

ALEXANDRE MARC AND THE PERSONALISM OF L'ORDRE NOUVEAU 1920-1940

Christian Roy

History Department

McGill University, Montreal

November 1986

**A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and
Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of Master of Arts in History.**

© Christian Roy, 1986

Permission has been granted to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author (copyright owner) has reserved other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her written permission.

L'autorisation a été accordée à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur (titulaire du droit d'auteur) se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation écrite.

ISBN 0-315-38146-9

ABSTRACT

Born in Russia in 1904, Alexandre Marc was very active in the circles of the French non-conformist movements of the early 1930s. He founded the movement *L'Ordre Nouveau* in 1931; there, under the leadership of Arnaud Dandieu, who died prematurely in 1933, a philosophy of personalism was elaborated a few years before it was at the review *Esprit* where the term was made famous. Marc played an important role in the early *Esprit*. He established contacts on behalf of L'O.N. with a number of other youth movements both in France and abroad, most notably in Germany, Belgium and Great-Britain, in view of a revolution of youth against both liberal democracy and totalitarianism, for the advent of a federalist New Order that would do away with the centralized Nation-State. Marc was among the first French intellectuals to be conversant with German existentialist philosophy. He also took an active part in the Catholic revival in France, having converted in 1933.

RESUME

Né en Russie en 1904, Alexandre Marc a été très actif dans le milieu des mouvements non-conformistes français du début des années trente. En 1931 il fonde le mouvement L'Ordre Nouveau où, sous l'égide d'Arnaud Dandieu, la philosophie du personnalisme est élaborée quelques années avant qu'elle ne le soit à la revue Esprit, qui la rendra célèbre. Marc a joué un rôle important dans les débuts d'Esprit. Il a établi des contacts pour L'O.N. avec de nombreux mouvements de jeunesse en France comme à l'étranger -surtout en Allemagne, en Belgique et en Grande-Bretagne, en vue d'une révolution de la jeunesse contre le libéralisme et le totalitarisme, et de l'avènement d'un Ordre Nouveau fédéraliste sur les ruines de l'Etat-Nation. Marc a été parmi les premiers intellectuels français à être familier de la philosophie existentielle allemande. Il a également pris une part active au renouveau catholique en France, s'étant converti en 1933.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	i
Résumé	ii
Table of Contents	iii
Introduction	1
Footnotes to Introduction	5
I. ALEXANDRE MARC AND L'ORDRE NOUVEAU 1904-1933	6
Footnotes to chapter I	52
II. A SYNTHESIS OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE REVIEW L'ORDRE NOUVEAU	66
Footnotes to chapter II	102
III. ALEXANDRE MARC AND L'ORDRE NOUVEAU 1933-1940	115
Footnotes to chapter III	170
Conclusion	185
Footnotes to Conclusion	198
Bibliography	199
Appendix: A Rothkrugian View of European History	209
Footnotes to Appendix	227

INTRODUCTION

When in 1960 Jean Touchard published his ground-breaking study of the spirit of the early thirties in France, he pointed out that further research in that area "need not necessarily be centered on a review or a movement. The biography of certain men whose role has been very important (Dandieu or Mounier for instance) may be more suggestive in certain respects."¹ This could well be the case of Alexandre Marc. For not only was it largely through him that contacts were made between the various groups of the "*non-conformistes des années 30*" (to quote the title of Jean-Louis Loubet del Bayle's book inspired from Touchard's study)², so that there emerged for a while the lineaments of what seemed to be a "common front of youth" running across political and geographical boundaries, but his own spiritual and political evolution epitomizes in many ways that of a number of intellectuals of his generation.

It has already been treated in a collective tribute to this "master of integral federalism and eminent pioneer of the building of Europe"³, entitled *Le fédéralisme et Alexandre Marc*, which came out in 1974. As for the *L'Ordre Nouveau* movement founded by Marc, his son Edmond Lipiansky has devoted a special study to it, which was published alongside one of the *Club Jean-Moulin* by Bruno Rettenbach under the common title *Ordre et*

Démocratie in 1967.⁴ Jean-Louis Loubet del Bayle examined *L'Ordre Nouveau* in a comparative perspective in his aforementioned book published two years later. Drawing largely from the work of Lipiansky and Loubet del Bayle, Lutz Roemheld has portrayed *L'Ordre Nouveau* as the direct forerunner of the post-war federalist movement in Europe, in the first, historical volume of his *Integraler Föderalismus*, published in 1977.⁵ John Hellman has also discussed it in his biography of Emmanuel Mounier,⁶ published in 1981, where he highlighted Alexandre Marc's role in the beginnings of Esprit, and suggested that personalism originated at *L'Ordre Nouveau* rather than at the Esprit group as is commonly believed.

The present work explores some avenues opened by Professor Hellman. It clearly spells out the antecedence of *L'Ordre Nouveau*'s personalism as a coherent system over against Esprit's; it is examined primarily on its own terms, though its relation to Esprit's is discussed at length as well. The German roots of this personalism are also traced, and the debt it owes to the little known philosopher William Stern is emphasized. More light is thrown on the international contacts of *L'Ordre Nouveau*, the extent of which was unique for French movements at the time, and was due mostly to Marc. Generally, the importance of Marc's contribution to the life of these new movements can be more fully appreciated with the help of his own verbal account of his activities. For instance, he reveals that he invented

the German philosopher Otto Neumann to whose imaginary book *Revolution des Geistes* he devoted a very important article in the special issue of *Esprit* called *Rupture entre l'ordre chrétien et le désordre établi*.

If this thesis is primarily concerned with the history of ideas, it also purports to make some contribution to the history of mentalities. The ideas and attitudes of the people discussed here are put in the broader context of the *longue durée* in comments in the footnotes as well as in the conclusion. The framework for this effort of interpretation is the global and complex historiographical system devised by Lionel Rothkrug of Concordia University, who is both a profound theorist and a gifted practitioner of the history of mentalities. An outline of his view of European history is given as an appendix, which the reader is urged to peruse first, or at least before chapter II, where several footnotes refer to its contents. This thesis will thus constitute one of the first attempts at applying Rothkrug's method to the XXth century, after his own article on the medieval origins of Nazism.⁷

The author wishes to thank Professor Rothkrug for many a stimulating conversation relating (or not) to the issues raised by this thesis, as well as for his constant encouragement. Special gratitude is due to Professor Hellman for first suggesting the subject of this thesis, for making available to the

author one of two collections of L'Ordre Nouveau to be found in the Western Hemisphere as well as the tapes of Alexandre Marc's extensive comments on his book, and for recording a lengthy interview with M. Marc using questions prepared by the author. M. Alexandre Marc himself is heartily thanked for this interview and for having diligently answered all the author's subsequent queries, as well as having put him in contact with and often spoken on his behalf to a number of people susceptible of helping him. Among them, two veterans of L'Ordre Nouveau, MM. Xavier de Lignac and Louis Ollivier, must be thanked for their very complete answers to the author's questionnaires. The special zeal shown by M. André Moosmann in persistently sending, aside from enlightening answers, all manners of original documents he could find that could be of help to the author (notably on the Sohlberg and its aftermath), as well as copies of relevant passages from the memoirs of Philippe Lamour, Jacques Chabannes, and Pierre Andreu, of which the author had been previously unaware, was greatly appreciated. A great debt is owed to Mr. Harry Rutherford of the New Atlantis Foundation for putting the author on the right track after his search for literature on the non-conformist movements of Great-Britain had proved fruitless, and for providing original documents from them to boot. The author is also very grateful to Pr. Dr. Lutz Roemheld for sending him a copy of his book *Integraler Föderalismus*, the first volume of which had turned out to be out of print.

FOOTNOTES

1) Jean Touchard. "L'esprit des années 30: une tentative de renouvellement de la pensée politique française", in ***. *Tendances politiques dans la vie française depuis 1789*. Paris, Hachette, "Colloques. Cahiers de civilisation", 1960, p. 119.

2) Jean-Louis Loubet del Bayle. *Les non-conformistes des années 30. Une tentative de renouvellement de la pensée politique française*. Paris, Editions du Seuil, 1969, 496 p.

3) ***. *Le Fédéralisme et Alexandre Marc*. Lausanne, Centre de recherches européennes, 1974, p. VII.

4) Edmond Lipiansky & Bernard Rettenbach. *Ordre et Démocratie. Deux sociétés de pensée: De l'Ordre Nouveau au Club Jean-Moulin*. Préface de Jean de Soto. Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, "Travaux et Recherches de la Faculté de Droit et des Sciences Economiques de Paris, série 'Science Politique'", n° 10, 1967, 176 p.

5) Lutz Roemheld. *Integraler Föderalismus. Modell für Europa. Ein Weg zur personalen Gruppengesellschaft*. Band 1: *Geschichtliche Entwicklung*. München, Verlag Ernst Vögel, "Politik und politische Bildung", herausgegeben von Theo Stammen und Heinz Rausch, 1977, 336 S.

6) John Hellman. *Emmanuel Mounier and the New Catholic Left 1930-1950*. Toronto, Buffalo, London, University of Toronto Press, 1981, 360 p.

7) Lionel Rothkrug. "Peasant and Jew: Fears of Pollution" and "German Collective Perceptions", in *Historical Reflections/Réflexions historiques*, Vol. 10, No. 1, Spring 1983, pp. 59-77.

I. ALEXANDRE MARC AND L'ORDRE NOUVEAU 1904-1933

Alexandre Marc was born Aleksandr Markovich Lipiansky on February 1 (January 19 Old Style) 1904 in Odessa.¹ He lived there for only three years, as his family moved to Moscow in 1907. His parents were Jewish, and would normally have been forbidden to live in Moscow or Saint Petersburg. But Mr. Lipiansky converted to Lutheranism in order to evade this prohibition. As a convinced Marxist and fervent atheist, he made no bones about matters so trivial as religion. However, he was determined that his son remain untouched by such superstitions, and had him taught by private tutors out of fear that he might be contaminated by reactionary beliefs if he went to school with other children.² This did not prevent young Shura (to use the common diminutive form of his name by which he was then going)³ from having a Bar Mitzvah; for when he was about nine years old, his parents left him with his maternal grandparents, and his grandfather, being a Talmudist and very pious, took the opportunity to bring him to a synagogue and have him take part in a ceremony. He made him read a text written in Cyrillic characters but in a language which the boy did not understand. When afterwards Shura asked his grandfather what this had all been about, the old man's reply was: "It is because you are Jewish, you must belong to the Jewish religion, but you mustn't tell Mom and Dad." The promise was kept, but the lad's attention was now drawn to similarly inexplicable gatherings of

people like the ones he could not help noticing around a strange old building - a church - on the corner of Blagovishensky Alley, where his family lived. One day he finally asked his mother what this old building was that attracted such crowds. Was it a museum? She had to explain, after a moment of embarrassment, that there were superstitious people with bizarre ideas, who were not *kulturnye cheloveki* (literally, "cultured people", but with the connotation of "gentlemen"). This was the whole extent of Aleksandr Markovich Lipiansky's religious education as a child. But he remained intrigued.⁴

His curiosity did not lack other outlets, though. That same year - 1914, on a visit to his uncle Léon Mirlesse, a Menshevik who had settled in France after the failure of the Revolution of 1905, he read his first philosophical book: *Also sprach Zarathustra*. Though it was in a bad French translation, he was moved by the sheer poetry of it, even if he did not understand much of what it was about. It awoke in him a life-long interest in Nietzsche, because he did recognize that this thinker stood for man against all determinisms, and this was grist for Lipiansky's mill, as he was reacting at that time against his parents' Marxism, by taking the side of the tradition in Russian thought that privileged the role of man in history as opposed to the blind determinisms highlighted by its Hegelian tradition. It is not without ground that Alexandre Marc locates the roots of his personalism in the tradition of Bel-

insky and Mikhailovsky.⁵ Vissarion Grigorievich Belinsky (1821-1848) could proclaim that "the fate of the subject, the individual, the personality is more important than the fate of the whole world and the health of the Emperor of China (i.e. the Hegelian *Allgemeinheit*)."⁶ Dostoevsky once said of him: "He believed... that socialism not only does not destroy the freedom of the individual personality but, on the contrary, restores it to unheard-of splendour, on new and this time adamant foundations."⁷ This is precisely the type of revolution envisioned by personalism. As for Nikolai Konstantinovich Mikhailovsky (1842-1904), he saw "all of history as an endless 'struggle for individuality' and described the coming golden age as one of 'subjective anthropocentrism'. "⁸ As in personalism, man becomes here the measure of all things. Also, Russian populists like Mikhailovsky, just as French socialists like Proudhon, who would provide a model for a personalist, revolutionary politics, "believed in 'subjective socialism' to be brought about by moral ideals rather than 'objective socialism' that is created irrespective of human wishes by economic forces."⁹ By Lipiansky's time, the Socialist Revolutionaries stood for the former, as opposed to the Social Democrats who stood for the latter. He was therefore a supporter of the SR's, and subsequently never strayed from the libertarian, communalist and federalist thrust of their brand of politics, that makes them proto-personalist in his eyes.¹⁰

Lipiansky's commitment to this ideal of human dignity, naive as it was at this early age, was nonetheless total. The Revolution would soon give him the opportunity to demonstrate what he would preach all his life: that thought and action are inseparable. Soon after the Bolsheviks took over, he was briefly arrested for making a speech against a separate peace in front of the Pushkin monument. "How can we do this to France, the land of the Revolution?", he cried. The Red Guard who had intervened, after asking his age, told him to go away in no uncertain terms.¹¹ Undaunted, he took part in the demonstration protesting the dissolution of the Constituent Assembly, where the SR's had just obtained a majority in the only free election in Russian history. The demonstrators never got to the Supreme Soviet where they were headed, as they were welcomed with machine gun fire. Most disbanded, but a small contingent went on. Shura Lipiansky was among them. "Come back, idiot, you are too young to die!", a woman shouted from a window. The protesters were mowed down, and there were only three survivors, including Lipiansky, covered with the dead's blood, but himself uninjured. On another occasion, he was part of a clandestine group of young people, led by their elder, a 17-year old girl with whom he was infatuated. One day he volunteered to get the Pravda, as there was talk of a change in the Supreme Soviet and the group wanted to get the facts straight. When he came back, the house where it was meeting had been surrounded; Lipiansky's comrades were all executed.¹²

In 1918 the Lipiansky family fled Russia and sought refuge in Paris. Mr. Lipiansky, though a Marxist, was also a multimillionaire. He had amassed a fortune since 1914, when the success of a popular textbook of literary history he had written allowed him to go into business. He had a partner in America who was in charge of their company's financial interests there; he counted on him to get his share back. Instead, his partner disappeared with all of Mr. Lipiansky's assets outside Russia. Nevertheless, convinced, like many émigrés, that the Bolsheviks would soon be ousted and his fortune restored to him, he started spending all the money he had on luxury apartments that he could not afford. Eventually, as the Bolsheviks lingered in power, he decided to try and go into business in Berlin, where he had many contacts in the Russian colony. But Alexandre (as Shura then started being called) stayed behind with his uncle Léon in order to complete his high school studies at the Lycée Saint-Louis, which he had started in 1919. He specialized in mathematics. During this period, his study of biology convinced him that Darwinism was an unsatisfactory theory and that there had to be some sort of higher being to account for the purposefulness of Nature. Having read Dmitri Merezhkovsky's world-historical novel trilogy Christ and Antichrist, he had by then realized that interest in religion was not confined to *nekulturnye cheloveki*, that it was indeed a serious pursuit, since someone could be willing to write thous-

ands of pages on that improbable topic without fear of ridicule. To see if he could not flesh out his new-found deism, the 16-year old Alexandre Lipiansky launched upon an investigation of living religion, starting with Protestantism, the one most acceptable in his milieu. This religion had something else to commend itself to him; it was also the religion of Kant, through whose works he had browsed when he was twelve or thirteen. He had liked Kant's emphasis on the subject, consonant as it was with his need to establish the irreducibility of the self to its material conditions over against the determinist assumptions current in his environment, and yet still scientific enough to have credibility for someone with Lipiansky's outlook. But Kant notwithstanding, Lipiansky's interest in Protestantism was short-lived, as he found the Reformed religion rather barren.¹³

The next step in Lipiansky's inquiry into religion was Orthodoxy, which he came to know, if not to appreciate, through Berdyaeff, who had just been expelled from the University of Moscow. He made Berdyaeff's acquaintance when he joined his parents in Berlin after having obtained his *baccalauréat*. He took part in the meetings of the Berdyaeff Circle, and had numerous private discussions with the master about philosophical problems, especially that of human freedom, which was becoming of central importance to him. It is from Berdyaeff that Lipiansky would derive certain tendencies to religious speculation

which the abbé Plaquevent, who would baptize him a decade later, would warn him against, calling them "gnostic".¹⁴ But Berdyaeff's influence did not go so far as to significantly alter Lipiansky's image of Orthodoxy as hopelessly medieval, at a time when he still shared progressive assumptions about the "Dark" Middle Ages. Also, this religion went against the grain of his thinking, which was basically rationalistic. So, being in the land of philosophy, he decided to take up this discipline at university. He spent the Fall semester of 1923 at the University of Jena, where his professors failed to impress him, except for Jonas Cohn, whose course on the dialectics of classic philosophers like Hegel and Kant gave him a firm grounding in an area that was to occupy a central place in his thought.¹⁵ But the neo-Kantianism of his professors put him off; a renegade from this school of thought, Nicolai Hartmann, a fellow Russian whom Lipiansky knew and admired, had deflated his appreciation of Kant.¹⁶ For him, all problems were problems of Being. He shared this approach with his former master Edmund Husserl, which may be one of the reasons Lipiansky moved on to Freiburg, where he was teaching, for the Winter semester of 1924. He had been tantalized by Husserl's pretension to rid philosophy of psychological categorizations. He soon found, however, that if any philosophy was mired in psychology, it was Husserl's phenomenology. Furthermore, Husserl's ideal of "*Philosophie als strenge Wissenschaft*" was completely foreign to his thought.¹⁷ Eight years later, he would attack it in "*Misère*

et grandeur du spirituel"¹⁸, an article written with Arnaud Dandieu, who knew of Husserl and contemporary German philosophers mostly through Marc, though partly also through the sociologist Georges Gurvitch, with whom he was acquainted, and to whose work Marc would often refer to in the pages of *L'Ordre Nouveau*, as his ideas (on law especially) were close to those put forward by the review.¹⁹ Husserl's assistant Martin Heidegger did not make much of an impression on Lipiansky either, though students were already talking of him as "our Aristotle". And yet, when *Sein und Zeit* came out in 1927, he immediately read it and told his friends it was a very important book.²⁰ In specialized philosophical works (like his articles for the *Archives de philosophie* in the mid-1930's), Alexandre Marc would often refer to Heidegger. But not too much should be made of his awareness of Husserl and Heidegger, noteworthy as it is for that period in France, because it was just that: an awareness, and not an actual influence.

Not so for Max Scheler. Alexandre Lipiansky was deeply influenced by the two major works of the Jewish-born thinker's Catholic period: *Der Formalismus in der Ethik und die materiale Wertethik*, written between 1913 and 1916, and especially *Wesen und Formen der Sympathie*, first published in 1913, which came out in a second edition in 1923. That year, Lipiansky paid Scheler a visit in Cologne, and later would even begin a French translation of the latter book, which he would abandon

only, because he lacked academic help in finding a publisher.²¹ The book on sympathy contained a number of personalist elements, like the postulate of the irreducible unity of body and soul; and the identification of the person with its acts. The idea that their subject is the person, and that it is located in the individual, albeit in communion with other persons, must have had a special attraction to Lipiansky, given the drift of his philosophical inquiries since early youth. It was also to be found in the magnum opus of a now forgotten thinker of that time, William Stern. Lipiansky was profoundly affected by browsing through the three volumes of the latter's *Person und Sache. System des kritischen Personalismus*, published in 1923 and 1924. This system of personalism had been conceived at the turn of the century by a psychologist specializing in the development of the personality. Though his prime interest was really philosophy, he could not bring himself to work within the academic establishment in this discipline, because his real passion was for metaphysics, and at that time this kind of concern was even less in fashion than in Heidegger's. This was not the only thing Stern had in common with Heidegger. He defined the metaphysical question as "not that of the cause, but of the meaning of Being [*das Seiende*]." ²² And like Heidegger, Stern sought this meaning at the heart of concrete human existence. He went about this task outside of any established school and without founding his own -although it is possible to see in French personalism a direct continuation of his effort.

Thus, as we shall see later on, through Alexandre Marc, the personalism of the non-conformist groups of the 1930s owes Stern its name (though Scheler's *Formalismus* was also subtitled *Neuer Versuch der Grundlegung eines ethischen Personalismus*). But this may not be all that it owes him. There are so many elements in William Stern's system of critical personalism that prefigure French personalism (that of *L'Ordre Nouveau*, at any rate) that one is entitled to wonder if Alexandre Marc did not carry them with him as the nuclei of some formulations of this philosophy.

In any case, he himself highlighted the convergence of both systems on many points in an article written under the name of René Dupuis and published in the *Revue d'Allemagne* in April 1933: "Le 'personnalisme' de William Stern et la jeunesse française"²³. One "precise and singularly important" such point was the insistence that, "if 'persons' are individual and concrete, it is they who, in the final analysis, found and justify the abstract and the general [...]" and not the "things", which are "neither individual nor concrete"; they are mere aggregates, held together by force fields, unlike the person, whose characteristic according to Stern is "*konkrete, ziel-tätige Ganzheit*"²⁴. By taking it and everything else as an object and thus as a thing, philosophy has become reified, and "has given inert and impersonal categories to 'positivists' and 'idealists' alike." Such are the body and the soul conceived

as separate entities. "On this point of capital importance, French personalism and the 'personalism' of William Stern meet in complete accord. [...] For him [as for *L'Ordre Nouveau*], the physical and the psychical are only aspects or modes of manifestation of the 'person' which is, as such, indifferent relative to this distinction (*psychophysischneutral*).". Moreover, the person for William Stern is not a "given" but a "vocation" (*Berufensein*) - another "fundamental point" of "concordance of French personalism and Stern's 'personalism'." Many more would be revealed by a thorough comparison of the two systems of thought. But such an undertaking is not possible within the scope of this thesis. Let it simply be said for the time being that some of the philosophical roots of French personalism seem to lie in the German personalism of William Stern and Max Scheler.

It is not only the seeds of Alexandre Marc's personalism that were sown while he was in Germany. His European federalism had also taken shape by the time he left²⁵, including his contempt for pacifism, which he had already demonstrated during the Russian Revolution, and that kept him from attending a Franco-German congress held in Freiburg and organized in a pacifistic spirit by Marc Sangnier's Republican Catholic paper *Le Sillon*; instead, interested if sceptical, Lipiansky watched the people coming in and out of the meeting hall... Having been disappointed by the academic study of philosophy, he

returned to France to pursue his interest in politics, studying law as well.²⁶ He graduated from the Ecole libre des Sciences politiques in 1927, and was hired by the Editions Hachette as secretary to the director of the great works department. By then, he already considered himself a Frenchman, a feeling which his discovery of Péguy towards the end of the decade can only have strengthened. It is out of reverence for Péguy that soon afterwards Lipiansky took an interest in Bergson (though he never became a bona fide Bergsonian), as the poet had taken up the cause of the philosopher when he had been attacked by the *Action française* before the war.²⁷

However imbued Lipiansky became with the eternal spirit of France he would extol in the pages of *L'Ordre Nouveau*, he kept a lively interest in Germany, and made a number of short stays there in the second half of the twenties. On one occasion, while he was staying with a family of Social-Democrats in Bavaria, he had the opportunity to attend a speech by Adolf Hitler in the course of which the latter, being heckled in the following terms: "Shut up! Germany will never follow you!", responded unabashedly: "Germany? I am Germany!" Asked by his hosts if he had fun at "that man Hittel"'s meeting, Lipiansky reported the incident, saying that "someone who can say things like that without fear of ridicule is dangerous". He wrote an article inspired by his fears, entitled "Hitler au pouvoir", and submitted it to *Le Correspondant*, which mockingly turned it

down. This was in 1929.²⁸

Two years later, Lipiansky, who had just resigned from Hachette to found the press agency Pax-Press, concerned with European unity²⁹, took part in a gathering of French and German youth on the Sohlberg in the Black Forest, south of Baden Baden, from July 26 to August 3, 1930. It was the pet project of the president of the working community of Karlsruhe youth movements (*Arbeitsgemeinschaft Karlsruher Jugendbünde*), a young drawing teacher who was a passionate lover of France: Otto Abetz. Though at the time he was still a staunch opponent of Nazism, and alerted Lipiansky to its worst aspects, during the war he would be Germany's ambassador to France.³⁰ On the French side, the meeting was organized by Jean Luchaire, the ambitious and corrupt editor of the subsidized Briandist weekly *Notre Temps*, the self-styled *revue des nouvelles générations*.³¹ The *groupement universitaire franco-allemand* was also involved. Because of the artificial character of the non-partisan group thus assembled from both sides of the Rhine, the level of discussion was not particularly high.³² Abetz's big idea was to form new friendships as a concrete means towards Franco-German rapprochement and eventual unity. Lipiansky thought that was all well and good, except that he saw this simply as a first step towards the formation of a movement for European federation, an idea that left Abetz cold, as well as most of the participants in the Franco-German camp, whose chief interest

was in the nights spent in song around campfires and in moonlight walks with young ladies.³³ Alexandre Lipiansky was therefore rather disappointed by the whole experience. He had more serious things on his mind. André Moosmann, who met him at the camp, as a slavist was "struck and interested by the personality" of this "amusing, rather dandy-like" Russian Jew who confided to him that he was on his way to a conversion not to Orthodoxy, but to Catholicism.³⁴

A short while before, walking past the Encyclopédie catholique at the Bibliothèque Nationale, Lipiansky had suddenly wondered what Catholics had to say on freedom, a philosophical problem that was preoccupying him at the time. As the article on freedom contained many interesting citations from saint Augustine, he asked a librarian for a book by that author. The librarian gave him Augustine's Confessions. Reading it, Lipiansky was dazzled, overwhelmed. The book changed his life forever. It got him so interested in Catholicism that when he came to the fourth or fifth meeting of the veterans of the Sohlberg at a restaurant on the rue du Moulin Vert, seeing that not much was happening since Jean Luchaire, who had founded the circle, had lost interest in it, he took over its vacant leadership and turned it into a forum for oecumenical discussions (as a matter of fact the first one of its kind at a non-institutional level), basically as a pretext for getting to meet Catholics. He managed to bring to what would come to be known

as the *Club du Moulin Vert* the philosopher Gabriel Marcel, some Dominicans from Juvisy, and future theologians Father Jean Daniélou and Father Yves Congar, OP, who at that time was still a novice at Saulchoir in Belgium, whence Lipiansky fetched him personally.³⁵

André Moosmann, who had attended the first meeting of the *Anciens du Schilberg* at the *Moulin Vert* on Monday, October 27, 1930, was away in Germany for a while. When he came back, he found Lipiansky running things; he "seemed to be possessed by the search for new principles and by religious problems", Moosmann recalls. Lipiansky asked him for contacts with Russian Orthodox thinkers and bright young Protestants (Moosmann was Protestant himself).³⁶ On the Orthodox side, Lipiansky had already gotten his old friend Berdyaeff interested.³⁷ Thanks to Moosmann, the naturalized Father Eugraphe Kovalevski³⁸, the French Father Lev Gillet, a former Benedictine now associated with the *Mouvement des Etudiants Chrétiens Russes*³⁹, and the theologian Father Bulgakoff, an authority on sophiology, joined Berdyaeff.⁴⁰ Through Moosmann also came Protestant ministers Westphal, Pierre Maury, W. Visser t'Hooft, secretary general of the "Ecumenical Council in formation", Roland de Pury, then still a student, who would distinguish himself in the Resistance, and Max Dominicé, who brought with him a Swiss countryman and fellow disciple of the theologian Karl Barth, Denis de Rougemont.⁴¹ He had until recently been absorbed in German

Romanticism and fascinated by Surrealism, and had also dabbled in esoteric doctrines. Now that all this mystical haze was dissipating from his life under the sobering influence of the stern existential Christianity of Karl Barth, de Rougemont was itching for a kind of spiritual commitment that would also be firmly rooted in concrete human existence, and would thus be eminently political. The object of this engagement, as he would come to call it, bestowing upon his generation as well as a few subsequent ones an enduring shibboleth, was first revealed to him in a flash upon reading a capitalized sentence in the middle of a sheet of paper bearing the title *Manifeste*, that was handed to him by a smiling and urbane Russian at the house of the Catholic critic Charles Du Bos in Versailles in early 1931:

"WE ARE NEITHER INDIVIDUALISTS NOR COLLECTIVISTS, WE ARE PERSONALISTS!"⁴²

This document was the *Manifeste pour un Ordre Nouveau*, and it was signed by Alexandre Marc, Gabriel Marcel and Gabriel Rey. But it is Alexandre Marc (the pen-name Lipiansky had just started to use on the suggestion of his superior at Hachette, René Vaubourdolle, after he signed an article against Nazism "Alex. M. Lipiansky"⁴³) who was its sole author. The manifesto was the product of a split that had taken place in the *Club du Moulin Vert* after the debate following Marc's first presentation, which drew largely on the theories of Werner Sombart to demonstrate the role played by Protestantism in the development

of capitalism.⁴⁴ If it was clear to everyone present that a discussion of spirituality in the modern world could not but spill over into that of the politics of this world in which the Spirit no longer seemed to have a place, the Catholics in the group, led by Alexandre Marc, insisted that there should be a separate group devoted exclusively to political studies, leaving properly religious concerns to the original oecumenical circle. Despite initial resistance to the idea from the Protestants, led by Roland de Pury and Denis de Rougemont, the scission was unanimously agreed to. Marc had put the issue bluntly: since the way things were going war was inevitable, the alternative was either to recognize there was nothing to be done and go to Canada, as they spoke French there, and found a colony that would constitute a reserve for rebuilding France after the war, or to stay in France and attempt to prevent the war by making her strong again through a New Order that would stand beyond the various impasses of the modern world and overcome its artificial dichotomies.⁴⁵

Alexandre Marc made it a point to distribute the manifesto to all his acquaintances, and thus formed from those who were interested the first nucleus of what would soon become the *Ordre Nouveau* movement. Aside from Denis de Rougemont, he thus enrolled two former colleagues from Hachette, Gabriel Rey and the ex-Trotskyite Jacques Naville, and three old friends from *Sciences Po*: the "fanciful and imaginative" Jean Jardin,

who had followed both surrealism and the *Action française*⁴⁶, René Dupuis, "an intelligent but whimsical young man" who was the son of the principal of the Ecole libre des Sciences politiques,⁴⁷ and Yvonne Serruys, a bright and very beautiful Belgian who was rumoured to be Marc's fiancée. However, the group would soon crystallize around the personality of the author of a new book on Proust whom Marc sought out, because he found the book so good, and was intrigued by the fact that its undeniable quality had elicited its co-publication in Paris and Oxford. Marc found Arnaud Dandieu at the Bibliothèque Nationale, where he was employed.⁴⁸ (Other future luminaries were his colleagues there: Georges Bataille, the philosopher of desire, and Henri Corbin, the translator of Heidegger turned specialist on Shiite mysticism.⁴⁹) In the course of their conversation, Marc and Dandieu found that they had much more in common than an interest in Proust. Their perspectives on life in general and politics in particular converged on many points.⁵⁰ If certain thinkers had played a part in the intellectual formation of both men: Nietzsche, Bergson, Sombart, others would be introduced to *L'Ordre Nouveau* by Dandieu: Proudhon, first editions of whose works were kept as heirlooms by the Dandieu family in the Garonne, proud as it was of its peasant roots and socialist traditions; Marx, whom Dandieu used to describe as "a revolutionary who died young"; Sorel, whom he liked "for his impenitent individualism, his hatred of all utopias, and the choice place he gave to violence in the order of ideas as in

that of action"; and the psychiatrist Eugène Minkowski⁵¹, who would even contribute to L'Ordre Nouveau, and whose definition of schizophrenia as the loss of vital contact with the real would provide the movement with a key metaphor for the condition of modern man.

This idea loomed large in the thinking of Dandieu; he was inclined to wax philosophical about it. As his friend Jean Canu reports, "Arnaud Dandieu was one of these men, increasingly numerous in France today, for whom metaphysics exist, for whom they even constitute the only way of access to the real." This is why "whatever he says, whatever he does, the metaphysical preoccupation haunts him, inspiring his words and deeds. He does not see in the critique of the mind or of science an agreeable rhetor's game, a decent way of wasting time without having to take a stand, as the more or less avowed positivists of the preceding age liked to think. He feels a physical need, a famished eagerness to reach the real, to escape appearances, abstractions, frameworks where thought becomes frozen and sterile."⁵² It is what made Dandieu come out in favour of thinkers who are unfettered by loyalties to established schools which reduce the real to a simplistic scheme, in his introduction to an impressive *Anthologie des philosophes français contemporains* he edited in 1929. It is also what had impelled him for two years before that to undertake, in close collaboration with Robert Aron, a schoolmate from the Lycée Condorcet who had founded the

surrealist Théâtre Alfred-Jarry and produced Artaud's plays, thorough doctrinal work in view of a radical critique of the rationalist constructs that stand between man and the full reality of experience. This effort would come to fruition in 1931 in two books that fitted perfectly into the project of total reassessment of received ideas that was the original impetus of *L'Ordre Nouveau*. One was the controversial *Décadence de la Nation française*, whose very title caused a sensation⁵³; it opposed to the "abstract and oppressive myths of the Nation and the Revolution" "two words that complete each other as federalism completes internationalism": "Patrie and Revolution", "means of aggression and of contact of the individual with the world" that "bring the necessary solution to modern absurdities."⁵⁴ The other book, drawn in part from a series of articles in the review *Europe*, was entitled *Le cancer américain*; its title referred to the disease of misguided rationalism, which had found a perfect breeding ground in America, though it had originated in Europe and was now threatening to overwhelm her in turn.

Along with these two books, Arnaud Dandieu brought to *L'Ordre Nouveau* a ready-made method, his "dichotomic method" (which shall be discussed at length in the next section of this thesis), and thus provided it with the backbone of its doctrine. But the "revolutionary individualism" which he had put forward in his writings up to then lent itself to certain amb-

iguities because of the liberal overtones of the word "individual". Alexandre Marc was quick to point this out to him, and Dandieu readily acknowledged it, accepting Marc's alternative term of "personalism", suggested with Stern in mind.⁵⁵ The word had already been used somewhat vaguely as a slogan in Marc's *Manifeste pour un Ordre Nouveau*; it was now fleshed out by its application to the developing philosophical system of Arnaud Dandieu, and could begin in earnest its brilliant career in French intellectual history. For it must be remembered that in 1931 what would become the Esprit group was still toying with the idea of a review devoted to "the spiritual", and that the concept of person, let alone that of personalism, did not yet occupy the central place it later would have in its proceedings.⁵⁶ By contrast, at *L'Ordre Nouveau*, personalism, as conceived by Marc and shaped by Dandieu, provided from the outset the focus of discussion.

But, as Jean-Louis Loubet del Bayle put it, "if Arnaud Dandieu was the 'thinker' of *L'Ordre Nouveau*, Daniel-Rops was its most effective spokesman."⁵⁷ He had been invited on the suggestion of Marc's friend the painter Jean Drieyès.⁵⁸ Daniel-Rops was the pen name of Henri Petiot, a history teacher permeated by the visions of doom of Oswald Spengler and René Guénon. His first book was a noted generational *témoignage*, significantly entitled *Notre inquiétude*, and published in 1926. Three years later his first novel *L'Ame obscure*, in which

autobiographical elements abounded, was a variation on the same theme; "this book," wrote Gabriel Marcel, "in what is original and deep in it, is the picture of a soul that ends up finding in its very *inquiétude* a kind of culpable delight, and who, imperceptibly, becomes an accomplice of the dark forces that lead it to its ruin."⁵⁹ Petiot himself managed to overcome this temptation and, like Marc, turned to Catholicism. He had come to realize that "genuine *inquiétude*, the only one that is valid in itself, is metaphysical *inquiétude*"⁶⁰; it leads us to recognize "that only an inner order capable of making an end of the crisis of modern man would secure genuine peace, not only material peace but peace of mind, and would restore to the world the sense of a lost calm."⁶¹ Daniel-Rops wrote this in *Le monde sans âme*, a book he had been working on since 1926 and finished writing after having joined *L'Ordre Nouveau*, where many shared yearnings akin to his own. It was the first in a string of essays in which the ideas of the movement would be made familiar to a larger public, who would pay attention to what a young writer, hailed as one of the most promising of his generation, had to say.

