

Chapter 8

Revolt in Photos

The French May '68 in the Student and Mainstream Press

Antigoni Memou

The black-and-white photographs of students demonstrating, occupying universities, constructing barricades, setting fires on street corners, throwing flaming Molotov cocktails, and fighting with the police, taken during the events in Paris in May 1968, stand as quintessential images of a remarkable revolt. Initially published in newspapers, magazines, leaflets, and activist material, the photographs were later reproduced on the internet, in photobooks, in academic books, in institutional displays, and kept in public and private archives. Historians, political theorists, and sociologists have used these photographs to “illustrate” their accounts of the '68 events, disregarding the ability of photography to be a source of historical, political, or sociological research. This chapter regards these photographs not simply as an “exercise in nostalgia”—as Fred Ritchin once put it (Ritchin 2003: 62–73)—but as a path to reexplore, rethink, and discuss the French May 1968.

The chapter focuses on the photographs published in the student and mainstream press during May and June 1968. In particular, the chapter examines the student newspapers that were published during the events, namely, *Action*, *Barricades*, *L'Avant Garde Jeunesse*, *Servir Le Peuple*, *Le Monde Libertaire*, and *Lutte Socialiste*, and three French dailies published in Paris, *Le Figaro* and *L'Humanité*. Given that *Le Monde* did not include any photographs in its editorials, it will not be included in this analysis.¹

The chapter focuses on a selection of distinctive photographic instances from these

publications, aiming at shedding light on the real differences that separated the photographs published in the student and mainstream press. In particular, the chapter argues that the differences arose around three broad themes: the representation of the police, the figure of the young protester, and the representation of the alliance between the students and the workers during the events. These instances are not the only pertinent examples, but are, in my view, the important ones, illustrating the role that media played in the ways May '68 was framed by photography. Based on the premise that the photographic meaning depends on some external matrix of conditions and presuppositions, that it is “necessarily context determined” (Sekula 1984: 4), the chapter examines how photographs of May '68 function within these different contexts. In the following, an outline of the movement, the major student and mainstream publications, and their political orientation will be followed by an analysis of the photographic material published in them.

The Movement, its Publications, and the Mainstream Press

The events of May 1968 were initiated as a large-scale student protest. The first protests were documented at the beginning of May, when students closed Nanterre's Faculté de Lettres. The arrest of five hundred students at the Sorbonne after a poorly attended meeting on 3 May was followed by the occupation of the Sorbonne, calls for liberation of the arrested, and the first barricades and clashes between the students and the police (Reader 1993: 10). As is well-known, the government's tactics and the increasing brutality of the police contributed to the explosion of public meetings, organized action committees, and vigorous demonstrations along the boulevards and the narrow streets of the Latin Quarter, widespread occupations that culminated with the highly symbolic “night of the barricades.” In the “night of the barricades” on 10 May,

students and workers constructed barricades in the Latin Quarter, responding to the established social order and the oppressive power of the police, and creating a space for expressing their demands (Touraine 1971: 176). The violence exhibited between the police and the students and the symbolic value of the barricades—a revival of a technique used in earlier moments of popular uprisings in French history, namely, in 1830, 1848, and in the Paris Commune—mobilized other social groups (Weber, as quoted in Fraser 1988: 185; Reader 1993: 11). A large wave of support for the students was generated as a response to the government's repression (Feenberg and Freedman 2001: 25–26).

