conference

on Proudhon held in Brussels in 1965 (and whose proceedings, including Guérin's contribution on Proudhon and self-management, were published as *L'Actualité de Proudhon* [The Contemporary Relevance of Proudhon] in 1967).⁵²

But Guérin was already very familiar with such ideas. He had in his youth been attracted by syndicalism and worked with the revolutionary syndicalist Pierre Monatte in the early 1930s.⁵³ (A special issue of *Autogestion* edited by Guérin included an article by the anarcho-syndicalist René Berthier on the syndicalist conception of self-management, 'which is both economic and political'.⁵⁴) He was also familiar with the council communist tradition, having met Karl Korsch in Berlin in 1932 and again in 1947 in Cambridge (Massachusetts), where they spent many hours together.⁵⁵ Guérin was also a personal friend of C. L. R. James, the author of *Every Cook Can Govern, A Study of Democracy in Ancient Greece: Its Meaning for Today* published in 1956.⁵⁶ Guérin's discovery of Bakunin's complete works in 1956 (which he would retrospectively credit with having definitively turned him away from any form of bolshevism) coincided with the appearance of workers' committees in the Hungarian revolution. These events provoked Guérin into studying the councilist tradition, which had come to be seen by many as representing a form of revolutionary socialist direct democracy in contrast to the Bolshevik-controlled soviets, in greater depth.⁵⁷

Despite the multiplicity of interpretations and the various debates surrounding the concept, 'autogestion' was a central feature of the '*mouvement d'émancipation*' during the whole of the twentieth century. According to Claudie Weill, a participant in this movement as well as a historian:

Self-management [*l'autogestion*] has continually resurfaced in various different forms but with one aim: people taking control of their own lives, whether in the factory or in the wider community [*la cité*], as a form of direct democracy.⁵⁸

In the anarchist tradition, discussion of their vision of a free society is couched as often as not in terms not of political structures but of economic organisation. Chomsky's introduction to Guérin's *Anarchism*, for instance, quotes Rudolf Rocker:

The method is not the conquest and exercise of state power, or stultifying parliamentarianism, but rather 'to reconstruct the economic life of the people from the ground up and build it in the spirit of Socialism'.⁵⁹

What is necessary is 'an alliance of free groups of men and women based on co-operative labor and a planned administration of things in the interest of the community.'⁶⁰ Similarly, Chomsky quotes the Dutch Council Communist Anton Pannekoek, for whom working-class liberation 'cannot be reached by a new directing and governing class substituting itself for the bourgeoisie. It is only realized by the workers themselves being master over production.'⁶¹ For Chomsky, some form of council communism with its demand for self-management reflects

the intuitive understanding that democracy is largely a sham when the industrial system is controlled by any form of autocratic elite, whether of owners, managers and technocrats, a 'vanguard' party, or a state bureaucracy.⁶²

In his *Anarchism*, Guérin devotes an unusually large amount of space to the idea of self-management and to debates about different models of economic democracy from the congresses of the First International onwards. Self-management is thus constantly linked to analysis of the idea of the state. He quotes for instance from a resolution of the 1868 Brussels congress that 'collective property would belong to society as a whole, but would be conceded to associations of workers. The State would be no more than a federation of various groups of workers.'⁶³ He paid particular attention to a sympathetic exegesis of Proudhon's ideas on workers' associations, which would enable property to be replaced by federal, co-operative ownership vested in the people as a whole, united in a vast agricultural and industrial federation. Guérin also insisted that, contrary to widespread misconceptions on the left and even among anarchists, Proudhon was aware that large-scale modern industry required co-ordination: 'We put economic centralization in the place of political centralization.'⁶⁴

Proudhon, 'father of self-management'

Guérin's interest in Proudhon is surprising given that Proudhon was anathema to most anarchists in the post-war period. (The mainstream was anarchist-communist and tended to refer to either Kropotkin or Bakunin.⁶⁵) The fact that Proudhon is so central to Guérin's rehabilitation of anarchism therefore tells us something about how it is he came to study anarchism in such depth: whereas Proudhon had already for many years been commonly referred to as the 'father of anarchy', Guérin refers to him as the 'father of self-management'. Guérin saw in self-management and a socialised economy a guarantee that any future revolution would not be hijacked by a centralised power.⁶⁶ Workers' control was, for Guérin, 'without any doubt the most original creation of anarchism, and goes right to the heart of contemporary realities.'⁶⁷ Unlike Marx, Guérin insisted, Proudhon paid this question a great deal of attention.⁶⁸ Proudhon had been one of the first to try to answer the question raised by other social reformers of the early nineteenth century. As Guérin put it: 'Who should manage the economy? Private capitalism? The State? Workers' organisations? In other words, there were—and still are—three options: free enterprise, nationalisation, or socialisation (ie. self-management).'⁶⁹ From 1840 onwards, Proudhon had argued passionately for the third option, something which set him apart from most other socialists of the time, who, like Louis Blanc, argued for one form or another of State control (if only on a transitional basis).⁷⁰ Unlike Marx, Engels and others, Guérin argued, Proudhon saw workers' control as a concrete problem to be raised now, rather than relegated to some distant future. As a consequence, he thought and wrote in detail about how it might function: 'Almost all the issues which have caused such problems for present-day experiments in self-management were already foreseen and described in Proudhon's writings.'⁷¹

Bakunin similarly saw the future based on a federation of ‘workers’ co-operative associations’ with a co-ordinating assembly at its head. The Bakuninist James Guillaume envisaged trade union federations taking over the role of economic planning agencies. These developments in ‘collectivist’ anarchist thinking filled what Guérin saw as the gap in Proudhon’s writings, which were less clear on the mechanisms which would prevent workers’ co-operatives reverting to competition amongst themselves.

But in some respects, Guérin was quite critical of ‘traditional’ anarchism, with what he saw as its knee-jerk rejection of organisation, and particularly what he considered to be its simplistic, Manichean approach to the question of the ‘state’ in modern, industrial and increasingly internationalised societies. Guérin was keen to ‘revivify everything that was constructive in anarchism’s contribution in the past’ and the 1965 book on anarchism focused on ‘social, constructive, collectivist, or communist anarchism’.⁷² He became interested particularly in militants such as the Spanish anarchist Diego Abad de Santillán, whose ideas on ‘integrated’ economic self-management contrasted with what Guérin insisted was the backward-looking policy of the Spanish CNT adopted at its 1936 Saragossa conference.⁷³ 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—who argued against the anarchists of the Jura Federation in favour of what he called an ‘an-archic state’—on the national and transnational organization of public services within a libertarian framework.⁷⁴ Guérin’s study of anarchism also includes several pages devoted to the Italian factory council movement of 1919-20: the manifesto of the newspaper *Ordine Nuovo*, which brought together anarchists and non-anarchist socialists, regarded the factory councils as ‘organs suited to future communist management of both the individual factory and the whole society’.⁷⁵

Bureaucratisation and the Workers’ Opposition

In the summer of 1965, Guérin wrote enthusiastically to Cornelius Castoriadis, a former comrade from their days together in the Trotskyist *Parti communiste internationaliste*. He had just re-read an earlier issue of Castoriadis’s review, *Socialisme ou Barbarie*, which had carried the Russian Bolshevik Alexandra Kollontai’s text on the Workers’ Opposition: ‘I do not believe anything more illuminating has been written on the contemporary problems of self-management than this text of 1921.’⁷⁶

Kollontai’s article dealt with what on the face of it was a debate about the role of the trade unions in the creation of a communist economy, the question of collegial management *versus* management by a single individual, and the bureaucratisation of both the Party and the institutions of the Soviet state. In fact it went much deeper, and beyond providing a class analysis of the political situation in which the Bolsheviks found themselves at the beginning of 1921, Kollontai focussed on the fundamental conflict between, on the one hand,

management and government by the bureaucracy, and on the other hand, the 'creative capacity' and 'autonomous activity' of the working class.