With the addition of Daniel-Rops, the first *L'Ordre Nouveau* team had now taken shape. But as Robert Aron recalls in his memoirs, "around the original nucleus thus constituted were soon gathered friends and acquaintances, who would participate intensively in our effort. Dandieu brought Claude Chevalley,

the mathematician, whose father, Abel Chevalley, the renowned scholar of English studies, had become interested in the research of my friend and had facilitated the publication of his work on Proust. He also attracted a young lawyer, Robert Kiéfé, who would later turn to Marxism. He also recruited sympathizers of the first hour, like one of his colleagues from the Bibliothèque Nationale, Jacques Lavaud, or one of his schoolmates, Jean Canu.⁶² There were still others who were associated with *L'Ordre Nouveau* for a spell, "coming from very diverse horizons"⁶³, like A. de Chauveron, P. Mardrus, André Poncet, Pierre-Olivier Lapie and Louis Deschizeau. (The latter two would eventually become deputies in hopes of changing the system from the inside)⁶⁴. "Contacts were multiplied, appointments for exchanges of opinions were becoming more numerous: behind the scene at the Bibliothèque Nationale or at the NRF, at café terraces or at restaurant tables in-depth work was beginning to be accomplished where young people met, concerned with real efficacy and not with rapid success."⁶⁵ (Robert Aron) At the end of 1931, this work was institutionalized with the creation of a *Centre d'Étude de l'Ordre Nouveau* "open to all people attracted by its effort". Aside from private sessions of doctrinal work, it organized public meetings where people like Eugenio d'Ors, Ramón Fernandez, André Siegfried, and Gaston Bergery agreed to give talks.⁶⁶

In November, *L'Ordre Nouveau* found another forum in a very stylish review called *Plans*. Published under patronage of the wife of a rich architect, it was the brainchild of Philippe La-mour, a lawyer who had once led a short-lived radical splinter group from Georges Valois's Blueshirts, the *Parti fasciste révolutionnaire*.⁶⁷ Alexandre Marc had made his acquaintance shortly thereafter at the end of the twenties⁶⁸, and was now helping him run the new review, along with Hubert Lagardelle, a comrade of Sorel whom they had fetched from his semi-retirement in Toulouse out of their common enthusiasm for anarcho-syndicalism. (Lagardelle actually did not do much, and eventually absconded to live in a Roman palace provided by his admirer Mussolini.)⁶⁹ In the tenth issue of *Plans*, *L'Ordre Nouveau* was officially welcomed in the editorial team. The Manifeste de "*L'Ordre Nouveau*", written in March and where the outline of the movement's doctrine was already well defined, was published with slight emendations. The formation of a *Comité d'Action Plans-Ordre Nouveau* was announced, whose main task was to organize the French section of a *Front unique de la jeunesse européenne* for the revolutionary dismantling of the Nation-State and the building of a "real European federalism" based on a planned economy.⁷⁰ The German wing was represented by Otto Abetz, who was now a collaborator of Baldur von Schirach (the future *Hitler-Jugend* leader) in the Social-Democratic paramilitary league *Reichsbanner Schwarz-Rot-Gold*, and Harro Schulze-Boysen, the president of the *Berlin Cercle d'Amis de Plans*.⁷¹ If

relations grew cool with Abetz because of his association with Jean Luchaire, whom both Marc and Lamour despised⁷², close contacts would be formed with Harro Schulze-Boysen. A formal meeting between his *Gegner* movement and *Plans-Ordre Nouveau* took place at Burg Liebenstein on the Rhine two days after Christmas.⁷³

It was followed by a congress of European youth held in Frankfurt during the carnival⁷⁴, and organized chiefly by Marc in hopes of "mobilizing all forces which could have opposed Nazism"⁷⁵, whose rising tide had appalled him and Lamour on their preceding trips to Germany.⁷⁶ In the course of the preparation of the congress, Marc had passed through Mannheim, where André Moosmann was now teaching. Moosmann recalls: "I found a new Marc, the dandy had totally vanished. He constantly spoke of 'revolution' and lived in great exaltation."⁷⁷ He was disappointed however by the congress, because if he had been left unimpressed by the levity of the German delegates at the Sohlberg, he was now shocked by the depravity of those who came to Frankfurt, who turned out to be mostly homosexuals.⁷⁸ Nevertheless, this congress marked the beginning of intense contacts with a variety of non-Marxist and anti-Nazi revolutionary movements in Germany, all effected through the agency of Harro Schulze-Boysen. His *Gegner* movement differed radically from *L'Ordre Nouveau* in the importance it gave to doctrine: none. Armin Mohler has aptly put its *Weltanschauung*

in a nutshell: "*Bewegung als Selbstzweck*".⁷⁹ Marc ascribes this difference in attitude to the one in age: "we were doctrinaires and grown men, and they were kids who were restless, wanted to do something, anything, like sticking placards - it was a different style."⁸⁰ Still, both movements were based on the central assumption of the *Front unique de la jeunesse européenne* as stated in Plans in November: "The great revolutionary gesture and the first one to accomplish is the union on the horizontal plane of all the youth of any country and any party representing the will of a new world against the artificially shaded block of all the upholders of the old spirit."⁸¹ As this was the sole *raison d'être* of the *Gegner* and they only believed in direct and immediate action, it made them all the more useful in *L'Ordre Nouveau's* quest for new revolutionary movements, because of its ready-made ties with most of them. Schulze-Boysen's connections in high places (he was an admiral's son and Tirpitz's grandson⁸²) also proved invaluable; for instance, they allowed him to get Marc a free pass for all of Lufthansa's internal flights.⁸³

Among the groups Marc thus had the opportunity to meet, there was the one around the review *Die Tat*, to which he would devote an article in the *Revue d'Allemagne* in October 1932. The *Tatkreis*, like the *Gegner* and *L'Ordre Nouveau*, favoured the overcoming of the Nation-State structure in Europe. Moreover, the "*Volksstaat*" it was propounding was to be the emanation of

a popular movement, embodied in an order of people who had first made the revolution in their own lives by breaking with the bourgeois world-view, thus conquering the spiritual authority that alone could lead the Nation and Europe into a new era where the Economy would be submitted to ideal values and materialism finally overcome. This notion of an Order of revolutionaries of the spirit as the nucleus for the New Order of all society was also at the very root of *L'Ordre Nouveau*'s attitude, and was what the *Gegner* meant by the term "Ordenstaat" it applied to its ideal society. But the only parallel acknowledged by Marc in his article between the doctrines of *Die Tat* and *Plans-Ordre Nouveau* was the rejection of capitalism for the sterility of the all-encompassing economic sphere in which it had drawn the world. Such views had just been expounded in a best-selling book by someone from the *Tatkreis*, which was being translated into French: *Das Ende des Kapitalismus*.⁸⁴ Marc tried several times in vain to meet its mysterious author Ferdinand Fried (actually a pen name for Friedrich Zimmermann, who was hiding behind it).⁸⁵

However, thanks to Schulze-Boysen, Marc did have the privilege of visiting another celebrity of the day, Lieutenant Richard Scheringer, in his cell at the citadel of Gollnow in Mecklenburg. He had been convicted of high treason for Nazi agitation in his regiment in the famous *Reichswehr* trial of 1930, where Hitler was a witness. But while in prison, he had

very publicly gone over to Communism, a statement to that effect having been read in the Reichstag on March 19, 1931. Freed shortly thereafter, he was tried again in the spring of 1932, and again convicted of high treason, for Communist agitation this time.⁸⁶ If he had turned his coat, it was in order to be consistent, for he had done it out of unwavering nationalism, hoping "to use social revolution for patriotic ends"⁸⁷. Not a few ultra-nationalists cherished the same dream; they were willing to do anything short of becoming Communists themselves to promote all out class-struggle and alliance with the U.S.S.R. so as to free Germany from the shackles of capitalism, equated with the West. Only the proletariat, it was reckoned, was untainted by its internationalism, and could be the vector of national rebirth. Germany had to throw in her lot with the other oppressed peoples of the world, the proletarian nations, the coloured races. The *Gegner* liked to toy with such ideas, which they shared with other more radical groups. They were part of what has come to be known as the National-Bolshevist movement, and it is therefore within this movement that Marc's German contacts were concentrated. For instance, he met with Karl O. Paetel, a leader of the Youth Movement and the chief spokesman of the *Gruppe sozialrevolutionärer Nationalisten*, which went further than any other National-Bolshevist group in the direction of cooperation with the Communists, without ceasing to stress that their nationalism had nothing to do with Marxism. Hans Ebeling, the editor of the *Vorkämpfer*, on the

other hand used Marxism as a tool for nationalism, and was especially determined that nothing should stand in the way of the State, not the economy, not the individual, and certainly not intermediate bodies like those of corporatism - this was the ground of his antifascism, common to most National-Bolshevists: the Fascist State was too weak! As for Ernst Niekisch, leader of the Widerstand movement, he wanted "*Ein Reich von Vlissingen bis Wladiwostok*". The Soviet Union for him, far from being a workers' paradise, was an armed camp against the West, which Germany should join. He therefore took offence at Gegner's meeting with Plans in Frankfurt, and a controversy arose in which Gegner distanced itself from the National-Bolshevik movement in May.⁸⁸ It is unclear whether it is before or after this official break that Marc was invited to a restaurant by Niekisch. Up to then, like the other National-Bolsheviks, he had assured Marc of his admiration for France. But when Marc had gotten him drunk on wine, the cat finally came out of the bag. He told him that it saddened him, but that the Germans would have to occupy half of France, because she was negrified. They would have to select those Frenchmen that were of sound Germanic stock, descended from the Franks; as for the others, Niekisch remained vague, but Marc saw what he was getting at.⁸⁹ This was the last straw for Marc as far as National-Bolshevism was concerned. He was doubtless already distressed by their "statolatry", and would at any rate denounce it in an article on autarchy written in December for the

Revue d'Allemagne.⁹⁰

As for the *Gegner*, though they were hardly free from such leanings, they were not wholly given over to them. Because they did not really have a doctrine of their own and were in contact with all German revolutionary movements, Alexandre Marc had high hopes for them. *L'Ordre Nouveau* could give them the doctrine they lacked, which might allow them to become the rallying point of German youth. However, it is on the personality of Harro Schulze-Boysen himself that Marc was counting. For one thing, Schulze-Boysen was receptive to personalist ideas, and agreed with Marc that man should be the starting point of revolutionary thought; Marc even claims that by the time he last saw Schulze-Boysen, his influence was showing in the latter's writings.⁹¹ Marc was also impressed with Schulze-Boysen's charisma and grit; given ten years, this 22-year old activist might well become the leader of a revolutionary European federalist movement, he thought.⁹² But this could happen only if the Nazi tide was stemmed. When Marc had delivered speeches in Heidelberg and Frankfurt, his audience had been made up of young people deceived by Nazism, with whom no dialogue was possible. "There was a magnificent youth," he recalls, "with a power of detachment from preconceptions, ~~old~~ political parties, obsolete institutions, seeking for something new, but which was captured by a madman: Hitler."

Even though, on one occasion, when Philippe Lamour by sheer dint of oratory had so roused a Berlin audience of a couple of thousand people with a speech delivered in French, that people said he was the only one who could stop Hitler, it soon became clear to Marc that the only realistic course was to prepare for armed resistance in the nearly inevitable event of a Nazi takeover. And so he did. Using the Lufthansa pass provided by Schulze-Boysen, Marc criss-crossed Germany to establish bases of operations where to hide weapons and ammunitions that were to be smuggled from France. It is only in Stuttgart and Mannheim that he found support. Even that was in vain, as he realized upon making his report to *L'Ordre Nouveau* that nobody in his own movement supported him. The protest against his initiative was led by Robert Kieffé, who said he thought he had joined a movement of ideas, and was now hearing adventurer's talk. Marc defended himself by saying that *L'Ordre Nouveau* was a revolutionary movement, that they were not there merely to play with ideas and abstractions, that if Nazism triumphed there would be war and that they had to do everything in their power to prevent it.⁹³

This whole episode is the best example of a distinctive trait of Marc's personality. If his favorite slogan, inspired by Lenin's *What is to be done?*, was "No revolutionary action without revolutionary doctrine"⁹⁴, this was in no wise a pretext for eluding action, as he never lost sight of this

ultimate goal. L'Ordre Nouveau would often insist on this to defend itself from charges of being too abstract, and this basic stance can be ascribed to Alexandre Marc. As he would put it in an article on *Die Tat*: "It is impossible to say too often that there is not, between 'thought' and 'action', a difference of 'nature', but only of 'degree', and that thought naturally becomes action insofar as it is the expression of an encounter of concrete reality and the mind."⁹⁵

Philippe Lamour, however, if he was keen on immediate action, was very hasty in matters of doctrine. One day he gathered members of *L'Ordre Nouveau* around a table with a pencil and a sheet of paper in front of each seat, and declared: "We have the afternoon to work out our doctrine." Most of *L'Ordre Nouveau's* members thereafter refrained from contributing to *Plans*, finding that Lamour was too much in a hurry.⁹⁶ For his part, he mocked their reluctance to engage in any action "that could blemish the virginal purity of the pure doctrine in the making". *Plans* and *L'Ordre Nouveau* thus parted as movements within a couple of months of their loudly announced fusion. The few members of *L'Ordre Nouveau* who stayed on were those involved with the *Front unique* and its German contacts: René Dupuis, Denis de Rougemont, and Alexandre Marc. Even they were eventually dismissed by Lamour for always trying to impose the O.N. point of view. That was in July 1932.⁹⁷

The month before, *L'Ordre Nouveau* had found another forum in a bulletin called *Mouvements*. It was meant to be a monthly review of new political movements where the spirit of the young generations expressed itself. It had been launched by two men from *L'Ordre Nouveau*: André Poncet and the young lawyer Pierre-Olivier Lapie.⁹⁸ It is at the latter's flat that *L'Ordre Nouveau* met Otto Strasser, the leader of the *Schwarze Front*, a left-wing splinter from the Nazi party. He had been invited to give an interview to *Mouvements*, which was published in June.⁹⁹ Alexandre Marc had first been introduced to him by Harro Schulze-Boysen, and had been favourably impressed by his European outlook, his opposition to imperialism, and his regionalism. But when he and his friends tried to sound Strasser out on the subject of the person, they were appalled to discover that for him man was "like a brick, and it is with bricks that we build a house. But what counts is the house, not the brick." When Strasser left, they all agreed that they had heard enough, and decided that he was too far from their personalism.¹⁰⁰ The latter would be spelled out on several major points, like the proletariat, the civic service, the distinction between *patrie* and nation, and revolutionary federalism, in the pages of *Mouvements*, written mostly by people from *L'Ordre Nouveau*. Nonetheless, after one year, the movement was once again expelled from the review by associates who were tired of endless doctrinal preparation and itching for immediate action. Like *Plans* before it, *Mouvements* soon drifted to the Left. As for Pierre-

Olivier Lapie, he became one of a number of personalists who fell under the spell of the dissident Radical Gaston Bergery. Other founding members also broke away from the movement at this juncture, like André Poncet, Gabriel Rey, and Jacques Naville.¹⁰¹

These renegades ostensibly took offence at the allegedly growing Catholic influence within *L'Ordre Nouveau*.¹⁰² Denis de Rougemont has denied that there was any truth to these charges. According to him, "from the standpoint of religion, [...] here is the state of the O.N. group in 1933: Rops and Jardin (and perhaps Dupuis) are declared Catholics; I am a Protestant of Barth's school. Arnaud Dandieu, Catholic in origin, Claude Chevalley, Protestant in origin, Robert Aron, Jewish in origin, at that time claim to be Nietzscheans (all three would later come back to their 'faith'). Finally, Marc will become Catholic in 1933. The net result of these diversities is a total religious neutrality for the O.N. group taken all together, whereas the denominational obedience of *Esprit* is beyond question."¹⁰³ However, it was obvious that two pillars of the movement, Daniel-Rops, its best spokesman, and Alexandre Marc, the man who kept its members in constant personal contact, were becoming increasingly involved with Catholic circles, albeit as private persons.¹⁰⁴ Thus, Marc started associating with the Dominicans, and was a regular contributor to their review *La Vie Intellectuelle* in 1932 and 1933.¹⁰⁵

But Marc's interest in Catholicism also had implications for the whole movement, as it led him to look for Catholic non-conformist groups. He became a good friend of Jean de Fabrègues, Charles Maurras's secretary and the leader of the Réaction group of young dissidents from the *Action française*¹⁰⁶; as a result, many articles by members of *L'Ordre Nouveau* would appear in his *Revue du Siècle*, and it is Les Editions du Siècle which published Daniel-Rops' essay *Les Années tournantes* in December 1932. Marc had been impressed by an award-winning book on Nietzsche written by another leader of the *Jeune Droite*, the 23-year old Thierry Maulnier, and organized a meeting with him on this pretext, taking Dandieu along as a fellow Nietzschean. Maulnier would contribute to *L'Ordre Nouveau*, and members of *L'Ordre Nouveau*, especially Marc, to his *Revue française*. Marc would also write articles for Maulnier's later, more extremist review *Combat*. As Marc's future wife Suzanne Jean and Robert Brasillach grew up together, Marc worked with Brasillach at the *Revue universelle*, contributing articles on British youth. He gave up after a few months however when he realized that they disagreed on fundamental issues, even though it had first seemed that they felt the same way about a lot of things.¹⁰⁷

A far more fruitful collaboration had been initiated by Marc with another young Catholic group while he was still working at Plans. One day, Emmanuel Mounier, accompanied by

Georges Izard and Louis-Emile Galey, had come to him¹⁰⁸ to ask for his help in launching "a review like *Plans*, animated by ideas close to *L'Ordre Nouveau's* - but Catholic."¹⁰⁹ Marc thought *Esprit* might become the literary review of *L'Ordre Nouveau*, complementing the doctrinal organ it already had in *Mouvements*.¹¹⁰ But as it turned out, the period of *L'Ordre Nouveau's* association with *Esprit* was also that of the review's "doctrinaire period", as Mounier himself would later put it.¹¹¹ Only the contributions of Daniel-Rops and Denis de Rougemont would be more literary than was usual for *L'Ordre Nouveau*. As for Marc, eventually followed in this by Dandieu and Aron, he used *Esprit* as just another vehicle for the elaboration of his movement's doctrine. In his first article for the review, he simply picked up where he last left: "We have elsewhere thrown light on our conception of the personality in its relations with the revolutionary idea, as well as other important notions like those of order, of violence, of property, of the proletariat, of the *patrie* and the nation..." He went on, as a professor announcing the subject of the day's lecture: "To complete the study of the essential bases of the revolution, it is important today, rigorously basing ourselves on the already acquired results, to pass from our notion of *patrie* to that of 'international' organization [...]."¹¹²

This kind of talk did not go down well with Mounier. Of a following article by Marc in the January 1933 issue, he wrote

in the foreword that "we [Esprit] would countersign many analyses, but not however the premature systematic framework, nor always the guiding ideology and even the tone."¹¹³ The latter grievance was actually carried over from warnings by Maritain, whose support Mounier was very afraid of losing.¹¹⁴ Maritain was very annoyed at the amount of revolutionary rhetoric and lack of reference to Catholic values that to him characterized the first issues of Esprit, and were epitomized by *L'Ordre Nouveau's* contributions. "It is true", wrote a contrite Mounier in his diary after a "moving meeting with Maritain", "that we were a little carried away."¹¹⁵ So he started relaying Maritain's criticisms to Marc, without saying that he was under pressure from Maritain. He constantly reproached Marc for affirming too many things, seeming to want to overthrow everything and then rebuild all by himself, and sounding like a Communist (despite his anti-Communist articles, including criticisms of the Five-year plan which everybody found unwarranted) because of his talk of Revolution.¹¹⁶ Mounier did not need Maritain's warnings, however, to be put off by the ready-made system within which *L'Ordre Nouveau* operated. He referred to it in his diary as Dandieu's "personalism", emphasizing the term in a way that implies that it was new to him and was the name of the philosophy of *L'Ordre Nouveau*, as distinct from his own unspecified position.¹¹⁷ Thus, in October 1932, Emmanuel Mounier himself acknowledged the prior existence of personalism as the official doctrine of *L'Ordre Nouveau*, and

was rather hostile to it *as such*. The common equation of personalism with Mounier and *Esprit* then simply does not hold true as far as the origin of this school of thought is concerned.

Mounier took an instant dislike to Dandieu¹¹⁸, and the feeling was mutual. As Denis de Rougemont put it: "Dandieu reproached *Esprit* with a certain left-wing Catholic's virtuism. Mounier reproached *L'Ordre Nouveau* with a peremptory tone, a certain sectarianism."¹¹⁹ Yet he liked Marc as a fellow Catholic. "I pray the Father everyday", he wrote him, "that He preserve us from the *Ordre Nouveau* spirit. Aside from that, we agree. But you know that I like the best part of you, the one they don't have."¹²⁰ Marc's hopes of winning over *Esprit* to *L'Ordre Nouveau* thus proved ill-founded, but his personal rapport with Mounier still allowed him to have a decisive influence on the early *Esprit*. After his first meeting with the *Esprit* team, Marc had been made responsible for the review's development, especially at the international level.¹²¹ He was given an office besides Mounier's at the Desclée de Brouwer publishing house, and it was upon his suggestion that the review got its subtitle: *Revue internationale, édition française*. Even though at that stage it was still wishful thinking, the foreword to the first issue promised that every effort would be made to live up to it. It is thanks to Marc that Otto Strasser and Harro Schulze-Boysen contributed to *Esprit*. As a matter of fact, it is through Marc that Mounier got all his information

on Germany, including contemporary philosophy, until Paul-Louis Landsberg took over in 1934. This student of Max Scheler was more competent than Marc in this field. But it is Marc who first spoke of Scheler to Mounier¹²² and got him interested in this philosopher whose ideas would come to play a crucial role in Mounier's thought and Esprit's own personalism.¹²³

Another German philosopher who had a profound impact on Mounier and whom he could only have known through Marc was called Otto Neumann. Marc wrote an article on him as his contribution to the special issue of Esprit entitled *Rupture entre l'ordre chrétien et le désordre établi*. (The latter term would become a catch-phrase of both Esprit and *L'Ordre Nouveau*, and was first coined by Marc.¹²⁴) It was Mounier who, in order to prevent new revolutionary outbursts by Marc, attempted to divert him towards a safe topic by suggesting he should write an article on a German thinker, since he knew German philosophy so well. So Marc chose to review *Revolution des Geistes*, the first book, still under press, of an unknown young Catholic. If the work was so obscure, it is because it was a figment of Marc's imagination, used as a device to synthesize what was basically *L'Ordre Nouveau's* personalism in a number of striking images and sparkling paradoxes. But more importantly, this was an opportunity for Marc to express those ideas as a Catholic, which he was not yet. Thus, it is in this review of an imaginary book that personalism, at least insofar

as the generation of 1930 was concerned, was first presented as an essentially Catholic doctrine. It declared Revolution and Christianity to be inseparable; indeed, Christianity was to be the very source of the Revolution.¹²⁵ The article made a deep impression on Mounier. He wanted to contact Otto Neumann, and Marc was hard pressed to evade his persistent queries, as he feared to lose Mounier's friendship if he told him of the hoax. But one day, Mounier wrote to him that he had made arrangements to publish Otto Neumann's complete works in French. Marc had to tell him that Neumann had recently died in a car accident. Mounier must have talked of Neumann around him even after that, for some time later Marc was amazed to read in a Franco-German journal a notice of Otto Neumann's death, which included a short biography giving details Marc had not known about! Even that did not stop Mounier from asking Marc for years afterwards if he knew nothing of papers Neumann might have left or of relatives of his.¹²⁶ Given Mounier's extraordinary interest in Neumann, it is quite possible that Marc had a decisive influence on the shaping of his thought. According to John Hellman, many concepts and formulas first used in *Esprit* by Otto Neumann start turning up thereafter in Mounier's writings, becoming part of his basic intellectual apparatus.¹²⁷

It is also to Alexandre Marc that *Esprit* owed the name of its political wing: the *Troisième Force*. He had suggested it at the movement's founding meeting in November 1932, having in

mind the concept of a "third front" beyond Fascism and Communism that was current in the circles he had frequented in Germany, especially in the *Tatkreis* and the *Schwarze Front* it supported.¹²⁸ He also used the phrase in that month's issue of *Esprit* as the title of a new column on non-conformist movements, of which he was supposed to be responsible, but that Galey would in effect take over. Marc's article was called "Vers un ordre nouveau", and its title referred to the object of the yearnings that inspired the small independent groups of young people springing up all over Europe in search of a new doctrine beyond all conformisms.¹²⁹ The aim of the column was to be the coordination of all these groups, as long as it did not entail compromising on doctrine.¹³⁰ This the *Troisième Force* was all too ready to do, and as it led it into the orbit of Gaston Bergery, Marc broke with it after having assessed the Frontist leader's opportunistic character. During a speaking tour he made with him in the summer of 1933.¹³¹ *Esprit* as a whole amicably distanced itself from the *Troisième Force* in July, and Mounier henceforward turned to the *Amis d'Esprit* for political action¹³², taking over a formula first evolved by Plans and further developed in *L'Ordre Nouveau* as the basis of this movement's praxis: the doctrinal cell as revolutionary nucleus.

If Marc's involvement with the *Troisième Force* within the framework of a *Comité d'Action Esprit-Ordre Nouveau* did not

live up to the hopes enshrined in the movement's name, another more informal joint venture was more successful in crystallizing a common front of youth. At the same time as an article on the aspirations of French youth was commissioned from Daniel-Rops by reviews from Hungary, Germany, Italy and Great-Britain, and also published in *La Revue des Vivants* in July 1932,¹³³ an article on the same topic by Denis de Rougemont entitled "Cause commune" came out in a new Swiss review called *Présence*. (This was appropriate, as he summed up the aspirations of youth in a longing for presence to the world, characterizing groups he was involved or in contact with, including his own just created Barthian group named in the same vein *Hic et nunc*.)¹³⁴ Upon reading this article, Jean Paulhan commissioned de Rougemont to put together a *Cahier de revendications* of revolutionary French youth, to appear in the December issue of the *Nouvelle Revue Française*. Half of it was taken up by the contributions of personalists (including Alexandre Marc and René Dupuis posing as a distinct group called *Combat* in order to get more pages than *L'Ordre Nouveau* and *Esprit* were otherwise entitled to), a quarter by Communists (Henri Lefebvre and Paul Nizan), an eighth by Philippe Lamour and Jean Sylveire, left-leaning semi-personalists, and another eighth by Thierry Maulnier, a personalist of the Right. The articles elicited numerous reactions. Among those from de Rougemont's acquaintances was an especially interesting one by Pierre Drieu La Rochelle: "bouleversé, la jeunesse est fasciste!"¹³⁵ This would suggest that people like

Drieu and Brasillach (who as we have seen recognized himself in Marc's ideas) were looking for personalism in Fascism. For them, Fascism seemed to answer to the same yearnings that were articulated by personalism.¹³⁶

The *Cahier de revendications* was followed by other manifestations of the "common front" of youth. In April 1933, *L'Ordre Nouveau* contributed a number of articles to a special issue of Maulnier's *Revue française* entitled "Témoignages sur la jeunesse française"¹³⁷, and in May, in a survey by *Réaction*'s new organ *La Revue du Siècle* on "La jeunesse française devant l'Allemagne nouvelle", its answers again joined those of the *Jeune Droite*, as well as one from a pro-Communist Plans veteran, Georges Dupeyron.¹³⁸ *Esprit* had been represented alongside *L'Ordre Nouveau* and *Réaction* at a public debate in February about "non-Marxist revolutionary positions", organized by the *Union pour la Vérité*, whose founder Paul Desjardins had been amazed to discover there could be such a thing when the *Cahier* came out.¹³⁹ It had certainly done a lot to put *L'Ordre Nouveau* on the map and at the forefront of the new movements along with the books of its members and their contributions to a variety of publications, from Europe and Charles Dulot's *Information sociale* to *Le Correspondant* and *La Revue des Vivants*, conservative reviews in which Daniel-Rops had a foothold, not to mention specialized journals like the *Revue d'Allemagne*, Alexandre Marc's province. "Our notoriety was growing",

remembers Robert Aron: "a few provocative or riotous manifestations, including a meeting hostile to the American spirit, earned us a reputation of 'toughness' [*une réputation de "durs"*] among the young movements which then abounded in Paris." For "by the year 1932, our group is constituted: it starts to manifest itself by sessions of work in common, that usually took place at Dandieu's, or by more or less formal public meetings, sometimes near the Quartier Latin, in the hall of the Musée Social on the rue Las Cases, sometimes at the house of one of us." At larger venues, "when *L'Ordre Nouveau*, with only the strength of its ideas and its intransigence, intervened in a debate, there was an attentive silence: were we not the bearers of a coherent and independent message?" "There were also lunches or dinners taken in common, during which projects were exchanged, including the most important, the most ambitious, the best realized: that of a monthly review."¹⁴⁰

It was finally launched in May 1933 in a format that made it clear that it was totally dedicated to the serious business of elaborating a doctrine. This small (14 x 22 cm), slim (32 page) publication was very densely printed on cheap, thin, yellowish paper. It systematically avoided topicality, and was content of sometimes alluding to current events as a way of illustrating points that would have been made anyway. The only mentions of the February 1934 riots in the issue that appeared

the following week were a dedication to their victims and a notice to the effect that the group would "speed up its doctrinal work in the hope of avoiding any new shedding of French blood in the improvised prefaces to the necessary revolution."¹⁴¹ This work had been carried out in common for years; and its product was a single doctrine expounded by many writers. To be sure, they all had their specialties: philosophy, law, and the critique of the Nation-State for Alexandre Marc; the critique of totalitarianism for Denis de Rougemont; the global crisis of modern civilization for Daniel-Rops; contact with the real for Claude Chevalley, etc. But these differences were ones of emphasis, slightly different angles taken in the exposition of one body of doctrine. It also had a unity in time, for all its major lines of development are to be found in the movement's early manifestos; the review would merely follow them, adding precision to its concepts, working out details, finding possible applications, without ever altering its message over the four years of its uninterrupted publication. (When the review reappeared after the first break in its publication, it was a different matter, as the formula had changed.) This unity of L'Ordre Nouveau's doctrine over time despite the number of its authors has allowed other writers (Lipiansky, Roemheld) to treat it as a coherent whole in their summaries of it. The synthesis offered here differs from these however in that it is not so much methodical as genealogical. Instead of being organized into familiar rubrics, it

operates within the same logic as personalism by starting from and constantly coming back to the most immediate facts of human existence in the world, first as they should be in the fullness of their reality, then as they are negated in the "established disorder" of the modern world, and finally as they are to be restored in a New Order.

FOOTNOTES

1) Letters to the author from Alexandre Marc, 25/10/1986, 8/1/1986.

2) Interview with Alexandre Marc recorded by John Hellman using the author's questions in Cogne, Val d'Aoste, on July 16, 1985, and in the following days.

3) Letter to the author from Alexandre Marc, 8/1/1986.

4) Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions.

5) Ibid.

6) Cited in James H. Billington. *The Icon and the Axe. An Interpretive History of Russian Culture.* New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1966, p. 396.

7) Cited in Sir Isaiah Berlin. *Russian Thinkers.* New York, The Viking Press, 1978, p. 172.

8) James H. Billington. *ibid.* p. 394.

9) Ibid. p. 399.

10) Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions.

11) Ibid.

12) Interview of Alexandre Marc by John Hellman. Denis de Rougemont, in his *Journal d'une époque (1926-1946)* (Paris, Gallimard, 1966, p. 93), mixes up this last incident with the first one in this paragraph.

13) Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions.

14) Ibid. An example of what the abbé probably meant can be found in Marc's article "Le 'personnalisme' de William Stern et la jeunesse française" (*Revue d'Allemagne*, 5 avril 1933, pp. 311-330, written under the name of René Dupuis), in a digression on the consummation of time that will be attained "only when everywhere the social order will be fused with the primacy of the person" in the true Millenium that is the goal of history (p. 323).

15) Ibid. and interview by John Hellman, 1984. See for instance Marc's post-war works *Dialectique du déchaînement, Fondements philosophiques du Fédéralisme* (Paris, La Colombe-Editions

du Vieux Colombier, coll. "Réalités du Présent", n° 2, 1961, 128 p.) and *De la Méthodologie à la Dialectique* (Paris, Presses d'Europe, coll. "Réalités du Présent", n° 8, 1970, 112 p.).

16) Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions.

17) Interview with A. Marc by J. Hellman.

18) Arnaud Dandieu & Alexandre Marc. *Misère et grandeur du spirituel*. Documents du C.I.F.E., nouvelle série, n° 34, 1974, p. 7: "*Si donc la 'philosophie' est bien une géométrie de l'esprit, une 'strange Wissenschaft' (Husserl), une synthèse suprême, nous pouvons proclamer que le propre de la personne est d'être l'écueil sur lequel toute 'philosophie' échoue éternellement. En vérité, l'on ne peut 'voir', constater, démontrer ou enseigner la personne: on ne peut que l'être.*" (Cf. Appendix, p. 213: "If in the act of cognition we embody the thing we know then we neither remember nor forget what we know. For we can neither remember nor forget to be; we simply are.")

19) Interview of A. Marc by J. Hellman. Throughout this thesis, bold type is used for the title of a review and italics for the name of a movement, even though they are often the same, as in the case of *L'Ordre Nouveau*; italics are then used until the corresponding review is launched, and even after when referring to the movement in general as opposed to its organ. However, in the case of *Esprit*, the movement is so closely identified with the review that bold type is almost always used.

20) Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions.

21) Ibid.

22) William Stern. "William Stern", in *Die Philosophie der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellungen*, VI. Band, herausgegeben von Dr. Raymund Schmidt. Leipzig, Verlag von Felix Meiner, 1927, p. 146.

By William Stern, see also:

Person und Sache. System des kritischen Personalismus. Leipzig, Verlag von Johann Ambrosius Barth. Band I: *Ableitung und Grundlehre des kritischen Personalismus*. 2., unveränderte Auflage. Mit einem Begleitwort zu Band I, II, III. 1923, 434 p.; Band II: *Die menschliche Persönlichkeit*. 3., unveränderte Auflage, 1923, 272 p.; Band III: *Wertphilosophie*. 1924, 474 p.

"*Personalistische Psychologie*", in *Einführung in die neuere Psychologie*, herausgegeben von Emil Saupe. 2. und 3. Auflage. "*Handbücher der neueren Erziehungswissenschaft*", herausgegeben

von Emil Saupe, Band 3. Osterwieck am Harz, A. W. Zickfeldt, Verlag, 1928, pp. 192-202.

Studien zur Personwissenschaft. Erster Teil: Personalistik als Wissenschaft. Leipzig, Verlag von Johann Ambrosius Barth, 1930.

On William Stern, see:

Adolph, Heinrich. Personalistische Philosophie. Leipzig, Felix Meiner Verlag, 1931, 122 p.

23) René Dupuis (Alexandre Marc). "Le "personnalisme" de William Stern et la jeunesse française", in Revue d'Allemagne, 5 avril 1933, pp. 311-330.

24) William Stern. "William Stern", in op. cit. p. 164.

25) Letter to the author from Alexandre Marc, 13/3/1986.

26) Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions.

27) Letter to the author from Alexandre Marc, 13/3/1986. Personalist elements abound in Péguy's work, which has played such a formative role in the thought of that generation of French intellectuals (A. Marc, Daniel-Rops, E. Mounier and Georges Izard, to mention only personalists, all wrote books on Péguy). Especially noteworthy are the concept of "double racination", outlined in the poem of that name ("*Car le surnaturel est lui-même charnel/[...] / Et l'arbre de la race est lui-même éternel.*" Morceaux choisis. Poésie. Paris, Gallimard, coll. "Le livre de poche chrétien" dirigée par Daniel-Rops, 1963, p. 181.), and the notion that "*toute Révolution est une opération d'ordre*" (Cahiers de la quinzaine, 5 novembre 1905, in Péguy tel qu'on l'ignore, Textes choisis et présentés par Jean Bataille. Paris, Gallimard, coll. "Idées", 1973, p. 26), which would be central to the doctrine of *L'Ordre Nouveau*.

28) Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions.

29) Letter to the author from Alexandre Marc, 13/3/1986

30) Abetz would keep asking Marc's friend the Vichy minister Jean Jardin where he was to be found, but Jardin would always pretend not to know, because Marc did not want to owe his life to Abetz if the case arose where he was in trouble and Abetz was in a position to save him, as he had done for a number of people, including André Weil-Curiel, the organizer of the Rethel gathering following up on that on the Schöberg. Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions.

31) Luchaire would be executed in 1946 as a collaborator. On his career, see Robert E. Wohl. *The Generation of 1914*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1979, pp. 33-35.

32) Letter to the author from André Moosmann, 24/1/1986.

33) Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions.

34) Letter to the author from André Moosmann, 24/1/1986.

35) Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions. It is Denis de Rougemont who asserts that "*l'initiative d'Alexandre Marc anticipait de plusieurs décennies sur l'évolution de l'oecuménisme*", in "*Alexandre Marc et l'invention du personnalisme*", his contribution to ***. *Le fédéralisme et Alexandre Marc*. Lausanne, Centre de Recherches Européennes, 1974, p. 56.