The movement was organized by various groups and committees and was lacking formal leadership, hierarchy, and centralized structure. In the university milieu, various revolutionary and sometimes conflicting groups, affiliated with Maoism, Trotskyism, anarchism, and looser forms of revolutionary socialism, filled the void left by the Union Nationale des Étudiants de France (UNEF) (National Union of French Students) and its main component the Union des Étudiants Communistes (UEC) (Union of Communist Students), the student organization of the orthodox Parti Communiste Français (PCF) (French Communist Party), which had gradually lost its strength after the war in Algeria and failed to attract a great number of the activist student youth (Seidman 2004: 24).² At the dawn of the student mobilization in May 1968, the main groups were two Trotskyist groups, Jeunesse Communiste Révolutionnaire (JCR) (Revolutionary Communist Youth) and Fédération des Étudiants Révolutionnaires (FER) (Federation of Revolutionary Students), the Maoist group Union des Jeunesses Communistes Marxistes-Leninistes (UJCML) (Union of Marxist-Leninist Communist Youth), the Fédération Anarchiste (FAF) (Anarchist Federation), and the small socialist group Étudiants Socialistes Unifiés (ESU) (Socialist Students United). The newspapers published by these groups became the most crucial

sites of the production and distribution of the movement's ideas during the events. The movement's main paper, *Action*, which represented the UNEF, the SNEsup (Syndicat National de l'Enseignement Supérieur, National Union of Higher Education), and the 22 March movement, became very popular and was widely disseminated during May (Feenberg and Freedman 2001: 43).³ It often had a detachable front page that could be used as a street poster, and was notable for the absurdity, eccentricity, and humor of its slogans and cartoons, frequently by Siné, a well-known French political cartoonist famous for his anticolonialism and anticapitalism (Ross 2002: 114–15n123). *Action*'s popularity grew rapidly during May and June and provided daily information about the evolution of the events, especially when other journals and newspapers were paralyzed by the strike. After the decline of the movement, in the second half of 1968, *Action* "was one of the outlawed publications particularly pursued by the government, in part because of its rapid growth from 100,000 printings of each issue to 550,000" (Ross 2002: 114–15n123). *Barricades* was published by the high school student organization Comité d'Action Lycéens (CAL) (High School Action Committees), and was circulated during May. CAL was founded shortly before the May crisis as a combination of Comité Vietnam de Base (CVB) (Basic Committees on Vietnam) and Comité Vietnam National (CVN) (National Committee On Vietnam), both organizations opposing the Vietnam War (Ross 2002: 217). Most of the members of the CAL were "militants of far left youth movements who had broken with young Communists because of the soft attitude of PCF towards the Vietnam War" (Ross 2002: 217).

The Trotskyist part of the movement was represented by the monthly circulated journal *L'Avant Garde Jeunesse*, which became the mouthpiece of the JCR, one of the two Trotskyist groups. The JCR was among the initiators of the 22 March movement and exercised the greatest

influence on the movement, as it “proved more open in its theoretical approach, more flexible in its tactics, more aware of the specific problems of the student movement, and as such was to exercise a greater influence during the crisis” (Singer 2002: 58). *L’Avant Garde Jeunesse* stopped being circulated in June 1968, when the JCR was declared illegal by the government. Smaller minorities within the movement were the Maoist (UJCML), anarchist, and “socialist” groups. The UJCML’s journal was published by both students and workers and was called *Servir Le Peuple*.⁴ The anarchist group, FAF, published a newspaper called the *Le Monde Libertaire*, while the ESU, a small socialist party, and their equivalent workers’ groups published *Lutte Socialiste*.

While the student press was circulated within the ranks, hung on the walls of the Sorbonne, or sometimes disseminated as posters during May and June 1968, the wider French public was informed about the events through the mainstream media, mostly the transistor radio and the mainstream newspapers. Yet, French television and radio was under “firm governmental control,” such that public broadcasting equated with state broadcasting, or as Daniel C. Hallin and Paolo Mancini in their comparative study of media systems argue, the French broadcasting under de Gaulle is a quintessential case of the “governmental model” of broadcast organization (Hallin and Mancini 2004: 30). In fact, the staff of the French Radio Television Française (RTF) was “appointed directly by the Minister of Information until 1964” and was “under tight political control even later” (Hallin and Mancini 2004: 106). Television programs such as *Panorama*, which used to give a weekly review of events, did not even mention the growing demonstrations and occupations in Paris and in the rest of the country on 10 May (Feenberg and Freedman 2001: 42). It was international radio, in particular Europe 1 and Radio Télé Luxembourg (RTL), available and willing to report from the heart of the barricades and demonstrations, that became