The 'one man management' is a product of the individualist conception of the bourgeois class. The 'one man management' is in principle an unrestricted, isolated, free will of one man, disconnected from the collective.⁷⁷

This is reminiscent of Guérin's critique of the Jacobin mentality during the French Revolution, and it has to do much more broadly with conceptions of democracy for society as a whole, rather than just the mode of organisation of the workplace. As Kollontai put it:

This idea finds its reflection in all spheres of human endeavour - beginning with the appointment of a sovereign for the State, and ending with a sovereign director of the factory. This is the supreme wisdom of bourgeois thought. The bourgeoisie do not believe in the power of a collective body. They like to whip the masses into an obedient flock, and drive them wherever their unrestricted will desires. The working class and its spokesmen, on the contrary, realise that the new Communist aspirations can be obtained only through the collective efforts of the workers themselves.⁷⁸

Kollontai's argument concerning the influence over the Bolshevik leadership of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois elements need not detain us here, beyond her insistence that it is a core aspect of capitalist ideology that workers are incapable of organising production themselves and that they need to be managed in a hierarchical and authoritarian way. What is of interest is her emphasis on the fundamental importance of this question to the continuing democratisation of Soviet society, and how it is tied up with an insistence on the need not only for greater trust among the Bolshevik leadership with regard to the creative capacity of ordinary working people, but also for greater freedom of expression within the Bolshevik Party, greater democracy within the Party and its institutions (election of delegates at all levels, revocability, etc):

The administrative economic body in the workers' republic during the present transitory period must be a body directly elected by the producers themselves. All the other administrative economic Soviet institutions should serve only as executive centres of the economic policy of the all-important economic body of the workers' republic.

Kollontai paints a bleak picture of an increasingly centralised and undemocratic Party and state apparatus.

The harm in bureaucracy does not only lie in the red tape as some comrades would want us to believe - they narrow the whole controversy to the sanitation of Soviet institutions. The harm lies in the solution of all problems, not by means of an open exchange of opinions or by the immediate efforts of all concerned, but by means of formal decisions handed down from the central institutions. These decisions are arrived at either by one person or by an extremely limited collective, wherein the interested people are quite often entirely absent. Some third person decides your fate:

this is the whole essence of bureaucracy. [...] It is necessary to revert to the state of affairs where all the cardinal questions of Party activity and Soviet policy were submitted to the consideration of the rank and file, and only after that were supervised by the leaders.

Perhaps the most important point in Castoriadis' 1964 introduction to Kollontai's text—a text which for Guérin was 'no less remarkable' than Kollontai's⁷⁹—is his critique of the Bolsheviks' belief that it is possible to see capitalist management practices as a mere technique, a neutral means to achieve practical ends with no negative consequences for the construction of a socialist republic:

The idea that the same methods cannot simply be used for very different purposes, that there is an intrinsic connection between the instruments one uses and the results one gets, that above all neither the army nor the factory are simple 'means' or 'instruments' but are social structures in which two fundamental forms of relations between men – production and violence – are organised, that one can see in them the essential expression of the type of social relations which characterise an epoch – this idea, which should moreover go without saying for Marxists, was totally 'forgotten'.⁸⁰

Capitalist management practices produce submissive and alienated proletarians, they do not produce the new socialist or communist citizen, no matter whether the factory belongs to a capitalist or to the state.⁸¹

Algeria and Yugoslavia

Guérin had direct knowledge of the spontaneous appearance and then legalisation of worker self-management in the newly independent Algeria (1963-5), having been granted permission to travel the country studying developments, before submitting a report on his findings to President Ben Bella.⁸² What he saw he found at once astonishing and saddening:

Algerian self-management gave us a glimpse – and the object lesson had universal value – of what the workers are capable of when they are allowed to manage their work themselves. But at the same time, the bureaucracy's authoritarian and arbitrary interference, stifling initiative at the base, [...] paralysed an exciting experiment.⁸³

Self-management clearly still has many enemies and the various experiments in self-management have experienced different problems, not least the 'pendulum-like movement' which makes it swing between two extremes, 'excessive autonomy or excessive centralization; authority or anarchy; control from above or control from below'.⁸⁴

After examining both the history of workers' councils and self-management and the more recent experiments, Guérin concluded in *Anarchism*, 'If its wings are not clipped, self-management is undoubtedly an institution with democratic, even libertarian tendencies', contributing to 'the disalienation of the producer who will become a free and self-determining being'.⁸⁵ And he went on to rebuke those anarchists who, 'from rather too far

away', were excessively critical of the model's achievements. Even in states such as Yugoslavia, Guérin believed, self-management contained a 'democratic virus' which contributes to the democratization of the regime.

Self-management [has] the merit of enabling the masses to pass through an apprenticeship in direct democracy acting from the bottom upward; the merit of developing, encouraging and stimulating their free initiative, of imbuing them with a sense of responsibility instead of perpetuating age-old habits of passivity, submission, and the inferiority complex left to them by past oppression, as is the case under state communism.⁸⁶

In conclusion, then, self-management for Guérin represents 'a real, authentic socialism, that is to say, socialism combined with liberty.'⁸⁷

But it was also much more than 'universal suffrage in the economy', as a leading CFDT activist would put it during the heyday of the idea of 'autogestion' in 1970s France.⁸⁸ For some, *autogestion* necessarily transcended the boundaries between different economic, political and ideological struggles, undermining those who still held that there was a hierarchy between what they called the 'principal front' and 'secondary fronts' (i.e. gender, sexuality, race, environment, education, etc). Instead, *autogestion* attacked the 'cultural conditions of capitalism' and required 'the creation of new social relations'.⁸⁹ For the PSU (1973), it was through *autogestion* that 'the worker and the citizen, dissociated one from the other by the bourgeoisie, can be reconciled'.⁹⁰ As philosopher Henri Lefebvre wrote in the journal *Autogestion*:

The optimal and maximal perspective immediately opened [by workers taking control of their workplaces] is the radical transformation of the whole of society, the metamorphosis of life.⁹¹

Revolution in 'everyday life' was something which was very much in the air in the 1960s, but as the historian Jacqueline Pluet commented (again in the review *Autogestion*), it was rarely mentioned in revolutionary programmes.⁹² Yet for Guérin, the liberation and disalienation of the individual in their everyday life, including interpersonal relations, was the corollary and indeed precondition of a libertarian socialist democracy.