36) Letter to the author from André Moosmann, 24/1/1986.

37) Interview of A. Marc by J. Hellman.

38) Denis de Rougemont. op. cit. p. 55; on Father Kovalevski's career, see Daniel-Rops. *Ces chrétiens nos frères*. Paris, Librairie Arthème Fayard, 1964, p. 541.

39) Id.; on Father Gillet, see Daniel-Rops. op. cit., p. 541, and Elisabeth Behr-Sigel. "*Une religieuse russe à Paris: Mère Marie Skobtsov 1891-1945*", in *Unité des chrétiens*. Revue trimestrielle de formation et d'information, n° 58, 1985, p. 22.

40) Denis de Rougemont. id.

41) Denis de Rougemont. id., and letter to the author from André Moosmann, 24/1/1986.

42) Denis de Rougemont. op. cit., his *Journal d'une époque (1926-1946)*, pp. 86ss, and "*Témoignage*", in ***. *Le personnalisme d'Emmanuel Mounier hier et demain*. Pour un cinquantenaire. Paris, Editions du Seuil, 1985, p. 36.

43) Letter to the author from Alexandre Marc, 08/01/1986.

44) Letter to the author from Alexandre Marc, 24/10/1985. The former Marxist, "revolutionary conservative" economic historian Werner Sombart would be one of the authorities most often quoted in *L'Ordre Nouveau* on economic matters.

45) Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions.

46) Interview with A. Marc by J. Hellman.

47) Letter to the author from Alexandre Marc, 12/6/1986. Dupuis's father, a conservative man, would cause unspecified trouble to Marc, believing he was trying to turn his son into a Communist; since he called himself a revolutionary; this according to Alexandre Marc in an interview recorded by John Hellman, using the author's questions.

48) Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions.

49) Denis de Rougemont. "Alexandre Marc et l'invention du personnalisme", op. cit., p. 60.

50) Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions.

51) Robert Aron. "Un précurseur: Arnaud Dandieu (1897-1933)", in ***. *Le fédéralisme et Alexandre Marc*. pp. 38-39; Jean Canu. "Arnaud Dandieu et la jeunesse française contemporaine", in *Revue Bleue*, n° 16, 17 août 1935, pp. 555-565.

52) Jean Canu. *ibid.*, p. 557.

53) Jean-Louis Loubet del Bayle. *Les non-conformistes des années 30. Une tentative de renouvellement de la pensée politique française*. Paris, Editions du Seuil, 1969, p. 87.

54) Robert Aron & Arnaud Dandieu. *Décadence de la Nation française*. Paris, Les Editions Rieder, 1931, p. 203.

55) Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions.

56) See John Hellman. *Emmanuel Mounier and the New Catholic Left 1930-1950*. Toronto, Buffalo, London, University of Toronto Press, 1981, pp. 36-51.

57) Jean-Louis Loubet del Bayle. *op. cit.* p. 86.

58) Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions. According to Pierre Andreu (*Nation française*, n° 336), it is Gabriel Marcel who suggested to Daniel-Rops that he should get in touch with *L'Ordre Nouveau*. See Jean-Louis Loubet del Bayle. *op. cit.* p. 85.

59) Quoted in an insert in Daniel-Rops. *Les Années tournantes*. Paris, Editions du Siècle, 1932.

60) Daniel-Rops. *Le monde sans âme*. Paris, Librairie Plon, 1932, p. 12.

61) Ibid., p. 30.

62) Robert Aron. *Fragments d'une vie*. Préface de Denis de Rougemont. Postface de Sabine Robert-Aron. Paris, Plon, 1981, pp. 104-105.

63) Jean-Louis Loubet del Bayle. op. cit. p. 86.

64) Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions.

65) Robert Aron. op. cit. p. 103.

66) Jean-Louis Loubet del Bayle. op. cit. p. 86.

67) Ibid. p. 94.

68) Letter to Philippe Lamour from Alexandre Marc, 14/1/1986.

69) Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions.

70) Jean-Louis Loubet del Bayle. op. cit. pp. 97-98, and Edmond Lipiansky. *Ordre et Démocratie*. Paris, Presses universitaires de France, 1967, pp. 15-16. The Manifeste de "L'Ordre Nouveau" is reproduced as an appendix in Jean-Louis Loubet del Bayle. op. cit. pp. 442-444.

71) Jean-Louis Loubet del Bayle. op. cit. p. 96. Such circles were organized in France and in neighbouring countries starting in October 1931. Philippe Lamour, in his memoirs (*Le cadran solaire*, Paris, Robert Laffont, 1980, p. 118), seems to take the office of Schulze-Boysen's review *Gegner* for that of a "replica of Plans" called *Planen*, for which there does not appear to be any evidence in German sources. A replica of a review of the caliber of *Plans*, which counted Le Corbusier, Fernand Léger, Arthur Honegger, Claude Autant-Lara and René Clair among its contributors, would surely have left some trace, and would not have been a slight undertaking for the young men around Schulze-Boysen. There is evidence, however, that he led *Plans*'s "Verbindungsstelle in Berlin-Grünwald" (Karl O. Paetel's review *Die Kommenden VII*, 5, 31.1.1932, cited in Otto-Ernst Schüddekopf. *National-Bolschewismus in Deutschland 1918-1933*. Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, Wien, Verlag Ullstein GmbH, 1972, p. 532). This would be the grain of truth in the references to a review *Planen* that are to be found in the books of Jean-Louis Loubet del Bayle and John Hellman. Finally, one might remark that the literal translation of "Plans" into German would be "*Pläne*", not "*Planen*".

72) Jean-Louis Loubet del Bayle. op. cit. p. 98. Marc had

invited Lamour to the Franco-German gathering at Rethel in the Ardennes in August 1931 mostly for the sake of his oratory skills; he wanted his friend to use them to "shoot Luchaire down in flames" - which Lamour was only too glad to do. Letter to Philippe Lamour from Alexandre Marc, 1/14/1986. (It is unlikely to be at Rethel that they first met Schulze-Boysen, as Edmond Lipiansky would have it (op. cit. p. 14), because Gegner only started as such in January 1932.)

73)Gegner, 17, 15.12.1931, p. 47, cited in Otto-Ernst Schüddekopf. *ibid.* p. 532.

74)Denis de Rougemont. *op. cit.* p. 92.

75)Letter to Philippe Lamour from Alexandre Marc, 1/14/1986.

76)Edmond Lipiansky. *op. cit.* p. 16.

77)Letter to the author from André Moosmann, 1/24/1986.

78)Letters to the author from Alexandre Marc, 10/24/1985, 3/13/1986.

79)Armin Mohler. *Die konservative Revolution in Deutschland 1918-1932. Ein Handbuch.* Zweite, völlig neu bearbeitete Fassung. Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972, p. 469.

80)Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions.

81)Edmond Lipiansky. *op. cit.* p. 15.

82)Otto-Ernst Schüddekopf. *op. cit.* p. 364.

83)Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions.

84)Alex. M. Lipiansky. "Pour un communisme national: La Revue Die Tat", in *Revue d'Allemagne*, 15 octobre 1932, pp. 849-867. On the *Tatkreis*, see also Edmond Vermeil. *Doctrinaires de la Révolution allemande (1918-1938)*. Paris, Fernand Sorlot, 1938, pp. 175-220.

85)Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions.

86)Richard Scheringer died on May 9, 1986; On his career, see Robert de Herte. "Du nazisme au communisme", in *Eléments pour la civilisation européenne*, n° 59, Eté 1986, pp. 61-63, and the erratum to this article in the following issue of *Eléments* (n° 60, Automne 1986, p. 58).

87) Louis Dupeux. *Stratégie communiste et dynamique conservatrice. Essai sur les différents sens de l'expression "national-bolchévisme" en Allemagne, sous la République de Weimar (1919-1933)*. Thèse présentée devant l'université de Paris I le 28 novembre 1974. Paris, Librairie Honoré Champion, 1976, p. 569. It is mostly from this book that this paragraph on National-Bolshevism is drawn. See also Otto-Ernst Schüddekopf. op. cit., and by Karl O. Paetel:

Das geistige Gesicht der nationalen Jugend. Flarchheim in Thüringen, Verlag Die Kommenden, "Handbuch der deutschen Jugendbewegung" in Einzeldarstellungen herausgegeben von Karl O. Paetel, 1930, 56 p.

Die Struktur der nationalen Jugend. Flarchheim in Thüringen, Verlag Die Kommenden, "Handbuch der deutschen Jugendbewegung" in Einzeldarstellungen herausgegeben von Karl O. Paetel, 1930, 56 p.

Sozialrevolutionärer Nationalismus. Flarchheim in Thüringen, Verlag Die Kommenden, "Schriften der Kommenden" herausgegeben von Karl O. Paetel, 1930, 96 p.

By Ernst Niekisch, see:

Erinnerungen eines deutschen Revolutionärs. Erster Band: *Gewagtes Leben 1889-1945*. Köln, Verlag Wissenschaft und Politik, 1973, 393 p.

On Ernst Niekisch, see:

Friedrich Kabermann. *Widerstand und Entscheidung eines deutschen Revolutionärs: Leben und Denken von Ernst Niekisch*. Köln, Verlag Wissenschaft und Politik, 1974, 419 p.

88) Otto-Ernst Schüddekopf. op. cit. p. 365.

89) Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions.

90) Alexandre Marc. "L'Etat fermé ou autarchie", in *Revue d'Allemagne*, 5 janvier 1933, pp. 1-19.

91) Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions. There are indeed many traces of what could be Marc's influence, or at least remarkable parallels with *L'Ordre Nouveau*, to be found in *Gegner von heute, Kampfgenossen von morgen*, a collection of articles by Harro Schulze-Boysen that came out at the end of 1932 (Berlin, Waldemar Hoffmann Verlag, "Die Schriften der Gegner", 30 p.); but only closer scrutiny of the whole *Gegner* collection could confirm Marc's assertion.

92) Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions. Marc believed Schulze-Boysen to be younger than he actually was, because of something juvenile in his manner. Nonetheless, he would write, "one cannot help admiring his youthful ardor, his optimism, and his courage. (...) Men like Harro Schulze-Boysen prefigure right now the revolutionary community which alone will be able to triumph over all obstacles." (Alexandre Marc. "Jeunesse allemande", in *Esprit*, n° 5, 1^{er} février 1933, p. 728.) Marc's assessment of the strength of Harro Schulze-Boysen's character proved accurate. In April 1933, the *Gegner* was closed down and Schulze-Boysen was arrested and beaten up for hours. "There, I learned to suffer", he wrote Marc. He told Ernst von Salomon, a colleague from the *Gegner*, and the author of *Die Geächteten*, the classic account of free corps activism, whom Marc had met, that he had "put his revenge on ice" (*Der Fragebogen*, Reinbek bei Hamburg, Rohwolt, 1961, p. 397). He later attained an important post in the Air Ministry, and meeting Denis de Rougemont by chance at a railway station in Switzerland while on his way to Rome with a government delegation, he told him to assure Marc that he was keeping up the struggle by organizing the resistance. (Same interview with Marc.) He would eventually provide intelligence to the USSR during the war, and even before, according to East German literature. It presents Schulze-Boysen as a sort of fellow traveller who came to understand and to support the peace-loving policy of the Soviet Union while working at the Air Ministry, with a little help from functionaries of the KPD. (*Institut für Marxismus-Leninismus beim Zentralkomitee der SED. Deutsche Widerstandskämpfer 1933-1945. Biographien und Briefe, Band 2.* Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1970, p. 224ff.) Even Western writers often assume that Schulze-Boysen became a Marxist-Leninist. (See for instance Henri Bernard. *L'Autre Allemagne. La Résistance allemande à Hitler, 1933-1945.* Bruxelles, La Renaissance du Livre, 1976, p. 181.) It did not actually have to be so. Though the so-called Red Orchestra headed by Harro Schulze-Boysen and Arvid Harnack consisted largely of Communists, it was not essentially a Communist operation, and drew from a wide range of political opinion. As one of its members put it in telegraphic style: "*Allgemeine Tendenz: Liebhaber der demokratischen Freiheit. [...] Zusammenarbeit mit russischen Stellen, da die Westmächte damals noch keine Front in Europa errichtet hatten.*" (Cited in Elsa Boysen. *Harro Schulze-Boysen. Das Bild eines Freiheitskämpfers. Zusammenge stellt nach seinen Briefen, nach Berichten der Eltern und anderen Aufzeichnungen.* Düsseldorf, Komet-Verlag, 1947, p. 20.) The latter point was confirmed to Alexandre Marc by the man who was the last to see Schulze-Boysen before he was arrested by the Gestapo (he would be decapitated on December 22, 1942). He assured Marc that Schulze-Boysen had not varied in his beliefs since knowing him. There is no reason to doubt it. It was hardly out of character for a National-Bolshevist to turn to the East for help in the struggle for the liberation of Germany. *Ostorientierung* had always been an essential tenet of the brand

of idealistic nationalism advocated by Schulze-Boysen as well as his fellow National-Bolshevist Arvid Harnack. Says Louis Dupeux (op. cit. p. 492): "Harnack et Schulze-Boysen honoraient ainsi l'engagement pris par la plupart des 'nationaux-bolchevistes' une dizaine d'années plus tôt, de ne pas rester les bras croisés en cas d'agression contre l'U.R.S.S." (See Harro Schulze-Boysen. "Lettre ouverte d'un jeune Allemand à la France", in *Esprit*, n° 5, 1^{er} février 1933, p. 732: "C'est ainsi que nous nous opposons à toutes les tentatives d'intervention dirigées contre l'Union Soviétique, - tentatives qui nous paraissent particulièrement dangereuses. Je considère que l'un des devoirs qui incombent au prolétariat et aux intellectuels français est de combattre ces projets d'intervention.")

93) Interview of A. Marc by J. Hellman.

94) Denis de Rougemont. "Alexandre Marc et l'invention du personnalisme", in op. cit. p. 54.

95) Alexandre Marc. "Pour un communisme national: La Revue *Die Tat*", in op. cit. p. 850.

96) Robert Aron. op. cit. p. 102.

97) Edmond Lippansky. op. cit. p. 16.

98) Jean-Louis Loubet del Bayle. op. cit. pp. 101-102.

99) Louis Dupeux. op. cit. p. 503.

100) Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions. It is perhaps an indication of the difference between the personalism of *L'Ordre Nouveau* and that of *Esprit* that Mounier, who knew Strasser through Marc, did not seem to mind so much Strasser's collectivism, since he published a long series of articles by him in 1933. (Plans had published the manifesto of the *Schwarze Front* in its December 1931 issue, before the decisive meeting in Paris. Edmond Lippansky. op. cit. p. 14.) By Otto Strasser, see:

Aufbau des deutschen Sozialismus. Mit Vorwort von Weigand von Miltenberg. Leipzig, Wolfgang Richard Lindner, 1932, 104 p.

On Otto Strasser, see:

Reed, Douglas. *Nemesis? The Story of Otto Strasser and the Black Front*. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1940, 274 p.

101) Jean-Louis Loubet del Bayle. op. cit. p. 103.

102) Id.

103) Denis de Rougemont. "Alexandre Marc et l'invention du

personnalisme", in op. cit., p. 61.

104) Jean-Louis Loubet del Bayle. loc. cit.

105) Ibid. p. 467.

106) Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions. It is important to note that the group's review, launched in 1930, was first called *Réaction pour l'Ordre*. As Jean-Louis Loubet del Bayle has shown, it is a sign of the common concerns of non-conformist youth in France in the 1930s. *"Très significatif de cette commune volonté 'constructive' fut l'emploi extrêmement fréquent du mot 'ordre' qui fut un des mots de passe de cette génération. 'Réaction pour l'Ordre', 'l'Ordre Nouveau', 'Rupture avec le désordre établi', ce terme se retrouvait dans les titres ou les manifestes de toutes les publications de jeunes des années 1930."* (Ibid. p. 330)

107) Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions

108) Ibid.

109) Alexandre Marc, in his foreword to Arnaud Dandieu & Alexandre Marc. *"Misère et grandeur du spirituel"*. op. cit. p. 1.

110) Alexandre Marc in *Arts*, 4-10 avril 1956, cited in Jean-Louis Loubet del Bayle. op. cit. p. 141.

111) Emmanuel Mounier, in *Dieu vivant*, 1950, n° 16, p. 43, cited in Jean-Louis Loubet del Bayle. op. cit. p. 143.

112) Alexandre Marc & René Dupuis. *"Le fédéralisme révolutionnaire"*, in *Esprit*, n° 2, 1^{er} novembre 1932, p. 316.

113) *"Peuple ou Prolétariat?"* Foreword to Alexandre Marc, *"Le Prolétariat"*, and André Ulmann, *"Les fondements humains de la révolution"*, in *Esprit*, n° 4, 1^{er} janvier 1933, p. 556.

114) See John Hellman. op. cit. p. 60.

115) Diary entry for November 9, 1932, in Emmanuel Mounier. *Oeuvres*. Tome IV: *Recueils posthumes, correspondance*. Paris, Editions du Seuil, 1963, p. 511.

116) Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions

117) Diary entry for October 18, 1932, in Emmanuel Mounier. op. cit. p. 508.

118) See id., for the oft quoted passages on Mounier's first

meeting with Dandieu, organized by Marc.

119) Denis de Rougemont. op. cit. p. 98.

120) Unpublished letter to Alexandre Marc from Emmanuel Mounier, cited in Edmond Liplansky. op. cit. p. 9.

121) Alexandre Marc, in his foreword to Arnaud Dandieu & Alexandre Marc. "Misère et grandeur du spirituel", op. cit., p. 1.

122) Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions

123) See John Hellman. op. cit. pp. 81, 84-85.

124) According to John Hellman (op. cit., p. 281n59), it is Alexandre Marc who first used this phrase in his article "Jeunesse allemande" in February 1933 (op. cit., p. 726): "Le désordre établi was employed by Mounier in the subsequent issue of Esprit and became a cliché at the review to describe what Esprit stood against. At this writing the term is used now and then in Le Monde and, like personalism, attributed to Mounier, never to Marc."

125) Alexandre Marc. "Le Christianisme et la Révolution spirituelle", in Esprit, n° 6, 1^{er} mars 1933, pp. 938-939.

126) Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions

127) Comments made by John Hellman in the course of the just cited interview. Another indication of the prime importance Otto Neumann seems to have had in the development of Mounier's thought is that, in the review of the major events of the year that appears at the beginning of every chapter of Mounier et sa génération (a selection of intimate writings), Mounier's heirs have placed the name of Otto Neumann first under the rubric on religion for 1933, before Karl Barth, The Commonwealth and Quadragesimo Anno! (Emmanuel Mounier. op. cit. p. 515.)

128) Ibid. On the "third front" concept in Germany, see Armin Mohler. op. cit. pp. 53-57. Young Germans were present at this meeting (see John Hellman. op. cit. p. 65), who may in part have been sent by Harro Schulze-Boysen, as Alexandre Marc is inclined to think (interview recorded by John Hellman, using the author's questions), since Marc referred to contacts between the Gagner and Troisième Force in his article "Jeunesse allemande" (op. cit. p. 729); but they were mostly from the Wandervogel, as Marc recalls (same interview).

129) Alexandre Marc. "Vers un ordre nouveau", in Esprit, n° 2, 1^{er} novembre 1932, p. 331.

130) Ibid., p. 334.

131) Interview of A. Marc by J. Hellman.

132) Jean-Louis Loubet del Bayle. op. cit. p. 151.

133) Daniel-Rops. "Les aspirations de la jeunesse française", in *La Revue des Vivants*, juillet 1932, pp. 99-110.

134) Denis de Rougemont. "Cause commune", in *Présence*, juillet 1932, p. 14.

135) Denis de Rougemont. op. cit. pp. 96-105.

136) The following excerpts from Zeev Sternhell's *Ni droite ni gauche. L'idéologie fasciste en France*. (Paris, Editions du Seuil, 1983, 414 p.) shows clearly that people like Brasillach and Drieu recognized in Fascism the fulfillment of aspirations which the personalists also shared: "Par des actes volontaires d'ascétisme, des jeunes gens essaient de se dépouiller des besoins imposés par la culture: Brasillach fait de l'auto-stop et considère que toutes ces 'graves personnes' qui protestent contre cette nouvelle façon de voir le monde n'ont 'évidemment pas l'esprit fasciste'. Cet esprit qui s'exprime, le plus clairement peut-être, dans cette culture de communauté, voulue spontanément, à laquelle aspire cette partie de la jeunesse en révolte contre l'ordre bourgeois. Car c'est bien en cela que consiste 'l'air fasciste' de Drieu. C'est bien cela qui fait le fond de ce 'fascisme immense et rouge' qu'évoque Brasillach, 'avec les chants, les délires, la conquête du pouvoir, José Antonio, la jeunesse virile, la nation.'" (p. 282) "Une nation est une, exactement comme est une l'équipe sportive", écrit Brasillach. Les fascistes aiment beaucoup cette image qui leur permet d'opposer deux types d'homme, deux types de société, deux types de civilisation." (p. 280.) Lionel Rothkrug uses the same simile to give an idea of the unlearned body language uniting pre-literate societies in collective persons (*Modes of Perception in Religion and Culture. The James A. Gray Lectures*, Fall 1986, Lecture One, First Draft, pp. 2-3; see Appendix, pp. 213-214) -which would suggest that such a physical sense of communion, unconsciously handed down by generations of Europeans from the Middle Ages, was at the root of the longing for physicality and community that these Fascists had in common with the personalists (see Appendix, pp. 226-228).

137) Jean-Louis Loubet del Bayle. op. cit. pp. 56, 172.

138) Jean de Fabrègues, ed. "La Jeunesse française devant l'Allemagne nouvelle (Enquête)", in *La Revue du Siècle. Organe des Groupes "Latinité" et "Réaction"*. n° 2, mai 1933, pp. 1-14.

139) Jean-Louis Loubet del Bayle. op. cit. p. 172, and Denis de Rougemont. op. cit. p. 105.

140) Robert Aron. *op. cit.* p. 105.

141) "Valeurs françaises", in *L'Ordre Nouveau*, n° 8, février 1934, p. 1.

II. A SYNTHESIS OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE REVIEW L'ORDRE NOUVEAU

The central tenet of L'Ordre Nouveau's doctrine, constantly reiterated by contributors to the review, was "the preeminence of the human person over any other value"¹, as it was in their eyes "the supreme value which is the true end of any society"², and on the respect of which "any genuine civilization could not but be founded."³ And yet, "it is not true that this person has the right to break away from the natural and historical solidarities where the concrete conditions of its existence are defined."⁴ This is because "what characterizes the person before anything else is that - unlike the individual, who is, spiritually speaking, closed and isolated - it is open, tied to its peers and its kin."⁵ "Real man [one of L'Ordre Nouveau's synonyms for the person, along with "concrete man", "total man", "integral man"], even when he knows *solitude*, is never *isolated*. A thousand physiological, psychical, spiritual links tie him to his family, to his local *patrie*, to the human beings who practice the same trade as he, to the nation which contributed to shape his mind... We have sufficiently insisted on this point in all our writings to consider it admitted." Most of these "intertwined links" are "anterior to any conscious decision, and *a fortiori* to any 'formal' (e.g. contractual) ascertainment"⁶; for "from the moment we open our eyes, [...], through the agency of the senses that contact which is at once magical and precise is established between the outside world

and us [...]"⁷ the natural contact in which every one of us enters with "the extra-conceptual existence of things and of other people" - "a real, that is immediate, bodily [*corps à corps*] relationship with the outside world, which he perceives as alive, thus as participating in his own life, or threatening it[...]"⁸

In much the same way, "it seems that, generally speaking, primitive man - in the widest sense of the term - is born within small collective groups that form as many microcosms, [...], where nature, the human, and the divine [...] are inextricably mixed, psychically and materially."⁹ For L'Ordre Nouveau, the *patrie* ought to be the locus of a revival of this primitive sense of communion with the world. Quoting Bergson (*Les deux sources de la Morale et de la Religion*), Alexandre Marc says of the real *patrie* that "it reminds us of this truth unrecognized by nationalism as well as cosmopolitanism, 'that man was made for very small societies'...[where] 'he forms one body with society; he and it are absorbed together in the same task of individual and social conservation.[...] The individual and the social are not distinct from one another. [...]" Since it evokes the physical urgency of these primal conditions of existence, "the term *patrie* always retains an 'affective', carnal resonance, - a faint echo of 'the real and readily perceptible patriotisms of the ancient city or of the medieval principalities, objects that were concrete and close to the

heart.'" However, "the limits of the *patrie* [...] cannot be indefinitely distended without destroying this mysterious feeling of familiarity, of 'home', from which patriotism springs." "For 'the *patrie* is for us, (...), the part of the world which participates in our affective life and incorporates with our consciousness.' This privileged part of the universe contributes to form what we may consider the deepest, most stable layer of the psycho-physiological organism of man: it permeates him, nourishes him, shapes him. It allows this primal, elementary contact, which is at once carnal and sentimental, between man and the environment where he lives, which makes inadequate from the outset the individualist, atomistic notion of the human being. [...] His natural *enracinement*, anterior to any 'theory', foils in advance the tricks of those who would reduce man to being a mere monad, separated by a chasm (which, once created, can only become impassable) from the real world" - be they "the 'idealists' who strive to conceive man as a 'spirit' separated from the world of bodies", or "the individualists, [who see him] as an individual separated from society; both the latter and the former pretend to forget that man - [...] 'needs fulcra (...), at once founded in matter and mixed to the acts of life'"¹⁰

But even though "it is absurd to suppose that one of these individuals shuttered within themselves could exist other than in the imagination of philosophers, yet we can perceive all too

clearly in the present world a tendency to produce this type of 'robot' at the expense of the real people we still are. The chances of an effective contact with the world are becoming ever slimmer. The mechanization of labour *separates* spiritually and sentimentally the worker from the material he shapes. Big cities *separate* man from the earth and nature, of which tourism gives him back but an indifferent caricature. Money, the capitalist economy, slogan politics, *mass* formations, parties, leagues, *separate* man from his fellows, from his family, from himself."¹¹ All of these phenomena can be traced back, in an *Ordre Nouveau* perspective, to that "liberal individualism which is against the person", as "it knows and creates only a man without a *patrie*, without a family, detached from any cultural community, uprooted and thus mutilated. By making of profit the only rule of life of the individual, by ordering society according to the hierarchy of fortunes, it founds bourgeois disorder. By not conceiving any other goal to labour than wages, it founds the proletariat."¹²

The latter is thought of by L'Ordre Nouveau less as a class than as a state: that of the worker who has to forsake any expression of his personal creativity in order to comply with the impersonal demands of maximum production for maximum profit. Quantity takes precedence over quality, the abstract over the concrete, the merely mechanical over the properly human, in a system that turns the worker into "a ghost, the

anonymous and standardized image of the "genuine person"¹³: the proletarian, no longer defined according to the "iron law" of ever declining wages rendered obsolete by the machine age, "no longer according to the Marxist scheme of absolute plus-value, but from the inside"¹⁴, "after the nature of the work performed, and the attitude of the worker towards his own activity."¹⁵ It acquires a parcellary character through the "proletarianization" of labour. "The 'craftsman' creates or reproduces 'a thing' considered as a whole; the proletarianized worker is more and more condemned to performing only partial tasks. The whole escapes him. It must be added that the division of labour is anterior to machinism proper and that the factory had already fostered it: the machine has only increased this tendency to fragmentation," as well as the mechanical character of the work itself. Also, "since labour is a commodity" in a system that can apprehend it only quantitatively, "there must be a labour market, [...] corresponding to optimal conditions for the buyer: concentration, easy publicity, mobility... Hence the 'modern' nomadism, that of the proletariat. It is this very nomadism which, contributing to the constitution of these huge slave armies, whose multitude swarms in the suburbs of the tentacular cities, allows urban concentration" ["the cancerous proliferation of cities"], which is "linked to industrial concentration" and implies the "proletarianization of life. Dwellings -be they slums or 'living machines' [machine à habiter, Le Corbusier's ideal, and one of Marc's *bêtes noires*],

at choice- become anonymous", interchangeable, impersonal, little more than warehouses. Similarly, even "pleasures are 'standardized'". This "disastrous levelling of culture and its subjection to the international masters of Hollywood and elsewhere" is but one aspect of the "*break with living tradition*" commanded by the proletarian condition; another is the expansion of nationalism. The proletarian condition also "tends to tear the human being from his regional surroundings and to make him a *sans-patrie*". Even the family is threatened, not to mention property.¹⁶

As a result, the proletarian, this "STANDARD, ANONYMOUS BEING, SEPARATED FROM EVERYTHING REAL"¹⁷, can be seen as the very type of that "*anonymous representative on an undifferentiated mass*" that is "the 'public' man with an artificial existence", "the abstract individual [who] is called citizen when we place ourselves from the point of view of the State", and "militant when we think of a party"¹⁸. By thus "reducing the role of man in the polity to that of one forty-millionth of a block that is bought and sold in slices", the same liberal individualism that founds the proletariat "establishes political corruption"¹⁹; for L'Ordre Nouveau, graft is not so much the fact of shady politicians as the very essence of the parliamentary system, the principle of mass democracy. "In this order of ideas, scandals and individual malversations are like the vomiting fits that are an effect, and not the cause, of the

general poisoning of the organism."²⁰ To have anything to do with the disease of the body politic that is the parliamentary system is to defile oneself. Not voting becomes not only a civic duty, but more like a matter of hygiene, or better still: a question of personal integrity, of ritual purity ultimately.

It is forbidden to vote as it is forbidden to spit on the ground. These prohibitions are not justified by displaying a thousand good reasons of hygiene or morals. We comply with them because of a personal sense of what is dirty and what is clean.²¹

Therefore, "an end must be made of the present electoral and parliamentary system", "founded exclusively on individual vote", whose supporters "postulate that society is made out of a dust of individuals."²² But so do those of "the Marxist-Stalinist system", in an even more rigorous manner. "That is why", writes Denis de Rougemont, "we consider Communism to be the most sophisticated agent of the atomic disaggregation of our world, - a disaggregation whose fatal outcome would be the ruin of all organic life and of all real solidarity, as it was, in the capitalist regime, the war of law and justice."²³ Indeed, "under the pretext of correcting the disorder of decadent liberalism, the Bolsheviks have tried to establish a society of insects", so that "Bolshevism is but capitalism worsened."²⁴ "Deep down, there is no difference between Stalinian productivism and that of Ford"²⁵, between stakhanovism and taylorism.²⁶ This basic identity can be traced back

to Marx himself, who "seems not to have seen any more than the liberals that the man of flesh, blood and soul is the only one who exists, and that the 'homo economicus' is but a caricature of him, or more precisely a secondary aspect. Like the liberals, Marx has negated man, the person, albeit doubtless unconsciously."²⁷ Nonetheless, as a result, "Marxist collectivism is against the person. Heir to bourgeois individualism, it takes away from man this last remnant of personality, property. By making of every man a functionary, it organizes a herd of oppressed and irresponsible beings. By not giving any other goal to labour than massive production at the service of an industrial P. R. state [*un état industriel et publicitaire*], it ensures the permanence of the proletariat."²⁸ All the more so as "instead of seeing in the proletarian a *mutilated man*, Marx sees in him only an *unfinished man*, which brings him to seek not the suppression of the proletarian condition but its blossoming and raising[*exhaussement*]."²⁹ Thus, "Communism takes this man uprooted [by capitalism], i. e. not only deprived of property, but soon of genuine national attachment, of a regional *patrie*, of a family, and makes him the ideal that is called the proletariat. If it increases proletarianization and makes it more frank, it realizes it by going through the same channels as capitalism."³⁰ It is merely burrowing even deeper in the same rut that capitalism is mired in. This allowed L'Ordre Nouveau to declare itself in the same breath "AGAINST CAPITALIST DIS-ORDER AND COMMUNIST OPPRESSION" on the first page of the first

issue of its organ .

"AGAINST PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT AND FASCISM"³¹, it immediately added. For, in the words of Jean Jardin, writing in the same issue, "taking a stand against liberal individualism, which makes man isolated at the level of life, [...] and consequently without genuine spiritual freedom and 'waiting for death', is for us the very basis of any revolutionary sentiment, but if it is to make of man a regimented unit, we say there is a mistake."³² Fascism appears especially futile in the light of L'Ordre Nouveau's conviction that "dictatorship is but a brutal fixation of disorder"³³, and what is more, its end product. "Indeed, in the political sphere, Fascism has completed the natural cycle of democratic evolution. It has carried to its logical outcome the primacy of numbers, the basis of liberal and Jacobin democracy. The will of the majority of the electoral body has very naturally given way to the instinctive, unformulated - and if need be presumed - will of everybody, expressed, translated and specified by the dictator, leader of the one party and hence of the state. At the same time, Fascism has brought to its point of completion the liberal process of administrative and psychological uniformization of nationals and of identification of nation and state, by the doctrine of the totalitarian State."³⁴ The latter, though formulated in Italy, is not however confined to right-wing dictatorships in its applications, as "Stalinism and Fascism are

not opposite poles (like the old Left and the old Right), but two increasingly similar aspects of one madness, the totalitarian State"³⁵.

At any rate, "the totalitarian States are merely bringing to their perfection the principles of the sovereign nation-State, established and put into practice in Europe since the XVIth century"³⁶, when, "after three hundred years of underhand work, kings and legists were successful in laying down as a dogma, a postulate, a taboo, the principle according to which all political sovereignty resides in the Nation-State and there only. Princes have so well convinced themselves of this 'prime truth', of this 'revelation', that they have sacrificed their concrete personality to the abstract idea of *the king as first servant of the state* and have striven to acquire the inhuman virtues of the 'statesman' [...]"³⁷ "At this game, from Philip the Fair to Louis XVI, through Louis XI, Francis I, Charles IX, Louis XIV, the descendants of Louis IX - bemoaned at his death by all Frenchmen - ended up being greeted, as their coffins went by, with shouts of tally-ho! tally-ho!, and then being pushed under the blade of the guillotine."³⁸ "The Jacobins, Napoleon and their successors past and present" brought to "its logical perfection" this "policy of spiritual and temporal uniformization and centralization" "which has put in the head of so many Frenchmen the absurd idea that in order to be a 'good Frenchman' it was necessary to speak the State language, to be,

according to 'the period, Catholic like Bossuet, Voltairien like M. Homais, or a sentimental deist like the *vicaire savoyard*, and to discuss local politics, in Strasbourg as in Périgueux, on the same Radical-Socialist or Left Republican mode."³⁹ "The centralization of nation-states, their pretension to fuse human and natural diversities in the crucible of a general conformism, can only be considered a veritable perversion", which a world super-state would only deepen. "The universal levelling to which such an undertaking would not fail to lead would only put the finishing touch to the baneful work of dehumanization undertaken by the nation-states."⁴⁰ This is why L'Ordre Nouveau thought the paneuropeism advocated by some supporters of the League of Nations (or the *Esdéenne*, as L'Ordre Nouveau liked to mockingly transcribe its French initials) and pacifism in general "as dangerous and vain as autarchic nationalism"⁴¹; not only as a dim though unlikely prospect, but also as a failure to recognize that "there exists only one form of genuine and effective 'rapprochement' between nation-states, and that is war. [...] As Proudhon says, 'every State is by nature annexionist. Nothing stops its invading march, save the encounter with another State, like it an invader.'"⁴²

Consequently, "THE TOTALITARIAN STATE IS THE STATE OF WAR."⁴³ "Is not the Spanish Civil War the prologue to and the prefiguration of the merciless struggle of totalitarianisms, destined - regardless of their identity of nature, and because of it

even - 'to fight over the unitary Empire of Europe, after having perhaps tried to practice a 'coparcenary' policy towards the liberal States, the new Poland of the XXth century?" René Dupuis's assessment of the situation in Europe in 1937 was of course prophetic, although it was Poland herself (hardly a liberal State), true to her historical destiny, which, along with her Baltic neighbours, was to be the object of the new sharing of Europe between contending powers. But L'Ordre Nouveau's hopes for averting the looming disaster did not however rest on ground as firm as its awareness of the latter's near inevitability. Dupuis went on: "The nation-States of the classic type will not be able to resist long to the thrust of the totalitarian States; for the good reason that they are themselves hardly anything but imperfect and shame-faced totalitarian States. But that does not mean that the totalitarian States are invincible. The inhuman rigidity of their structure makes them vulnerable. Their power tends to be of the order of things; thereby is it inferior to that of a fully human order. And so the only way of preventing the co-sharing or the clash of the totalitarianisms is to promote, where it is still possible, a political, social and economic order on the scale of the human person and, thereby, consonant with the true and essential tradition of Western civilization."⁴⁴

To L'Ordre Nouveau, France was the "decisive land" where this was still possible, as it was the only continental power

left not to have yet made its anti-liberal revolution; this is why, as Robert Aron and Arnaud Dandieu put it in *La Révolution nécessaire*, "to save the West and Europe, we must first, today, rely on France."⁴⁵ It was less, however, a matter of priority than one of identity; in the words of Alexandre Marc: "We are advocating a total break only in order to rediscover the sense of the *living tradition*. This tradition, we give it a name: we call it Europe, we call it the West, we call it France."⁴⁶ It comes into focus in France as "a breakless tradition of liberation of the human person"⁴⁷. "France has always tried to define and to present a *personal ideal* in all the great periods of her history", be it that "of the humanist, or later that of the *honnête homme*. [...] It is French thought, it is French philosophy, it is French ethics which - while others get lost in 'metaphysical' mazes, in purely abstract speculations - constantly come back to man, scrutinize man, exalt man, appeal to man: from Rabelais to Proust, through Montaigne, the *moralistes*, the great classics, the *Encyclopédistes*, Stendhal, Balzac, Baudelaire, (to name but a few names at random), all the great summits of the French spirit display this faith at once passionate and lucid in flesh and bone man, in living and concrete man, in *integral man*."⁴⁸ For "to make a world on a human scale, such has always been the mission of France." "Over against the gregarious revolutions, let her affirm the Revolution of man." "We want France to save herself by saving the dignity of the person"⁴⁹, as "in the great periods of her

history, those where she helped mankind define a personalist revolutionary doctrine, [when] France never distinguished the salvation of mankind from her own salvation." Robert Aron even went so far as to take up the nationalist cliché: "Tout homme a deux patries, la sienne et puis la France."⁵⁰ He considered it true insofar as France corresponded to the O.N. definition of her as "the land of personalism", which made "traitors to France" of "all those who, from the *Comité des Forges* to the leaders of the various Internationals, submit the human person to abstract mechanisms, who uproot it by depriving it of its real bases."⁵¹ "These fallen beings, the state considers them like Frenchmen; by contrast, it treats like strangers those who - without becoming 'naturalized', like so many far-sighted and cynical *métèques* - have been 'assimilated', integrated by the powerful stream of the national tradition, and those also who, living beyond state 'limits', are nonetheless bound up with this tradition", notably in Belgium, Switzerland and Canada.