the central means of information for French citizens (Scott 2008: 5). *Le Figaro*, France's oldest national daily, which enjoyed a comfortable existence as the voice of the conservative middle classes, *L'Humanité*, the official organ of the French Communist Party, and *Le Monde*, the left-of-center paper, were gradually losing the students' trust. This reinforced the growing confidence in the movement's own publications, not only within the movement but also in wider society, when journalists, producers, and technicians in the mainstream media joined the nationwide strike (Ross 2002: 15; Singer 2002: 19).

“Down with the Police State”

The students expressed their frustration with the learning process, their career and life prospects, the bureaucratic and hierarchical university structures, and the government's endeavors to limit access to higher education. Their demands were not restricted to the democratization and decentralization of the French educational system and the subsequent ending of class bias, the modernization of an outdated curriculum, and a decrease in unemployment. Their critique of the hierarchical university extended to a critique of societal hierarchies, as the slogan “De la Critique de l'Université à la Critique de la Société” (‘From the Critique of the University to the Critique of the Society’) reminds us. Their demands for radical reconstruction and democratization touched upon every sphere of life. The students critiqued capitalism, the culture of consumption, and the mass media, and questioned the oppression of women, discrimination against minorities, and the segregation of youth.

Although the students had a broad range of demands, they were all based on the principles of the “destructive critique.”⁵ “Destructive critique” is not meant to improve the existing societal conditions by the consolidation of political power, but is a critique that operates

outside the rules, norms, and limitations of liberal parliamentary democracy and seeks to demolish the status quo and all its structures of inequality, subordination, and power. The student movement was ignited by the explosive power of “destructive critique” and its characteristics, namely, doubt, negation, irony, and destruction. The motto “De omnibus dubitandum” (Doubt everything) was omnipresent within the movement, which doubted the existing “system of order” and therefore demanded its destruction.

The target of the students was any form of power as exercised in factories, schools, universities, and the whole of society. Within this wide range of repressive forces, the police had a predominant position, personifying the oppressive and authoritarian nature of the existing government. As a response to their violent outbreaks on the streets of Paris and their instrumental role in securing the capitalist order, more and more people took to the streets. Activists, according to Ross, disrupted the natural “givenness” of places assigned by the police (Ross 2002: 24–25). This disruption consisted of physical dislocation of students, workers, and farmers, whose contact, although prevented by the police, became possible in meetings, which brought them together.

The way that the mainstream and activist media represented the protesters’ efforts to disrupt the places assigned to them by the police suggest a substantial discrepancy, with photographs portraying the police in a disapproving light in the student publications unsurprisingly dominating. Numerous photographs show policemen in aggressive positions, being violent and using tear gas or confronting demonstrators with an aggressive attitude. Indicatively, *Action*’s front page in its first issue, published on 7 May, was covered by a photograph that depicted policemen blocking the entrance of the Faculté de Lettres. The headline “Repression: Faire Face!” (Repression: Stand Up!) equates police with repression. The following

article entitled “Pourquoi nous nous battons” (This Is Why We Are Fighting) explains the reasons for the uprising, arguing against the television and radio misrepresentation of their mobilization. Photographs of policemen brutally beating protesters with truncheons appeared in almost all the issues of *Action*, rendering police the unmediated representative of an authoritarian and repressive state.

In many cases, photographs were seen together with cartoons, most of which were explicitly ironic toward the police. Indicative is the photograph published in *Barricades* (see figure 8.1) that shows a group of armed policemen beating a demonstrator. The headline “Les Voyous” (The Hooligans) creates an ironic inversion. Although the article that follows refers to the protesters, who performed acts of violence during the events, the immediate connection that can be made is to relate the headline to the policemen’s thuggish behavior. This irony becomes even crueler if one takes into account the accusations of the mainstream press, both of the Right and the Left, accusing the students of insults, violence, and irresponsible acts (Singer 2002: 122–23). In contrast to these accusations, the article that accompanies the photograph gives reasons for the insulting behavior of a section of the students, presenting it as an unavoidable outcome of the social and economic inequalities of capitalist society. The cartoon underneath extends the sarcastic character of the page.