III: Individual autonomy

Bookchin expressed this interconnectedness as follows:

What social forms will replace existing ones depends on what relations free people decide to establish between themselves. Every personal relationship has a social dimension; every social relationship has a deeply personal side to it. [...] The liberation of man—not in some vague 'historical', moral, or philosophical sense, but in the intimate details of day-to-day life—is a profoundly social act and raises the problem of social forms as modes of relations between individuals.⁹³

Stirner, ‘father of anarchy’

In 1965, Guérin caused something of a stir when, several decades before the German individualist Max Stirner became fashionable among academics in the USA and Britain, he offered a partial rehabilitation of this thinker, who up until then had been anathema to both the majority of anarchists as well as to Marxists in France as elsewhere. Firstly, he included extracts from three texts by Stirner as well as an article about Stirner by the French individualist E. Armand in his very popular two-volume anthology *Ni Dieu ni Maître*.⁹⁴ Secondly, despite presenting what is arguably an original and distinctly collectivist conception of anarchism in his *L’Anarchisme, de la doctrine à la pratique*, published the same year, he wrote in the introduction:

At first sight it is true that there may seem to be a vast difference between the individualist anarchism of Stirner (1806-1856) and social anarchism. When one looks more deeply into the matter, however, the partisans of total freedom and those of social organization do not appear as far apart as they may have thought themselves, or as others might at first glance suppose. The anarchist *sociétaire* is also an individualist and the individualist anarchist may well be a partisan of the *sociétaire* approach who fears to declare himself.⁹⁵

A later French edition of this very successful book—which had sold like hot cakes at the Sorbonne in May 68—included in an appendix the text of an article first published in the anarchist review *La Rue* in 1979.⁹⁶ In these ‘Compléments sur Stirner’, Guérin suggested that Stirner could in fact be seen as the ‘father of anarchism’—an honour normally reserved for Proudhon.⁹⁷ So why did Guérin turn to Stirner? How did Stirner contribute to Guérin’s ideas on democracy?

Stirner’s critique of all those authorities—states, religions, morality, ideologies—to which humankind is subjected (or subjects itself) is well known. In the context of Guérin’s own concern with sexual liberation, he insisted that ‘Stirner’s greatest originality, his most memorable innovation, is the discovery of the uniqueness of each individual’.⁹⁸ Stirner was ‘the spokesman of all those who challenge ‘normality’’.⁹⁹ This absolute rejection of bourgeois morality and indeed of all forms of State-imposed conformism made of Stirner, for Guérin, ‘a precursor of May 68’.¹⁰⁰

Guérin also drew on Stirner’s scathing attack on ‘The False Principles of Our Education’ (translated into French for the first time by Guérin’s German-born wife, Marie).¹⁰¹ For Stirner, the existing education system merely broke pupils in, it taught them how to behave, producing submissiveness, servility and knowledgeable philistines.

The ultimate objective of education can no longer be mere knowledge. [...] In a word, education will tend to create a personal or free man. [...] It must liberate us from whatever is alien to us, it must free us radically from all authority [...]. School does not produce free personalities. [...] As in some other areas, the pedagogical domain is

one of those where no opposition is tolerated. What is required is submission. [...] Our natural human tendency to rebelliousness is stifled.

What is needed, according to Stirner, is not ‘useful citizens’: ‘mankind’s supreme task is neither instruction, nor civilisation, but self-activity.’ The awakening of the idea of freedom in young people is thus essential for the creation of a free society:

If once one awakens in mankind the idea of freedom, free people only want to liberate *themselves* now and always; if, on the other hand, we make of them only learned people, they adapt to any circumstances in the most cultured and refined way, they fall to the level of submissive and obedient souls. [...] The starting point of pedagogy must not be to *civilise* people, but to form free personalities, sovereign characters.¹⁰²

Guérin defends Stirner against Marx and other critics on the left, insisting that he was often misrepresented: ‘Stirner, contrary to what some of his critics would have us believe, did not adopt a rigidly individualist position.’¹⁰³ Stirner was at heart a socialist, Guérin argues, but one who was opposed to the ‘sacralisation’ of socialism (‘[Stirner] is not against the socialists, but against holy socialists’¹⁰⁴) and who was profoundly aware of the dangers for the individual of all states, even socialist or communist ones. In Stirner’s words:

It is with good reason that the communist rises up against the oppression from which I suffer thanks to individual proprietors, but the power which they place in the hands of the collectivity is even more terrible.¹⁰⁵

It is true, Guérin concedes, that Stirner’s ‘synthesis of the individual and society remains fragile. [...] The social anarchists would attack him for it.’¹⁰⁶ On the other hand, the sometimes exaggerated and poorly expressed individualism in Stirner’s thinking has now become even more important than before:

For the most urgent task in the contemporary world is to preserve the individual from being put through the mill of totalitarian society. [...] Stirner has the merit of having dramatically emphasised the peril which human society has brought upon itself. He showed that beyond the material liberation of the individual, other forms of equally limiting alienation risk continuing to crush them. [...] Stirner reminds us that the ultimate objective of any form of socialism, whatever labels it attaches to itself, is—beyond a radical economic change—the disalienation of the individual.¹⁰⁷

Indeed Stirner’s focus is ‘the intrinsic value of the “unique” individual’. This notion corresponds to ‘the preoccupation of the contemporary world, concerned to save the individual from all the forms of alienation which crush them, the alienation of industrial slavery as much as that of totalitarian conformism.’¹⁰⁸ One can certainly see how Stirner’s imprecations against the nature of political parties would have resonated with Guérin, who was ‘viscerally antistalinist’ from an early age, and who had become increasingly alienated from Trotskyist organisations by what he saw as their dogmatism and sectarianism. And, of course, the hegemony of the PCF over the post-war Left in France was a major target of the

various elements of the new left, as well as of the anarchists, in the years leading up to 1968. The Party, for Stirner, is no more than ‘a state within the state’¹⁰⁹:

A Party, of whatever kind, can never do without a profession of faith. Its members must believe in its principles and never doubt or question them. These principles are for the members that which is certain, indubitable. In a word, one must belong body and soul to the Party [...].¹¹⁰

It is doubtless also true that Guérin’s emphasis on the importance of Stirner is rooted in Guérin’s own suffering as a bisexual man forced to hide his true nature by society’s prejudices. It was Guérin’s personal experience of and outrage at the homophobia of many Marxists and other supposed revolutionaries and what seemed to be classical Marxism’s exclusive concern with material progress and with class-based oppression that accounts in large part for his sympathy with Stirner and his insistent concern to reconcile personal autonomy with socialism.¹¹¹

One can perhaps also see Stirner’s critique as providing a useful corrective to the Left’s (and indeed Guérin’s) tendency to think and speak in terms of ‘the masses’, ‘the working class’, ‘humanity’, ‘man’ and other universalising entities, and encouraging instead the need for ‘a greater emphasis on the sensuous, needful, individual human being’, as Paul Thomas has put it.¹¹²

Guérin may be best known amongst contemporary anarchists for his attempt to ‘synthesise’ anarchism and Marxism; but he also clearly wanted to integrate into his ‘libertarian communism’ Stirner’s concern with the unique individual – but without producing a ‘synthesis’ in the manner of a Sébastien Faure, whose model of the anarchist movement saw anarchist individualists, anarchist communists and anarchist syndicalists existing side by side but in separate currents, in a complementary rather than an integrated way.¹¹³ This was another aspect of Guérin’s originality.