L'Ordre Nouveau prefers the "clearly spiritual" late XVIIIth century meaning of the word "nation": "For the volunteers of 92, the Nation was the Revolution (...), it was opposed to royal despotism, it was identified with freedom. In the mind of those who spoke this quasi-sacred name, the notion of borders does not intervene (...). Nationality does not depend on the place of birth (or depends upon it insofar as a place is spiritualized!), but on the spirit. Anacharsis Cloots and

Thomas Payne represent the French nation (...) in the same capacity as the other deputies." Alexandre Marc adds to this citation from *Décadence de la nation française*: "At that time, as in certain other historical periods, the French nation sensed with particular acuity that it is in a 'spiritual and sentimental community that it finds its unity, rather than in barriers'⁵² of whatever sort. As this community for L'Ordre Nouveau was defined by a sound sense of the human person, the movement felt entitled to wrap itself in the French flag, invoking the eternal personalist mission of France and construing French history in this light. Thus, it made constant references to the French Revolution, as it purported to revive what it saw as its initial personalist and federalist impulse. For Arnaud Dandieu, "behind the abstract rights of man and, in a way, in spite of them, it is impossible not to recognize the deepest personalist thrust in history."⁵³ For René Dupuis, the French Revolution at the same time "shows, for a moment, at the *fête de la Fédération*, that France is a community of local *patries* bound by a tradition and a mission"⁵⁴, soon to be betrayed by the Jacobin and Bonapartist anti-personalist deviations of the Revolution, which it was nevertheless up to France and part of her mission to correct. "The present mission of France is to overcome the rigid, national forms, into which her mission of yesterday has frozen itself, when the French Revolution ended in bureaucracy and caesarism. The mission, or pseudo-mission of other peoples uncovers, after more than a century, the resid-

ues of the French mission, in the form of borders, of centralization, of nationalism... [...] It is France who first diverted the Revolution from its goal: it is her who must give it back to it.⁵⁵

In order to achieve this task, France had to get back in touch with her home-grown "personalistic" revolutionary tradition, that of French socialism before it was contaminated and taken over by the German socialist tradition, with which it was contrasted in the following terms by Xavier de Lignac: "Proudhonian federalism versus Marxist centralism, an anarchist conception of freedom versus a conception of 'collective violence', the objective of the classless country versus the objective of the dictatorship of the proletariat, French socialist thought with a personalist tendency versus German socialist thought with a collectivist and determinist tendency."⁵⁶ However, "if there is in France a distinct revolutionary tradition which, through Proudhon and the Commune, reaches revolutionary syndicalism, we must not conceal the fact that, up until now, one of the constants of this tradition has been the string of failures that have marked its efforts. At the present time, the dictatorial hells are paved with French revolutionary intentions, but naturally deviated and misunderstood." These failures are symbolized by the flag of the Paris Commune which serves as Lenin's shroud, and by the conversion to Fascism of Hubert Lagardelle, who had been an old comrade of Sorel.⁵⁷ "The

example of Italy, where the Fascist leaders have strongly come under the influence of the trade union movement" appeared to L'Ordre Nouveau "symptomatic" of what it saw as a fatality: that "any doctrinal inadequacy is liable to amount to disorders, and these to lead, willy-nilly, to the establishment of some centralizing dictatorship."⁵⁸ L'Ordre Nouveau was well aware that the French revolutionary tradition was flawed in this respect. "Before Marx," Robert Aron admitted, "everything was confused among the socialist doctrinaires of a more or less anarchist tendency. But everything was alive."⁵⁹

To rekindle the vitality of the French revolutionary tradition and put it to good use, L'Ordre Nouveau endeavoured to give it a firm doctrinal ground by drawing upon another national tradition: what it perceived as the "specifically French" philosophical tradition of "refusal of the third term, whose stages are Rabelais, Descartes, Diderot, Proudhon, Sorel and Dandieu."⁶⁰ The latter's "dichotomic method" was seen as the clearest, deepest and most fruitful expression of this tradition, and as such provided the framework within which all of L'Ordre Nouveau's reflection was conceived and developed. It was an anti-Hegelian dialectics that excluded the resolution of tensions into some higher principle, for it considered conflict the very substance of reality and equated its suspension with death. By so doing, "the dichotomic method places itself from the outset beyond the opposition between dualism and monism.

Conflict is at once one and manifold. There is conflict only because there is diversity: no tension could exist in a homogeneous or continuous world [cf. Bergson]. But it is equally true to assert that there is conflict only because there is unity: radically separate elements could never even come into contact."⁶¹ This contact, for L'Ordre Nouveau, is the prime given of existence, as should be clear by now; but it is also brought about by our very existence, which itself implies an elemental distinctness of the self from the world. There results from this a vital conflict of self and world, where the former has to hold on to the latter in order to exist in it - that is *somewhere*, in a particular context, and also has to keep it at bay and to shape it in order to exist as something other than it - that is *to live*. Self and world thus coexist in the fullest sense of the term, inextricably intertwined in an embrace that is also a struggle, as each is carried by its own impetus to take over or escape from the other, without ever being able to, as their respective beings partake of each other through the underlying unity of their antagonism. Being thus appears as an act rather than a state and "the perspective of the act" as "the only one that we can fill with our presence"; by the same token, being "appears as *agonal*, i.e. 'in struggle'. Polar opposition is the condition of the real unity of being; a unity which aims at destroying which aims at destroying tension, destroys itself, [...]. The antinomies of understanding are only a consequence of this agonal structure of

being, i.e., identically, of this polar structure of the act. To forget this truth which, in the strong sense, we can term *fundamental*, is to bring about false crystallizations of which it would be easy to cite innumerable examples. So it is that the habit of speaking of an 'outside' world and an 'inside' world encourages us to conceive of these 'worlds' as two realms separated by a quasi-geographical border and, what is worse, to act accordingly."⁶² The liberal distinction between public and private man, often denounced in the pages of *L'Ordre Nouveau*⁶³, is the political application of this confusion of a polarity with a duality; on the one hand, it admits man into the polity only insofar as he abstracts himself from his concrete circumstances (which liberal institutions do for him anyway), while on the other it grants him an area of individual irresponsibility aside from the life of society.

The dichotomic method provided *L'Ordre Nouveau* with weapons to fight such aberrations; for, said Arnaud Dandieu and Denis de Rougemont in a manifesto published in the review in 1933, "it is in the name of fertile natural antagonisms that we want to eliminate the artificial and destructive antagonisms brought about by materialist capitalism", "whose determinism the soviets do not escape."⁶⁴ These "natural, fertile antagonisms" which *L'Ordre Nouveau* aimed at restoring were defined by Alexandre Marc as "a series of tensions whose poles are respectively: the gregarious/the differentiated, the individual/the

person, 'nature'/the 'spirit', the given/conquest, etc... We designate more specifically as 'societies' these social bodies that are polarized towards the first series of terms of all these oppositions; those, however, where it is the series of the second terms that predominates, we call them 'communities'. [...]. The society and the community correspond to two complementary and inseparable aspects of total man, aspects of which the one or the other predominates in this or that particular case, without ever prevailing completely."⁶⁵ The first aspect is that of "flesh and bone man", who "is not only 'himself'"; "he 'is' his family, his race, his patrie, his social environment, his trade, his nation... He is his own situation." The other aspect is the one in which, as "a free spirit, an individual and a person"⁶⁶, "far from being one with what he is (as a situation in the world), man is always beyond himself. To any given state of things, man opposes an attitude which this state cannot explain."⁶⁷ "The person remains forever superior to any given state, man always protrudes: the transcendence of this 'vertical being' which is called *man standing* (*l'homme debout*) answers victoriously to the 'horizontal' of immanence that would reduce everything to the stable, to the stagnant, to the level."⁶⁸

This irreducible core of transcendence of the human personality is what characterizes man among all other creatures; "he is conditioned by nature and life instead of being subordinated

to them like the animal or the plant. And his peculiar sphere is that of action; that is of change, of changes that his activity imposes, in all spheres, to the external world"⁶⁹, as it is "always, in the final analysis, of an agonal nature", originating in "this act of aggressivity, this act of expansion, which constitutes the redoubtable privilege of man."⁷⁰ For, in the opening words of Arnaud Dandieu's key text "L'intelligence épée", reprinted in an issue of L'Ordre Nouveau, "the spiritual is characterized before anything else by the human effort for conquest and the affirmation of the personality"⁷¹ which, according to René Dupuis, is directed, on the one hand, "against the material conditions imposed to man by nature: i.e. effort of information and domination of matter by man"; and, on the other hand, "against the undifferentiated character of the primitive social 'given'; effort of awakening to personal consciousness by the members of the group tending to recreate society on bases of conscious solidarity, freely willed and accepted by each; in a greater or lesser measure of course and never completely excluding the constraint of the 'given'. An effort tending, in other words, to transform, as far as possible, the initial collective magma into a community of people conscious of their own individualities and trying to transform ties of necessity into affective and voluntary ties, to add the latter to the former at least."⁷² But these are simply ignored by the Nation-State, which, whatever its official ideology, purports to create emotional and moral solidarity in a void, on

a scale that makes it simply impossible to truly assimilate for concrete man, compelling the state to foist it on him by artificial means like the inducement of mass fanaticism; for the abstract individuals postulated by liberalism can only come together as an undifferentiated mass, be it an innocuously 'sovereign' electorate or a totalitarian one-party bent on absolute power - in both cases hostile to whatever specifies man as a person.

"Now", L'Ordre Nouveau argued, "against imperialism in all its forms, against the rule of the Number, against the State and the super-State, [there is] only one cure: Federalism."⁷³ To Alexandre Marc, it "appears as the common denominator of all our efforts."⁷⁴ He feels it is "needless to remind our readers that we do not for one moment think of federating Nation-States: a day-dream lingering on the shores of the blue lake [of Geneva]... The whole dynamic power of our Federalism springs from its communal foundation."⁷⁵ For "man was not made on the scale of these huge political conglomerates which some try to make him take for 'his patrie': they are much too big... or too small for him. Too small if we try to restrict his spiritual horizon to the borders of the nation-state; too big if we attempt to make it the locus of this direct contact with flesh and earth that is necessary to man."⁷⁶ "Earth and flesh are the foundations of human equilibrium. But earth and flesh can commune only in an intimacy which dispersion, scatt-

ering, distance would soon make impossible. To be sure, intimacy cannot be expressed by exact measurements, but it always imply a spatially limited character"⁷⁷ that is only to be found in the commune, defined by L'Ordre Nouveau as "the place where is established the 'current' between man and the world, where the contact with this 'infinitely fertile thing, familiar and solid, both limit and fulcrum', which is called: flesh and earth, becomes possible again, as in a 'state of childhood where the touching of new things is the delight and like the goal of life'." This is why for L'Ordre Nouveau the commune must become the true center of administration and of self-government. "But it will be able to only by being first a climate, a vicinity, a local continuity..."⁷⁸ in keeping with the first essential character of federalism: that it "starts from limited human groupings, that are thus coherent and competent, because they do not exceed the possibilities of experience and of activity of a human being."⁷⁹ Accordingly, "the O.N. commune is the grouping on a limited territory of those who are united by a community of life and local spirit. Thus the people of which it is composed feel the physical bond that unites them to the soil, and the human bond that unites them between themselves."⁸⁰

"And yet we must not think that the person exhausts all its reality in this contact that is as it were static. On the contrary, the person can only be conceived as an active center;

its vocation is not only to participate in the life of the ambient universe, but also and above all to act upon the world, to impress upon it the mark of its own singularity. Now, it is not in the sphere of patriotic feeling, of the contact with earth and flesh, that this creative singularity of the person can find the opportunity to manifest itself fully. The commune is, in Bergson's terminology, a closed society [...] where the persistence of elementary inertias, necessary to life, lends itself to turning these ever renewed inertias into routines."⁸¹

To avert the danger of parochialism, the local *patries* (or small groups of communes) must be "opened" by the nation, which, unlike the *patrie* that is "bound in the most direct fashion to physiological realities, themselves functions of soil and blood, and to elementary psychological realities", "depends only indirectly on local realities: it is, first and foremost, a spiritual vocation underlying that of persons"; it prevents them from "falling into the stagnation of a provincialism without horizon, without *élan*... As for this concrete, carnal *enracinement* that is represented by the *patries*, only it can preserve the nation from the loss of contact with the real from which inevitably arise morbid phenomena: hardening, a taste for the artificial, the triumph of the abstruse, neuroses. There thus exists between the patriotic and national poles a phenomenon of tension: if, instead of respecting this fertile and necessary tension, we try to bring these poles closer together or even to make them coincide, everything

becomes confused. Either carnal factors invade the spiritual sphere of the nation, -invasion of the racist type, for instance- or still, national unity degenerates into a unification that tends to devastate the diversity of *patries*, to destroy local customs and autonomies, thus undermining its own base and suppressing the tension between the spiritual and the carnal, without which there is only levelling and decadence."⁸² This conflict at the root of human existence is thus reflected in the New Order as the fruitful antagonism of the basic social cell that is the commune⁸³ and the "national fact" as it is oriented towards the communal pole that entails "a minimum of conscious creative effort (conquest), a common spiritual thrust ('spirit'), the existence of ethical (personal) ties and of actual relationships between active persons"⁸⁴.

But if the commune is, as the political unit, an institution that is daily involved with bodily existence, the nation is ultimately little more than a state of mind. It is defined as "a historical tradition and a node of culture; it corresponds to the spiritual factors common to various regional *patries*: in it is embodied, in a concrete form, the spirit of universality that rules over particular lands."⁸⁵ It does not take the form of central institutions that would perform the administrative functions belonging by right to the communes and partly delegated by them to state technical bodies, which have nothing to do with the spiritual entity that is the nation and

are but an outgrowth of the communes themselves. Hence the second essential character of L'Ordre Nouveau's communalist federalism: the freedom of association of limited human groupings, that lets them federate not along arbitrary or bureaucratic lines, but in a way that is determined by "their activity and their very existence". This would lead to the abolition of boundaries as they are defined under the regime of the Nation-State; for "if the *patrie* denotes particularly the concrete belonging of man to the soil, if the nation corresponds to the whole of the people belonging to the same culture, if the state corresponds to a certain number of common administrative bodies, a human group will be able to belong to a *patrie*, to a nation and to a state variously situated and having different limits."⁸⁶

This being said, "in the hierarchy of values, *patrie*, nation, community are superior to the State", because they "correspond to human, spiritual and real values; the state corresponds to a subordinate administrative necessity."⁸⁷ Such is the substance of the last of the three essential characters of federalism as L'Ordre Nouveau understood it. Within its framework, "the state, an administrative and bureaucratic body, corresponds, by virtue of the dichotomic function, to the performance of the routines and automatisms necessary to the functioning of society, and to the free play of particular initiatives"⁸⁸ belonging "to the communes, the corporations [the ec-

onomic counterpart of the communes] and to the various intermediate groupings." "The O.N. state will therefore be at the service of societies." "Moreover, the O.N. state will respect the fundamental primacy of the community. Now it is the O.N. cells and the Supreme Council which are to be tomorrow the expression of the revolutionary community."⁸⁹ The O.N. cells, formed of "persons whose lucidity and morality" make them "serve as spiritual guides" in their local milieu, be it in the commune or in the corporation, exert spiritual authority outside of all administrative functions, as does the Supreme Council (formed of elders of the Revolution and of successors recruited on a co-optative basis) on the scale of the whole Federation; it acts as a guarantor of the status of the person and a court of ultimate appeal (not unlike the Supreme Court of the United States) as well as the arbitrator of the unresolved internal conflicts of the federation. These bodies have no coercive powers of their own, which is precisely why, in an *Ordre Nouveau* perspective, they have supreme authority. For "the distinction between authority and power corresponds at the level of government to the dichotomic distinction between forces of routine and forces of creation." "Power is of the order of matter, authority of that of spirit", so that, unlike power, it can be "neither defined nor regulated: it is exerted. Its influence either is or is not: but it is not susceptible to deviate or to stiffen, like power, whose failures or excesses it is its function to accuse."⁹⁰

Aside from keeping it in check, the authorities thus have to make sure that the state, as the repository of central power, is not carried away by its submission to the multifarious human groups at whose service it is, as it has the moral duty "to adapt the technical or material demands of the communes and firms [*"entreprises"*, a term favoured over *"corporations"* by L'Ordre Nouveau in its later years, probably because of the confusions with Fascist institutions that the earlier term lent itself to] to the obligations formulated by the spiritual authorities of the federation and constituting the status of the person."⁹¹ Indeed, *"O.N. institutions will function only if they are served by a state that is as well organized and powerful as possible in its limited sphere"*⁹², which is a technical and an administrative one. "At the administrative level, it has essentially a coordinating and statistical role, aiming at interpreting or at harmonizing the initiatives and needs of firms or communes."⁹³ This is achieved by means of the O.N. Plan, which "differs from the Five-year Plan in that it does not affect the whole of economic life, but only a limited and subordinate sector", not defined by the degree of industrial evolution as it is in the de Man and C.G.T. plans, that also distinguish between two sectors, but *"after the nature of the needs to be satisfied."* Thus, "the production of goods destined for the satisfaction of the vital needs of man is planned."⁹⁴ It is guaranteed by the planned sector, so "driv-

ing away the specter of misery and allowing man to rise above uncertainties and purely animal covetousness," while "playing the stabilizing role of a flywheel in economic life."⁹⁵ "On the other hand, the particular needs of everyone, which, while being for the most part necessary to the affirmation of the personality, present nonetheless a character of lesser urgency [...] are answered to by the free sector of the economy, where everybody will accomplish his vocation of initiative and risk."⁹⁶

To have such a vocation or peculiar destiny was the essence of freedom for L'Ordre Nouveau; "such is the meaning of our personalism", wrote Denis de Rougemont.⁹⁷ "We mean by freedom something other than the absence of any constraint."⁹⁸ "In reality, we can give the word 'freedom' a meaning and, consequently, concrete applications only if we define it as the possibility, for everyone, of developing without being hindered the creative faculties that he possesses in this or that sphere of human activity."⁹⁹ The problem becomes one of "ensuring an order within which the free activity of everyone could, normally, develop itself"¹⁰⁰, whereas this opportunity is denied to vast segments of society under the "established disorder"¹⁰¹ of capitalism. Therefore, freedom must be organized: "there is no freedom at the top of the human hierarchy of values if there is no discipline at the bottom."¹⁰² This is the idea behind the Civic Service, which like the Plan and all other state inst-

'tutions of the New Order, of which it is "the very type"¹⁰³,
 is "a subordinate institution, destined, by a partial const-
 raint, to free man from a worse oppression"¹⁰⁴; in this
 case, the proletariat. "We want the proletarian class to be no
 longer alone in carrying the burden of inhuman labour"¹⁰⁵. The
 latter is the kind of work that "always demands the repetition
 of the same gestures, thus tending to become mechanical, autom-
 atic and routine (like that of the assembly line worker or of
 the unskilled labourer)", distinguished through the dichotomic
 method from work "entailing a share of creation and personal
 initiative (like that of the skilled labourer or of the crafts-
 man)". It is the first type of labour that is the lot of the
 proletarianized worker, thus making him "essentially a man cond-
 emned all his life to an undifferentiated labour that reduces
 him to the level of the machine, or even worse, to that of a
 servant of the machine."¹⁰⁶ "The dictatorship and the slavery
 of the proletariat being both equally consolidations of the
 technical oppression endured by the workers", the New Order
 would have to be "founded on the abolition of the proletarian
 condition", which entailed "distributing on the totality of the
 body politic, regardless of class, the whole of the inhuman and
 automatic labour, which bourgeois rationalization had imposed
 on the sole proletarians"¹⁰⁷; this by way of a periodical
 levy, "a compulsory civic service which, even if added to or
 integrated into the military service, would not last more than
 eighteen months." Thus, "everyone will bear part of the burd-

en¹⁰⁸, "allowing all those who, otherwise, would have been the slaves of an inhuman function, to lead a human existence."

Moreover, "the Civic Service will not only fulfill this role of human solidarity, but will also allow the development of technical progress, now hindered by the fear of unemployment.

[...] With the Civic Service, every new machine put into use will bring about a reduction of the length of the Civic Service and will therefore constitute, humanly speaking, a good."¹⁰⁹

This was important for *L'Ordre Nouveau*, as it considered it necessary "that the machines could develop without limits; for the benefit and not the prejudice of man"¹¹⁰; not only because of "the wonderful liberation that the machine grants us"¹¹¹ from routine tasks, but also because *L'Ordre Nouveau* assumed that "the possibilities of modern machinism would be such as to ensure all Europeans of the material conditions of existence corresponding to their state of civilization."¹¹² *L'Ordre*

Nouveau would achieve this by way of a European Vital Minimum to be shared between states, which would in turn provide for a Guaranteed Vital Minimum, "i.e. a material starting base"¹¹³ for everyone of their citizens. In short, "a civilization that will ensure everyone the satisfaction of a minimum of vital necessities; an economic regime that will not impose to only one part of the body politic the slavery of chores where the spirit has no part to play: That is what we intend to put in the place of defunct liberalism and obsolete socialism."¹¹⁴

To bring about this New Order, L'Ordre Nouveau claimed to have but one tactics: faithfulness to its doctrine.¹¹⁵ As Alexandre Marc never failed to point out,¹¹⁶ the latter was more an attitude than an ideology or a code; as a total and coherent way of looking at life in all its aspects, it was really a faith. It was hoped that, when a crisis would come and the bankruptcy of all ideologies would appear plainly to all, the people might follow the holders of that faith, as they would be untainted by the crumbling established disorder, had a clear idea of the order to be built in its wake, and were totally dedicated to its advent. They would thus have long since secured authority; as a result, power would simply fall in their lap when it was ripe. For "power is not an inert object that is 'taken'; power is the tangible form, the concrete expression of authority", which is "anterior and superior" to it. "This is why every time that the established order becomes disorder and power a more or less open form of dictatorship, authority must be transferred to the Revolution." Power will follow, its actual seizure requiring but a final "coup de pousse"¹¹⁷, that can be contrasted with the "coup de force"

L'Action française was waiting for as the precondition for any effective attempt at changing the system, not unlike the Communists and, for that matter, all political parties, L'Ordre Nouveau would argue. Hence its "tactical watch-word", "launched from the beginning": "neither Right nor Left", through which it did not intend to play in the hands of a third party, but to

condemn the practical impotence of the party formation¹¹⁸; for "being designed with the State in mind, the party aims at its conquest. Thus, it is not the radical transformation of society which is the primary aim of even the 'revolutionary' parties, but the 'seizure of power'. The party subordinates everything to this goal. Electoral promises, programs, even doctrines, are reduced to the level of means in view of the conquest of the State."¹¹⁹ But for L'Ordre Nouveau, "between action and thought, between doctrine and tactics, no separation is possible. There is no tactical cleverness that can prevail against a higher loyalty to revolutionary thought"¹²⁰, as "IT IS NOT THE 'SEIZURE OF POWER', BUT THE BIRTH OF THE NEW SOCIETY THAT CONSTITUTES THE PROPERLY REVOLUTIONARY FACT. The *Ordre Nouveau* groupings already prefigure the society of tomorrow, secrete its new substance, prepare its framework[cadres]."¹²¹ This is what L'Ordre Nouveau meant when it asserted that, "leaving to would-be dictators their dreams of uncertain riots, we identify right now our tactics with our methods of government."¹²² "We do not say: give us power first and then we will work. We say: Let's get to work, right away! The new order can be built here and now, among the ruins of the old order, using all that can be found in it that is still solid" to form "the first nuclei of an order that would really be at the service of man." This in every profession, in every community, in farmers' unions, in workers' unions, in education, in publishing and in the press." To constitute such "centers of resistance, to fed-

erate them, to get in touch with our action center, to give it the documentation that it needs, the critiques and local suggestions that it will have to use", was crucial among all the things that, "right now", L'Ordre Nouveau asked "all people who would work with us at the service of freedom."¹²³

This call was directed at all the readers of L'Ordre Nouveau, who were always reminded of the inseparability of doctrine and action in the total view of man promoted by the review. Concretely, this meant that "acquiescence to a thought entails a personal commitment"¹²⁴, demonstrated by a willingness to accomplish the kind of limited acts that "must be the seed of future institutions and constitute a fairly reliable, albeit time-delayed spiritual explosive, to blow up one day the framework of the old order." The detonating power of these acts resided however not so much in their immediate efficiency as in a moral charge far greater than their limited practical scope. In this respect, the O.N. militants were to follow in the footsteps of the Knights and the Terrorists, according to Robert Aron¹²⁵; for Daniel-Rops, they were to become themselves something like a knighthood, or a free corps, in short: an order, "a word that implies renunciation, loyalty, deep, freely granted discipline."¹²⁶ The same author could assert elsewhere as "one of the central points of our doctrine" that "the revolution must first be effected within ourselves, by a deepening of our moral and spiritual life, by a steady casting

off of all that which, in us, hampers the advent of the spirit.¹²⁷ The dynamics of the personalist revolution were thus the exact opposite of those of the Marxist revolution; whereas the latter, being materialist, "or better yet reiform", takes place outside of man as a fact, the former takes place inside man, as an act. "It is born of the movement of intense spiritual violence through which man can break the contact with the established order that oppresses him and create in himself new values, situated beyond the determinisms of the existing false order."¹²⁸ That movement is the "*changement de plan*" around which the whole *Ordre Nouveau* attitude revolves. The deliberately ambiguous phrase that was one of the most important slogans of the group can be translated both as "change of plan" and "change of plane". Yet it is always clear that the change of plan advocated by L'Ordre Nouveau is but a formal consequence of a far deeper change of plane: a turn from the contingent to the transcendent, to that realm of Being whence values could be derived to reshape the given circumstances of history, and polarize them anew towards a higher sphere of absolute meaning.¹²⁹

Thus, "the true violence that we await is an inner one"¹³⁰, directed against all received ideas and current attitudes, and requiring a power of detachment of which only a small élite is capable; in this respect, the masses as such are inert. For "it is not in the 'mass', unorganized and given over to schem-

atic slogans and to panics, it is in the conscience of human persons that are born the new tables of values. All social and political creation is possible only by the upthrust[surrection] of a group of men in whom the awareness of an order to be established becomes acute enough to then irradiate in society, which embodies this order into institutions."¹³¹ In that sense, "the Revolution of Order will be made 'before' the Revolution"¹³², for "when order is no longer in order, it must be in the Revolution."¹³³ What the political clubs had been to the Revolution of 1789, what the Communes had been to the Revolution of 1871, what the Bolsheviks had been to the Revolution of 1917, *L'Ordre Nouveau* intended to be to the approaching new French Revolution.¹³⁴ It was to be an order of persons impelled to bring about an order along the same lines in the world around them, since they could no longer endure its chaos. As Denis de Rougemont put it, summing up all that *L'Ordre Nouveau* was about in the ambiguity of its name: "We want to be, and will be more and more, an order, a community of persons who have made the revolution in their lives, and suffer because of this from the established disorder around them, and who cannot but fight at every step this disorder, to found, right now, the concrete bases of the New Order."¹³⁵

FOOTNOTES

1) Fernand Prévot. "Ordre Nouveau et Coopération", in L'Ordre Nouveau, n° 28, 15 février 1936, p. 10.

2) "Quelques précisions", in L'O.N., n° 11, 15 mai 1934, insert.

3) Daniel Rops. "Thèmes doctrinaux" (an excerpt from the conclusion of *Éléments de notre destin*, reproduced as a summary of the main points of L'O.N.'s doctrines), in L'O.N., n° 8, 15 février 1934, insert.

4) "Quelques précisions", loc. cit.

5) Dominique Ardouint (Jean Jardin) & Alexandre Marc. "Libération de la propriété", in L'O.N., n° 16, 15 décembre 1934, p. 11.

6) A. Marc. "Le droit et les faits sociaux", in L'O.N., n° 29, 15 mars 1936, p. 23.

7) Robert Aron & Arnaud Dandieu. *Décadence de la nation française*, cited in A. Marc. "Patrie, nation, état", in L'O.N., n° 32, 15 juin 1936, p. 30.

8) Claude Chevalley & A. Marc. "A la taille de l'homme: la commune", in L'O.N., n° 39, 1^{er} avril 1937, p. 31.

9) René Dupuis. "Autour du mot 'révolution'", in L'O.N., n° 41, 1^{er} juin 1937, p. 4.

10) A. Marc. "Patrie, nation, état", loc. cit., pp. 30ff. Marc is quoting from Robert Aron & Arnaud Dandieu. *Décadence de la nation française*. Paris, Rieder, 1931. Cf. Appendix, pp. 212-214. It is on the dynamics of this immediate, intensely participatory experience of the world that Lionel Rothkrug has based his interpretation of world-history. He quotes Jesuit linguist Walter J. Ong to support his basic premise of "empathetic identification", that does not apply only to primitive peoples, as Aron and Dandieu realized full well too. Like them, Rothkrug takes as examples "Ancient Greece and Rome and medieval Europe" which were "all pre-literate societies where everyone, even the most learned, also assumed that 'There exists between the universe and the individual human being an identity both anatomical and psychical.' [...] The principle of 'empathetic identification' applied also to people's conceptions of their society. A collectivity embodied its inhabitants in the same way that they embodied the cosmos. They believed they were members of a plural person with whom they shared common physical and psychological traits. The organic analogy was pervasive. By the twelfth century the king and his subjects were united as

the head is to the body." (Lionel Rothkrug. *Modes of Perception in Religion and Culture*. The James A. Gray Lectures Fall 1986, Lecture One (First Draft), p. 3.) Also worthy of note is Marc's use of a term and a concept that could be drawn from William Stern, that of "psycho-physiological organism" (cf. "psychophysische Neutralität").

11) C. Chevalley & A. Marc. "A la taille de l'homme: la commune", loc. cit.

12) "Premiers principes: Le bourgeois, le prolétaire et la personne", in L'O.N., n° 13, 15 juillet 1934, p. 2 of cover.

13) "Lettre à Hitler", in L'O.N., n° 5, 15 novembre 1933, p. 11.

14) Daniel-Rops. "Le Paysan et sa terre", in L'O.N., n° 6, 15 décembre 1933, p. 1.

15) "Définitions", in L'O.N., n° 9, mars 1934, p. III.

16) A. Marc. "Esclavage pas mort...", in L'O.N., n° 25, 15 novembre 1935, pp. 9ss.

17) Daniel-Rops. "Le Paysan et sa terre", in L'O.N., n° 6, 15 décembre 1933, p. 1.

18) C. Chevalley & Michel Glady (A. Marc). "La mort des partis", in L'O.N., n° 4, octobre 1933, p. 21.

19) M. Glady (A. Marc). "Pensées simples sur le parlementarisme", in L'O.N., n° 30, 15 avril 1936, p. 8.

20) "Premiers principes: Le bourgeois, le prolétaire et la personne", in L'O.N., n° 13, 15 juillet 1934, p. 2 of cover.

21) D. Ardouint (J. Jardin) & Xavier de Lignac. "Ne votez pas", in L'O.N., n° 30, 15 avril 1936, p. 7. The definition of corruption as the reduction of the body politic to a piece of dead meat, treated as such in a quantitative way ignoring its organic quality; the comparison of the polity to an organism poisoned by the disease of democracy; the irrational, almost physical, "personal sense of what is dirty and what is clean" that makes voting loathsome; these images all point to a very characteristic trait of the French mentality as Lionel Rothkrug has analyzed it: the conception of France as a mystical body, deriving its sanctity from that of relics (see below, note 37 and Appendix, pp. 216-218). The saint who left relics in the first place was a person who "possessed sacred powers that proceeded chiefly from systematic denial of the flesh. Often iconography makes visible his ribs or other bones to indicate the divine power that shines through his flesh. At death the saint exuviates the flesh, and divine power saturates his entire

person. For his discarnate form, making him totally impervious to the desires and sins of the flesh, receives holiness and full personality in each of its parts just as, subsequently, the doctrine of transubstantiation will declare each particle of the consecrated Host to be the entire body of Christ." (Lionel Rothkrug. *Religious Practices and Collective Perceptions: Hidden Homologies in the Renaissance and Reformation*. Special Issue of *Historical Reflections/Réflexions historiques*, Vol./Tome 7, No. 1, Spring/Printemps 1980, p. 3.) This is the kind of sanctity that clings to the body politic in the French mentality. It gives rise to a political discourse opposing purity and corruption, with intimate, even sexual overtones. Professor Rothkrug has found it was prevalent in the XVIIth and XVIIIth centuries; he has shown the author bibliographies of the political literature of that period where suggestive titles abound. These trends come to a head in the Republic of Virtue, led by ascetic men like Robespierre and Saint-Just. And of course, long before that France was saved by a maiden. In the twentieth century, physical "disgust" with the established order remains a favorite theme of revolutionary rhetoric; as Zeev Sternhell notes: "*Comme 'au temps du boulangisme dont elle fut le slogan, cette expression revient constamment chez les révoltés des années trente. Le plus souvent la désaffection envers ce qui est s'exprime également, tout comme à la fin du XIX^e siècle, par le refus de 'la facilité' et par l'appel à 'la propriété' [...].*" (Ni droite ni gauche. *L'idéologie fasciste en France*. Paris, Editions du Seuil, 1983, p. 280.) L'Ordre Nouveau's discourse on democracy falls within a long established pattern of perceived contamination of the (mystical) body politic by lower impulses, and of desired purification by ascetic means. Both the stain and the urge to cleanse are keenly felt even by the individual as pertaining to his or her own personal integrity, because the mystical body of the Nation, as we have seen above, "receives holiness and full personality in each of its parts." René-Dupuis was well aware of this when he wrote that in France, in contrast to Germany, "*chacun a le sentiment de posséder en soi la nation beaucoup plus encore que d'appartenir à celle-ci*" ("*Les gouvernements totalitaires*", in L'O.N., n° 40, 1^{er} mai 1937, p. 13).

22) M. Glady (A. Marc). "*Pensées simples sur le parlementarisme*", loc. cit., pp. 9 & 14.

23) Denis de Rougemont. "*Communauté révolutionnaire*", in L'O.N., n° 8, 15 février 1934, p. 14.

24) "*Nous voulons*", in L'O.N., n° 9, mars 1934, p. 4.

25) Daniel-Rops. "*Libéralisme et liberté*", in L'O.N., n° 21, 1^{er} juin 1935, p. 4.

26) D. de Rougemont. "*Pour la liberté*", in L'O.N., n° 34,

octobre 1936, p. 6.

27) R. Dupuis. "Le marxisme contre les prolétaires", in L'O.N., n° 25, 15 novembre 1935, p. 30.

28) "Premiers principes: Le bourgeois, le prolétaire et la personne", loc. cit.

29) R. Dupuis. "Le marxisme contre les prolétaires", loc. cit.

30) D. Ardouint & A. Marc. "Libération de la propriété", op. cit. p. 10.

31) "Premiers principes", in L'O.N., n° 1, mai 1933, p. 2 of cover.