In fact, there were many examples of photographs of police being juxtaposed with cartoons that commented on their brutality. An interesting example is a photograph that was published in the first issue of *Action*. The photograph shows policemen lined up and is taken from the back, so that their faces are not visible. One cannot see any violence or conflict depicted, only some smoke on the right of the photograph. Nevertheless, the cartoon by Siné, just above the photograph, depicts the arrest of an injured student. The drawing of one policeman

with a moustache like Hitler's and the ironic dialogue, "Il était armé? Oui, chef . . . d'un diploma" (Was he armed? Yes, sir . . . with a degree), are caustic comments on the police's extreme brutality against the students.

In contrast with the omnipresence of photographs of the police's brutal behavior in the student press, neither in *L'Humanité* nor in *Le Figaro* were these photographs customary. One of the few exceptions is the coverage on 7 May, when both newspapers published photographs of police on their front pages. In both cases, the photographs were positioned at the center of the pages and depicted a group of policemen attacking students, with the students hardly visible in the background. Despite these similarities, their headlines have an absolutely different tone indicating the political orientation of each newspaper. In fact, *L'Humanité* directly accused the government of being responsible for the escalation of the violence in the Latin Quarter, while *Le Figaro* presented the events in a rather neutral tone.⁶ Nevertheless, photographs of the police never became the focus of the attention in the mainstream press, and gradually disappeared from their coverage at the end of May and during the month of June.

While negation and irony as characteristics of the students' destructive critique are depicted in many photographs, as shown in the examples from *Action* and *Barricades*, photographs depicting destruction are very rare. While there were many photographs taken by photojournalists that show students in violent and destructive gestures, similar images were absent from the students' publications.⁷ An exception is a photograph published in the FAF's newspaper *Le Monde Libertaire*, where an open-air meeting of high school students is depicted (see figure 8.2). The meeting numbers only a few participants and looks like a spontaneous gathering of students rather than a well-organized meeting. Although the young people seem to look in different directions, there is a speaker among them. Nevertheless, neither the gazes of the

students depicted nor the focus of the photograph directs our attention to him. Instead, the picture focuses on another student, who is lifting an object into the air. The student looks profoundly irritated and his gesture implies that he is under inordinate stress. There is no indication in the picture as to whether the student is pointing at something, nor does he seem to be confronting the police or any other material forces. Instead, he seems to be performing an act of violence without an immediate recipient. The focus is on the violent gesture, which, compulsive, dramatic, and aggressive as it is, functions as a signifier of destruction for its own sake. While this violent gesture may be the result of the repression of living with capitalist injustices and exploitation, destruction as such did not seem to be valued in the May movement.

“Ensemble: Etudiants, Travailleurs”: Photography, Innovations, and Antinomies

The movement soon went far beyond its university origins to unite students, workers, and professionals in a common struggle against de Gaulle’s regime. On 13 May, the students made a decision of decisive importance, to allow workers to enter the Sorbonne (Viénet 1992: 44). On the same day, the two main unions, the CGT and the CFDT, provoked by the students’ mobilization, decided on a general workers’ strike (Reader 1993: 117). Although the strike was initially small in scale, it provoked a chain reaction, and within a few days 7.5 to 9 million workers went on strike (Gilcher-Holtey 1998: 263). On 13 May, students and workers demonstrated together in Paris in a march led by both student leaders and trade unions. The next weeks saw extended occupations in schools and universities and strikes in factories, department stores, banks, public transportation, gas stations, and even newspapers and television all over the country.⁸ The majority of the intellectual and literary world also expressed their support for and solidarity with the movement (Singer 2002: 159). By 24 May, France was paralyzed by the

biggest strike that it and probably any other European country had ever known up to that time (Singer 2002: 156). This student-worker juncture was exceptional; in no other major Western country did the student and worker movements intersect as they did in France.