Conclusion

Writing in 1962 in the review *Arguments* (with which Guérin was associated), the sociologist Edgar Morin and the philosopher Georges Lapassade distinguished between the ‘macro-social’ and ‘micro-social’ approaches to ‘the political question’:

The political question is generally posed at the level of the structures of global society in the philosophical tradition from Plato to Hegel. Marx turned this viewpoint on its head whilst conserving it. Indeed although Marx’s starting point was human beings and although he sees ‘society’ as the product and the location of their alienation, it is nevertheless true that for him it is enough to revolutionise the global social structure in order to change humankind. The social revolution would fundamentally be the overturning of ‘macro-social’ structures.¹¹⁴

Morin and Lapassade identified another tendency, ‘a ‘micro-social’ current’ discernible in Fourier and other ‘utopian socialists’, as well as later in ‘anarcho-syndicalism’, which exhibits an emphasis on experimentation and ‘the idea that the construction of a socialist society must be carried out at the level of the small, basic units of society.’ In the twentieth century, they argued, the soviets and councils, as well as their partial rediscovery in Poland, Hungary and Yugoslavia since 1945, also belonged to this tradition. More recently, they went on, a number of philosophers, sociologists and psychologists had begun to put the emphasis at an even more ‘micro’ level, as it were:

It seemed to some Marxists, such as H. Lefebvre, that the problems of social life necessarily had to be raised at the level of everyday life—that is to say at the level of the concrete relations between people, at work, in their leisure activities, in their private lives. In this sense one could say that society has not been revolutionised if, when the structures of ownership or the state system are transformed, human and interhuman relations remain what they were before.¹¹⁵

The argument in this article is that between the 1940s and the 1960s Guérin similarly shifted his focus from the macro-social to the micro-social, from direct democratic structures at societal level to self-management in the workplace, to the concomitant disalienation of the individual in everyday life and in interpersonal relations: only through a synthesis of these three forms or levels of liberation could an authentic democracy and true socialism be achieved. In 1969, for instance, Guérin was interviewed for *Le Monde*. His *Essai sur la révolution sexuelle après Reich et Kinsey* [Essay on the Sexual Revolution after Reich and Kinsey] and his *Pour un Marxisme libertaire* [For a Libertarian Marxism] had both just appeared.¹¹⁶ Asked if this simultaneity was a coincidence, he replied emphatically ‘Non’:

The subjects dealt with make a whole. The libertarian critique of the bourgeois regime is not possible without a critique of bourgeois *mores*. The revolution cannot be simply political. It must be, at the same time, both cultural and sexual and thus transform every aspect of life and of society. [...] The revolt of the spring of 68 rejected *all* the faces of subjugation.¹¹⁷

What can we say about the importance or originality of Guérin’s contribution to thinking about democracy? It is certainly the case that contemporaries coming from different ideological perspectives acknowledged the importance and innovative character of Guérin’s contribution to the debate about the future of socialism, the question of power, the relationship between socialism and freedom, and individual autonomy. C. L. R. James described Guérin’s analysis of the French revolution as ‘one of the most important modern textbooks in [...] the study of Marxism’ and ‘one of the great theoretical landmarks of our movement’.¹¹⁸

Maurice Joyeux, one of the leading lights of the post-war *Fédération Anarchiste*, insisted—despite the fact that Guérin was a Marxist and not an anarchist—that his *Jeunesse du Socialisme Libertaire* was ‘the most important—I would even go so far as to say the only—serious essay devoted to anarchist ideas since the Liberation’:

Through the discussions to which it will give rise, and which our newspaper will happily publish, it will shake up our anarchist movement and drag it out of the complacent opposition to change in which it too often wallows. The questions which Guérin poses will have to be answered.¹¹⁹

In an article on the ‘crisis of socialism’ published in *Le Monde* in 1959, the philosopher Jean Lacroix, a social Catholic and associate of the ‘personalist’ review *Esprit*, was similarly positive regarding the contribution made by Guérin’s continuing reflections on the lessons of the French Revolution with respect to ‘the crucial question of socialism: that of power’ and the reconciliation of socialism and freedom—essential questions in the debates of the first half of the twentieth century involving left-wing Christians.¹²⁰

On the other side of the Channel, the erudite English anarchist, Nicolas Walter found that Guérin’s *L’Anarchisme* represented ‘the expression of an original and exciting view of anarchism’—and this after commenting on the unusual emphasis on worker self-management.¹²¹

As for the ‘micro-social’—the disalienation of the individual and the need to promote this within a libertarian socialist framework—we have already seen how novel this was in the 1960s. Guérin’s courageous championing of the cause of gay liberation and his insistence that such liberation could only truly be won through a libertarian socialist transformation of society earned him the gratitude and support of campaigners such as Pierre Hahn, a founder of the Front Homosexuel d’Action Révolutionnaire, for whom Guérin’s combination of politics ‘in the traditional sense’ and ‘sexology’ were what made him an important figure.¹²² Guérin was arguing for the recognition of intersectionality some years before the term was coined.¹²³

As the Italian anarchist Amadeo Bertolo argued in an examination of the relationship between anarchism and democracy, ‘politics’, ‘economics’ and ‘private life’ are constructs, whereas anarchism is “a holistic conception of society and can only be beyond politics, economics and so on”:

The social organism is not just a sum, a mechanical combination of politics, economics..., but rather an organic relationship of political, economic and other functions. There can be no real democracy in the political sphere unless all those acting in it are socially equal (or if you prefer, equivalent). Thus it is not possible to have political democracy without economic democracy, which we may call self-management. And it is not possible to have self-management unless the people involved are equal, i.e. without the integration of manual and intellectual work. And so it goes on.¹²⁴

¹ David Held, *Models of Democracy* (Cambridge: Polity, 1996), p. 268.

² Cornelius Castoriadis, ‘The Logic of Magmas and the Question of Autonomy’ (1983) in David Ames Surtis (Ed. & trans.), *The Castoriadis Reader* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1997), pp. 290-318, quotation pp. 313-14.

³ For an overview of Guérin's life, see David Berry, 'Un contradictoire permanent': The ideological and political itinerary of Daniel Guérin' in Julian Bourg (Ed.), *After the Deluge: New Perspectives on the Intellectual and Cultural History of Postwar France* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2004), pp. 149-174. See also the web site of the Association des Amis de Daniel Guérin at <http://www.danielguerin.info/>.

⁴ See Stuart Hall, 'Life and Times of the First New Left' in *New Left Review* 61 (January-February 2010), pp.177-96. As Hall explains (pp.177-8), although the term 'New Left' is often associated with 1968, an earlier 'New Left' had already come into being in response to the events of 1956 in Hungary. However this British 'first New Left' borrowed the label from their French comrades: 'Nouvelle Gauche' was already being used earlier in the 1950s to refer to those who were attempting to define a 'third way' on the left which rejected both Stalinism and social democracy. On the differences between the impact of Hungary 1956 in Britain and France, see also Ian Birchall, '1956 and the French Left' in *Revolutionary History* 903, available at <http://www.revolutionaryhistory.co.uk/index.php/187-articles/articles-of-rh0903/8314-french-2> (last accessed 20/09/17).

⁵ Murray Bookchin, 'The Forms of Freedom', in *Post-Scarcity Anarchism* (Montréal: Black Rose Books, 1971), p. 143.

⁶ Peter Kropotkin, *The Great French Revolution, 1789-1793* (London: Elephant Editions, 1986 [1909]); Alfred Bonanno's 1975 introduction to this edition, pp. 7-13, discusses the contemporary relevance of Guérin's interpretation.