32) J. Jardin. "Italie: Misère de l'étatisme politique", in L'O.N., n° 1, mai 1933, p. 28.

33) "Nous voulons", loc. cit.

34) R. Dupuis. "Où en est l'Europe?", in L'O.N., n° 24, 15 octobre 1935, p. 16.

35) D. de Rougemont. "Du socialisme au fascisme", in L'O.N., n° 35, 15 novembre 1936, p. 19.

36) R. Dupuis. "Les gouvernements totalitaires", in loc. cit., p. 28. According to Denis de Rougemont, "Etat-nation" is a "terme forgé par l'Ordre Nouveau et que tout le monde utilise aujourd'hui" ("Témoignage", in ***. Le personnalisme d'Emmanuel Mounier hier et demain. Pour un cinquantenaire. Paris, Editions du Seuil, 1985, p. 38); Alexandre Marc likes to think he has invented it (Letter to the author, 3/13/1986).

37) R. Dupuis. "Election et souveraineté", in L'O.N., n° 30, 15 avril 1936, p. 29. Cf. Appendix, pp. 217-218. Dupuis (or Marc, who often wrote under his friend's name, as he has stated in a letter to the author dated June 12, 1986) recognizes here a process in which Rothkrug has seen a mentality shift: one from the crystallization of transregional devotional patterns (in the form of relic-worship) around the person of the King, to the sacralization of this national network of common perceptions as the source of the King's authority -- "the body politic, conceived to be un corps mystique. It had sacramental qualities that were displayed ostentatiously in the organization of royal funerals around the ceremonial separation of the 'King's' two bodies" -- his effigy, the symbol of the Crown, and his corpse. The royal effigy, juxtaposed to the cadaver, was the Crown made flesh." (Lionel Rothkrug. George Armstrong Kelly's Paper, 7 November, 1985: A Comment, p. 2.) By then, it is only as the animated counterpart of this stone effigy of the

transpersonal essence of sovereignty that the King had authority. No wonder then that he had to acquire in parallel the impersonal qualities of the servant of the State, that is of the "Nation" he had once embodied but that was now identified with kingship as opposed to kings. Marc seems to have sensed the mystical aura of the early modern French monarchy, if his choice of words is any indication: "dogma", "taboo"...

38)R. Dupuis. "Indications historiques sur les rapports entre autorité et pouvoir", in L'O.N., n° 31, 15 mai 1936, p. 20.

Cf. Appendix, p. 218. As the Nation and the King became increasingly self-aware, each one deriving its sense of primacy from the sacrality of their former identity in a mystical body, there arose between them an antagonism that came to a head with Louis XIV's shedding of the King's stone effigy and corollary proclamation of his identity with the State. The latter was no longer identified with France and the King with her-through it, but rather, with the King as an individual, who thus lost touch with the Nation, as Lionel Rothkrug has shown in his published Ph. D. thesis: *Opposition to Louis XIV: The Political and Social Origins of the French Enlightenment*. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1965, 533 p. In his paper *From Sanctity and Heresy to Virtue and Corruption: The Ideological Backgrounds to the French Revolution* (Prepared for the Thirty-Second Annual Meeting of the Society for French Historical Studies, Quebec, P. Q., 20-23 March 1986), he has argued that this dissociation of the State and the Nation in the XVIIth century led directly to the French Revolution. Wide-spread henriolatry was an ominous sign, because "commoners thought Henry IV incarnated the nation, not the French state as did Louis XIV and his successor." (p. 6.)

39)R. Dupuis & Pierre Prévot. "L'Etat contre les patries: L'Alsace", in L'O.N., n° 27, 15 janvier 1936, p. 16.

Cf. Appendix, pp. 218-219. The authors of this article ascribe to a deliberate policy what Lionel Rothkrug would see as a consequence of that "upward displacement of loyalty and sacrality" that is central to his interpretation of Western and especially French history. For la religion royale, with its identification of Nation and kingship in a mystical body, "started to acquire assimilationist traits in the Hundred Years War." (From *Sanctity and Heresy...*, p. 8.). The shift of sacrality from local shrines to a central focus in the head of the mystical body that the Kingdom had become made possible the valuation of a uniform mode of behaviour, as a manifestation of that non-local community in which the sanctity of relics had come to rest as a result of its absorption by the monarchy.

40)M. Glady (A. Marc). "A hauteur d'homme (Des frontières au fédéralisme)", in L'O.N., n° 15, novembre 1934, p. 15.

41)R. Dupuis. "Le Problème International: La paix armée ne

nourrit pas", in L'O.N., n° 34, octobre 1936, p. 51.

42) M. Glady (A. Marc). "A hauteur d'homme, (Des frontières au fédéralisme)", loc. cit., p. 13.

43) L'Ordre Nouveau. "Pour la liberté", in L'O.N., n° 34, 15 octobre 1934, p. 8.

44) R. Dupuis. "Les gouvernements totalitaires", loc. cit., p. 30.

45) Robert Aron & Arnaud Dandieu. La Révolution nécessaire. Paris, Editions Bernard Grasset, 1933, p. 77.

46) A. Marc. "Un destin? -TON destin!", in L'O.N., n° 11, 15 mai 1934, p. 30.

47) R. Dupuis. "Révolution permanente", in L'O.N., n° 8, 15 février 1934, p. 21.

48) A. Marc. "Tradition renouée", in L'O.N., n° 8, 15 février 1934, pp. 4-5. Cf. Appendix, p. 224. The contrast alluded to by Marc between French and German thought stems from the formation in France and the absence in Germany of a mystical body that could have left in its wake a valuation of human intercourse as such, as well as "the ideal of an integrated self within a shared, verbalized network of affective meaning" (Lionel Rothkrug. Modes of Perception in Religion and Culture p. 16) -that is, of a personality, free to handle as it wishes and to weave into an original unity the disjointed strands of collective perceptions that are less and less immediate and somatic, and more and more indirect and verbalized. Hence the appearance of the narrative as we know it in the West at the time of the Renaissance, for "personality appears in European literature only when literary characters finally voice over affective meaning in the imagery of the entire sensorium." (loc. cit.) "That is why German literature virtually disappears from about 1550 to 1750" (ibid. p. 20), whereas "all the great summits of the French spirit" evoked by Marc are authors. In short, the interest of the French in the human personality is related to their ability to verbalize experience.

49) "Nous voulons", loc. cit., p. 10.

50) R. Aron. "Liberté", in L'O.N., n° 8, 15 février 1934, p. 10.

51) "Définitions", loc. cit., p. I.

52) A. Marc. "Patrie, nation, état", loc. cit., pp. 39-40. Cf. Appendix, pp. 220-221. To speak thus of the Nation as a thing of the spirit is an obvious throwback to the concept of the mystical body from which were derived the aforementioned

"assimilationist traits" of *la religion royale*. When it later evolved into *la religion et la civilisation royale et française* "only France placed converted savages on an equal footing with her subjects, both in this life and in the next [...]" (Lionel Rothkrug. *From Sanctity and Heresy...* p. 9.) Post-revolutionary France was following a long-established pattern with its common equation of freedom and civilization with a French citizenship of the spirit. She was being true to an old missionary impulse which even Alexandre Marc felt very keenly, as it is from experience that he spoke of strangers being "assimilated, integrated into the powerful stream of the national tradition." The power of that stream is peculiar to France, for as Professor Rothkrug has asserted: "No European culture is more difficult for foreigners to understand than the German whereas the French has proved widely assimilable." (*Religious Practices and Collective Perceptions*. p. 194.)

53)A. Dandieu. Excerpt from "Y a-t-il un seuil entre cité et humanité", reproduced in the column "Textes de doctrine et d'action", L'O.N., n° 13, 15 juillet 1934, p. 3 of cover.

54)R. Dupuis. "Destin des régimes", in L'O.N., n° 11, 15 mai 1934, p. 14.

55)L'Ordre Nouveau. "Mission ou démission de la France", in L'O.N., n° 1, mai 1933, p. 4.

56)X. de Lignac. "Syndicalisme, Socialisme et Révolution", in L'O.N., n° 35, 15 novembre 1936, p. 26.

57)R. Aron. "Deux fausses sorties: Duboin, Bat'a", in L'O.N., n° 37, janvier 1937, pp. 21-22.

58)C. Chevalley. "Politique syndicale", in L'O.N., n° 32, 15 juin 1936, p. 27.

59)R. Aron. "De l'anarchisme au marxisme: Décadence du militant", in L'O.N., 1^{er} juin 1937, p. 11.

60)I.-S. Révah. "D. H. Lawrence", in L'O.N., n° 40, 1^{er} mai 1937, p. 64.

61)C. Chevalley & A. Marc. "La tentation de l'Unité", in L'O.N., n° 37, janvier 1937, p. 47. This reasoning lends itself to parallels with some Eastern philosophies. It is akin to the yin/yang concept of Taoism, and can be related to the kind of non-dualism put forward by Tantrism. The Kulārṇava-Tantra (I,110) attributes the following words to Para Shakti, the Ultimate Reality: "Some understand me in a dualistic way (*dvaitavāda*), some understand me in a monistic way (*advaitavāda*), but my reality is beyond dualism and monism (*dvaitadvaita-vivarjita*)."(Cited in Julius Evola. *La yoga tantrique*.)

Sa métaphysique; ses pratiques. Traduit de l'italien par Gabrielle Robinet. Paris, Librairie Arthème Fayard, 1971, p. 59.)

62) C. Chevalley. "De la méthode dichotomique", in L'O.N., n° 36, 15 décembre 1936, p. 39.

63) See for instance C. Chevalley & M. Glady (A. Marc). "La mort des partis", in L'O.N., n° 4, octobre 1933, p. 18ss.

64) A. Dandieu & D. de Rougemont. "Positions d'attaque", in L'O.N., n° 6, 15 décembre 1933, pp. 2-3 of cover.

65) A. Marc. "Le droit et les faits sociaux", in L'O.N., n° 29, 15 mars 1936, pp. 26-27.

66) A. Marc. "L'état sans majuscule", in L'O.N., n° 14, 15 octobre 1934, p. 28.

67) C. Chevalley & Alexandre Marc. "L'être qui dit non", in L'O.N., n° 38, 1^{er} mars 1937, p. 47.

68) A. Marc. "Introduction à un droit nouveau", in L'O.N., n° 20, 1^{er} mai 1935, p. 31.

69) R. Dupuis. "Autour du mot 'révolution'", loc. cit., p. 3.

70) A. Marc. "Echange et Magie", in L'O.N., n° 40, 1^{er} mai 1937, p. 55.

71) A. Dandieu. "L'intelligence épee", reprinted in the column "Texte de doctrine et d'action" in L'O.N., n° 20, 1^{er} mai 1935, p. 2 of cover.

72) R. Dupuis. "Autour du mot 'révolution'", loc. cit., p. 5. Compare Appendix, pp. 218-219. This effort is the whole thrust of French civilization, which by displacing the focus of loyalty and sacrality unto a larger, ultimately universal whole, beyond the confines of the locally based collective persons, has made it possible for the individual to come into its own as a distinct entity, who would then consciously strive to belong to a new community based on the affective accord of discrete selves. But the effect of this emphasis on voluntary participation in a community has historically been to generate uprootedness, as it has taken the shape of the kind of abstract, unsatisfying allegiances which *L'Ordre Nouveau* constantly denounces. It is thus trying to have its cake and eat it too, so to speak, when it expresses yearnings for close-knit, locally based communities, while insisting on keeping the liberal principle of free association of individuals in civil society. This goes to show how deeply coloured by the French mentality and its "ideal of an integrated self within a shared, verbalized

network of affective meaning"(see footnote 48) these yearnings are, for elsewhere in Europe, say in Germany, movements animated by the same ones would not hesitate to sacrifice the individual on the altar of the community.

73)A. Marc. "L'Etat contre les Nations: Guerre Italienne et drame Allemand", in L'O.N., n° 27, 15 janvier 1936, p. 12.

74)A. Marc. "En guise de Conclusion et de Préface", in L'O.N., n° 25, 15 novembre 1935, p. 38.

75)A. Marc. "L'Etat contre les Nations: Guerre italienne et drame Allemand", in loc. cit., pp. 12-13.

76)M. Glady (A. Marc). "A hauteur d'homme (Des frontières au fédéralisme)", loc. cit., p. 9.

77)A. Marc. "Patrie, nation, état", loc. cit., p. 31.

78)M. Glady (A. Marc). "A hauteur d'homme (Des frontières au fédéralisme)", loc. cit., p. 9. Marc is quoting from Dandieu's "Discours contre la Méthode". Note the similarity between Dandieu's phrase "*la chair et la terre*" and the Nazi slogan "*Blut und Boden*"; there are common longings at play here, which L'Ordre Nouveau's Lettre à Hitler would readily acknowledge ("*Vous êtes revenu au réel, au charnel*", loc. cit., p. 11), and on which it would base its constructive criticism of the Führer's policies. Perhaps it was of "*la chair et la terre*" that Mounier was thinking when he referred to Dandieu's "open sympathies for certain Hitlerite themes"(see John Hellman. Emmanuel Mounier and the New Catholic Left 1930-1950. Toronto, Buffalo, London, University of Toronto Press, 1981, p. 60); if so, it was also a basic theme of what would become his own personalism that he was then dismissing as Nazi.

79)"Précis Ordre Nouveau", in L'O.N., n° 34, octobre 1936, p. 24 (see also, under the same title, n°s 22-23, juillet-août 1935, p. 64).

80)Ibid., p. 21. Compare Appendix, p. 214, on the necessarily local character of the participatory psycho-physical experience of the world characteristic of pre-literate peoples, and see above, footnote 72 on the paradox entailed by L'Ordre Nouveau's valuation of it.

81)C. Chevalley & A. Marc. "A la taille de l'homme: la Commune", loc. cit., p. 33.

82)A. Marc. "Patrie, nation, état", loc. cit., pp. 36-37.

83)M. Glady (A. Marc). "A hauteur d'homme (Des frontières au fédéralisme)", loc. cit., p. 9.

84) A. Marc. "Patrie, nation, état", loc. cit., p. 34.

By an interesting coincidence, it is as "pre-ethical societies" that Professor Rothkrug designates those primitive human groups characterized by the lack of interpersonal behaviour as such, since they are undifferentiated collective persons, out of which individuals step into the mystical body of the Nation by way of what may well be termed a "spiritual vocation", following L'O.N.'s usage, given the religious origin of this phenomenon.

85) "Définitions", loc. cit., p. II.

86) "Précis O.N.", loc. cit., pp. 24-25.

87) "Définitions", loc. cit., p. I.

88) "Précis O.N.", loc. cit., p. 25.

89) A. Marc. "L'état sans majuscule", in L'O.N., n° 41, 15 octobre 1934, p. 31.

90) "Précis O.N.", loc. cit., pp. 34-35.

91) Ibid., p. 26.

92) C. Chevalley & D. de Rougemont. "L'autorité assure les libertés", in L'O.N., n° 40, 1^{er} mai 1937, p. 45.

93) "Précis O.N.", loc. cit., p. 26.

94) "Précis O.N.", loc. cit., p. 27.

95) "Quelques précisions", in L'O.N., n° 12, 15 juin 1934, insert.

96) "Précis O.N.", loc. cit., p. 27.

97) D. de Rougemont. "Destin du siècle ou destin de l'homme?", in L'O.N., n° 11, 15 mai 1934, p. 3.

98) L'Ordre Nouveau. "Pour la liberté", in L'O.N., n° 34, octobre 1934, p. 2.

99) R. Dupuis. "Autour du mot 'révolution'", loc. cit., p. 10.

100) L'Ordre Nouveau. "Pour la liberté", loc. cit., p. 9.

101) "Nous voulons", loc. cit., p. 2.

102) R. Aron. "Liberté", in L'O.N., n° 8, 15 février 1934, p. 13 (see also L'Ordre Nouveau. "Pour la liberté", loc. cit.,

p. 9, and "Précis O.N.", loc. cit., p. 26).

103) Robert Gibrat & Robert Loustau. "L'organisation du service civil", in L'O.N., n° 20, 1^{er} mai 1935, p. 13.

105) "Nous voulons", loc. cit., p. 18.

106) "Précis O.N.", loc. cit., p. 26.

107) "Premiers principes", loc. cit., p. 2 of cover.

108) "Nous voulons", loc. cit., p. 18.

109) "Précis O.N.", loc. cit., p. 30.

110) Daniel-Rops. "La Révolution de l'attelage", in L'O.N., n° 4, octobre 1933, p. 32.

111) Ibid., p. 31.

112) R. Dupuis. "Pourquoi la guerre?", in L'O.N., n° 26, 15 décembre 1935, p. 7.

113) D. de Rougemont. "Qu'est-ce que la politique?", in L'O.N., n° 32, 15 juin 1936, p. 7.

114) Daniel-Rops. "Libéralisme et liberté", in L'O.N., n° 21, 1^{er} juin 1935, p. 6.

115) C. Chevalley & M. Glady (A. Marc). "La mort des partis", loc. cit., p. 22.

116) See for instance C. Chevalley & A. Marc. "La folie des frontières (Exemple de méthode dichotomique)", in L'O.N., n° 12, 15 juin 1934, p. 19.

117) "Premiers principes. VI.-La tactique", in L'O.N., n° 8, février 1934, p. 2 of cover.

118) "Qui fera la Révolution?", in L'O.N., n° 35, 15 novembre 1936, p. 2.

119) C. Chevalley & M. Glady (A. Marc). "La mort des partis", loc. cit., p. 20.

120) "Nous voulons", loc. cit., p. 28.

121) C. Chevalley & M. Glady (A. Marc). "La mort des partis", loc. cit., p. 22.

122) "Nous voulons", loc. cit., p. 29.

123) L'Ordre Nouveau. "Pour la liberté", loc. cit., pp. 14ss.

124) "A nos lecteurs, à tous nos amis", in L'O.N., n° 34, octobre 1936, p. 2 of cover.

125) R. Aron. "Esquisse d'une méthode d'action révolutionnaire", in L'O.N., n° 20, 1^{er} mai 1935, p. 18.

126) Daniel-Rops. "Pour quelques-uns", in L'O.N., n° 17, janvier 1935, p. 3. This must be related to the "systematic denial of the flesh" (see above, footnote 21) whence sprang the sanctity that suffused the French nation and gave by this channel an ascetic dimension to the Frenchman's sense of personal identity. It comes to the fore in many a personalist in the time of profound crisis in which they felt they were living. Alexandre Marc, as we shall see in the next section, was very serious about the idea of an order, and did not simply invoke it as Robert Aron, Daniel-Rops, and Denis de Rougemont do here. Emmanuel Mounier and Raymond de Becker also meant business when they spoke about founding an order. In the concept of an order, the yearning for community comes into its own, that is back to its original religious context. As asceticism is so intimately bound up with the French identity, it is no wonder that this notion held so much fascination for personalists.

127) Daniel-Rops. "Ce qui meurt et ce qui naît", in L'O.N., n° 8, 15 février 1934, p. 28.

128) R. Dupuis. "Révolution permanente", in L'O.N., n° 8, 15 février 1934, pp. 19ss.

129) A good example of the ambiguous use of the term "plan" is Marc's assertion that "*les mesures que nous préconisons constituent un véritable changement de plan. Il nous faut donc repenser tous les problèmes en fonction de ce plan.*" ("La terre libérée", in L'O.N., n° 6, décembre 1933, p. 31.) It must be noted too that a change of plane is precisely what happens when a saint goes against the current of natural earthly determinisms; it is thus that he partakes of the supernatural, of the Holy, of the transcendent.

130) Daniel-Rops, "Pour quelques-uns", loc. cit.

131) C. Chevalley & D. de Rougemont. "L'autorité assure les libertés", in L'O.N., n° 40, 1^{er} mai 1937, pp. 44-45.

132) C. Chevalley & M. Glady. "La mort des partis", in loc. cit. p. 22.

133) "Nous voulons", in loc. cit., p. 31.

134) C. Chevalley & D. de Rougemont. "L'autorité assure les

libertés", in L'O.N., n° 40, 1^{er} mai 1937, pp. 44-45.

135) Denis de Rougemont. "Un exemple de tactique révolutionnaire chez Lénine", in L'O.N., n° 17, janvier 1935, p. 12.

III. "ALEXANDRE MARC AND L'ORDRE NOUVEAU 1933-1940

L'Ordre Nouveau was never printed in more than 2000 copies. It was financed mostly by its subscribers, who numbered a thousand at its peak.¹ The trenchancy of the certainties it expounded had to put off most people, as it did Mounier. But those who were not deterred by it shared them, so that L'Ordre Nouveau's subscribers made up in quality what they lacked in quantity. "They were more than mere readers", Edmond Lipiansky has written; "they were always sympathizers and often militants. They were in close contact with the movement, reacted to the articles, took a stand, as rather abundant mail demonstrates."² Theirs was "such a personal commitment, such a strong conviction," says Robert Aron, "that they were enough to establish our renown and spread our ideas. Most of them, even after the end of the review and the suspension of our militant action, remained faithful to us, and a good many followed us after the war in the federalist movement, born of personalism."³ Nevertheless, L'Ordre Nouveau relied on more than the personal charisma of its militants to spread its ideas. Its leaders also wrote successful books that considerably widened the movement's audience. In December 1933, an ad on the back cover of the sixth issue of L'Ordre Nouveau announced that La Revue Hebdomadaire had "begun to publish *Eléments de notre destin* by Daniel-Rops. All contemporary problems are examined in this essay in the light of the principles of L'Ordre Nouveau. The conclusions of this book constitute the basis of

decisive action", and are reproduced in an insert to n° 8 as a summary of the O.N. doctrine. The book's first edition was issued in over 35 000 copies. In 1934, *Politique de la personne*, a collection of articles and speeches on personalism by Denis de Rougemont, was also printed in large quantities. Dandieu and Aron's *La Révolution nécessaire* was reissued seven times in a row when it appeared in November 1933, and was reviewed in a number of important newspapers and monthlies.⁴ The chapter elaborating L'Ordre Nouveau's theory of labour and the proletariat was even published in *Esprit* shortly before the book came out. The latter was described by Mounier as "perhaps the first essential work in the French language that we can oppose to *Das Kapital*."⁵ Alexandre Marc certainly thought so, and still does; he considers it the book of his movement, and makes it a required reading in the courses he gives in the various federalist institutes founded by him.⁶

By a tragic quirk of fate, Arnaud Dandieu himself did not live to see his work widely acclaimed. That summer, having just finished writing *La Révolution nécessaire*, he decided to have a slight hernia removed before going on vacation. The operation itself was a success, except Dandieu somehow contracted septicemia. As antibiotics were not yet available, he was doomed. For six days he struggled with death, raving all the while about his unfinished life's work, and enjoining his friend Aron to continue it as best he could along with the rest of the L'Ordre Nouveau team, most of whom happened to be out

of town at the time. After he finally passed away in the morning of August 6, 1933, "manifestations of pain coming from elders like François Mauriac and Gabriel Marcel as well as comrades and friends bore witness to the audience attained by Dandieu."⁷ (Robert Aron) All who knew him recognized in him one of the greatest minds of his generation. Even Luchaire's Notre Temps, L'Ordre Nouveau's old rival in the fight for the hearts and minds of the young generations, bemoaned the death of "one of the leaders in which [they] could put the most confidence."⁸ According to Jean-Louis Loubet del Bayle, Daniel-Rops was summing up the consensus when 23 years later he wrote: "Dandieu was a man of genius. Had he lived, he would have been the Bergson of our generation."⁹ Alexandre Marc goes even further than that. "Spiritually," he says, "he was a universal man, more than a genius, a kind of - though it is strange to say because he died so young, but a kind of Goethe, that is to say that he was interested in everything." This Renaissance man "could talk to you of tennis (which he loved) in an analytical way, just as of English literature." He was preparing a book on Blake, as well as one on Time with Dr. Eugène Minkowski. He was also studying the problem of nomadism with the sociologist Marcel Mauss, because he related it to the proletarian condition.¹⁰ (The November 1933 issue of L'Ordre Nouveau would contain a statement of principle by Arnaud Dandieu "against economic nomadism".¹¹) A book on personalist philosophy on which Dandieu had been working with Marc (who had already written the plan), Dupuis, and de Rougemont, and which would have been ent-

itled *L'homme debout*, was also left unfinished.¹² A part of it written by Dandieu and de Rougemont, "*L'Acte comme point de départ*", was defended by them before the *Recherches philosophiques* group of Alexandre Koyré, Georges Gurvitch, Jean Wahl, and others,¹³ and discussed by Marc in the December 1933 issue of *Esprit*.¹⁴ Denis de Rougemont's "*Définition de la Personne*", written at the same time and published a bit later in *Esprit*, would be the object of two debates of another group of philosophers gathered around Berdiaeff and Gabriel Marcel.¹⁵ As it arose in the course of thorough discussions with Dandieu on the subject,¹⁶ one can presume that it was influenced by him, so that through de Rougemont and posthumously as it were, Dandieu's thought would find its way to the forefront of the proceedings of the philosophical circle entrusted by *Esprit* with the task of hammering out a personalist doctrine distinct from that of *L'Ordre Nouveau*, that is of Dandieu. If we recall the Otto Neumann affair, it may well appear that *Esprit*'s personalism was significantly -if surreptitiously- informed by that of *L'Ordre Nouveau*.

Dandieu's movement was however nearly shattered by his death. It had been held together largely by a charisma the like of which Marc has never found in anyone else in his entire life;¹⁷ "Dandieu was the sun and we were the planets", he likes to say. All the people he introduced to Dandieu (with the notable exception of Emmanuel Mounier) fell under his spell. For instance, his old friend Jean Jardin used to be a Maurrasian

sceptic, and became a rabid federalist under Dandieu's influence and not Marc's. He found him weeping in front of the clinic where Dandieu lay dead when he came back to Paris, having been alerted by his parents. "It's over. Our movement is dead", said Jardin. "No, we must go on", replied Marc.

--No, without Dandieu, it's over.¹⁸ Marc prevailed, but years

later he would have to admit that "after Dandieu's death, we

went on, but it never worked as well as when he was alive. He was the link. The group never found its cohesiveness back."¹⁹

Nevertheless, at the time, spurred on by Marc, it tried to put

on a brave face. In the following issue of L'Ordre Nouveau

(n° 4), one could read in a prefatory note entitled "Avenir

d'Arnaud Dandieu": "It is not so much the remembrance of a

départed one which, in these terrible days of August, has further

strengthened the unity of our group, as the care to watch over

the future of his work"²⁰, which it purported to continue. Two

years later, Alexandre Marc would claim that "the principles of

the O.N. plan were slowly ripened and specified in the course

of patient and methodical work which the spirit of Arnaud Dandi-

eu animated from the beginning and still goes on animating."²¹

Unpublished material by him would appear regularly in the rev-

iew, as well as reprints of old articles from before its creat-

ion. Hagiographic references to Dandieu were common, and somet-

imes bordered on superstition, as when Aron pointed out that

six months to the day, to the hour even, after Dandieu's death,

"the first victims of the Revolution he had announced fell on

the place de la Concorde" in the February 1934 riots.²² Marc,

on his part, has lived, as Robert Aron put it, "in an uninterrupted cult to the memory of Dandieu, naming his son Arnaud, and his daughter Mireille, like the sister of our friend"²³ (who was in charge of the administration of the review).

Marc considers Dandieu to be the man who has had the most influence on him. But not so much in terms of specific ideas which Dandieu would have transmitted to him (except for his concept of the civic service); it is rather a question of attitude, namely the determination to go to the bottom of things, to draw all necessary conclusions and put them forward in a forceful and uncompromising way. It is a quality of intransigence that Marc's thought has acquired from his contact with Arnaud Dandieu: a certain radicalism, a deliberate maximalism (which happens to be in the best SR tradition). For instance, it would no longer suffice for him to be a "good European"; only integral federalism would do. Throughout his life, Marc would often ask himself what Dandieu would have thought of such and such a problem or what he would have done in a given situation. So when he learnt from Aron that their mutual friend, in a final fit of raving, had experienced a deathbed conversion in the course of which he had addressed the absent Marc as if he was a representative of the Catholic Church, he was deeply shaken. The incident alerted him to the lack of consistency in his life, since for a couple of years he had sung the praises of the Church without actually belonging to it. The straw that broke the camel's back was, however, a

conversation Marc had with Denis de Rougemont about a month after Dandieu's death. They were arguing about a book on the Gospel by André Gide (whom Marc knew personally through Jacques Naville). Marc said there were dubious elements thrown in, and that this was typically Protestant. De Rougemont then denied that Gide was a Protestant. Marc replied that the Protestant position was too easy, since Protestants got to decide each by himself who belonged or not to the Church. --And you who belong to no church, what do you decide upon? De Rougemont's retort stabbed Marc like a dagger. He realized his friend was right, and so he decided to get baptized.²⁴

His baptism took place a few weeks later, on September 29 - Michaelmas; hence his middle name, Michel.²⁵ The ceremony was conducted by the abbé Jean Plaquevent, another contributor to Esprit, whose acquaintance Marc had made after sending him a note to tell him of his appreciation of a book by him. The abbé took Marc under his wing in hopes of working with him, writing books and the like. He went so far as to put him up along with his wife and his new-born daughter Mireille in a little house built especially for them in an enclosure on the grounds of the Couvent du Bon Pasteur in Pau, where he was the chaplain. There Marc, who was by then unemployed, could earn a living by his pen without having to pay a rent. This unheard of arrangement did not last long, however, because Marc's Calvinist wife kept protesting against the treatment of the penitent women at the convent, and Marc tended to side with her

against the Mother Superior, even though he respected the latter for her intelligence and progressive ideas. She was also his daughter's godmother, the abbé being her godfather. Things came to a head when Marc sought out the abbé and the Mother Superior while they were away on an excursion to Arca-chon, to ask them something he thought was important. But the abbé found this to be a total indiscretion, and back in Pau Marc immediately moved out. Understandably after all he had done for Marc, the abbé Plaquevent never forgave him. As for Marc, he had derived from his relationship with the abbé an enduring taste for etymology, as well as an awareness of his gnostic tendencies.²⁶

Marc went on to found an order of his own for married lay people, the Society of Saint Louis. It was located in the Ile-de-France on an estate bought by Eugène Primard, a friend of Arnaud Dandieu. According to Raymond de Becker, who heard of it, "its members were attempting to constitute farming communities where several families were living together and worked under the authority of a single leader"²⁷: Primard himself. Marc wanted the order to put into practice the *O.N.* concept of the guaranteed vital minimum. Everybody's earnings would be given to the order, which would distribute their average amount to all members. They would be free to keep whatever they earned in addition to this guaranteed minimum. There was hardly any time to implement these plans, however, as the order soon got mired in verbiage, turbulence and women's quarrels. Eugène

Primard did not have the stature of a spiritual leader, so that things got out of hands and the experiment had to be abandoned. The idea of an order kept haunting Marc, however, and he would try to revive it after the collapse of France, to form men in view of a struggle of resistance that a historian from *Esprit*, Henri-Irénée Marrou, in a report commissioned with this order in mind, had estimated could last decades. When he was still thinking about converting, Marc was also considering entering into an order. He was leaning towards the Jesuits, because they were soldiers for Christ - the Order of action, and Marc was not the contemplative type. But he also realized that he might not be able to accept the rigorous discipline of such an order if there were things he did not happen to agree with. All the same, he was determined to be celibate, and it is from this resolution that came the idea of the Society of Saint Louis, as something to fall back on, to live in an ascetic way even though he was wedded.²⁸

The news of his marriage to Suzanne Jean came as a shock to one of a number of women whom he had had the opportunity to marry. Margarita Abella Caprile felt betrayed, because she had returned to her native Argentina in the belief that Marc wished to remain celibate. "Her name", it has been written, "figures among the first in her country in matters of poetry."²⁹ Hers was often brooding and existential, haunted by the "atrocious consciousness of oneself".³⁰ Alexandre Marc had met her at the *Décades de Pontigny*³¹, a yearly thematic gathering of literary

celebrities, held in a former Cistercian abbey in the Yonne and organized by Paul Desjardins, of the *Union pour la Vérité*.

(It is at the August 1935 *décade* on asceticism³² that Marc would make the acquaintance of the Jewish personalist Martin Buber.) She loved him much, and Marc greatly admired her. Everybody thought they would marry. Marc's father was even counting on it to get back in business (his German venture having been a failure), as Margarita Abella Caprile was very wealthy. Her family partly owned *La Nación* of Buenos Aires, which was then one of the great newspapers of the world. She gave Marc his start in journalism by having a series of articles by him on the various youth movements of Europe published in it. Cut out and pasted together by Suzanne Jean and René Dupuis, they would give Alexandre Marc's first book: *Jeune Europe*, published in 1933. René Dupuis was supposed to be its co-author, but his actual contribution was limited to a few corrections.³³ This was the case with most of the pieces where his name appeared along with Marc's, as well as many where it was displayed alone.³⁴ According to Marc, he was "making a gesture for this awkward being who was in need of a meaning to his life."³⁵

Jeune Europe won an award of the Académie française.³⁶ It was not the only publication Marc owed to Abella Caprile. A segment of *L'homme debout* he had written in close collaboration with Arnaud Dandieu was published in Montevideo in 1933.³⁷ It was called "*Misère et grandeur du spirituel*". In his foreword

to its 1974 reprint as a *Document du Centre International de Formation Européenne*, Marc described it as the "source of this personalist federalism to which we have devoted our whole life."³⁸ It is indeed the thoroughest published formulation of Dandieu's philosophy, with its definition of the spiritual as "tension, conflict, and act"³⁹, that of the person by the three essential characters of "struggle, domination, creation"⁴⁰, and the concomitant "refutation of psycho-physical parallelism"⁴¹.