It seemed then that the slogan of the demonstration, “Students-Workers-Solidarity,” was taken seriously for the first time. Soon student leaflets began to draw a parallel between student and labor demands. “Between your problems and ours there are certain similarities: jobs and opportunities, standards and work pace, union rights, self-management” read one of the students’ leaflets (Feenberg and Freedman 2001: 124). As soon as the strike was announced, silkscreen posters by the Atelier Populaire promoted student-worker solidarity. On 14 May, the first posters that supported the student-worker alliance appeared with the slogans “Usines, Universités, Union” (Factories, universities, union), “Ensemble: Etudiants, Travailleurs” (All together: students, workers), and “Le Même Problème, La Même Lutte” (The same problem, the same struggle). The slogans became more concrete particularly at the Renault factory at Flins, including “Ouvriers, Etudiants, Population, Liaison Effective Flins” (Workers, students, the people in effective liaison at Flins) and “Solidarité Effective, Étudiants, Travailleurs” (Students, workers, effective solidarity) (Atelier Populaire 1969: 39).

Although the alliance between students and workers was verbally articulated in the students’ posters and publications, there was no photographic equivalent of these statements. An indicative example is the photograph on the cover of *Action* on 21 May, which depicts a student demonstration (see figure 8.3). The caption underneath gives us the time and the place: “Friday, 17 May. For the first time in France, a student demonstration went to a factory occupied by the workers: Renault.”⁹ The students are presented in a frontal view, demonstrating outside Renault. What is worth noting, however, is that although the presence of workers is implied, there are no

actual photographs of workers in the publication. The only reference to workers is the industrial background, to which the spontaneity and the impulsiveness of the students appear as a visual disruption. The background seems theatrical and overly contrived, and the sky and the banner are retouched heavily, so that the scene, although it may not be, seems constructed.

The majority of the photographs published in the student press depict young, passionate protesters full of revolutionary ardor. In many of them the students seem to be acting on a sudden irresistible impulse, which is related to their youthfulness. This omnipresence was at odds with the absence of photographs of older people and, specifically, of workers in these publications. A careful examination of the student press shows that photographs of workers occupying factories or marching along with the students did not appear in the student publications, even when the students had made an alliance with the workers. This is likely due to the physical dislocation of the protesters imposed by the police, which intended to isolate students in the Latin Quarter and workers in the factories (Ross 2002: 25). In many cases, this physical isolation was not effective, when (mostly) young workers joined the students on the streets, but the photographic documents of the period did fail to portray this alliance.

One of the very few, if not the only, photographs of workers that appeared in *Action* on 11 June 1968 depicted workers standing on the balcony of their factory (see figure 8.4). The workers do not face the camera, and it is not known where they are looking. There is no action shown in the picture or any visual reference to their factory's occupation or their strike. Their static posture contradicts the students' militancy and suggests that this photograph could have been taken on a normal working day. Only the caption reminds us that the photograph was taken at Sud-Aviation in Nantes, the first factory that was occupied by workers on 14 May.

Photographs of revolutionaries posing in front of the camera first appeared as early as the

Paris Commune in 1871, when the technology of photography was still primitive, making it impossible to take any action pictures: posed photographs of revolutionaries was a repeated theme in the French workers' movement. Similar poses can be seen in the images of the strikes of 1936 (Doy 1979: 16; Dell 2000: 599–621). This does not mean that there were not photographs of workers demonstrating; such photographs appeared to a great extent in *L'Humanité*, which is another indication of the different imagery that dominated the student and the mainstream press.