⁷ Daniel Guérin, *La Lutte de classes sous la Première République, 1793-1797*, 2 vols. (Paris: Gallimard, 1946; 2nd edition 1968). See also Denis Berger, 'La révolution plurielle (pour Daniel Guérin)', in E. Balibar, J.-S. Beek, D. Bensaïd et al., *Permanences de la Révolution. Pour un autre bicentenaire* (Paris: La Brèche, 1989), pp. 195-208; David Berry, 'Daniel Guérin à la Libération. De l'historien de la Révolution au militant révolutionnaire: un tournant idéologique', *Agone* 29-30 (2003), pp. 257-273; Michel Lequenne, 'Daniel Guérin, l'homme de 93 et le problème de Robespierre', *Critique communiste* 130-131 (May 1993), pp. 31-34.

⁸ Daniel Guérin, *La Révolution française et nous* (Paris: Maspero, 1976), pp. 7-8. Note that the reference to 'libertarian socialism' was written 30 years after the main text and after Guérin had moved closer to anarchism. Norah Carlin analyses the differences between the 1946 and 1968 editions of *La Lutte de classes* in 'Daniel Guérin and the working class in the French Revolution', *International Socialism* 47 (1990), pp. 197-223.

⁹ See chapter 24 of Kropotkin's *The Great French Revolution*.

¹⁰ Victor Leduc, *Aliénation ou autogestion, le dilemme de notre temps* (Paris: Éditions la Breche, 1989), quoted in Sophie Bérout, Claude Kowal and Patrick Silberstein, 'Autogestion', in Antoine Artous, Didier Epszajn and Patrick Silberstein (Eds.), *La France des années 1968* (Paris: Syllepse, 2008), pp. 141-2.

¹¹ Guérin, *La Lutte de classes* (1968), vol.I, p. 31.

¹² Guérin, *La Lutte de classes* (1968), vol I, p. 58.

¹³ Guérin, *La Révolution française et nous*, p. 7. For an overview of the historiographical debates, see Olivier Bétourné and Aglaia I. Hartig, *Penser l'histoire de la Révolution. Deux siècles de passion française* (Paris: La Découverte, 1989), esp. pp. 110-114. For a recent reassessment of the long-running dispute between Guérin and Georges Lefebvre, see Antonio de Francesco, 'Daniel Guérin et Georges Lefebvre, une rencontre improbable', *La Révolution française* (2010), <http://lrf.revues.org/index162.html>, date accessed 28 March 2011.

¹⁴ See Philippe Bourdin, 'Un siècle d'études révolutionnaires 1907-2007 - Introduction', in *Annales historiques de la Révolution française* [on-line] no.353 (July-September 2008): <http://ahrf.revues.org/10866> (accessed 21/09/17); Alice Gérard, *La Révolution française: mythes et interprétations, 1789-1970* (Paris: Flammarion, 1970), p.91; Robert Gildea, *The Past in French History* (New Haven & London : Yale University Press, 1994), pp.15 & 53 ; Isaac Deutscher, *Stalin : A Political Biography* (Harmondsworth : Penguin, 1966), p.342..

¹⁵ Guérin, *La Lutte de classes* (1968), vol.I, p. 27.

¹⁶ E.J. Hobsbawm, *Echoes of the Marseillaise: Two Centuries Look Back on the French Revolution* (London: Verso, 1990), p. 53.

¹⁷ *Class Struggle in the First French Republic: Bourgeois and Bras Nus 1793-1795* (London: Pluto Press, 1977), translated by I. Patterson.

¹⁸ Guérin, *La Lutte de classes* (1968), vol.I, p. 37.

¹⁹ *ibid.* On the political and ideological uses to which different interpretations or representations of the French Revolution have been put, see ch.1 of Robert Gildea, *The Past in French History* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1994).

²⁰ Bookchin, 'The Forms of Freedom', p. 165.

²¹ Guérin, *La Lutte de classes* (1968), vol.I, p. 37.

²² Saint-Simon, *Système industriel* (1892), quoted in *La Lutte de classes* (1968), vol.I, pp.37-38.

²³ *La Lutte de classes* (1968), vol.I, p. 38.

²⁴ *ibid.*

²⁵ Quoted in *La Lutte de classes* (1968), vol.I, p. 39.

- ²⁶ *La Lutte de classes* (1968), vol.I, p. 39.
- ²⁷ The text of the constitution of 1793 in English is available at <https://chnm.gmu.edu/revolution/d/430/>.
- ²⁸ Quoted in *La Lutte de classes* (1968), vol.I, p. 42.
- ²⁹ Quoted *La Lutte de classes* (1968), vol.I, p. 43.
- ³⁰ *ibid.*
- ³¹ Quoted in *La Lutte de classes* (1968), vol.I, p. 47.
- ³² *ibid.*
- ³³ *La Lutte de classes* (1968), vol.I, p. 49.
- ³⁴ Jaurès and the secretary of the correspondence committee, both quoted in *La Lutte de classes* (1968), vol.I, p. 51.
- ³⁵ Quoted in *La Lutte de classes* (1968), vol.I, p. 52.
- ³⁶ *Ibid.*
- ³⁷ *La Lutte de classes* (1968), vol.I, p. 53.
- ³⁸ 'La Révolution déjacobinisée', in *Jeunesse du socialisme libertaire* (Paris: Rivière, 1959), pp. 29-63. It would be included as an appendix in the second edition of *La Lutte de classes* (vol.II, pp. 465-488), republished the following year in *Pour un Marxisme libertaire* (Paris: Laffont, 1969) and republished again in *A la recherche d'un communisme libertaire* (Paris: Spartacus, 1984). An English translation can be found in Daniel Guérin, *For a Libertarian Communism* (Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2017).
- ³⁹ 1793: *Citoyenneté et Révolution* (Paris: Alternative libertaire, n.d.).
- ⁴⁰ *La Révolution française et nous* (Bruxelles: La Taupe, 1969; François Maspero, 1976). This was originally intended to be the preface for *La Lutte de classes*, but was only published much later and as a separate booklet.
- ⁴¹ 'La Révolution déjacobinisée', p. 38. See Julia Guseva, 'La Terreur pendant la Révolution et l'interprétation de D. Guérin', *Dissidences 2* (2007), pp. 77-88.
- ⁴² For a defence of Lenin (if not of Leninism) against Guérin's arguments, see Ian Birchall, 'Daniel Guérin's Dialogue with Leninism' in *Revolutionary History* vol.9, no.2 (2006), pp.194-216.
- ⁴³ 'La Révolution déjacobinisée', pp. 59-60.
- ⁴⁴ See Jean-Numa Ducange, 'Comment Daniel Guérin utilise-t-il l'œuvre de Karl Kautsky sur la Révolution française dans *La Lutte de classes sous la première République*, et pourquoi?', *Dissidences 2* (2007), 89-111.
- ⁴⁵ First published by Oxford University Press as *The Prophet Armed* (1954), *The Prophet Unarmed* (1959) and *The Prophet Outcast* (1963).
- ⁴⁶ 'La Révolution déjacobinisée', p. 57. Guérin and Deutsch had a lengthy correspondence about Jacobinism and Marxism in 1957: BDIC, Fonds Guérin, F°Δ721/23bis/7.
- ⁴⁷ 'La Révolution déjacobinisée', pp. 43-4.
- ⁴⁸ 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), pp. 20-21.
- ⁴⁹ 'La Révolution déjacobinisée', pp. 30-31.
- ⁵⁰ Letter to G. Gallimard, 18 September 1944, BDIC, Fonds Guérin, F°Δ Rés.688/10/2.
- ⁵¹ Noam Chomsky, 'Introduction', in Daniel Guérin, *Anarchism—From Theory to Practice* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1970), p. xvii.
- ⁵² 'Proudhon et l'autogestion ouvrière', in *L'Actualité de Proudhon. Colloque des 24 et 25 novembre 1965* (Bruxelles: Université libre de Bruxelles, 1967), pp. 67-87.
- ⁵³ See David Berry, 'From son of the bourgeoisie to servant of the Revolution: The roots of Daniel Guérin's revolutionary socialism', *Moving the Social - Journal of Social History and the History of Social Movements* no.51 (2014), pp. 283-311.
- ⁵⁴ René Berthier, 'Conceptions anarcho-syndicalistes de l'autogestion', in *Autogestion et socialisme*, no.18-19 (January-April 1972), special issue on 'Les anarchistes et l'autogestion'.
- ⁵⁵ Daniel Guérin, *Le Feu du sang, autobiographie politique et charnelle* (Paris: Grasset & Fasquelle, 1979), p. 189. Correspondence between Guérin and Korsch in BDIC, Fonds Guérin, F°Δ1792/085/4. On Korsch, see Douglas Kellner (Ed.), *Karl Korsch: Revolutionary Theory* (Austin & London: University of Texas Press, 1977).
- ⁵⁶ C. L. R. James, 'Every Cook Can Govern. A Study of Democracy in Ancient Greece. Its Meaning for Today' in *Correspondence*, Vol. 2, No. 12. June 1956.
- ⁵⁷ See Guérin's 1969 article, 'Conseils ouvriers et syndicalisme révolutionnaire. L'exemple hongrois, 1956' in *A la recherche*, pp. 111-115; the same piece was republished as 'Syndicalisme révolutionnaire et conseilisme' in *Pour le communisme libertaire*, pp. 155-162.
- ⁵⁸ Claudie Weill, 'La revue *Autogestion* comme observatoire des mouvements d'émancipation' in *L'Homme et la société*, no.132-133 (1999), p.29.
- ⁵⁹ Chomsky, 'Introduction', p. viii.
- ⁶⁰ Chomsky, 'Introduction', p. viii.