Alexandre Marc was married to Suzanne Jean at the City Hall of the XV^e arrondissement (where Marc had a flat) on November 18, 1933. The religious ceremony took place at the Dominican convent of Juvisy shortly thereafter - the only marriage ever celebrated in this institution,⁴² which goes to show how much of a fixture of the place Marc had become. The decision to marry had been taken spontaneously, without an engagement. Marc had known Jean for about a year; they first went out together to the founding meeting of the *Troisième Force*. He had invited her there when she had inquired about his activities, having been sent from England for this purpose to look for him at the *Esprit* office by a Mr. Mitrinovic whom she referred to as "our spiritual master".⁴³ She had been working for four years as a French teacher in an experimental school in Bristol, where the dance teacher, Valerie Cooper, had introduced her to a circle meeting at her London studio, and which revolved around an intimate friend of hers: a Serbian guru called Dimitrije Mitrinovic.⁴⁴ He was a mysterious figure

not unlike Georges Gurdjieff or Rudolf Steiner; his magnetic personality and syncretic spiritualist doctrine gathered around him people seeking wisdom and a meaning to their life in a secretive school of initiation. However, it differed from Gurdjieff's Institute for the Harmonious Development of Man or Steiner's anthroposophical school, in that it was geared toward social change and did not make of personal self-transformation an end in itself.⁴⁵ On the contrary, as Andrew Rigby writes, "the major theme of Mitrinovic's life and work" was "the preparation of a group of individuals for a new world-transforming initiative, to which he gave the name Senate. The function of senators would be that of working in and through all levels of society, helping people and groups to relate to each other cooperatively as constituent members of a common humanity"⁴⁶ thought of by Mitrinovic as "one great mind in process of becoming self-conscious."⁴⁷ "The foundation of Universal Humanity resided in the natural oneness of the world, instinctively recognised in the East, and the freewill and reason of self-conscious individuals in the West, upon whom a key task fell in creating the world organic order."⁴⁸ For, in the words of a disciple, "primitive and unconscious solidarity, now lost, must be replaced by adult and conscious unity"⁴⁹, up to a planetary scale. This made world federation "the inescapable need as well as the highest hope of the future."⁵⁰ Says Rigby:

For Mitrinovic European federation was seen as a major step towards world federation. The significance of Europe was that it was the continent where individ-

ual self-consciousness was most highly developed. But individual liberty was threatened by what he called the "Block State", the overcentralization of power and control. The transformation of the European order was called for, a "revolution of order", a conscious, planned voluntary revolution guided by the twin principles of devolution and federation. These represented the twin opposing principles upon which every human organisation was based--the forces of cohesion which tended to preserve unity and stability and the forces of diversity which tended to preserve individual differences and freedom. Devolution, the application of the principle of diversity, meant that every decision should be taken in the smallest possible grouping of those who either had to implement it or would be affected by it. Such devolution, if it was not to result in chaos, needed to be complemented by federation whereby all those with a common interest through their work, place of residence or cultural activity should consult together to reach agreement on matters of shared concern. [...] Tension and conflict between the two principles was therefore inevitable and neither could ever be fully attainable, yet Mitrović insisted that they be taken as regulative ideals, each to be taken as an absolute guide to action, maintaining the conflict and tension between them so that neither principle should prevail at the cost of the other.⁵¹

It is no wonder that, probably upon reading Marc's article on-revolutionary federalism in the November 1932 issue of *Esprit*, Mitrović was moved to contact its author. The similarities between his federalism and Marc's are downright uncanny. They extend to its aims, which have a distinctly personalistic ring to them, as summarized by J. V. Delahaye:

We conceive the purpose of human existence to be the fullest possible individuation, physical, mental and spiritual, of all persons and all races. Every being must be given the fullest opportunity to rise to his own full stature. This is the meaning of life. The purpose of Science, Politics, Economics, and of all Institutions and of all Societies and Parties whatsoever, is to contribute to this end. When they cease to do so they are without value. Believing that

man is "social to the core", we welcome the maximum extension of liberty and the greatest diversity in unity.⁵²

Thus, the "necessary opposition between the community and the individual" was denied, and the "parallel necessities for discipline and freedom" were acknowledged.⁵³ Discipline was needed to make sure that the "physiological, animal needs" in which "all men are alike" were met, and freedom to allow "the needs of the individual as a differentiated being" to be fulfilled.⁵⁴ "A condition of individual liberty" was therefore "the necessity for order, planning and authority, especially in economic matters."⁵⁵ Yet "we live, in fact, under a production Economy, in which the interest of the consumer - the human being as such - is secondary,"⁵⁶ subordinated as it is to the profit of a few who deliberately prolong the Age of Scarcity, when modern technology would make possible the advent of an Age of Plenty.⁵⁷ L'Ordre Nouveau denounced productivism in much the same terms.⁵⁸ Likewise, one is seized by a feeling of déjà vu when Delahaye asserts that "co-operation between States, except for purposes of aggression upon another group, is almost a contradiction in terms. Our programme aims in the first instance at removing the basic cause of international discord, i. e. struggles for economic and financial supremacy; secondly, at a radical change in the instrument of aggression, that is the state as at present constituted"⁵⁹ and purposely "confused with Society".⁶⁰ From their institutional blueprints (providing like L'O.N. for an Economic Council "based upon the co-ordinat-

ion of free industrial guilds, with workers' control and the abolition of the anachronistic, undignified and inhuman wage system⁶¹) to their tactics ("to create in every town and village a nucleus of disinterested and intelligent men and women, to awaken public consciousness to the issues that have to be faced, and to spread the conceptions and principles of the Movement"⁶²), the political movements inspired by Mitrinovic were rife with points of contact with L'Ordre Nouveau - be it the *New Europe Group*, *New Britain*, or *The Eleventh Hour*, whose name was meant to convey the same feeling out of which L'Ordre Nouveau was born, that is the urgency of establishing a New Order that could prevent war both civil and international and the attendant triumph of tyranny. ("The New Atlantis was the name Dimitrije Mitrinovic gave to his whole cultural orientation and initiative."⁶³)

Mutual influence is quite possible, and seems to be attested - for the British side at least - by Lewis Mumford, who in a letter to Alexandre Marc has stated that during his years in England he had been very aware of L'Ordre Nouveau's ideas, and knew them through none other than Sir Patrick Geddes, the first president of the *New Europe Group*.⁶⁴ It is at any rate unquestionable that there was a lot of common ground from the outset between the French and the British movements. L'Ordre Nouveau was well aware of this. When in February 1934 it published the answers to an international questionnaire for non-conformists on "French values seen from outside", it exp-

ressed its chagrin at not having received the answers of the English groups in time to include them: "*Nous le regrettons d'autant plus vivement que ces réponses eussent fait apercevoir, sans nul doute, la profonde communauté de vue entre L'Ordre Nouveau et les groupes similaires qui - en contact, et en collaboration avec nous-mêmes - préparent également, outre-Manche, le nouvel ordre -The New Order -humain et social.*"⁶⁵

The cooperation alluded to here became more formal when four months later two leaders of *New Britain*, including Winifred Gordon Fraser, "an energetic and intelligent Scotswoman", who was the secretary of the *New Europe Group*, were welcomed in Paris by Alexandre Marc and Claude Chevalley,⁶⁶ to confront the doctrinal points of view of the two movements and study the possibilities of concerted action by *New Britain* and *L'Ordre Nouveau*. These exchanges of views", it was reported in *L'Ordre Nouveau*, "as was to be expected from movements which for years despite certain important differences have worked along neighbouring lines, have turned out to be particularly easy and fruitful." It was decided that articles would be exchanged, that *L'Ordre Nouveau* would participate in the second conference of *New Britain* in August, and that the two movements would jointly organize a European congress in Paris in November where "representatives from various revolutionary movements would gather to study in a common spirit the problem of the corporation and that of the civic service."⁶⁷

Little of this seems to have actually come about, however.

No articles were exchanged, though Suzanne Jean and Alexandre Marc had written a column entitled "A French Point of View" in⁶⁸ the *New British Weekly* from its launching in May 1933 (at the same time as *L'Ordre Nouveau*) to October of the same year.⁶⁸ The first issue (October 1933) of the *New Britain* quarterly *The New Atlantis* had included an article by Marc and Dandieu, and the second (January 1934) excerpts from *L'Ordre Nouveau's* letter to Hitler.⁶⁹ (Mitrinovic had published his own letter to Hitler in the first issue⁷⁰ - a month before *L'Ordre Nouveau*.) The author has found no mention of an *O.N.* delegation at the *New Britain* conference in Glastonbury, where "without a weekly paper [the final issue having come out during the conference], with funds exhausted, it became clear even to the most committed and optimistic that the days of *New Britain* as a popular public initiative for the re-ordering of individual and social life were numbered."⁷¹ (Andrew Rigby) It was in the process of petering out when the international conference of non-conformist revolutionary movements loudly announced in June finally took place. By October, it had already been reduced in scale to "common work sessions, rather than a conference in the usual sense of the word", of representatives from *New Britain* and *L'Ordre Nouveau*, with a few foreign, chiefly Belgian observers.⁷² It is uncertain whether even these turned up at what the November issue of *L'Ordre Nouveau* now referred to as a Franco-British conference. It saluted "our English friends" for having been so "rapidly convinced of the inefficiency of all partial solutions", for having "thus understood the virtues of rev-

olutionary intransigence", even though they had "started from a reformist attitude, probably more in tune with their national character. They had seen the light and now "tended to join us"; an excerpt from the bulletin *Eleventh Hour* was triumphantly produced to give proof of their change of heart. Other than that, it was not deemed necessary to give an account of the conference, "because the important decisions that were taken there merely continue at the supra-national level our action whose principles are known, as well as that of our English friends. True to these principles, we will henceforward work *each by himself* [*chacun chez soi*] for the realization of this human order which, with different national and local modalities we are equally decided to make triumph."⁷³ The two movements thus quietly parted after a meeting which seems to have made apparent that there was actually not much to be achieved in common.

In the British Isles, Marc had also been in contact with Sir Oswald Mosley, when he was still a maverick Labour M.P. He had sent his future wife to interview him, and they had exchanged letters. Marc liked Mosley's critique of English politics, but he broke with him in 1933 when he chose what Marc saw as the easy way out: Fascism.⁷⁴ Then there was *An Phoblacht*, an extremist faction of the IRA with which Marc was in touch for a while.⁷⁵ This time, it broke with him when he refused to form an armed commando to take over the city of Rennes and proclaim the Celtic Empire.⁷⁶ In the mid-thirties, another link was

established elsewhere in the British Empire, namely in Canada. Marc had long taken an interest in French Canada, having even considered emigrating there just before *L'Ordre Nouveau* was founded in 1930. He was now corresponding with two Montreal students still in their teens: Jean-Marie Parent and Guy Frégault. If Parent did not leave any trace in Quebec history, in the 1940s Frégault would become a major historian of New France and later on an important figure in the Quiet Revolution of the 1960s, as the top civil servant of the new Quebec Ministry of Cultural Affairs. They launched a small review called *Annuaire la liberté*, which according to Marc was "very infiltrated by our [L'O.N.'s] ideas".⁷⁷ The author has been unable to find copies of this review. However, there is ample testimony that Frégault was heavily influenced by *L'Ordre Nouveau*, as well as Mounier and Jacques Rivière, according to Jean-Charles Falardeau.⁷⁸ In a letter to Lionel Groulx, who was something like the Maurras of Quebec, and whose disciple Frégault claimed to be, he criticized Quebec nationalism in terms clearly derived from Marc, saying that separatism "tends to reduce to a smaller scale the framework of the Nation-State, which would not be more acceptable for that."⁷⁹ Nationalist discourse, he wrote, clung to "the antiquated forms of the past, while repudiating the spiritual tension that had animated it."⁸⁰ In the Quebec personalist review *La Relève*, he stated that the French tradition he acknowledged did not start with Joan of Arc and stop with Péguy, as was the case with traditional nationalists, but also included 1789, Proudhon and Sorel⁸¹ - the chief intell-

actual references of L'Ordre Nouveau. He declared materialism and idealism to be "twins in the treason of the real"⁸², and thought that it is "by the acceptance of its spiritual and carnal environment that the person plunges fully into the real".⁸³ It is probably to L'Ordre Nouveau as well that Frégault owed a concern with labour, technology and the concrete in general that was rather unique among the spiritualist contributors to *La Relève*, and would be carried over into his historical works.⁸⁴ Finally, it is likely that either Frégault or Parent, or both, had a hand in the publication of a collective work entitled *Péguy et la vraie France* in Montreal in 1944, where their contributions joined others by Alexandre Marc, Daniel-Rops, Emmanuel Mounier, Pierre and Marcel Péguy, among others. (Marc's essay "Nous qui sommes l'autorité", written in 1938, was reprinted in his *Péguy et le socialisme* in 1973.) Thus, through Alexandre Marc's intercession, L'Ordre Nouveau found a distinct if limited echo in French Canada.

Marc also had a very cordial correspondence with José Antonio Primo de Rivera, where the leader of the *Falange* pronounced himself in favour of a federal organization of Spain -something that was completely ignored by Franco's followers in the mythology they built around his martyrdom. His early death at the hands of the Republicans saddened Marc, who thought his action could have been very positive. Marc had the opportunity to meet Léon Degrelle, the leader of a similar Belgian movement -the *Rexistes*; but he instantly recognized in him a dangerous

demagogue, and never had anything to do with him again. L'Ordre Nouveau did not lack other Belgian contacts, though. The movement's ideas were well received by a number of Belgian reviews like L'Esprit Nouveau, L'Avant-Garde and L'Avant-Poste.⁸⁵ The latter leftist review even put out a special issue entirely dedicated to L'Ordre Nouveau and its doctrines in February 1934.⁸⁶ A meeting would be organized with these movements in January 1936. Already in December 1934, a leader of such a group, Marc van Leemputten, in a letter to L'Ordre Nouveau, enthusiastically referred to its doctrine as "his own, but also that of over 50 000 Belgians."⁸⁷ Strictly speaking, this figure was probably exaggerated, unless it translates what Xavier de Lignac, in a letter from Belgium appearing in the December 1936 issue of L'Ordre Nouveau, describes as "a diffuse personalism, which awkwardly uses words to which others have given their meaning (human person, revolution, primacy of the spirit, communal life) [and] deeply legitimates the brutality with which the rebellion of this youth displays itself" (namely through Rex).⁸⁸ But if the extent of L'Ordre Nouveau's audience in Belgium is a matter of conjecture, there is no question of its quality. When King Albert I died on February 17, 1934, La Révolution nécessaire was found open on his desk, along with an issue of L'Ordre Nouveau, to which his daughter-in-law the new Queen Astrid was a subscriber; they were left untouched there for weeks⁸⁹. This could only add to the prestige of L'Ordre Nouveau in Belgium.

A review with which L'Ordre Nouveau had especially close ties was L'Esprit Nouveau; it advertised it⁹⁰, and had it represent Belgium in its round table on "French values seen from outside".⁹¹ This Catholic review aimed at gathering all the forces of Right and Left dedicated to the overthrow of the old liberal civilization.⁹² Its founder was a friend of Marc's, an engaging young Catholic non-conformist called Raymond de Becker.⁹³ In 1932, around the time Marc first made his acquaintance, his first book, entitled *Vers un ordre nouveau*, had met with considerable success, soon becoming out of print. In it, de Becker argued that a new order could only be a totalitarian order, like the only true order Europe had ever known, the medieval one.⁹⁴ He had first found this notion in Berdyaeff's *New Middle Ages*, where the idea that "a special type of monastic life in the world would be evolved, a kind of new order",⁹⁵ had struck a deep chord within him. It would lead him in turn to make an experiment in eremitic asceticism near the Trappe of Tamié, and to become a supporter of Hitler's New Order, thus making him the perfect example of the ambiguity of the yearnings for order so characteristic of his generation. In between the two, he was the cabinet chief of Paul-Henri Spaak in the mid-thirties, and as in his letters to Marc he began referring to Hendrik de Man, whose medieval-inspired, authoritarian brand of socialism he was attempting to implement, Marc broke with him.⁹⁶

In 1932, Alexandre Marc had been delegated by his friends

of *L'Ordre Nouveau* to meet de Man, because they had all been much impressed by his just published *Au-delà du marxisme*. To their great surprise, he made a completely negative report. He had spent a couple of days of intensive discussion with de Man in Frankfurt, where he was teaching social psychology at the university. Marc found that the similarities between the dichotomies in economic life proposed by de Man and *L'Ordre Nouveau* were only superficial, and that de Man leaned towards etatism, towards economic and ultimately political despotism. Marc's report was unanimously adopted, and *L'Ordre Nouveau* thus became unique among French non-conformist movements in being left untouched by the wave of de Manian planism that swept over the whole spectrum of French politics in the mid-1930s.⁹⁷ *Esprit* was not spared, far from it. Raymond de Becker had been introduced to Mounier by Marc,⁹⁸ and had a considerable sway over him, to the point of making him brave Maritain's disapproval of certain flaws in de Becker's thinking. It could well be largely due to de Becker that *Esprit* welcomed de Man's doctrines with open arms. In 1935, Mounier even did a speaking tour of France to propagandize them.⁹⁹ Already in the February 1934 issue of *Esprit*, the de Man Plan had been featured, and three other articles devoted to it. One expressed reservations; the other two were enthusiastic. Jean Lacroix favourably compared de Man's plan to *L'Ordre Nouveau*'s projects in terms anticipating those Mounier would use in his April "Réponse à *L'Ordre Nouveau*", that marked the formal break between the two movements.

This was Mounier's answer to a letter from the leaders of L'Ordre Nouveau, where they had contemptuously dismissed the suggestion that they were selling out, made by him in the special issue of *Esprit* on Fascism in January. Mounier had taken offence at the deferential tone of the *Lettre à Hitler* that had constituted the November 1933 issue of L'Ordre Nouveau, and at its warm reception by conservative papers, as well as the publication of Daniel-Rops' *Eléments de notre destin* in *La Revue Hebdomadaire*.¹⁰⁰ L'Ordre Nouveau retorted that it did not care who reported on it and whether it was for praise or for blame, "as long as all milieus are aware of the existence of a revolutionary doctrine and of a movement which, without making noise, is working towards realizing the Revolution of Order. Once the result is reached, we do not hesitate to throw away the worn out tools. The last example: *Esprit*."¹⁰¹ Mounier's review thus joined *Plans* and *Mouvements* in the garbage bin of history as seen by L'O.N. It had been of value only insofar as it had been another vector for L'Ordre Nouveau's doctrine; "the only truly creative effort [...] to throw light on the principles and the institutions of a new social and human order was to be found in the articles written by members of L'Ordre Nouveau."¹⁰²

It is with the same kind of doctrinaire self-assuredness that had always irked Mounier that L'Ordre Nouveau had addressed Adolf Hitler in the name of "revolutionary French youth,

which is neither Communist nor Fascist, and has successfully elaborated the principles of New Order necessary to the solution of the crisis and the salvation of the human person."¹⁰³ Alexandre Marc and Daniel-Rops, the authors of the letter,¹⁰⁴ endeavoured to communicate to the Chancellor these principles which, in the thick of action, he had not had the time to work out by himself, but which their group had. For it was the mission of France "to impose a spiritual *raison d'être* and a doctrinal coherence to movements which are otherwise liable to become perverted or to lead to some form of caesarism." Furthermore, this exercise allowed L'Ordre Nouveau "to draw the current balance-sheet [*dresser le bilan actuel*] of national-socialism".¹⁰⁵ It was to be but a pretext to illustrate what the Necessary Revolution would be like by taking as an object lesson the latest of the failed revolutions that announced it. But this implied recognizing that there was a common ground between National-Socialism and the true revolution, "a genuine greatness" at the root of Hitler's movement, in the name of which its accomplishments were criticized.¹⁰⁶ It is in such "greatness" that Marc had located the appeal of the totalitarian regimes for youth in Jeune Europe, to contrast it with the decrepitude of Western democracies. They had had the courage to break away from the liberal world-view, and managed to command the disciplined allegiance of the people in the task of rebuilding society on a new collective basis. Unfortunately, in all these revolutions, the break was not clean enough, and the old evils were soon reinstated in a systematized manner and

reinforced on a massive scale. The greatness of their initial impulse always ended up being squandered in the service of insatiably power-hungry one-party cliques and to the glory of megalomaniac dictators. However, neither Lacroix nor Mounier really appreciated the subtleties of Marc's position. They were distressed by his wholesale dismissal of democracy and fascination with the raw energy of youth. They decried the ill-digested Nietzscheanism that they detected in L'Ordre Nouveau's writings, the dubious "mystique of aggressivity",¹⁰⁸ "a diffuse aristocratism", and "a certain latent contempt for labour and the proletariat" to be found in the doctrine of the civic service.¹⁰⁹

All these grievances of Esprit against L'Ordre Nouveau can be traced to some crucial differences in the metaphysics of the two movements. Mounier had clearly discerned them upon his first meeting with Arnaud Dandieu. "His personalism, which all the others recite," he wrote in his diary, "is a basic affirmation of the power of creation of the human person, Nietzschean in a sense, he admits it."¹¹⁰ To this "apotheosis of the 'personality'" in values ranging from aggressivity to heroic tension, he would oppose in December 1934 "the abysses of the genuine person, which can be found only in giving oneself, and which brings us to the mysteries of being. The saint is at the end of this road as the hero is at the end of the other. It also integrates heroism and spiritual violence, but transfigured [...]",¹¹¹ whereas to L'Ordre Nouveau, they would be every-

thing, and sanctity, love and charity only valid insofar as they would be instances of such heroism and violence. Self-affirmation being the measure of the Good, all activity that is not creative is by the same token odious. At Esprit however, self-denial is the supreme value, so that Jean Lacroix can deplore L'Ordre Nouveau's lack of appreciation of the "greatness of even purely quantitative labour"¹¹² where, Dandieu would not have failed to point out, "the spirit has no part"; precisely because of this passivity, Esprit people can see this type of work as sanctifying. They define the spirit as giving, love, absence of self. O.N. militants see it as conquest, act, presence to the world.

Mounier writes of Dandieu that "what he calls, I think, the "present-here-and-now", carnal immediacy, in the heaviest sense of the word, has a prime value in this creative self-presence and he opposes it to my critique of contact[...]."¹¹³ Still, Dandieu's disciple Marc would have agreed with Mounier that "the person goes infinitely beyond this sensitive life", the "natural society" defined by "the whole of its affective ties with its immediate surroundings, the influences of which circulate within its reach."¹¹⁴ For Marc as for Mounier, these Bergsonian "closed societies" need to be opened out by the concrete universality of the nation. But whereas Marc would be content with a proper balance, a "fruitful tension" between *patrie* and nation, Mounier sees them as mere stepping stones to something far greater that is the source of their legitimacy.

"Above *patrie* and nation, we maintain the priority of the *personalist spiritual community*, which is realized more or less perfectly between persons, most often on a small scale, but which remains the remote model of the whole social development." It is the locus of a "spiritual universality which only each person as such can join and carry"¹¹⁵ in the free volition of an individual vocation. Everybody is called upon to become part of a collective person or "person of persons". This notion is derived from Scheler's idea of the *Gesamtperson* as the supreme form of community, whose willful nature was opposed to the givenness of the *Lebensgemeinschaft*. However, in taking over Scheler's distinction between community and society, Mounier somehow restricted his use of the term "community" to the *Gesamtperson*, conflating the more naturalistic forms of community with Scheler's "artificial" societies. So did Marc, who had first introduced Mounier to Scheler's thought, perhaps in the form of such a personal adaptation of Scheler's terminology. Yet Marc did not conceive of society (equated by him with *Lebensgemeinschaft*) as merely a crude prefiguration of some future all-encompassing collective person, as did Mounier, but as something legitimate in its own right, and which always contained a communal element, just as community was always societal in part. This Mounier, too, would have recognized, but as a vicissitude to be overcome as far as possible, as opposed to a tension to be maintained as Marc would have it.

Likewise, Marc and Mounier were both much impressed by

Bergson's *Les Deux Sources de la Morale et de la Religion*, which came out in 1932. Marc was struck by the notion of "closed society", that "man was made for small societies"; he frequently used it to put forward the communal basis of his federalism in his articles for *L'Ordre Nouveau*. Mounier on the other hand was deeply affected by the idea of an "open society" of persons wholly devoted to the distillation of the purest essence of their emotional life, unfettered by the weight of local traditions but bound together beyond space and time in an ideal society that could by its sole example lead the rest of humanity to become divine.¹¹⁶ "It is the way of the ideal, of a 'universal republic', of a 'mystical society' and of a humanity that is in many respects reminiscent of Comte's", according to Guy Lafrance.¹¹⁷ A resemblance that must have been much more striking for Mounier was the one with the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ, developed by the German theologian Karl Adam and popularized in France by the Dominican Yves Congar, in an article for *La Vie intellectuelle* that came out at about the same time as Bergson's book. This concept struck a very sensitive chord in French Catholic thought.¹¹⁸ Marc claims to have been influenced by it,¹¹⁹ but its impact on Mounier (as well as his friends) is much plainer to see. In a letter to his mentor Jacques Chevalier, Mounier would write in September 1932, in terms that betray Berdyaeff's heavy influence on him: "We must purify the revelation of collectivism and not blindly oppose it. The theory of the Mystical Body is there to sustain us."¹²⁰ It made him see the great mass movements of

the twentieth century as confused gropings towards the formation of this universal collective Person, and think that they might help bring it about if they were first purified by an infusion of spirituality from small societies of ascetic men and women dedicated to each other and the advent of what Mounier, in a trite paraphrase of Berdyaeff, called "a second Renaissance". (It is the very same goal of "Western Renaissance" that Mitri-novic was pursuing in England with his Senate initiative for the realization of the organic unity of the world.) John Hell-man asserts that "the theory of the Mystical Body helped Mounier explain the "unity in the spirit" he enjoyed with his friends."¹²¹ It made him see the *Communauté des Amis d'Esprit* he founded in July 1933 as the crucible of a future transfiguration of society, and entertain the same hopes to an even higher degree for Raymond de Becker's movement *Communauté*, with which he was personally involved. (It was one of the Belgian groups represented at the meeting with L'Ordre Nouveau in January 1936.) Mounier appears to have recognized in de Becker the kind of mystic described by Bergson, who before thinking of transmitting his ascetic élan to the whole of society must first communicate it to "a small number of privileged people who would together form a spiritual society."¹²² He was at any rate very receptive to de Becker's fascination with what Hell-man has termed "Berdyaev's notion of a dedicated community of laymen transforming the world by purely spiritual means."¹²³ This was the idea behind the two "perfect communities" he was trying to set up as a "small explosive nucleus" implying

"severity for people" as opposed to "mass political recruitment".¹²⁴

L'Ordre Nouveau's strategy was also based on "small explosive nuclei"; but they were only incidentally communal in nature. O.N. cells were first and foremost the seeds of future institutions. Their members took concrete if limited steps to create them, because they felt oppressed by the old ones. It was thus enlightened self-interest that brought them together to try and transform the world by essentially -not purely- spiritual means. For them, it was not enough to break with the established disorder; they had to do their best to bring about a new order through appropriate action, even if they recognized that even such purportedly efficacious steps would owe their potency largely to their symbolical charge. By contrast, the friends of Esprit sought togetherness as an end in itself; they saw it as intrinsically spiritual and revolutionary enough if coupled with renunciation of the world. As John Hellman has seen, "Mounier envisaged his ideal future society as one vast monastery in which the rule of money and the material would come to an end."¹²⁵ Esprit's paradigm of the spiritual revolutionary was the monk, while L'Ordre Nouveau's was the knight. This, in a nutshell, is the difference between the personalism of L'Ordre Nouveau and that of Esprit. For it implies a deep-seated difference in spirituality, one that is also age-old, as it was epitomized by the struggle of Papacy and Empire in Europe.¹²⁶ Throughout the High and Late Middle

Ages, clerical and courtly value-systems are in contention, the former essentially otherworldly, emphasizing contemplation, and the latter spiritually worldly, glorifying action. In the first type, authority is a function of the degree to which people and institutions are turned away from the world towards a transcendent realm; whereas the second aims at bringing out the inherent spirituality of the world, up to its transcendent limit. The ultimate limit of this system is the basis of the other, so that if they largely overlap in their defense of the spiritual in the world, they tend to clash over its origins and some of the institutional consequences implied by them. Such a difference of spiritual polarity was at the root of the split between the "Catholic" personalism of Esprit and the "Nietzschean" personalism of L'Ordre Nouveau.

Mounier and Lacroix were both keenly aware of the metaphysical nature of their conflict with L'Ordre Nouveau. In the first paragraph of his article on *La Révolution nécessaire*, Jean Lacroix announced "the most express reservations" he would have to make "on the metaphysical part of this work."¹²⁷ He quarrelled with its equation of the spirit with revolution as "the power to perform prime acts, the ability to surpass oneself."¹²⁸ He objected that in man "all activity is subordinated to a more fundamental receptivity." Contemplation is superior to action."¹²⁹ This was the bone of contention between the two philosophies. Mounier noted upon first meeting Dandieu that "he does recognize some irreducible passivity, a 'femin-

* ine' element in the world, but far from realizing the person it is the very obstacle that it is up against. All talk of renunciation, of giving, any allusion even to an outwardness appears to him as a sacrifice to this passivity, a step backward for man."¹³⁰ But Mounier even saw himself as a "feminine force", "not made for conquest, but for seduction", "who wants to be impregnated by outside impulsions" such as Izard's and de Becker's. He was well aware that he was a contemplative type, and anything but a man of action. "Deep down," he could write in his diary, "I will never be able, to get interested in anything but Being, not realization as such. [...] To organize tactics, attacks, a revolution in a word, I am no good for this."¹³¹

Consequently, instead of trying to prepare its own original revolution like L'Ordre Nouveau, Esprit would prefer to try and correct the course of the existing ones. In an Esprit perspective, they could not be all bad, since socialism, whether German or Russian, was seen by Mounier, with a historical optimism clearly derived from Berdyaeff's *New Middle Ages*, as "a stage --perhaps necessary in those countries-- on the way to integral personalism, the natural and spiritual end of the civilization of the West."¹³² This was a natural consequence of Mounier's "feminine" sense of the person, his definition of it in terms of passivity and self-denial, which entailed that "the person realizes itself only by giving itself, that is in and by the community [...]"¹³³ "Of this truth of our nature, we have

been able to make a metaphysics of the person; it is at the same time the non-contradictory metaphysics of the collectivism for which our time is yearning, which we must help and rectify with all our strength by pointing out to it its human direction [...]"¹³⁴, i. e. the community, "understood as an integration of persons in the entire safeguard of the vocation of everyone," which was for Esprit "a reality -and hence a value- approximately as fundamental as that of the person."¹³⁵ To stress this point, Emmanuel Mounier entitled a 1935 collection of his Esprit articles *Révolution personaliste et communautaire*. The phrase must have appeared pleonastic to L'Ordre Nouveau people, because it went without saying in their circles that the person was always part and parcel of a community. But Mounier must have felt that in the O.N. scheme of things, community was such a participatory experience that in the final analysis, it was, little more than an extension of the individual in his surroundings, be it ultimately *ad infinitum*; after all, Dandieu's doctrine was first articulated as a healthier form of individualism. Mounier's first impulse was always towards a free spiritual community founded on abnegation, and he had a certain tendency to confuse togetherness with holiness -something which accounts for his fascination with the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ as well as his indulgence towards collective movements. Hence also his special insistence on the communitarian character of the personalist revolution, aimed at dispelling the "ambiguities of personalism" he had discussed in a review of an article by Maurice Blondel on the dangers of personalism

understood as a superindividualism; the review concluded with a pointed reference to L'Ordre Nouveau -this in the first issue of Esprit after the break.¹³⁶

Since Esprit made turning away from the givenness of things in the world -starting with the self- the main criterion of moral worth, coming to the fore in collective life, it could not admit of a social system that would be based on the natural distinctions between individual people. The only legitimate hierarchies it recognized would have to be grounded in the gospel teaching: "He who would be great among you must first be your servant; he would be first among you must first be your slave." (Matthew 20, 26-27) This is why Jean Lacroix, soon echoed by Mounier, would reproach Aron, Dandieu, Dupuis and Marc with "falling back into the notion of élite or aristocracy -be it the aristocracy of blood, of money, of intelligence or any other one. Which appears to us essentially anti-personalist."¹³⁷ By contrast, O.N. cells were to be "free local aristocracies of merit" based on "the natural right of the "best citizens" to guide the others"¹³⁸, and the review did not mince its words against democracy, which remained an ideal at Esprit. As a result, the differing spiritual outlooks of the two wings of the personalist movement -the one founded on the egalitarian otherworldly paradigm of the monastery, and the other on the aristocratic worldly paradigm of an order of knights- had a very clear political consequence, which was articulated by Mounier in his retort to L'Ordre Nouveau, where

he stated that if both his movement and Dandieu's had used the slogan "neither Right nor Left", he had in effect really meant "Left" while L'Ordre Nouveau leaned to the Right¹³⁹ -something inherently reprehensible in his eyes. Already upon his first meeting with Arnaud Dandieu, Mounier had written in his diary about L'O.N.'s "surprising tactical opportunism" on account of its collaboration with *Réaction* and the groups of the Right.¹⁴⁰ As Robert Aron has observed, "Mounier was given to share some political prejudices: while for us the distinctions between right and left belonged to the past and no longer had any reason to exist, Mounier located himself on the Left and suspected of reaction whoever hesitated to join him there."¹⁴¹ This was but the most concrete expression of a profound difference in spirituality between the men of the two groups, generating tensions which nearly led to a break four or five times before it finally happened. All of these previous episodes had been defused by the intercession of Alexandre Marc,¹⁴² but even he could not keep this up forever. So the two wings of the personalist movement finally parted ways.

But the break was not as total as it has sometimes been portrayed by *Esprit* sympathizers anxious to read back the review's familiar Leftist politics into its more ambivalent pre-war years. In order to convey that impression, the editors of Mounier's *Oeuvres* even went so far as to deliberately misdate 1936 a February 15, 1934 letter to Berdyaeff, where Mounier expressed concern about the latent "anti-worker Fasc-

ism" of L'Ordre Nouveau.¹⁴³ As it happened, the relations between the two movements, though they were no longer organic, soon became fairly cordial again. Esprit would review -quite favourably overall- L'Ordre Nouveau's publications and even some of its issues, and L'Ordre Nouveau reciprocated to the smaller degree allowed by its format. Furthermore, Denis de Rougemont would remain actively involved with both movements, contributing a number of articles and many book reviews to Esprit up until the war. However, Gabriel Marcel, who had signed the first O.N. manifesto but had always felt uneasy about his membership of the group, resigned from it over the letter to Hitler ("It is not letters we should send to chancellor Hitler, but our army. To Berlin! To Berlin!" he cried during a heated discussion with Marc in front of the Gare Montparnasse¹⁴⁴), and joined Esprit's philosophy group; so that two of its most prominent members, de Rougemont and Marcel, actually came from the ranks of L'O.N.

Esprit was not alone in distancing itself from L'Ordre Nouveau in February 1934. That same month, the *Revue du Siècle* devoted a special issue to a critical assessment of the extent of its common ground with Esprit and L'Ordre Nouveau --this when the latter review spelled out its creed in formulaic fashion in a manifesto issue entitled *Nous Voulons*. Thus, as Jean-Louis Loubet del Bayle has noted, the common front of youth that L'Ordre Nouveau had been most actively trying to gather was falling apart as L'O.N.'s own position hardened into an

increasingly closed system.¹⁴⁵ But it kept on sending feelers to other movements. It joined some of the (including the *Nouvelles Equipes*, the *Front national syndicaliste*,¹⁴⁶ and *Préludes*, the heir to defunct *Plans*) in a short-lived *Club de Février* devoted to spreading the new French revolutionary doctrine elaborated by the non-conformist movements over the last few years, in order to prevent the future uprisings that were bound to happen from becoming such fiascos as the 1934 riots had been.¹⁴⁷ *L'Ordre Nouveau* also supported the rural agitation of the *Front paysan*.¹⁴⁸ Robert Aron won over to his movement two engineers from the *Centre polytechnicien d'études économiques*, better known as *X-Crise*. They were Robert Gibrat and Robert Loustau, and would become very active in the movement, especially in the specialized "technical cells" which had the task of finding concrete applications for *L'O.N.*'s doctrine in the various areas of life, and of preparing some of the thematic issues of the review. Gibrat and Loustau were also zealous propagandists for *L'Ordre Nouveau*; not only would they expound its doctrine to their friends of *X-Crise* and get the movement's founder Jean Coutrot interested, but they would even join colonel de la Roque's veterans' league *Croix de Feu* in order to have a hand in the elaboration of its social doctrine. Colonel de la Roque and *L'Ordre Nouveau* even had a meeting to see if the latter could not officially become the brain-trust of the *Croix de Feu*. But they were put off by each other's arrogance; de la Roque complained about being addressed "on a tone that makes me think you are forgetting who I am", and when

he bragged of having over a million men behind him, Robert Aron, always the surrealist, in one of his rare utterances declared that there were even more subscribers to the Gas Company.¹⁴⁹ From then on, L'Ordre Nouveau would never miss an opportunity of deriding "the good colonel"; as for Gibrat and Loustau, they eventually left the *Croix de Feu* in July 1935, taking along with them other disgruntled intellectuals of the league.¹⁵⁰

In 1933 and 1934, using pen-names, two members of *L'Ordre Nouveau* wrote articles for the *Courrier Royal*, the semi-official organ of the heir apparent to the throne of France. They were Alexandre Marc and Xavier de Lignac, who was usually given a topic and its development by Marc, and only had to put them in as accessible a form as possible.¹⁵¹ De Lignac was pursuing studies at the *Ecole libre des Etudes politiques* and in literature at the Sorbonne, which he would soon be forced to abandon due to financial need. This young man, whose general outlook had been shaped by Catholic opinion ranging from *L'Action française* to the Christian democracy of *L'Aube*, had been introduced to the inner circle of *L'Ordre Nouveau* at the end of 1933 by his friends Daniel-Rops and Jean Jardin¹⁵² (one of whom was probably the initial link between *L'O.N.* and the entourage of the Count of Paris¹⁵³); three years later, he would succeed Mireille Dandieu as administrative secretary of the review. Xavier de Lignac was part of a small team of four of the young new militants who came to *L'O.N.* after Dandieu's

death, who worked in close cooperation with the founders of the movement, and also comprised a protégé of Robert Aron, Albert Ollivier, his brother Louis --both like de Lignac basically Christian in outlook and fed up with party politics-- as well as René-Philippe Millet.¹⁵⁴ Other newcomers included the Greek Jew I.-S. Révah, introduced by Mireille Dandieu,¹⁵⁵ and the syndicalists Pierre Prévost, Albert Hayon, and Roger Boulot, who was the one working-class member of *L'Ordre Nouveau*.¹⁵⁶ (The others tended to be impoverished young intellectuals from well-to-do backgrounds, not unlike the review's readers.¹⁵⁷) They would all rise to prominence within the movement from late 1934 on as most of the founding members took a less active part in it. Jean Jardin became absorbed in his career in the State railroad system. Denis de Rougemont lost his job and lived in the country for a couple of years before accepting a readership at the university of Frankfurt in 1935. Daniel-Rops, beset by his old historical pessimism, increasingly turned away from a movement whose impact seemed all too slight.¹⁵⁸ In early 1937 he created a collection called "Présences" for his publisher, Plon. Among the first books to appear in it were his own *Ce qui meurt et ce qui naît*, and a collective work, *Le communisme et les chrétiens*, where his essay joined those of François Mauriac, the Dominican Ducattillon, Nikolai Berdyaeff, Denis de Rougemont and Alexandre Marc.¹⁵⁹ The latter's contribution was a reprint of an article from the column on Soviet affairs that he wrote for the *Dossiers de l'Action populaire*, a review of the Jesuits of Vanves.¹⁶⁰

Marc had much closer ties with the Dominicans however. He had been a contributor to their bimonthly review *La Vie intellectuelle*, and at the beginning of 1934 helped launch the new weekly *Sept*, which was supposed to be "the exact transposition of *La Vie intellectuelle* on the plane of journalism".¹⁶¹ It would discuss current events in the light of the social teachings of the Church, and attempt to create thereby a body of informed Catholic opinion that would stand above parties and beyond Left and Right. *Sept* thus provided its *O.N.* contributors Alexandre Marc, Daniel-Rops, and later Jacques Lassaigue, with a forum where they could pursue their non-conformist politics in a topical and specifically Catholic framework. Furthermore, the quest for a new order of society - a Catholic one - was, at least at the beginning, *Sept*'s overt aim. It was outlined by Etienne Gilson in a series of articles which, cut out and pasted together by Marc, were published in book form at the end of 1934 under the title *L'Ordre catholique*.¹⁶² Similarly, articles originally written for *Sept* were appended to Jacques Maritain's *Humanisme intégral* in 1936, a book which changed Marc's opinion of him; his neo-Thomism had always left Marc cold, but he now found that Maritain's social thought was very close to his, and thereafter kept a lively interest in it. (So much so that Marc had Maritain's *Au travers du désastre* clandestinely printed in 1940 by the Franciscans of Gap in the Alps; according to him, it was the first publication of the Resistance.)¹⁶³ Other high profile contributors to *Sept* were

Gabriel Marcel, François Mauriac and Georges Bernanos. There were also a number of Esprit personalists, like Pierre-Henri Simon, Jacques Madaule, Etienne Borne, Henri Guillemin, Maurice de Gandillac and Raymond de Becker. Simon and Madaule joined Daniel-Rops and Marc on the editorial staff, so that young personalists made up the better part of the lay contingent there. Marc himself was one of two laymen on the limited editorial committee. It may be a measure of his influence that the first issue of Sept bore on its cover the caption "Où en sommes-nous?", which was something of an O.N. slogan.¹⁶⁴ At any rate, his contributions were very prominent. Though he started out as the sports columnist, he was soon put in charge of a review of the foreign press, in addition to his two-page "Les idées et la vie" column on current events which immediately followed the editorial. He often signed his articles "Scrutator", a pen-name he also used in other Catholic publications such as Les Dossiers de l'A.P. and the Belgian paper La Cité chrétienne.¹⁶⁵ But it is as a journalist for Sept that he would earn a living after he abandoned Pax-Press in 1933,¹⁶⁶ and in this capacity he would help shape a new style of Catholic discourse and action that would triumph after Vatican II, and of which Sept was the crucible.¹⁶⁷

Aside from Catholic publications, Alexandre Marc also wrote a lot for philosophical journals, such as Koyré's Recherches philosophiques (where he published a fragment of a book on the person and the individual, L'Homme contre le Temps, that he

was writing but would leave unfinished), the Belgian *Revue néo-scolastique de philosophie*, and *Archives de philosophie*, to which he would contribute numerous book reviews and articles.