This difference was also evident in the photographs that depicted assemblies. In many photographs published in the student press, such as the photograph from *Le Monde Libertaire* discussed earlier, the students were depicted participating in nonhierarchically structured meetings. In a similar photograph published in *Action* depicting a meeting at the occupied Sorbonne, the student speaking is just one of the participants, and he does not seem to have a leading role within the movement. It is true that the movement was fiercely resistant to any kind of leadership and hierarchies within the university, the society, and in mainstream party politics. In the student meetings, anyone could have the floor and no order or opinion was imposed. This practice was also a negation of the traditional-conventional politics as understood within participatory organizational structures of the old labor and communist movement. The movement's originality was its break with the old world, and especially with the habits of the political establishment. The photographs reproduce exactly this refusal of any kind of leadership, hierarchy, or traditional political organization.

This lack of visually represented hierarchy is obvious when contrasted with photographs of workers' meetings, which were published in trade union publications such as *La Vie Ouvrière*, the weekly newspaper of the Confédération Générale du Travail (CGT), the largest French trade

union, which took the largest part in controlling the workers' strikes during May 1968, and *L'Humanité*. One photograph reproduced in both papers is indicative. The photograph depicts a meeting of workers at Renault being addressed by the president of the CGT. The focus is on the speaker, while the workers on strike are listening passively to their union delegate. The existing hierarchy and the separation between the party representatives and the public not only resemble older representations of the labor movement, but also remind us of the representation of mainstream politics. The photograph is divided into two levels: the upper stage, where the delegate addresses the crowd, and the lower level, where the mass of workers stand. As the photograph was taken from a high viewpoint, this division becomes even clearer, while the delegate occupies a significant proportion of the image, directing the viewer's attention toward the speaker and not the massed workers. In contrast to the delegate, who is clearly seen in the photograph, the crowd is represented as a mass, and it is difficult to distinguish the individuals' faces.

There seems to be a substantial difference in the way students and workers appeared in these photographic representations. The student press prioritized photographs of students, reproducing a specific idea about the movement being a spontaneous, impulsive youth movement. These photographs contradicted photographs published in the trade union publications and *L'Humanité*, which showed static workers posing in front of their occupied factories or participating in a hierarchically structured meeting that resembled mainstream politics.

In fact, photography visualized an existing dichotomy in the alliance between the student body and the workers and their trade unions. This contradictory character of the alliance has been nicely described by Feenberg and Freedman:

A movement built on this alliance inevitably had two contrary faces. The one embodied the energy of student leaders, diffused and avowedly immoderate; this student energy had driven the police to commit brutalities that inspired a popular demonstration unequaled in the history of the Fifth Republic. The other aspect, that of the Communist Party and France's major union, the General Confederation of Workers (CGT), presented a reformist, almost moderate face. (2001: 28)

The students rejected the old ideas and organizational structures of the labor movement, and challenged the existing hierarchies in their political praxis, and especially in student sit-ins and open meetings (Castoriadis 1997: 49). These antihierarchical and antiauthoritarian demands never gained the support of the communist-oriented CGT. The workers' initial demands, which prior to the May events were not fundamentally different from those of their unions, were soon rearticulated to include not only wage increases and a reduction of working hours, but also structural changes in industry, such as the reduction of hierarchies, workers' self-administration, and the reorganization of decision making.¹⁰ But that applied only to a minority of workers. The major workers' organizations and, consequently, the majority of workers were not actually influenced by the goals of the student movement, continuing for the most part to restrict their demands to improvements in wages and working conditions and to the forging of electoral alliances.

The main trade union, CGT, not only attempted to prevent the alliance between students and workers, but also discouraged the students' demonstration at Renault, refused to support the students in public, and declined to meet with representatives of the UNEF (Feenberg and

Freedman 2001: 49–50). In reality, the CGT struggled to keep students out of the factories on strike, calling them the “children of the big bourgeoisie” and trying to isolate the student movement (Katsiaficas 1987: 110). The CGT also aimed to direct “the protest into the orderly channel of a mediated settlement” (Katsiaficas 1987: 265). Therefore, in the middle of June, after a gradual decay of the movement, the workers’ unions decided on a general return to work and agreed to resolve the conflict in reformist ways. The students were promised a democratization of the educational system and although occupations, demonstrations, and barricades continued for a while, the movement lost its strength and vitality, and thus was isolated and easily suppressed by force.