- ⁶¹ Chomsky, 'Introduction', p. xv.
- ⁶² Chomsky, 'Introduction', p. xvi.
- ⁶³ Guérin, *Anarchism*, p. 47.
- ⁶⁴ Proudhon quoted in Guérin, *Anarchism*, p. 54.
- ⁶⁵ On the different ideological currents within French anarchism, see Jean Maitron, *Le Mouvement anarchiste en France* (Paris: La Découverte, 1992), 2 vols. ; Roland Biard, *Histoire du mouvement anarchiste, 1945-1975* (Paris : Editions Galilée, 1976) ; David Berry, *A History of the French Anarchist Movement, 1917-1945* (Oakland CA & Edinburgh: AK Press, 2009); Guy Bourgeois, preface to a new edition of the *Manifeste du communisme libertaire* (Paris: Editions "L", 1985; Manifesto first published 1953), pp.5-16.
- ⁶⁶ See his '1917-1921, de l'autogestion à la bureaucratie soviétique', in *De la Révolution d'octobre à l'empire éclaté: 70 ans de réflexions sur la nature de l'URSS* (Paris: Alternative libertaire/UTCL, n.d.), pp. 17-22; 'Proudhon et l'autogestion ouvrière' in *L'Actualité de Proudhon* (Bruxelles: Université libre de Bruxelles, 1967), pp. 67-87; 'L'Espagne libertaire', editorial introduction to part of *Autogestion et socialisme*, special issue on 'Les anarchistes et l'autogestion', no.18/19 (janvier-avril 1972), pp. 81-82; 'L'autogestion contemporaine', *Noir et rouge* no.31/32 (octobre1965 - février 1966), pp. 16-24.
- ⁶⁷ Guérin, *L'Anarchisme—De la doctrine à la pratique* (Paris: Gallimard, 1981 edition), p. 16.
- ⁶⁸ See similarly critical remarks about Marxism's neglect of this issue by Castoriadis in an interview for a special issue of the magazine of the UTCL (Union des Travailleurs Communistes Libertaires, Libertarian Communist Workers' Union) on the usefulness (or otherwise) of Marxism for libertarian communists: 'Marx aujourd'hui. Entretien avec Cornelius Castoriadis' *Lutter!* 5 (May 1983), pp. 15-18.
- ⁶⁹ 'Proudhon père de l'autogestion' (1965) in *Proudhon oui et non* (Paris: Gallimard, 1978), p. 165.
- ⁷⁰ See K. Steven Vincent, *Pierre-Joseph Proudhon and the Rise of French Republican Socialism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985).
- ⁷¹ 'Proudhon père de l'autogestion', p. 191.
- ⁷² Guérin, *Anarchism*, p. 237.
- ⁷³ On Abad de Santillan, see the section on 'L'Espagne libertaire,' in *Les anarchistes et l'autogestion*, Special Issue of *Autogestion et socialisme*, no.18-19 (1972), pp. 81-117.
- ⁷⁴ See Guérin, *Ni Dieu ni Maître: Anthologie de l'anarchisme* (Paris: La Découverte & Syros, 1999), vol. I, pp. 268-291.
- ⁷⁵ Guérin, *Anarchism*, p. 110.
- ⁷⁶ Alexandra Kollontaï, 'L'Opposition ouvrière' and Paul Cardan [pseudonym of Cornelius Castoriadis], 'Le rôle de l'idéologie bolchévik dans la naissance de la bureaucratie (Introduction à l'Opposition ouvrière d'Alexandra Kollontaï)' in *Socialisme ou Barbarie* no.35 (January-March 1964), pp.57-102 & 37-55 respectively. Guérin did, however, take issue with what he called Castoriadis's 'Gramscist' under-estimation of the trade unions and his insistence instead on the necessity for workers' councils. Castoriadis replied to ask for permission to publish Guérin's letter, along with texts by Voline and Maximoff which Guérin had drawn to his attention, but the review ceased publication soon after. Correspondence in BDIC, Fonds Guérin, F°Δ721/28bis: letter from Cardan to Guérin, 21 July 1965; reply from Guérin to Cardan, 13 August 1965. For a more critical view of Kollontaï and the Workers' Opposition, see Leonard Schapiro, *The Origin of the Communist Autocracy: Political Opposition in the Soviet State, First Phase, 1917-1922* (Palgrave Macmillan, 1977).
- ⁷⁷ Quotations from the original English translation produced by Sylvia Pankhurst's *Workers' Dreadnought* in 1921 and republished by *Solidarity* in 1962 – this was then translated into French by *Socialisme ou Barbarie*. Available on the Marxists Internet Archive at <https://www.Marxists.org/archive/kollonta/1921/workers-opposition/> (last accessed 18 August 2015).
- ⁷⁸ *ibid.*
- ⁷⁹ BDIC, Fonds Guérin, F°Δ721/28bis: letter from Guérin to Cardan, 13 August 1965.
- ⁸⁰ Castoriadis, 'Le rôle de l'idéologie bolchévik', pp. 53-54.
- ⁸¹ See Carole Pateman, *Participation and Democratic Theory* (Cambridge University Press, 1970).
- ⁸² The resultant articles were published as *L'Algérie qui se cherche* (Paris: Présence africaine, 1964). See Guérin, *Ci-gît le colonialisme: Algérie, Inde, Indochine, Madagascar, Maroc, Palestine, Polynésie, Tunisie. Témoignage militant* (Paris: Mouton la Haye, 1973), pp. 170-173.
- ⁸³ *Ci-gît le colonialisme*, pp. 170-171.
- ⁸⁴ *Anarchism*, p. 148.
- ⁸⁵ *Anarchism*, pp. 145 & 149.
- ⁸⁶ *Anarchism*, p. 150.
- ⁸⁷ *Anarchism*, p. 152.
- ⁸⁸ Quoted in Sophie Bérout, Claude Kowal and Patrick Silberstein, 'Autogestion', in Antoine Artous, Didier Epszajn and Patrick Silberstein (Eds.), *La France des années 1968* (Paris: Syllepse, 2008), p. 134.
- ⁸⁹ Quoted in Bérout *et al*, p. 141.