His philosophical writings were characterized by a keen appreciation of existentialist thought, which he would often relate to issues of theology. His essay *Principe et méthode de la métaphysique* for the 1935 *Archives* is a good example of this.

In it, existentialism, personalism and Catholicism are commonly grounded in a metaphysical preoccupation of which the quest for order is but a manifestation. Marc seems to be getting at the roots of the intertwined spiritual and temporal yearnings of his generation when he founds his anti-Hegelian dialectics on the tension of "absolute Being at the same time 'within' and 'above' relative being", as the "transcendent Being which no becoming can attain, but towards which all becoming 'tends'",

"the principle of all order" that is "but imperfectly expressed in order." Order thus appears as the home of Being in a world in becoming, the still point where it is revealed, the very center of the personality. Order allows an intimate connection of the human being with absolute Being that is properly religious. Marc can thus easily switch to Christian wording to make his point: *"God is at the same time above man and within him. [...] God alone is Being: but man was made in the Image of God."* Catholic doctrine put in existentialist terms leads Marc directly to personalism --in fact, this may well be the formula of his philosophy; "if the essence and the existence of man do not coincide, they are not completely separate

either. It is human existence which is the locus of the realization of Being. Or, in other words, it is through concrete man, real flesh and bone being, that the person is incarnated, blossoms and is created.¹⁶⁸

However reminiscent of Heidegger his ontology may sound here, Marc would oppose to existence conceived as *Dasein* or the givenness of individuality, Jaspers' notion of *Existenz* as the vocation of the person. In an article for the *Revue néoscholastique de philosophie* entitled "L'existence humaine et la raison", he criticized Heidegger for the two-dimensional immanence of existence, in *Sein und Zeit*, and praised Jaspers for the place he left for transcendent in *Vernunft und Existenz*.¹⁶⁹ Indeed, Marc had been preaching the cause of Jaspers around him since the early thirties, portraying him as the most important existentialist philosopher, and rather annoyed that he seemed to be eclipsed by the fame of Heidegger. Karl Jaspers was then quite unknown in France, and Alexandre Marc was one of the first French intellectuals to take an interest in him. It was awakened by Jaspers' social thought as expressed in *Die geistige Situation der Zeit*, which he picked up by chance while waiting for a train in Berlin; it deeply impressed him, and he would later welcome Maritain's *Humanisme intégral* as a proper complement to it.¹⁷⁰ Yet, in the aforementioned article, it is not to Maritain that Marc would compare Jaspers, but to Blondel, the philosopher who influenced him most in the thirties, and whom he would constantly cite even in *L'Ordre Nouveau*. He

appreciated much the central role played by action in Blondel's philosophy,¹⁷¹ and had such reverence for the master that it is largely in order to be closer to him that he settled in Aix in August 1937.¹⁷² But he had already been living in Provence since January 1935, because he liked this region where his wife had her roots.¹⁷³

Marc thus did not have a hand in the operation of the *Centre d'action Ordre Nouveau* set up by the young team, and whose function was "to prepare right now the building of the New Order."¹⁷⁴ It achieved this by realizing small-scale working models of *O.N.* institutions. The most ambitious such venture was a trial of the concept of the civic service organized by the technical cells, whereby young *O.N.* members would take over the job of non-qualified workers without being paid for it, thus allowing them to take paid vacations at a time when these were not guaranteed by law. The experiment was a great success, warmly received by all parties involved as well as by the press, and plans were made to expand upon it the next year -1936; but by then, the *Front populaire* had come to power and made paid vacations mandatory, so that what was probably *L'Ordre Nouveau's* one opportunity of gaining wide public appeal was nipped in the bud. To put into practice the idea of the Guaranteed Vital Minimum, the *Centre d'Action* also took part in a project that distributed basic staples among needy workers in the suburbs of Paris. It made plans for a European Vital Minimum,¹⁷⁵ and defended them in some of the monthly conferences

organized for small groups of students or workers in 1936 by Louis Ollivier, Robert Aron and Claude Chevalley. Ollivier expounded *L'Ordre Nouveau's* scheme at a workshop of the First World Congress of Youth held under the auspices of the League of Nations from August 31 to September 6 1936, but his address got a frigid reception.¹⁷⁶

Mounier represented *Esprit* at that congress, as he had the previous year at the Rome congress on corporatism organized by Hubert Lagardelle and Ugo Spirito, and where Robert Aron led a French delegation of non-conformist movements.¹⁷⁷ Aron's speech was as dogmatic as could be expected, criticizing the Fascist regime for ignoring the truths discovered by *L'Ordre Nouveau*. And yet, if Aron insisted on going to Rome in the first place, it is because of a certain indulgence he had long entertained towards Italy; he hoped that this "cradle of European civilization", as opposed to the "initialed countries" - the USSR and the USA, would achieve a balance between dictatorship and democracy and thereby join England, France and Belgium in the necessary renovation of the European spirit.¹⁷⁸ Marc found Aron's political judgement questionable, an opinion in which he would be confirmed when Aron would write the program of Bergery's *Frontisme* in 1938. At any rate, it was over his opposition that Aron, Chevalley and Dupuis went to Rome in May 1935. Marc's misgivings were not founded on antifascism, but on concern about the one-sidedness of the exchange; they could go to Mussolini, but Mussolini would not come to them, and all

this would achieve is compromise *L'Ordre Nouveau* with one regime as opposed to others. He reiterated this statement at the Italian embassy when it summoned him to know why he was refusing to go to Rome with the others. Shortly thereafter the Italians came to him with an offer to write articles in the Italian press. Marc accepted on the condition that not a word be altered. And so he wrote three articles for the *Corriere della Sera* critical of Italy's corporatist economy. They were published uncensored, but he was not asked for further articles. Still, Italo Balbo, one of the foremost hierarchs of the Fascist regime, had a meeting with Marc some time later in a Paris *bistro*, where he complained of the despotism of his government, which he was trying to moderate by remaining in power. Marc was left unmoved by his plight.¹⁷⁹

The internal struggle over representation at the Rome congress is a good illustration of the role played by Alexandre Marc in *L'Ordre Nouveau* after he moved from Paris. Aside from contributing serialized philosophical essays on law or federalism, he would admonish his friends from his Southern retreat -when not in person- to stick to the "neither Left nor Right" line he had defined early on, and to avoid the temptations of climbing on a band-wagon or even appearing to, at a time when politics were becoming increasingly polarized. "Our only chance of practical success," he wrote to Claude Chevalley on July 31, 1935, "is to become an indisputable rallying point for all the 'givers up' of tomorrow whose 'right-wing' or 'left-

wing' reflexes will prevent them from going over to the other side."¹⁸⁰ *L'Ordre Nouveau* had to refrain from condoning "lesser evils" if it was to have the credibility to lead the way to a new polity beyond Right and Left. Dealings with regimes of either stripe could only taint the movement in the eyes of potential supporters from the opposite camp at home, without truly winning over those from the corresponding one. This is why, largely under Marc's influence, *L'Ordre Nouveau* would take the war of Ethiopia as a mere demonstration of the fatal logic of the Nation-State, that could be avoided only by the establishment of the New Order; while deploring the whole mess, it would refuse to take sides, just as it would in the Spanish Civil War, taking a stand "against Fascism and Stalinism, for federalist Spain",¹⁸¹ which had its advocates in both camps. Indeed, federalism as *L'O.N.* understood it was presented as the last chance of peace,¹⁸² because it was the alternative to the totalitarian state, equated with the state of war, which implied "the end of all liberties and, materially, the end of Europe."¹⁸³

Alexandre Marc viewed the Italian-Abyssinian war as but another Balkanic War, that is as a dressed rehearsal for a European war that could not be far behind and this time might well put an end to 2000 years of history.¹⁸⁴ To stave off the imminent disaster, it was unwise to count only on a revolution that could still be a long way off. The military preparedness of France had to be considered as well, and the *L'Ordre Nouveau*

team was made aware of its flaws and of the measures that should be taken to correct them by Lieutenant-Colonel Charles de Gaulle. Robert Aron knew him through Colonel Emile Mayer, a common friend, who took him to a couple of meetings of *L'Ordre Nouveau* at the end of 1934 and the beginning of 1935 because de Gaulle was interested in the O.N. view of society and of Europe and wanted to know more about it. (He was already a subscriber to *Sept.*) At the first meeting, held in the apartment of Daniel Halévy (who would contribute to *L'Ordre Nouveau* in 1937), he dazzled the company with his vivid evocation of what the next world war would be like, down to the hour of the German attack. He very forcefully put his conception of the French army, and won over to it the leaders of *L'Ordre Nouveau*. The movement thereafter took the for it unusual step of sending an open letter to all deputies and senators to draw their attention to the dangers of the international situation and the French army's inability to face them, based on de Gaulle's theories. There were only five replies; four had been sent merely out of politeness and the fifth was very supportive, coming from Paul Reynaud, who was already a convert to de Gaulle's ideas. *L'Ordre Nouveau's* propaganda efforts on behalf of de Gaulle did not stop there, however. Daniel-Rops took it upon himself to publish de Gaulle's book *La France et son armée* in his "Présences" collection. Alexandre Marc gave talks inspired by de Gaulle at both the Air Academy and Saint-Cyr. There, the officer who introduced him made fun of his ideas, thanking him for having for a moment brought back his audience

to the happy time of childhood with the fantasies of Jules Verne... When Marc confronted him afterwards, the officer said he had been ironic because Marc did not know what he was talking about. Marc then referred to de Gaulle, and the officer, after having made sure that nobody was listening, replied:

*"Mais vous citez le grand hurluberlu de l'armée française!"*¹⁸⁵

This would not be the last time that Marc would be given trouble by the army on account of his interest in de Gaulle; after the collapse of France, he spent a week in jail in Marseille for "defeatist propaganda": books by de Gaulle had been found in his possession...¹⁸⁶

As the specter of war grew over Europe, the Right and the Left each closed ranks instead of frittering away as Marc had hoped, and *L'Ordre Nouveau* found itself increasingly isolated. Its material base was directly affected, as subscribers to the review became loath to renew. It is the growth of their numbers that had previously allowed the review's size to go from 32 pages to 48 in March 1935 and to 64 in October 1936. In addition to *L'Ordre Nouveau*, a *Bulletin de liaison des groupes Ordre Nouveau* had been launched in April 1935, on the initiative of the technical cells, profiling institutions and movements that could become the seeds of the New Order. Two even bolder ventures further burdened the movement in the already critical first months of 1937. One was an attempt to set up an alternative press network, untainted by the disinformation of the mass media, in cooperation with *Esprit* and Bergery's *La Flèche*; it does not seem to have really gotten off the ground. In

May, Mounier (who was involved in these *Clubs de Presse*) could announce in *Esprit* that "our comrades of *L'Ordre Nouveau* have just launched the first 'personalist weekly'", chiefly economic in orientation.¹⁸⁷ It was called *A nous la liberté* (like Guy Frégault's review in Canada, it probably owed its name to a 1931 film by René Clair). Robert Aron and René Dupuis were its "political directors", and René-Philippe Millet its editor. It was launched with the initial support of a group of industrialists who were eager to encourage young people with new ideas, and with whom Robert Aron had been put in touch by Jean Coutrot of *X-Crise*. However, the paper foundered and went under after ten issues.¹⁸⁸ It was soon followed by *L'Ordre Nouveau* itself, whose announced July issue failed to come out. A series of problems that had plagued the review for some time had suddenly come to a head. Xavier de Lignac, who managed the review at the time, mentions difficulties in collecting subscriptions, rapidly growing financial and technical burdens, the dispersion of the regular contributors, general weariness and the change of circumstances.¹⁸⁹ In short, *L'Ordre Nouveau* had lost its momentum.

And yet, the review was not altogether finished. In June 1938, a 32-page issue of *L'Ordre Nouveau* was put together "owing to the help of its friends and subscribers", "after a year-long interruption due solely to financial difficulties", during which "the various members of the group have multiplied as private persons their collaborations in the major press, or their contacts, often regular and organic, with political or

professional groupings", thus spreading L'O.N.'s ideas and furthering the necessary seizure of authority.¹⁹⁰ For instance, Robert Loustau had been on the executive committee of Jacques Doriot's *Parti populaire français*, and Robert Aron had become the ideologist of another stridently anti-Communist organization, Gaston Bergery's *Parti frontiste*, while Alexandre Marc had gone from *Sept* to its lay successor *Temps présent*, after the Dominicans were forced to close the former review due to the dissensions caused in their ranks by its overly balanced coverage of the War of Ethiopia and the Spanish Civil War.¹⁹¹ Marc did not contribute to the revived L'Ordre Nouveau, though he was on its editorial committee. It may have been because it was less keen on doctrine than the old series. Thus, it was announced in the July 1938 issue, devoted mainly to "twenty years of public finance", "the new formula of the Review, without abandoning our doctrinal principles, allows us, by historical, documentary and information articles, to show the application of our ideas to most concrete cases."¹⁹² The first issue of the new series had even been made up of contributions of representatives from various non-conformist movements, ranging from Thierry Maulnier of *Combat* to Jean Maze of *La Flèche*; L'Ordre Nouveau declared its intention of being a meeting place for the independent-minded men of all political stripes who, putting aside outworn labels, could work together and "usefully contribute to the revolutionary rebuilding of France".¹⁹³ L'Ordre Nouveau was thus to become a kind of French *Gegner*. This was a far cry from the bold doctrinal constructions of its hey-day. The review's aims had been toned down and made much

more pragmatic. But even that did not save it in the end. It shut down for good in the fall, after a couple of diminutive token summer issues published for tax purposes; appropriately enough, they were reprints of old articles by the review's founder Arnaud Dandieu.

Alexandre Marc did not stand idly by as his movement declined. As soon as 1937, he sought to continue its action in a small informal group he gathered around himself, and which held two federalist congresses, one in Boulogne-Billancourt and the other in Saint-Léger, in the Alps. Among his comrades were the young Marcel Arnaud, close to the Franciscans of Gap, Jean Coutrot, of *X-Crise*, and Joseph Voyant, from the O.N. cell of Lyon, who has long been senator for the Rhône and whose party under the Fourth Republic, the *Mouvement Républicain Populaire*, drew elements of its program from a charter co-written with Marc during the war. They would be joined by Emile Noël, the present secretary general of the Commission of European Communities, and by Bernard Voyenne, who is now an important figure of the Federalist movement and a historian of the European idea.¹⁹⁴ In 1939, Marc's group launched a small paper called *Agir*, whose motto was *Fédérer les Forces Françaises*.¹⁹⁵ It thus continued the same endeavour that the new *L'Ordre Nouveau* had briefly toyed with. But it was now directed more specifically towards other personalist groups, which proved very receptive, especially in the Lyon area. Indeed, according to John Hellman, "Mounier took the initiative in *Esprit's* contacts with the *Ordre Nouveau*."¹⁹⁶

It seems that the non-conformists of the 1930s were now ready to regroup in the face of the ordeal of war that was clearly awaiting France. Many personalists turned to the kind of Fascism of the Left advocated by Gaston Bergery.¹⁹⁷ Another possibility was the policy of appeasement proposed by Marcel Déat. When on the eve of the outbreak of war Déat read an article by Marc in the paper *Vendémiaire* stating that war would solve nothing and would be disastrous for Europe whatever the outcome, he was so impressed that he invited him for lunch in Paris. Marc accepted, but Déat soon realized that he had drawn the wrong conclusions from Marc's article, having assumed that being against the war that had been declared in the interval, Marc would be in favour of a quick settlement with Germany. Even if he knew from de Gaulle that France was not ready for war, Marc was in fact convinced that France should do her utmost to repel the onslaught of totalitarianism. And since for him holding a belief had always implied taking consequent action, he joined up that very day as a volunteer in the French army.¹⁹⁸

Alexandre Marc was among the last to be demobilized in July 1940. The next month, he paid a visit to Mounier in Vichy, and tried to discourage him from working for the government at the Ecole des Cadres of Uriage that was being set up. He had been appalled to hear Marshall Pétain use personalist wording in his first speech to the nation (written by Gaston Bergery, he would later find out), and was very aware that the

new regime was trying to recuperate personalism and being largely successful.¹⁹⁹ Many of the non-conformists of the 1930s would work side by side in the institutions of the National Revolution.²⁰⁰ But for Marc, the latter was but another counterfeit of the Necessary Revolution. He had to engage in active resistance against it, as he had against the Bolsheviks in 1918 and against the Nazis in 1932. This time though, his commitment may have been even deeper, as his enemies had now usurped the very name of that New Order to whose advent he had dedicated his existence for now a decade.²⁰¹ It was to defend his ideal against impostors that he immediately took up a struggle which at first appeared almost desperate, having been projected to last over half a century by the historian Henri-Irénée Marrou. Yet, he did not lose sight of what specifically he was fighting for; in 1942, he would become a leader of the movement *Libérer et Fédérer*, for which resistance was but the first step in a federalist reconstruction of society. Through Marc and many of his comrades both old and new, *L'Ordre Nouveau's* ideas would permeate large segments of the Resistance, and provide much of the framework for the post-war movement for a federal Europe.²⁰² To this day, Alexandre Marc has played a leading role within it, always striving to flesh out his vision of a personalist New Order.

FOOTNOTES

1)Edmond Lipiansky. *Ordre et Démocratie*. Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1967, p. 89.

2)Ibid. p. 90.

3)Robert Aron. *Fragments d'une vie*. Préface de Denis de Rougemont. Postface de Sabine Robert-Aron. Paris, Plon, 1981, p. 108.

4)See Edmond Lipiansky. *op. cit.* p. 90.

5)Emmanuel Mounier, foreword to Robert Aron & Arnaud Dandieu. "Travail et prolétariat", in *Esprit*, n° 2, 1^{er} novembre 1933, p. 180.

6)Interview of Alexandre Marc by John Hellman, 1984.

7)Robert Aron. *op. cit.* pp. 114-115.

8)G. Bénaben, in *Notre Temps*, 20 août 1933, p. 903, cited in Jean-Louis Loubet del Bayle. *Les non-conformistes des années 30. Une tentative de renouvellement de la pensée politique française*. Paris, Editions du Seuil, 1969, p. 109.

9)Arts, 4-10 avril 1956, cited in *ibid.*, p. 84.

10)Interview with Alexandre Marc recorded by John Hellman using the author's questions in *Cogne, Val d'Aoste*, on July 16, 1985, and on the following days.

11)"Premiers principes. IV.-Contre le nomadisme économique", in *L'Ordre Nouveau*, n° 5, novembre 1933, p. 2 of cover.

12)Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions ; "Bibliothèque de l'Ordre Nouveau", in *L'Ordre Nouveau*, n° 15, mai 1934, back cover.

13)Denis de Rougemont. *Journal d'une époque (1926-1946)*. Paris, Gallimard, 1968, p. 109.

14)Alexandre Marc. "Une philosophie nouvelle?", in *Esprit*, n° 3, 1^{er} décembre 1933, pp. 472-476.

15)See John Hellman. *Emmanuel Mounier and the New Catholic Left 1930-1950*. Toronto, Buffalo, London, University of Toronto Press, 1981, p. 81.

16)Denis de Rougemont. *op. cit.* p. 109.

17)Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the

author's questions.

18) Interview of A. Marc by J. Hellman.

19) Arts, 4-10 avril 1956, cited in Jean-Louis Loubet del Bayle, p. 110.

20) L'Ordre Nouveau. "Avenir d'Arnaud Dandieu", in L'Ordre Nouveau, n° 4, octobre 1933, p. 2 of cover.

21) Alexandre Marc. "Conditions de tout plan", in L'Ordre Nouveau, n°s 22-23, juillet-août 1935, p. 35.

22) Robert Aron. "Réforme ou révolution", in L'Ordre Nouveau, n° 17, janvier 1935, p. 16.

23) Robert Aron. op. cit. p. 103.

24) Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions.

25) Interview of A. Marc by J. Hellman.

26) Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions.

27) Raymond de Becker. Livre des vivants et des morts. Bruxelles, Editions de la Toison d'Or, 1942, p. 159.

28) Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions. This fascination with the idea of an order, inseparable from his Catholic leanings, shows to what remarkable degree Marc had (been) assimilated (by) the French mentality. Cf. chapter II, footnote 52.

29) Helena Percas. La poesia femenina argentina (1810-1950). Madrid, Ediciones Cultura Hispanica, 1958, p. 268. "Margarita Abella Caprile was a poet and a columnist. She was born in 1901 in Buenos Aires and died in the same city in 1960. Her poetry is characterized by a measured romanticism and a marked inclination for the classical, which relates her to the romances of Enrique Banchs. She wrote: Nieve (1919), Perfiles en la niebla (1923), Sombras en el mar (1930), Geografías (1936, travel notes), and El árbol derribado (1959). After her death her Obras completas were published with an introduction by Leónidas de Vedia." (Elida Ruiz. "Las escritoras", in ***. Historia de la literatura argentina. 3 Las primeras décadas del siglo. Centro Editor de América Latina S. A., 1981, p. 302.)

30) Margarita Abella Caprile. "Alba", cited in José Isaacson & Carlos Enrique Urquía. 40 años de poesia argentina 1920/1960. Tomo I (1920/1930). Buenos Aires, Editorial Aldaba, 1962,

p. 232.

31) Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions.

32) Raymond de Becker. op. cit. pp. 189-192.

33) Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions.

34) Letter to the author from Alexandre Marc, 6/12/1986.

35) Interview of A. Marc by J. Hellman.

36) Edmond Lipiansky. op. cit. p. 90.

37) ***. Le fédéralisme et Alexandre Marc. Lausanne, Centre de recherches européennes, 1974, p. 224.

38) Arnaud Dandieu & Alexandre Marc. Misère et grandeur du spirituel. Paris, "Documents du C.I.F.E.", nouvelle série n° 34, n°s 172-173 juillet-août 1974 de L'Europe en formation., p. 1.

39) Ibid. p. 2.

40) Ibid. p. 7.

41) Ibid. p. 2.

42) Letter to the author from Alexandre Marc, 10/24/1985.

43) Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions.

44) Letter to the author from Alexandre Marc, 3/13/1986, and Andrew Rigby. Initiation and Initiative. An Exploration of the Life and Ideas of Dimitrije Mitroinovic. Boulder, East European Monographs, 1984, pp. 62-63.

45) Ibid. pp. 167-168.

46) Ibid. p. 87.

47) Dimitrije Mitroinovic, in The New Age, August 26, 1920, p. 255, cited in ibid. p. 76.

48) Id.

49) J. V. Delahaye. Principles and Plans for a New Britain. 3rd edition. London, 1933, p. 27. Cf. Appendix, pp. 219, 226. This is a strikingly lucid nutshell statement of the whole project of Western civilization as it is revealed in the light of

Lionel Rothkrug's doctrine. For the grassroots, somatically based collective persons of the early Middle Ages, opened out by the proto-national mystical bodies of France and England and slowly dissolved by attendant social processes of atomization and centralization, bequeathed to the new verbally based individual persons characteristic of the modern age a lingering nostalgia for the former unity of self and world, which they would seek to recreate throughout modern history in the form of substitutes of the mystical bodies that had lured them from this primitive unity in the first place. But they purport to allow him to belong and to be an individual at the same time, which was probably the essence of their original appeal, and still is in the contemporary period for people who feel alienated by the individualism and the collectivism that first arose through the agency of these mystical bodies, ironically enough. The followers of New Britain were thus consciously attempting to bring to its successful completion the process of formation of a mystical body that is at the root of modernity in the West, as a way out of the general dislocation of the self and of society brought on by its subproducts. The same can be said of the personalists.

50) J. V. Delahaye et al. Politics: A Discussion of Realities. London, C. W. Daniel, 1929, p. 163, cited in Andrew Rigby. op. cit. p. 106.

51) Andrew Rigby. op. cit. p. 107.

52) J. V. Delahaye. op. cit. p. 10.

53) Ibid. p. 32.

54) Ibid. p. 12.

55) Ibid. p. 11.

56) Ibid. p. 7.

57) Ibid. pp. 19-20.

58) Cf. chapter II, pp. 69-70, 93, 96.

59) Ibid. p. 17.

60) Ibid. p. 18.

61) New Europe Group and Atlantic Initiative. London, 1939, p. 2.

62) What the New Britain Movement Is. Pamphlet No. 100. Watford, nd.

- 63) Principles and Aims of the New Atlantis Foundation. Ditchling, Hassocks, Sussex, nd.
- 64) Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions.
- 65) "Valeurs françaises vues du dehors", in L'Ordre Nouveau, n° 8, février 1934, p. 29.
- 66) Letter to the author from Alexandre Marc, 10, 24, 1985.
- 67) "New Britain", in L'Ordre Nouveau, n° 12, 15 juin 1934, insert.
- 68) It is Harry Rutherford of the New Atlantis Foundation who has pointed this out to the author in a letter from 05/06/1986.
- 69) Alexandre Marc and Arnaud Dandieu, "Revolution in the Present Order", translated by Cecil Eastgate, in The New Atlantis, vol. 1, no. 1, October 1933, pp. 12-13. "From New France Which Unfortunately Does Not Exist To New Germany, Which For The Time Unfortunately Exists: L'Ordre Nouveau Addresses Adolf Hitler", translated by C. A. Eastgate, in The New Atlantis, vol. 1, no. 2, January 1934, p. 53.
- 70) Dimitrije Mitrović. "Urgent Appeal to His Excellency the Chancellor of the Reich", in The New Atlantis, vol. 1, no. 1, October 1933, supplement.
- 71) Andrew Rigby. op. cit. p. 137. In its hey-day, "the sales of the paper had reached over 32,000 a week. It appealed particularly to disaffected youth, disillusioned with the state of Britain, searching for answers, but unwilling to embrace fascism or communism. [...] In addition to the young, the emphasis on guild socialism attracted support from socialists and trade unionists, whilst the concern with devolution drew regional nationalists and the followers of Patrick Geddes into the movement. Readers were urged to form New Britain groups in their own localities and neighbourhoods. Within two months of the launching of the paper there were 57 groups established around the country. [...] The central office was snowed under with requests for leaflets, pamphlets and literature [...]" (Ibid. pp. 121-122) Though L'Ordre Nouveau had much in common with New Britain in terms of doctrine and in the make-up of its audience, the latter's immediate impact in its own country much belittled L'O.N.'s.
- 72) "Où nous en sommes", in L'Ordre Nouveau, n° 14, 15 octobre 1934, p. 3 of cover.
- 73) "Par-dessus les frontières", in L'Ordre Nouveau, n° 15, novembre 1934, pp. 1-2.

74) Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions.

75) Letter to the author from Alexandre Marc, 10/24/1985.

76) Letter to the author from Alexandre Marc, 03/13/1986.

77) Letter to the author from Alexandre Marc, 01/23/1986.

78) Jean-Charles Falardeau. "La correspondance Frégault-Groulx 1937-1965", in Pierre Savard, ed. Guy Frégault (1918-1977). Actes du colloque tenu au Centre de recherche en civilisation canadienne-française de l'Université d'Ottawa le 7 novembre 1980. Montréal, Editions Bellarmin, 1981, p. 51.

79) Guy Frégault. "Lettre", in La Relève, 1^{er} cahier, 4^e série, janvier 1938, p. 29, cited in André-J. Bélanger. "Guy Frégault au temps de La Relève", in ibid. p. 22.

80) Ibid. p. 27, cited in André-J. Bélanger. op. cit. p. 22.

81) André-J. Bélanger. op. cit. p. 24.

82) Guy Frégault. "Au-delà du machinisme", in La Relève, 7^e cahier, 2^e série, novembre-décembre 1938, p. 208, cited in ibid. p. 23.

83) Guy Frégault. op. cit. p. 27, cited in André-J. Bélanger. op. cit. p. 21.

84) André-J. Bélanger. op. cit. pp. 23-24.

85) Edmond Lipiansky. op. cit. p. 87.

86) Jean-Louis Loubet del Bayle. op. cit. p. 113. A manifesto featured in this special issue of L'Avant-Poste, entitled "Principes pour un Ordre Nouveau", and that seems to have been written mainly by Daniel-Rops, appears as an appendix at the end of Loubet del Bayle's book.

87) Edmond Lipiansky. op. cit. p. 87.

88) Xavier de Lignac. "Echo de Belgique", in L'Ordre Nouveau, n^o 36, 15 décembre 1936, pp. 22-23.

89) Interview with A. Marc, recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions.

90) L'Ordre Nouveau, n^{os} 22-23, juillet-août 1935, back cover.

91) "Valeurs françaises vues du dehors", in L'Ordre Nouveau,

n° 8, 15 février 1934, pp. 31-32.

92) Raymond de Becker. op. cit. pp. 90-92.

93) Interview of A. Marc by J. Hellman. "In early 1934 de Becker had become director of L'Avant-Garde, the Louvain student newspaper which Léon Degrelle had made influential among Belgian youth." (John Hellman. op. cit. p. 88.)

94) Raymond de Becker. op. cit. p. 93.

95) Cited in *ibid.* p. 90.

96) Interview of A. Marc by J. Hellman.

97) Interviews with Alexandre Marc, 1984 & 7/1985; Robert Steuckers. "Henri de Man", in *Etudes et recherches pour la culture européenne*. Revue théorique publiée par l'association G.R.E.C.E. n° 3, 1984, pp. 35-47.

98) Interview of A. Marc by J. Hellman. A case could be made that Mounier knew de Becker through Maritain, as the first reference to the young Belgian appearing in *Mounier et sa génération* is dated September 6, 1933 (Emmanuel Mounier. *Oeuvres*. Tome IV: *Recueils posthumes, correspondance*. Paris, Editions du Seuil, 1963, p. 538), after de Becker was admitted into Maritain's circle on his way back from his retreat and pilgrimages. However, since it is only then that de Becker met Maritain in person, though he had corresponded with him from Tamié (Raymond de Becker. op. cit. p. 160), if Marc did indeed make the acquaintance of de Becker in 1932 (which is likely, since *L'Ordre Nouveau's* and especially Marc's contacts in Belgium seem to have been formed early on), he must have been the one who first introduced him to Mounier when they were both working side by side at the *Esprit* office. Nevertheless, only close inspection of Mounier's private papers (of which *Mounier et sa génération* is but a strict selection) might confirm Marc's claim.

99) See John Hellman. op. cit. pp. 87-95.

100) Emmanuel Mounier. "Prise de position", in *Esprit*, n° 16, 1^{er} janvier 1934, p. 540.

101) Cited in Emmanuel Mounier. "Réponse à *L'Ordre Nouveau*", in *Esprit*, n° 19, 1^{er} avril 1934, p. 200.

102) Cited in *ibid.* p. 199.

103) "Lettre à Hitler", in *L'Ordre Nouveau*, n° 5, 15 novembre 1933, p. 5.

104) Jean-Pierre Gouzy. "L'apport d'Alexandre Marc à la pensée et l'action fédéralistes", in ***. *Le fédéralisme et Alexandre Marc*. Lausanne, Centre de recherches européennes, 1974, p. 5.

105) "Lettre à Hitler", in op. cit., pp. 5-6.

106) Ibid.- pp. 14-15.

107) The following statement by Marc, published in *Esprit* soon after the Nazi takeover (n° 5, 1^{er} février 1933, pp. 726-727), makes it plain that this was how he viewed the case of Germany in particular:

Devenir national-socialiste, c'était, pour un jeune Allemand, faire preuve d'indépendance par rapport au désordre établi. C'était condamner un monde sans grandeur livré aux lâches compromissions du libéralisme et à la tentation matérialiste. C'était affirmer hautement les vertus d'une discipline librement acceptée dans un monde corrompu et dégénéré. Les jeunes national-socialistes étaient mûs par un besoin sincère de grandeur spirituelle qui se trouvait d'ailleurs en contradiction avec le dogme de la primauté de la race. Pendant que les chefs touchaient les subventions de l'industrie lourde, les jeunes croyaient lutter en faveur d'un socialisme national et idéaliste. Etrangers à toute idée d'agression guerrière, ils voyaient dans une organisation militaire la possibilité d'une exaltation héroïque et d'une éducation collective. Ils ont lutté, ils ont souffert, ils ont espéré... Aujourd'hui les meilleurs d'entre eux ont perdu confiance. Ils se sentent trahis et réduits à l'impuissance par une politique à la fois maladroite et louvoyante.

It is clear that Marc sees National-Socialism as the lure of German youth, a false alternative to bourgeois disorder, with which it was actually in league, while it promised to fulfill the spiritual needs of the disaffected young. The "genuine greatness" of National-Socialism for Marc lies in this spiritual aspiration insofar as it was channeled by Hitler's party, in spite of its exploitation for merely political ends. It is therefore preposterous to suggest, as Zeev Sternhell has done, ("Emmanuel Mounier et la contestation de la démocratie libérale dans la France des années trente", in *Revue française de science politique*, volume 34, numéro 6, décembre 1934, p. 1148), even citing the very same passage, that "Alexandre Marc n'a aucun doute sur le caractère fondamentalement positif du national-socialisme pur[...]". Not only was Marc appalled early on to see German youth being led astray by Hitler, not only did he take concrete steps to fight his party, but he even shunned his rival Strasser, who purported to represent "pure National-Socialism"; it is simply not true

that the latter had Marc's sympathy, as Sternhell assumes (ibid. p. 1147). Sternhell's charges can be dismissed out of hand, as they are based on a gross misreading of the very sources he extensively quotes.

108) Jean Lacroix. "De la "Révolution nécessaire" au "Plan" d'Henri de Man", in *Esprit*, n° 17, 1^{er} février 1934, p. 811.

109) Emmanuel Mounier. "Réponse à *L'Ordre Nouveau*", in op. cit. p. 202.

110) Diary entry for October 18, 1932, in Emmanuel Mounier. *Oeuvres*. Tome IV: Recueils posthumes, correspondance. Paris, Editions du Seuil, 1963, p. 508.

111) Emmanuel Mounier. *Oeuvres*. Tome I: 1931-1939. Paris, Editions du Seuil, 1961, p. 534,

112) Jean Lacroix. loc. cit. p. 808.

113) Emmanuel Mounier. op. cit. p. 508.

114) Emmanuel Mounier. *Oeuvres*. Tome I: 1931-1939. Paris, Editions du Seuil, 1961, p. 612.

115) Ibid. p. 615.

116) See John Hellman. op. cit. pp. 43-44.