De Gaulle’s electoral victory at the end of June was preceded by pro-Gaullist demonstrations. *Le Figaro*, in contrast with the student press and *L’Humanité*, covered the demonstrations in support of the general. In particular, the first demonstration in support of the government, which took place in Paris on 30 May 1968, made the front page of *Le Figaro*. On that day, General de Gaulle called for elections, announced the dissolution of the National Assembly, and asked French civilians to “undertake ‘civil action’ against subversion and the threat of ‘totalitarian Communism’” (Caute 1988: 218). In response, thousands of his supporters marched up the Champs-Élysées holding national flags. The photograph published on the front page is of a massive demonstration, taken from a very high standpoint. The viewer is therefore confronted by a mass of people and a few banners, whose slogans are not distinguishable. The photograph resembled photographs of demonstrating students published earlier in the month in the mainstream press, except for the captions, which indicate the real purpose of the demonstration.

Conclusion

Photographs retrieved from the press that served the movement highlighted how the photographic medium represented the police, the student body, and the alliance between the students and the workers. It is true that when the students allied with the workers, they “had accomplished what the major unions had considered practically impossible, what the Communist Party had declared theoretically absurd, and what the government had never imagined” (Feenberg and Freedman 2001: 36). When the student mobilization was extended to the workers’ body, the students’ leaflets drew parallels between the students’ and workers’ demands, but the photographs failed to represent this alliance. Photographs focused on the youthful body of the uprising, participating in antihierarchical meetings and expressing their “destructive critique” against the state, while neglecting the middle-aged workers and professionals who vigorously participated in the events.

In comparison, photographs that portrayed workers striking and occupying factories were present in the mainstream press, and most particularly in *L’Humanité*. Photographs of posing workers in their occupied factories dominated the communist newspaper. Their resemblance to photographs of old labor movement meetings and mainstream politics was at odds with the students’ rejection of conventional leftist perceptions of revolutionary practice and denunciation of the political status quo. The two different representations reveal the existing differences that the movement needed to overcome in order to find an effective way to transform society.

Illustrations

Figure 8.3. *Action*, no. 3, 21 May 1968: 1



Figure 8.4. *Action*, no. 7, 11 June 1968: 4

Bibliography

- Agnoli, J. 2003. "Destruction As the Determination of the Scholar in Miserable Times." In *Revolutionary Writing*, ed. W. Bonefeld. New York: Autonomedia.
- Atelier Populaire. 1969. *Posters from the Revolution, Paris, May 1968*. London: Usine Université Union.
- Castoriadis, C. 1997. *World in Fragments: Writings on Politics, Society, Psychoanalysis and the Imagination*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Caute, D. 1988. *Sixty-Eight: The Year of the Barricades*. London: Hamish Hamilton.
- Cohn Bendit, D. and G. 2000. *Obsolete Communism: The Left-Wing Alternative*, AK Press,

- Edinburgh, London & San Francisco.
- Daniels, R. V. 1989. *1968: The Year of the Heroic Guerrilla*. London: Harvard University Press.
- Dell, S. J. 2000. "Festival and Revolution: The Popular Front in France and the Press Coverage of the Strikes of 1936." *Art History* 23, no. 4 (November): 599–621.
- Doy, G. 1979. "The Camera Against the Paris Commune." *Photography/Politics: I*, ed. T. Denet and J. Spence. London: Photography Workshop.
- Feenberg, A., and J. Freedman. 2001. *When Poetry Ruled the Streets: The French May Events of 1968*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Fraser, R. 1988. *1968: A Student Generation in Revolt*. London: Chatto and Windus.
- Gilcher-Holtey, I. 1998. "May 1968 in France." In *1968: The World Transformed*, ed. C. Fink, P. Gassert, and D. Junker. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hallin, D. C., and P. Mancini. 2004. *Comparing Media Systems: Three Models of Media and Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Katsiaficas, G. 1987. *The Imagination of the New Left: A Global Analysis of 1968*. Boston: South End Press.
- Reader, K. A. 1993. *The May 1968 Events in France: Reproductions and Interpretations*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Ritchin, F. 2003. "1968: Unbearable Relevance of Photography." *Aperture* 171: 62–73
- Ross, K. 2002. *May '68 and Its Afterlives*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Scott, H. F. V. 2008. "May 1968 and the Question of Image." *Rutgers Art Review* 24; 1-18.
- Seale, P., and M. McConville. 1968. *French Revolution 1968*. London: Penguin.
- Seidman, M. 2004. *The Imaginary Revolution: Parisian Students and Workers in 1968*. New York: Berghahn Books.