- ⁹⁰ Quoted in Bérout *et al*, p. 142. Cf Ken Coates: 'The problem of self-management begins with a recognition that each worker has a complex of interests, often divergent ones, involving him as consumer, as producer and as citizen. These must persist as long as the division of labour itself compels men to adopt fixed roles during formative parts of their lives.' 'Democracy and Workers' Control', p. 51.
- ⁹¹ Quoted in Bérout *et al*, p. 132. Cf Henri Lefebvre, *La vie quotidienne dans le monde moderne* (Paris: Gallimard, 1968), translated as *Everyday Life in the Modern World* (London: Allen Lane, The Penguin Press, 1971).
- ⁹² Quoted in Weill, 'La revue *Autogestion*', p. 32.
- ⁹³ Bookchin, 'Forms of Freedom', pp. 143-144.
- ⁹⁴ *Ni Dieu ni Maître, anthologie de l'anarchisme* (Lausanne: La Cité-Lausanne, 1965; republished most recently by La Découverte & Syros, Paris, 1999). Translated by Paul Sharkey as *No Gods, No Masters: An Anthology of Anarchism* (Edinburgh: AK Press, 1998), 2 vols.
- ⁹⁵ Translation from *Anarchism* (1970), p. 4. The translator's note points out that the term '*sociétaire*' is used to define 'a form of anarchism which repudiates individualism and aims at integration into society'.
- ⁹⁶ *L'Anarchisme, de la doctrine à la pratique* (Paris: Gallimard, 1981 edition; first published 1965); 'Stirner, «Père de l'anarchisme»? in *La Rue* no.26 (1er et 2ème trim. 1979), pp. 76-89.
- ⁹⁷ 'Compléments sur Stirner' in *L'Anarchisme* (1981), pp. 253-279.
- ⁹⁸ *ibid.*, p. 267.
- ⁹⁹ *ibid.*, p. 268.
- ¹⁰⁰ *Ni Dieu ni Maître*, vol.I, p. 12.
- ¹⁰¹ The article had first appeared in *Die Rheinische Zeitung* in 1842. An extract is provided in *Ni Dieu ni Maître* and is discussed and quoted from at length in 'Compléments sur Stirner'.
- ¹⁰² 'Compléments sur Stirner', pp. 261-262.
- ¹⁰³ *ibid.*, p. 269.
- ¹⁰⁴ Stirner (writing of himself in the third person) in *Ni Dieu ni Maître*, vol.I, p. 35.
- ¹⁰⁵ Stirner quoted by Guérin in *L'Anarchisme* (1981), p. 265.
- ¹⁰⁶ *Ni Dieu ni Maître*, vol.I, p. 13.
- ¹⁰⁷ 'Compléments sur Stirner', pp. 278-279.
- ¹⁰⁸ *Ni Dieu ni Maître*, vol.I, p. 11.
- ¹⁰⁹ *Ni Dieu ni Maître*, vol.I, p. 29.
- ¹¹⁰ *Ni Dieu ni Maître*, vol.I, p. 31.
- ¹¹¹ For more detail, see David Berry, 'Workers of the World, Embrace!' Daniel Guérin, the Labour Movement and Homosexuality', *Left History*, 9:2 (Spring/Summer 2004), pp. 11-43.
- ¹¹² Paul Thomas, 'Max Stirner and Karl Marx: An Overlooked Contretemps', in Saul Newman (Ed.), *Max Stirner* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), p. 138.
- ¹¹³ See David Berry, *A History of the French Anarchist Movement, 1917-1945* (Oakland, CA: AK Press, 2009).
- ¹¹⁴ 'La question 'micro-sociale'', *Arguments* no.25-26 (1er trimestre 1962), p. 2.
- ¹¹⁵ *ibid.*
- ¹¹⁶ *Essai sur la révolution sexuelle après Reich et Kinsey* (Paris: Belfond, 1969); *Pour un Marxisme libertaire* (Paris: Laffont, 1969).
- ¹¹⁷ *Le Monde*, 15 November 1969.
- ¹¹⁸ James, letter to Guérin, 24 May 1956, BDIC, Fonds Guérin, F°Δ 721/57/2.
- ¹¹⁹ 'A propos de 'Jeunesse du Socialisme Libertaire'', *Le Monde libertaire* no.49 (April 1959).
- ¹²⁰ Jean Lacroix, 'Le socialisme libertaire' in *Le Monde*, 3 July 1959.
- ¹²¹ Nicolas Walter, 'Daniel Guérin's anarchism', *Anarchy*, vol.8, no.94 (12 December 1968), pp. 376-382; quotation pp.380-381.
- ¹²² See 'Une lettre du regretté Pierre Hahn', in Daniel Guérin, *Homosexualité et Révolution* (Paris: Spartacus, 2013), pp. 51-52.
- ¹²³ See Kimberlé Crenshaw, 'Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics', *The University of Chicago Legal Forum* (1989), pp. 139-167.
- ¹²⁴ Amadeo Bertolo, 'Democracy and Beyond' in *Democracy & Nature: The International Journal of Inclusive Democracy*, vol.5, no.2 (July 1999), pp. 311-324.

References

- Alternative libertaire, *1793: Citoyenneté et Révolution* (Paris: Alternative libertaire, n.d.).
- Denis Berger, 'La révolution plurielle (pour Daniel Guérin)', in E. Balibar, J.-S. Beek, D. Bensaïd et al, *Permanences de la Révolution. Pour un autre bicentenaire* (Paris: La Brèche, 1989), pp. 195-208.
- Sophie Bérout, Claude Kowal and Patrick Silberstein, 'Autogestion', in Antoine Artous, Didier Epszajn and Patrick Silberstein (Eds.), *La France des années 1968* (Paris: Syllepse, 2008), pp. 130-145.
- David Berry, 'Daniel Guérin à la Libération. De l'historien de la Révolution au militant révolutionnaire: un tournant idéologique', *Agone* 29-30 (2003), pp.257-273.
- '“Un contradicteur permanent”: The ideological and political itinerary of Daniel Guérin', in Julian Bourg (Ed.), *After the Deluge: New Perspectives on the Intellectual and Cultural History of Postwar France* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2004), pp. 149-174.
- *A History of the French Anarchist Movement, 1917-1945* (Oakland, CA: AK Press, 2009).
- Amadeo Bertolo, 'Democracy and Beyond' in *Democracy & Nature: The International Journal of Inclusive Democracy*, vol.5, no.2 (July 1999), pp. 311-324.
- Olivier Bétourné and Aglaia I. Hartig, *Penser l'histoire de la Révolution. Deux siècles de passion française* (Paris: La Découverte, 1989).
- Murray Bookchin, 'The Forms of Freedom' (1968) in *Post-Scarcity Anarchism* (Montréal: Black Rose Books, 1971), pp. 141-172.
- Paul Cardan (pseudonym of Cornelius Castoriadis), 'Le rôle de l'idéologie bolchévik dans la naissance de la bureaucratie', *Socialisme ou Barbarie*, no.35 (January-March 1964), pp. 37-55.
- Norah Carlin, 'Daniel Guérin and the working class in the French Revolution', *International Socialism* 47 (1990), pp. 197-223.
- Cornelius Castoriadis, 'Marx aujourd'hui. Entretien avec Cornelius Castoriadis' *Lutter!* no.5 (May 1983), pp. 15-18.
- Cornelius Castoriadis, 'The Logic of Magmas and the Question of Autonomy' (1983), in David Ames Surtis (Ed. & trans.), *The Castoriadis Reader* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1997), pp. 290-318.
- Noam Chomsky, 'Introduction', in Daniel Guérin, *Anarchism—From Theory to Practice* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1970), pp. vii-xx.