- Sekula, A. 1984. *Photography Against the Grain: Essays and Photoworks, 1973–1983*. Halifax: Press of the Nova Scotia College of Art and Design.
- Singer, D. 2002. *Prelude to Revolution: France in May 1968*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Touraine, A. 1971. *The May Movement: Revolt and Reform*. New York: Random House.
- Viénet, R. 1992. *Enrages and Situationists in the Occupation Movement: France, May 1968*. New York: Autonomedia and London: Rebel Press.
- Willsher, K. 2005. “Le Monde Lightens up.” *Guardian*, 8 November.
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/media/2005/nov/08/pressandpublishing.france> (accessed 7 May 2010).

Notes

1. *Le Monde* did not publish photographs until February 1972, when it published a cartoon for the first time. A photograph on its first page appeared only in December 1983. See Kim Willsher (2005).
2. As Daniel Singer explains, the UNEF was in the hands of various radical leftist groups after the mid-1950s. Although in its heyday during the Algerian war, after the war the UNEF gradually lost its strength. The Gaullist government contributed to its decay, since it deprived it of its subsidy and sponsored a nonpolitical union, which definitely weakened the UNEF (Singer 2002: 55). For a similar discussion, see Seale and McConville (1968). Also, Robert V. Daniels (1989: 155) argues that the UNEF moved toward the radical Left under the militant president Jaques Sauvageot. In March 1968, UNEF joined the anti-Vietnam campaign, proving its radical orientation.
3. For more details on the 22 March movement, see Cohn-Bendit and Cohn-Bendit (2000: 46–

53).

4. The Union des Jeunesses Communistes Marxistes-Leninistes (UJCML), along with the JCR, split from the orthodox Union des Étudiants Communistes (UEC, Union of Communist Students) (Singer 2002: 56–57).

5. For an interesting use of the terms “constructive critique” and “destructive critique,” see Agnoli (2003: 25–38).

6. *L’Humanité*’s headline read “Escalade de la violence policière au Quartier latin: Le Responsable c’est le gouvernement” (7 May 1968: 1). *Le Figaro*’s headline read “Violents Accrochages Hier jusqu’à 23 Heures” (7 May 1968: 1).

7. Photojournalists’ coverage of the events appeared later in photobooks, such as: Claude Dityvon, *Mai 68* (Paris: Camera Obscura, 1988); Bruno Barbey, *Mai 68 ou l’Imagination au Pouvoir* (Paris: Galerie Beaubourg, Editions de la Difference, 1998); Hood Museum of Art, Dartmouth College, *Protest in Paris 1968: Photographs by Serge Hambourg* (Hannover, NH: University Press of New England, 2006).

8. For a detailed overview of the various sectors’ strikes, see Seidman (2004: 161–214).

9. The caption in French reads: “Le vendredi 17 mai, pour la première fois en France, une manifestation étudiante a pris le chemin d’une usine occupée par les travailleurs: Renault.”

10. Ingrid Gilcher-Holtey (1998: 263) analyzes how the workers’ demands evolved from requests for the increase of wages and the reduction of working hours to more complicated demands. The new term *autogestion*, coined mainly by the CFDT, embraced demands of an antihierarchical and antiauthoritarian nature.