- Ken Coates, 'Democracy and Workers' Control' (1965), in *Workers' Control: Another World Is Possible. Arguments from the Institute for Workers' Control* (Nottingham: Spokesman for Socialist Renewal, 2003), pp. 33-55. First published in Perry Anderson and Robin Blackburn (Eds.), *Towards Socialism* (London: Fontana, 1965).
- Kimberlé Crenshaw, 'Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics', *The University of Chicago Legal Forum* (1989), pp. 139-167.
- Romain Denis & Georges Lapassade, 'Apprentissage de l'autogestion', *Arguments* 27-18 (1962), pp. 36-41.
- Jean-Numa Ducange, 'Comment Daniel Guérin utilise-t-il l'œuvre de Karl Kautsky sur la Révolution française dans *La Lutte de classes sous la première République*, et pourquoi?', *Dissidences* 2 (2007), pp. 89-111.
- Antonio de Francesco, 'Daniel Guérin et Georges Lefebvre, une rencontre improbable', *La Révolution française* (2010), <http://lrf.revues.org/index162.html> (last accessed 21 April 2017).
- Robert Gildea, *The Past in French History* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1994).
- Daniel Guérin, *La Lutte de classes sous la Pemière République, 1793-1797* (Paris: Gallimard, 1946; 2nd edition 1968), 2 vols.
- Jeunesse du socialisme libertaire* (Paris: Rivière, 1959).
- Front populaire, révolution manquée? Témoignage militant* (Paris: Julliard, 1963; revised edition François Maspero, 1970).
- L'Algérie qui se cherche* (Paris: Présence africaine, 1964).
- 'L'autogestion contemporaine', *Noir et Rouge* no.31/32 (octobre 1965 - février 1966), pp. 16-24.
- 'Proudhon et l'autogestion ouvrière', in *L'Actualité de Proudhon* (Bruxelles: Université libre de Bruxelles, 1967), pp. 67-87.
- Anarchism: From Theory to Practice* (New York & London: Monthly Review Press, 1970). Translated by Mary Klopfer.
- Pour un Marxisme libertaire* (Paris: Laffont, 1969).
- 'L'Espagne libertaire', editorial introduction to part of *Autogestion et socialisme*, special issue on 'Les anarchistes et l'autogestion', no.18/19 (janvier-avril 1972), pp. 81-82.
- Ci-gît le colonialisme: Algérie, Inde, Indochine, Madagascar, Maroc, Palestine, Polynésie, Tunisie. Témoignage militant* (Paris: Mouton la Haye, 1973).

- La Révolution française et nous* (Bruxelles: La Taupe, 1969; François Maspero, 1976).
- Class Struggle in the First French Republic: Bourgeois and Bras Nus 1793-1795* (London: Pluto Press, 1977); translated by I. Patterson.
- Proudhon oui et non* (Paris: Gallimard, 1978).
- Le Feu du sang, autobiographie politique et charnelle* (Paris: Grasset & Fasquelle, 1979).
- ‘Stirner, «Père de l’anarchisme»?’, *La Rue* no.26 (1er et 2ème trim. 1979), pp. 76-89.
- L’Anarchisme—De la doctrine à la pratique* (Paris: Gallimard, revised edition 1981; first published 1965).
- A la recherche d’un communisme libertaire* (Paris: Spartacus, 1984).
- Ni Dieu ni Maître: Anthologie de l’anarchisme* (Paris: La Découverte & Syros, 1999), 2 vols. Translated by Paul Sharkey as *No Gods, No Masters: An Anthology of Anarchism* (Edinburgh: AK Press, 1998).
- ‘1917-1921, de l’autogestion à la bureaucratie soviétique’, in *De la Révolution d’octobre à l’empire éclaté: 70 ans de réflexions sur la nature de l’URSS* (Paris: Alternative libertaire/UTCL, n.d.), pp. 17-22.
- Homosexualité et Révolution* (Paris: Spartacus, 2013; first published 1983).
- Julia Guseva, ‘La Terreur pendant la Révolution et l’interprétation de D. Guérin’, *Dissidences* 2 (2007), pp. 77-88.
- Pierre Hahn, ‘Une lettre du regretté Pierre Hahn’, in Daniel Guérin, *Homosexualité et Révolution* (Paris: Spartacus, 2013), pp. 51-52.
- Stuart Hall, ‘The ‘First’ New Left: Life and Times’, in Robin Archer *et al* (Eds.), *Out of Apathy. Voices of the New Left Thirty Years On* (London: Verso, 1989), pp. 11-38.
- E. J. Hobsbawm, *Echoes of the Marseillaise: Two Centuries Look Back on the French Revolution* (London: Verso, 1990).
- 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), pp. 20-21.
- Alexandra Kollontaï, ‘L’Opposition ouvrière’, *Socialisme ou Barbarie*, no.35 (January-March 1964), pp. 57-102.
- Peter Kropotkin, *The Great French Revolution, 1789-1793* (London: Elephant Editions, 1986 [1909]), 2 vols.; introduction (1975) by Alfred Bonanno, pp. 7-13.
- Victor Leduc, *Aliénation ou autogestion, le dilemme de notre temps* (Paris: Éditions la Brèche, 1989).

Henri Lefebvre, *La vie quotidienne dans le monde moderne* (Paris: Gallimard, 1968); translated as *Everyday Life in the Modern World* (London: Allen Lane, The Penguin Press, 1971).

Michel Lequenne, 'Daniel Guérin, l'homme de 93 et le problème de Robespierre', *Critique communiste* no.130-131 (May 1993), pp. 31-34.

Alex Prichard, 'David Held is an Anarchist. Discuss', *Millennium—Journal of International Studies* 39 (December 2010), pp. 439-459.

Leonard Schapiro, *The Origin of the Communist Autocracy: Political Opposition in the Soviet State, First Phase, 1917-1922* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1977).

Paul Thomas, 'Max Stirner and Karl Marx: An Overlooked Contretemps', in Saul Newman (Ed.), *Max Stirner* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), pp. 113-142.

Nicolas Walter, 'Daniel Guérin's anarchism', *Anarchy*, vol.8, no.94 (12 December 1968), pp. 376-382.

Claudie Weill, 'La revue Autogestion comme observatoire des mouvements d'émancipation', *L'Homme et la société*, no.132-133 (1999), pp. 29-36.

Archival sources

Fonds Guérin, Bibliothèque de Documentation Internationale Contemporaine, Nanterre.

12,253 words, including endnotes and list of references