117) Guy Lafrance. *La philosophie sociale de Bergson. Sources et interprétation*. Ottawa, Editions de l'Université d'Ottawa, coll. "Philosophica", 1974, p. 123. If Bergson's "mystical society" and Comte's Humanity are so similar, it is probably because they are but two avatars of the same mystical body that is central to the French mentality and held a conscious fascination for Mounier (see below); like it, they can be defined as the organic and sacred unity of people coming together by their own free volition as distinct self-conscious individuals and regardless of locale or background.

118) John Hellman. op. cit. pp. 49-50, 277nn89-91.

119) Letter to the author from Alexandre Marc, 3/13/1986.

120) Letter to Jacques Chevalier, September 20, 1932, in Emmanuel Mounier. *Oeuvres*. Tome IV: Recueils posthumes, correspondance. Paris, Editions du Seuil, 1963, p. 503.

121) John Hellman. op. cit. p. 49.

122) Henri Bergson. *Les Deux Sources de la Morale et de la*

Religion. p. 250, cited in Guy Lafrance. op. cit. p. 128.

123) John Hellman. op. cit. p. 87.

124) Letter to Georges Izard from Emmanuel Mounier, October 18, 1934, cited in Jean-Louis Loubet del Bayle. op. cit. p. 150.

125) John Hellman. op. cit. p. 80.

126) This conflict also spans many cultures, though especially Indo-European ones, as it reflects the antagonism of the leading two functions of the three around which the ideology of these peoples tends to revolve according to Georges Dumézil, i.e. those of the priest, the warrior, and the farmer or tradesman. In this perspective, the rivalry of the traditional brahmin (priest) and kshatriya (warrior) castes of India is the archetype of the kind of conflict of spiritualities outlined here.

127) Jean Lacroix. "De la "Révolution nécessaire" au "Plan" d'Henri de Man", loc. cit. p. 805.

128) Ibid. p. 808.

129) Ibid. p. 809.

130) Diary entry for October 18, 1932, in Emmanuel Mounier. Oeuvres. Tome IV: Recueils posthumes, Correspondance. Paris, Editions du Seuil, 1963, p. 508.

131) Ibid. pp. 551-552.

132) Emmanuel Mounier. "Revue des revues", in Esprit, n° 56, mai 1937, p. 300.

133) Emmanuel Mounier. "Dialogue sur l'Etat fasciste" (avec G. de Santillana), in Esprit, n°s 35-36, 1^{er} septembre 1935, p. 728.

134) Emmanuel Mounier. Oeuvres. Tome I: 1931-1939. Paris, Editions du Seuil, 1961, p. 165.

135) Emmanuel Mounier. "Qu'est-ce que le personalisme?", in Esprit, n° 27, 1^{er} décembre 1934, p. 357.

136) Emmanuel Mounier. "Les équivoques du personalisme", in Esprit, n° 20, 1^{er} mai 1934, pp. 316-318.

137) Jean Lacroix. "De la "Révolution nécessaire" au "Plan" d'Henri de Man", loc. cit. p. 812.

138) René Dupuis. "Election et souveraineté", in L'Ordre Nouveau, n° 30, 15 avril 1936, p. 35.

139) Emmanuel Mounier. "Réponse à L'Ordre Nouveau", loc. cit., p. 202.

140) Diary entry for October 18, 1932, in Emmanuel Mounier. Oeuvres. Tome IV: Recueils posthumes, Correspondance. Paris, Editions du Seuil, 1963, p. 508.

141) Robert Aron. op. cit. p. 107.

142) Denis de Rougemont. "Alexandre Marc et l'invention du personnalisme", in op. cit. p. 58.

143) See John Hellman. op. cit. pp. 81 & 286n39.

144) Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions.

145) Jean-Louis Loubet del Bayle. op. cit. p. 177.

146) Pierre Andreu recalls in his memoirs (Le rouge et le blanc 1928-1944. Paris, La Table Ronde, 1977, pp. 73-77): "Notre petit groupe -- nous avons baptisé notre mouvement le Front national syndicaliste et notre journal L'Assaut, il portait en exergue cette phrase de Péguy: 'La révolution sociale sera morale ou ne sera pas' -- était assez étrange. Nous avons adopté un programme en vingt-quatre points, où l'on trouvait curieusement mélangées les traditions libertaires du syndicalisme français, qu'avec Sorel je défendais, et celles d'un christianisme réellement vécu, illuminé encore et toujours par 'la grande lumière du Moyen-Age'. [...] Nous ne connaissions qu'un vif désir d'égaliser, puis de surpasser, les peuples les plus vivants de notre vieille Europe. Et plus que pour les peuples pris globalement, nous éprouvions une vive sympathie pour les jeunes Italiens, les jeunes Allemands, les jeunes Russes qui s'étaient attaqués, ou s'attaquaient aux mêmes problèmes de grandeur que nous et qui semblaient nous avoir précédés victorieusement, du moins le croyions-nous, sur le chemin de la révolution. Nous ne cachions pas l'attrait qui nous entraînait vers les pays révolutionnaires; ce qui ne nous empêchait pas, en même temps, de souligner les insuffisances économiques et spirituelles de leur révolution." L'Ordre Nouveau's first issue, devoted to these, is cited by Andreu as reflecting his attitude and that of his friends. It might be added that Marc's Jeune Europe was written in a spirit akin to theirs as it is evoked here, with the significant difference that there was no doubt in Marc's mind that these other revolutions were in effect tragic if splendid failures.

147) See Jean-Louis Loubet del Bayle. op. cit. pp. 116-117.

148) An excerpt from a letter of support from the peasant leader

Achille Bouxin was published in the column "Texte de doctrine et d'action" in L'Ordre Nouveau, n° 19, 15 mars-1^{er} avril 1935, third page of cover; see Edmond Lipiansky. op. cit. p. 84.

149) Interview of Alexandre Marc by John Hellman, and Robert Aron. op. cit. p. 108.

150) Edmond Lipiansky. op. cit. p. 76, and John Hellman. op. cit. p. 314n43. On Gibrat and Loustau's respective careers, see also Jean-Louis Loubet del Bayle. op. cit. pp. 463, 466-7.

151) Letter to the author from Xavier de Lignac, 07/13/1986.

152) Letter to the author from Xavier de Lignac, 04/26/1986.

153) Letter to the author from Xavier de Lignac, 07/13/1986.

154) Letter to the author from Louis Ollivier, 01/16/1986.

155) Letter to the author from Alexandre Marc, 06/12/1986.

156) Edmond Lipiansky. op. cit. p. 77.

157) Jean-Louis Loubet del Bayle. op. cit. p. 117.

158) For more details on the audience of L'Ordre Nouveau, see Edmond Lipiansky. op. cit. pp. 89-91.

159) See Emmanuel Mounier's very positive review of the book in Esprit, n° 56, mai 1937, pp. 306-308.

160) Letter to the author from Alexandre Marc, 10/24/1985.

161) Une oeuvre dominicaine: Juvisy, leaflet cited in Aline Coutrot. Un courant de la pensée catholique: l'hebdomadaire "Sept" (mars 1934-août 1937). Préface de René Rémond. Paris, Les Editions du Cerf, coll. "Rencontres" 61, 1961, p. 36. Except where otherwise indicated, the following paragraph on Sept is drawn from this book.

162) Interview with A. Marc by J. Hellman, using the author's questions.

163) Ibid.

164) For instance, an article on the movement's progress in L'Ordre Nouveau, n° 14, octobre 1934, was entitled "Où nous en sommes", as was the whole October 1935 issue (n° 24); since they were published after Sept first came out, it is also possible that Marc came up with the phrase at Sept and carried it over to L'Ordre Nouveau.

165) Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman, using the author's questions.

166) Letter to the author from Alexandre Marc, 3/13/1986.

167) "Au-delà des groupes de foyers, des communautés de quartier, de certains groupes syndicaux et de mouvements de jeunesse, dont l'action s'inscrit dans la trace de celle de Sept, le catholicisme contemporain est redevable à l'hebdomadaire d'un certain mode d'engagement et d'expression dans le monde, de certaines manifestations d'une foi communautaire - les messes dialoguées en particulier - et d'un engagement civique. [...] L'histoire de Sept présente en raccourci tout ce dont vivra le catholicisme français après la seconde guerre mondiale; là réside son intérêt et sa principale originalité." (Aline Coutrot. op. cit. pp. 315-316.)

168) Alexandre Marc. "Principe et méthode de la métaphysique", in Archives de philosophie, Paris, tome XI, 1935, pp. 83-108.

169) Alexandre Marc. "L'existence humaine et la raison", in Revue néoscholastique de philosophie publiée par la société philosophique de Louvain. Tome 39, nov. 1936, pp. 518-524.

170) Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions.

171) Letter to the author from Alexandre Marc, 10/24/1985.

172) Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions.

173) Edmond Lipiansky. op. cit. p. 77.

174) "A nos amis", in L'Ordre Nouveau, n° 30, 15 avril 1936, p. 3 of cover.

175) Id.

176) Letter to the author from Louis Ollivier, 01/16/1986.

177) See John Hellman. op. cit. p. 97, and Edmond Lipiansky. op. cit. pp. 87-88.

178) Robert Aron. "Fausses sorties", in L'Ordre Nouveau, n° 21, 1^{er} juin 1935, pp. 23, 20.

179) Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman using the author's questions.

180) Cited in Edmond Lipiansky. op. cit. p. 85.

181) Denis de Rougemont. "Ballet de la non-intervention", in L'Ordre Nouveau, n° 39, 1^{er} avril 1937, p. 44.

182) Denis de Rougemont. "Jacobins en chemises brunes", in L'Ordre Nouveau, n° 36, 15 décembre 1936, p. 5.

183) L'Ordre Nouveau. "Pour la liberté", in L'Ordre Nouveau, n° 34, octobre 1936, p. 8. The belief that another world war, because of the means of destruction made available by technology (air raids, tanks, gas), would spell the end of European civilization, was widespread in the late thirties; it is reflected for instance in W. C. Menzies' film of H. G. Wells' *The Shape of Things to Come* (1936).

184) Alexandre Marc. "L'Etat contre les Nations. Guerre italienne et drame allemand", in L'Ordre Nouveau, n° 27, 15 janvier 1936, pp. 10, 3.

185) Interview of A. Marc by J. Hellman, and Pascal Sigoda. "Charles de Gaulle, la 'Révolution conservatrice' et le personnalisme du mouvement 'l'Ordre Nouveau'", in *Espoir*, numéro 46, mars 1984, pp. 46-47.

186) Interview with A. Marc recorded by J. Hellman, using the author's questions.

187) Emmanuel Mounier. "Revue des revues", in *Esprit*, n° 56, mai 1937, p. 297.

188) Letter from Louis Ollivier, 1/16/1986.

189) Letter from Xavier de Lignac, 4/26/1986.

190) "A nos abonnés, à nos lecteurs", in L'Ordre Nouveau, n° 42, 15 juin 1938, p. 2 of cover.

191) Aline Coutrot. op. cit. p. 302.

192) "Remerciements", in L'Ordre Nouveau, n° 43, 15 juillet 1938, p. 2 of cover.

193) "Les responsables", in L'Ordre Nouveau, n° 42, 15 juin 1938, p. 1.

194) Interview of Alexandre Marc by Gilbert Ganne, *Arts* 4-10 avril 1956, cited in Edmond Lipiansky. op. cit. p. 92, and letter to the author from Alexandre Marc, 06/12/1986.

195) Bernard Voyenne. "Alexandre Marc: 'homme debout'", in ***. *Le fédéralisme et Alexandre Marc*. Lausanne, Centre de recherches européennes, 1974, p. 33, and letter to the author from Alexandre Marc, 08/01/1986.

196) John Hellman. op. cit. p. 145.

197) See ibid. pp. 138-145.

198) Interview of A. Marc by J. Hellman.

199) Interview with A. Marc, recorded by J. Hellman, using the author's questions.

200) See Jean-Louis Loubet del Bayle. op. cit. pp. 410-413.

201) According to Denis de Rougemont (*Politique de la personne*. Paris, Editions "Je sers", 1946, p. 8), the term "New Order" came into Nazi parlance through Joachim von Ribbentrop and his assistant Otto Abetz, who were both keen readers of French non-conformist reviews.

202) See Lutz Roemheld. *Integraler Föderalismus. Modell für Europa. Ein Weg zur personalen Gruppengesellschaft. Band 1: Geschichtliche Entwicklung.* München, Verlag Ernst Vögel, "Politik und politische Bildung", herausgegeben von Theo Stammen, 1977, pp. 177-296.

CONCLUSION

Perhaps the most remarkable feature of the life of Alexandre Marc is that he has been a man of action as well as a profound thinker -by the same token even, one might add. For if some of his mentors like Arnaud Dandieu and Maurice Blondel can be said to be philosophers of action, Alexandre Marc appears by contrast as the philosopher in action. Ideas for him were never mere matters of opinion, but the intellectual aspect of an inner stance of his whole being, involving a parallel attitude towards the world and consequent action within it. Thought and action are here cosubstantial, being both rooted in the self's effort to preserve its integrity over against all that would reduce it to the state of a mere resultant of objective external forces. Marc's own milieu was the first battlefield where he had to come to grips with his intimate enemy: determinism, in the form of his parents' Marxism and positivism. He slowly distanced himself from it, turning away from Hegel to side with Kant and Nietzsche, rejecting Marx to go over to Belinsky and Mikhailovsky, opposing Darwinism to adopt deism, on his way from atheism to Catholicism. As his thought thus took shape, his actions followed suit; still a teenager, he was already prepared to bodily stand in the way of a totalitarian regime because it promoted a view of life that was abhorrent to him. It was resolutely putting into practice the ideologies Marc was rebelling against, that saw as irrelevant the individual characteristics of human beings. This Marc took personally as a threat to his own being, about

which he had grown self-conscious in reaction to the assumptions current in his background.

But if Marc could not sit idly by as Bolshevism, and then Nazism grew in power, if he also had to actively promote the dismantling of the Nation-State, it is not merely out of ideological vindictiveness. At the ground of his militant opposition to all forms of determinism was a deep-seated sense that not only was his individuality irreducible to the mass and insoluble in the flow of history, but that his own individuality did not exhaust his being. He felt that his being someone in particular was ultimately but a particular manifestation of Being itself, which was therefore the ground of his own being. This utterly intimate yet universal Being, which can be equated with the Spirit, gradually became the focus of Marc's life. It would demand of him a total personal commitment to the establishment of a New Order that would bring out the sense of such Being in everyone everywhere, as Marc identified the depths of his being with this universal Being. The intuition of such an identity instilled in him early on a curiosity about religion, which he approached with an open mind, not having been exposed to it as a child, and in what he would come to recognize as a gnostic perspective. Typically, it is the same concern for individual freedom that had haunted him since the beginning of his conscious life and had always been the Archimedes' point of his resistance against determinism that proved decisive in arousing his interest in the religion he would come to embrace: Catholicism.

Marc's faith in Being -considered both within himself and in itself- thus had a political as well as a religious dimension; but it was also at the heart of his philosophical thinking, that is of his view of the world and of his place within it. By reaction against his milieu, Marc first favoured the subjective sense of Being that he gathered from Kant and Nietzsche. As he started to study philosophy in university, he gained a more objective, transcendent view of Being from Hartmann. Scheler and Stern then allowed him to reach a synthesis of both perspectives by locating an ultimately transcendent Being nowhere but at the heart of its immanent manifestation, within the focus of experience provided by the individual self in its immediate involvement in the world. Marc thus became a follower of German personalism in the early twenties, and as he would found the movement *L'Ordre Nouveau* in 1930 in the course of religious discussions, it is in terms of this personalism that he would define the New Order he was seeking. He bestowed the name of the current of German philosophy that had most impressed him upon the system of his friend Arnaud Dandieu, which would become the official philosophy of *L'Ordre Nouveau*. Despite odd precedents for the use of the term "personalism" in France, England or America, it is from Germany through the agency of Marc that it entered French parlance and the common vocabulary of Western philosophy, as it was soon adopted by Mounier under Marc's influence, and it is to Mounier that this philosophy owes its world-wide fame. This is ironic, since his *Esprit* group started elaborating its

version of personalism in a systematic way three years after it was first formulated by Dandieu and *L'Ordre Nouveau*, and largely in reaction to them. Moreover, it is likely that, at this crucial stage of its development, *Esprit's* personalism was influenced by *L'Ordre Nouveau's* through three channels: Alexandre Marc posing as Otto Neumann, Denis de Rougemont as a double agent, and possibly also Gabriel Marcel, who was a defector from *L'O.N.*

It is nonetheless impossible to overlook the profound differences between the two branches of French personalism; as has been shown, *L'O.N.'s* personalism was based on a knightly or heroic paradigm of self-assertion and conquest to bring out the inherent spirituality of the world, while *Esprit's* was founded on a priestly or ascetic paradigm of self-denial and love to bring transcendence into the world. This being said, one is entitled to see Arnaud Dandieu as possibly the greatest might-have-been in contemporary French intellectual history; for given the power of his genius, had he lived, his brand of personalism might well have overshadowed Mounier's, or at least have seriously rivaled it. It could even have been a redoubtable contender for Sartre's existentialism; the whole face of modern thought would have been different. But as it turned out, personalism, with Mounier as its one identifiable leader, came to reflect the latter's personality; its politics, especially after the war, tended to consist mainly in sprinkling holy water on existing collective movements in hopes of purifying them. Personalism thus came to

represent little more than a sanctimonious variant of fellow-travelling, an alibi for Christian Leftists. Yet behind the scenes of the European movement, Dandieu's doctrine lived on, propounded by zealous epigons of which Marc was the foremost. Under the guise of European federalism, a personalist alternative to existing political systems continued to be elaborated. Still, it largely failed to reach the public eye. Both the review *Esprit* and the European federalist movement that is heir to *L'Ordre Nouveau* survive to this day; whether we consider one or the other the most successful branch of personalism depends on whose main standard we adopt. *Esprit* always put more emphasis on the spreading of its ideas, and it certainly comes out on top in this department. But in terms of integrity of doctrine and of concrete steps taken towards the building of an alternative order of society - the priorities of *L'Ordre Nouveau*, personalism is better served by the European federalist movement in which Alexandre Marc has been so active since the war.

Be it as it may, personalism as a whole was an attempt to cope with the deep existential *malaise* of the generation of 1930. Alexandre Marc had a knack for associating with fellow sufferers. Such were the women in his life, be it Margarita Abella Caprile with her anguished poetry or Suzanne Jean with her Serbian guru. His friends at *L'Ordre Nouveau* were mostly acute cases: Denis de Rougemont longed for presence to the world, Arnaud Dandieu and Claude Chevalley craved for intimate contact with reality, and Daniel-Rops, like Marc himself,

wanted to bring order into his soul and into the world in the same movement, as order is a focus on Being, which is the common ground of self and world. The yearning for such an order underlies the unrest of the *Zeitgeist*, and subsumes all its symptoms. Alexandre Marc was keenly aware of this, and tried to found such a New Order on the coalition of all who felt the need for it. He thus became the link between the youth movements which were dissatisfied with the established disorder and all ready-made alternatives to it, not only in France, but in all of Western Europe. More than anyone else in his generation, he was the initiator of numerous -albeit fleeting- crystallizations of its common spirit.

Many of the movements with which Marc thus formed contacts for *L'Ordre Nouveau* were characterized by the need to establish an intimate correspondence between a renewed inner order and a reformed social order, often by means of a revolutionary knightly or religious order of selflessly dedicated militants; for instance, *Réaction*, *Communauté*, *New Atlantis*, the *Gegner* and the *Tatkreis*. Yet the same need was felt by many a Fascist, be it Pierre Drieu La Rochelle, who reacted so positively to the *Cahier de revendications*, Robert Brasillach, with whom Alexandre Marc could get along fine for a while, or Raymond de Becker, who became fascinated by the Third Reich and its *Ordnungen*.¹ Is this to say that the movements mentioned above, starting with *L'Ordre Nouveau* itself, though purportedly antifascist, were in effect crypto-Fascist? It would be easy to arrive at such a conclusion from the perspective adopted by

Zeev Sternhell in his *Ni droite ni gauche*. L'idéologie fasciste en France. To be sure, Sternhell is well aware that, in France between the wars, "*beaucoup plus nombreux que les fascistes confirmés seront les tenants d'une révolution d'un type nouveau, antimarxiste et non prolétarienne, d'une révolution de l'esprit*"; but for him, this only goes to show that "*l'écho que rencontrent les intellectuels fascistes est alors plus étendu que ce que l'ont [sic] croit souvent*."² Though he admits that "*tout antimatérialisme n'est pas fascisme*", he goes on to add that "*le fascisme constitue une variété d'antimatérialisme et canalise tous les courants essentiels de l'antimatérialisme du XX^e siècle*."³ If "*canalise*" is translated as "draws from", there can be no question of the accuracy of this statement; for Fascism was indeed the most spectacular form taken by the reaction against the liberal view of man in the first half of this century. However, when he uses the word "*canalise*", Sternhell probably means that Fascism was the natural repository and logical end-point of all antimaterialism; this is the drift of his whole book. In antimaterialist discourse he recognizes -not without some justification- an open door for Fascism; from this he jumps to the conclusion that it represents therefore of necessity an inroad of Fascism.⁴ This allows him to encapsulate the whole anti-liberal *Zeitgeist* of the thirties under the heading of "the Fascist ideology".

Using loaded terms so loosely is of no help in understanding the period; all it does is introduce an element of

polemics that only confuses the issue. Fascism was but the main expression of a mentality which it nevertheless did not exhaust. The historical interest of a non-conformist movement like *L'Ordre Nouveau* is that its members, though moved by the same yearnings that pushed so many of their contemporaries into the arms of some form or other of totalitarianism, resisted this temptation and thought out more carefully the nature of these yearnings and the ways of satisfying them. They saw that the existing anti-liberal regimes were in fact compounding the vices of the established disorder and going overboard in the direction of collectivism. They too wanted to belong -but to a true community, not to a fanaticized crowd. Wary of blind impulses, the intellectuals of *L'Ordre Nouveau* painstakingly elaborated the original doctrinal apparatus necessary to see clearly into their own hearts and to throw light on the discrepancies between the desires they harboured and the conditions of the world that frustrated them. Insofar as they were successful, they provide us with a precious insight into the mentality that produced Fascism as well as personalism, both being responses to the same visceral call, though the second was more articulate.

The origin of this call can only be discerned on the scale of the *longue durée*, and in terms of Lionel Rothkrug's "somatic" interpretation of history. For there can be no doubt of the physicality of the longings that impelled *L'Ordre Nouveau*'s personalists to action and doctrinal preparation for it. It is in the very fiber of their existence that they were--

repelled by the shallowness of its present conditions, and aspired to a more intense and immediate sense of it. This sense would have to be rooted in the body, in the surroundings that were in effect part and parcel of it prior to any conceptualization, and more specifically in the community circumscribed by them, wherein a deeper, less individualized, more participatory sense of Being was to be attained. Such a sense characterized the collective persons of which pre-literate societies consisted, and came to the fore as the community united in worship, where its heightened awareness of itself was indistinguishable from that of the sacred. This profound involvement of the whole human being in a transpersonal Being left an indelible mark on the European consciousness, which would try to recreate it among by then distinct individual persons throughout the Modern Period. As the latter came to a head in the XIXth and XXth centuries, with the industrial atomization of society and the death of God, Western man often could not be satisfied with the poor substitutes offered by humanist civilization for the primitive fullness of existence. He might then feel an almost physical pull towards the latter, the sense of which had been latent in him for centuries. This seems to have been the case of the writers of *L'Ordre Nouveau*, troubled young men who came to see in a return to the commune defined in terms of physical experience a probable balm for their restlessness, and who were so surely guided by their somatic memory that they defined the sense of integration they wanted to revive and the process by which history had deprived them of it in the first place, in terms that are uncannily

reminiscent of those used by Lionel Rothkrug to account for the course of European history since the Early Middle Ages on the basis of shifting collective mentalities.

Fascists (not to mention Communists) shared that impulse towards renewed collective existence. But they did not bother about problems of scale as *L'Ordre Nouveau* did, and were also ready to enforce collectivism by any means, starting with the most readily available to them: the absolute power of the Nation-State. If people like Marc (and even Mounier) could hail the communal impulse at the origin of National-Socialism, they could not go along with its exploitation of it on a national scale that tore it away from its concrete roots and turned it into a mass hysteria. Not only was a healthy impulse that they shared thus debased and spoiled, but the person was also given short shrift in the process. Communally inspired revolutionary movements east of the Rhine tended not to be so particular about the prerogatives of the individual person. This went also for those with which *L'Ordre Nouveau* had the closest affinities. By contrast, *L'Ordre Nouveau's* communal yearnings were always tempered by a concern for the irreducibility of the person in the mass of its fellows. There was thus a striking ambiguity in the group's position in that, though moved by a nostalgia for the immediacy of experience within pre-literate collective persons, it would often insist on the necessity of replacing as far as possible such given natural ties between people by affective and voluntary ones. But this is the very process by which the unitary,

immediate sense of the world that prevailed in small-scale societies, and which *L'Ordre Nouveau* aimed at restoring, was undermined and swept away in the first place. The sacrality that had long dwelt in their midst had been absorbed into the larger mystical body of France, to which could belong only individuals brought together over a distance by the learning of a largely verbalized common pattern of behaviour, away from the unlearned somatically based collective perceptions of local societies. This implied the formation of distinct persons who as such had a legitimacy within the proto-national mystical body of France, whereas their German equivalents would remain mere individuals in the absence of such a collective body. In Germany, not having soaked in the sacrality of a mystical body, individuals could be dismissed in the resurgence of primitive communal longings. Not so in France, where the sacrality issuing from the old collective persons, having settled in a mystical body, could permeate the individual and make it a person, sacred as such in its own right. This may well be the reason why that resurgence which swept over Europe in the first half of the XXth century could take in France the hybrid form of personalism; for there, the person was, so to speak, *incontournable*.

This applies as well to *New Atlantis*, for England evolved along a pattern similar to France's. Like *L'Ordre Nouveau*, Mitrinovic's movements were also largely ascetic in inspiration. However, this can be said of many of the movements with which *L'Ordre Nouveau* -or, more specifically, Alexandre Marc-

was in contact throughout Europe. It was only natural; after all, were not their members seeking a heightened awareness of Being both within and without themselves? This demanded a sustained effort of self-discipline, not unlike that of the saints in whose cult the pre-literate collective persons of Medieval Europe had long found the center of their existence. Nowhere as in France and Belgium was this so keenly felt, as there the holiness of relics had been directly transfused into the mystical body constituted by the polity, so that every citizen was called upon to live up to it. Whether the call was answered is a different matter; still, the fact remains that an ascetic notion of personal and collective purity always comes to the fore in French discourse in times of crisis. Alexandre Marc, along with many of the people with whom he was connected in the thirties, is a good example of this -all the more so as he was an adoptive Frenchman. While growing up in the most unabashedly, even bleakly modern environment conceivable -as the son of an atheist Jewish Marxist capitalist, he felt the lack of a fuller, more active presence to the world, one that was denied him in his milieu. Transplanted in France, his yearnings soon took on the features of the local mentality, to the point where, as he was discovering Catholicism, he formulated the notion of a New Order meant as both that of society at large and that of the small society of self-disciplined individuals which would lead it. Their own personal purity would be the catalyst of that of the whole people. Asceticism and Revolution were thus cosubstantial; both were efforts to break through to the realm of the Spirit

so as to bring it back into a fallen world. Such an equation was common to Marc, Mounier and de Becker, to name but a few of its most resolute advocates; but it held a fascination for countless contemporaries. This notion of a New Order, which Marc was among the first to come up with, had an even wider appeal than he would have cared for. It was taken over by the Nazis, who had an idea of purity very different from his. And yet it is strangely appropriate that the climactic event of modern European history should have been named after the aspiration that had underlaid it since the waning of the Middle Ages; the one for a New Order that could replace the lost traditional order, and of which L'Ordre Nouveau may well have been the most lucid exponent.

FOOTNOTES

1) See Raymond de Becker. *Livre des Vivants et des Morts*. Bruxelles, Editions de la Toison d'Or, 1942, pp. 226-228; this passage is cited in its entirety in John Hellman. *Emmanuel Mounier and the New Catholic Left 1930-1950*. Toronto, Buffalo, London, University of Toronto Press, 1981, pp. 316-318n75.

2) Zeev Sternhell. *Ni droite ni gauche. L'idéologie fasciste en France*. Paris, Editions du Seuil, 1983, p. 295.

3) Ibid. p. 293.

4) See for instance *ibid.*, p. 239: "Précisément, le fait même que des représentants de courants d'idées aux antipodes du fascisme [like personalism] perçoivent les faiblesses de la France et conçoivent ses maux en des termes identiques à ceux des tenants de l'idéologie fasciste rend la pénétration de celle-ci aussi aisée et aussi profonde."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The most complete bibliography of Alexandre Marc is to be found at the end of *Le fédéralisme et Alexandre Marc* (see below). The following are the works used for this thesis.

I. Primary sources

1. Periodicals

Esprit. Revue internationale, édition française. n^{os} 1 (October 1932)-92(July 1940).

The New Atlantis for Western Renaissance and World Socialism. n^{os} 1(October 1933)-2(January 1934).

New Britain. A Weekly Organ for National Renaissance. n^{os} 1 (May 24, 1933)-53(May 23, 1934); n^o 43(March 14, 1934) was missing from the collection used here.

L'Ordre Nouveau. n^{os} 1(May 1933)-44(August 1938); n^{os} 3(July 1933), 7(January 1934), 10(April 1934), 33(July 1936), and 45 (September 1938) were missing from the collection used here.

Sohlbergkreis. I.(September 1931)-II.(December 1931).

2. Pamphlets

Integration of Europe. The Way to Reconstitute the States of Europe as an Organic Society in a New World Order. Disarmament - Federation - Communal Credit. London, New Europe Group, 1931, 8 p.

New Europe Group and Atlantic Initiative. London, 1939, 4 p.

Principles and Aims of the New Atlantis Foundation. Ditchling, Hassocks, Sussex, nd, 28 p.

Sohlberg Camp 28. VII. - 3. VIII. 1930. Karlsruhe, 1930, 4 p.

What the New Britain Movement Is. Pamphlet No. 100. Watford, nd, 4 p.

Delahaye, J. V. Principles and Plans for a New Britain. 3rd edition, London, 1933, 48 p.

3. Books

Andreu, Pierre. Le rouge et le blanc 1928-1944. Paris, La Table Ronde, 1977, 241 p.

Aron, Robert. Dictature de la liberté. Paris, Editions Bernard Grasset, 1935, 289 p.

Aron, Robert. Fragments d'une vie. Préface de Denis de Rougemont. Postface de Sabine Robert-Aron. Paris, Plon, 1981, 250 p.

Aron, Robert & Arnaud Dandieu. Le cancer américain. 6^e édition. Paris, Rieder, 1931, 246 p.

Aron, Robert & Arnaud Dandieu. Décadence de la nation française. 6^e édition. Paris, Rieder, 1931, 246 p.

Aron, Robert & Arnaud Dandieu. La Révolution nécessaire. Paris, Editions Bernard Grasset, 1933, 297 p.

Becker, Raymond de. Livre des Vivants et des Morts. Bruxelles, Paris, Editions de la Toison d'Or, 1942, 289 p.

Chabannes, Jacques. Paris à 20 ans. Paris, Editions France-Empire, 1974, 325 p.

Daniel-Rops. L'âme obscure. Paris, Le Livre de Poche, 1962, 448 p.

Daniel-Rops. Les années tournantes. Paris, Editions du Siècle, 1932, 263 p.

Daniel-Rops. Eléments de notre destin. Paris, Spes, 1934, 253 p.

Daniel-Rops. Le monde sans âme. Librairie Plon, 1932, 255 p.

Daniel-Rops. Notre Inquiétude. Essais, précédés de "Ce quart de siècle", préface inédite à la réédition 1953. Paris, Librairie Académique Perrin, Editeur, 1953, 300 p.

Daniel-Rops, Pierre Péguy et al. *Péguy et la vraie France*.
Edition originale. Montréal, Editions Serge, 1944, 284 p.

Jaspers, Karl. *Die geistige Situation der Zeit*. Fünfte, zum Teil neubearbeitete Auflage. Berlin, Leipzig, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Sammlung Göschen, Band 1000, 1933, 192 p.

Lamour, Philippe. *Le cadran solaire*. Paris, Robert Laffont, 1980, 464 p.

Marc, Alexandre. *Dialectique du déchainement, Fondements philosophiques du Fédéralisme*. Paris, La Colombe-Editions du Vieux Colombier, coll. "Réalités du Présent" n° 2, 1961, 128 p.

Marc, Alexandre. *De la Méthodologie à la Dialectique*. Paris, Presses d'Europe, coll. "Réalités du Présent", n° 8, 1970, 112 p.

Marc, Alexandre. *Péguy et le socialisme*. Paris, Presses d'Europe, coll. "Réalités du présent", n° 10, 1973, 190 p.

Maritain, Jacques. *Humanisme intégral. Problèmes temporels et spirituels d'une nouvelle chrétienté*. Paris, Fernand Aubier, 1936, 336 p.

Mauriac, François, R. P. Ducatillon et al. *Le communisme et les chrétiens*. Paris, Librairie Plon, coll. "Présences", 1937, 268 p.

Mounier, Emmanuel. *Oeuvres*. Paris, Editions du Seuil.
Tome I: 1931-1939. 1961, 944 p. Tome IV: Recueils posthumes, Correspondance. 1963, 912 p.

Niekisch, Ernst. *Erinnerungen eines deutschen Revolutionärs*.
Erster Band: *Gewagtes Leben 1889-1945*. Köln, Verlag Wissenschaft und Politik, 1973, 393 p.

Paetel, Karl O. *Das geistige Gesicht der nationalen Jugend*.
Flarchheim in Thüringen, Verlag Die Kommenden, "Handbuch der deutschen Jugendbewegung" in Einzeldarstellungen herausgegeben von Karl O. Paetel, 1930, 56 p.

Paetel, Karl O. *Die Struktur der nationalen Jugend*. Flarchheim in Thüringen, Verlag Die Kommenden, "Handbuch der deutschen Jugendbewegung" in Einzeldarstellungen herausgegeben von Karl O. Paetel, 1930, 56 p.

Paetel, Karl O. *Sozialrevolutionärer Nationalismus*. Flarchheim in Thüringen, Verlag Die Kommenden, "Schriften der 'Kommenden' herausgegeben von Karl O. Paetel, 1930, 96 p.

Péguy, Charles. *Morceaux choisis. Poésie.* Paris, Gallimard, coll. "Le livre de poche chrétien" dirigée par Daniel-Rops, 1963, 256 p.

Péguy tel qu'on l'ignore. Textes choisis et présentés par Jean Bastaire. Paris, Gallimard, coll. "Idées", 1973, 380 p.

Rougemont, Denis de. *Politique de la personne.* Nouvelle édition revue et augmentée. Paris, Editions "Je sers", "Etudes, témoignages et documents sur notre temps", 1946, 263 p.

Rougemont, Denis de. *Penser avec les mains.* Paris, Editions Albin Michel, Neuchatel, Editions de la Baconnière, 1946, 253 p.

Salomon, Ernst von. *Der Fragebogen.* Reinbek bei Hamburg, Rohwolt, 1961, 670 p.

Scheler, Max. *Der Formalismus in der Ethik und die materiale Wertethik. Neuer Versuch der Grundlegung eines ethischen Personalismus.* Vierte, durchgesehene Auflage mit einem neuen Sachregister von Maria Scheleř. Bern, Francke Verlag, 1954, 676 p.

Scheler, Max. *Gesammelte Werke; Band 7: Wesen und Formen der Sympathie.* 6., durchgesehene Auflage. Die deutsche Philosophie der Gegenwart. 2., durchgesehene Auflage. Herausgegeben mit einem Anhang von Manfred S. Fringa. Bern, München, Francke, 1973, 372 p.

Schulze-Boysen, Harro. *Gegner von heute, Kampfgenossen von morgen.* Berlin, Waldemar Hoffmann Verlag, "Die Schriften der Gegner", 1932, 30 p.

Selver, Paul. *Orage and the New Age Circle: Reminiscences and Reflections.* London, Allen & Unwin, 1959, 100 p.

Stern, William. *Person und Sache. System des kritischen Personalismus.* Leipzig, Verlag von Johann Ambrosius Barth. Band I: *Ableitung und Grundlehre des kritischen Personalismus.* 2., unveränderte Auflage. Mit einem Begleitwort zu Band I, II, III. 1923, 434 p.; Band II: *Die menschliche Persönlichkeit.* 3., unveränderte Auflage, 1923, 272 p.; Band III: *Wertphilosophie.* 1924, 474 p.

Stern, William. "Personalistische Psychologie", in *Einführung in die neuere Psychologie*, herausgegeben von Emil Saupe. 2. und 3. Auflage. "Handbücher der neueren Erziehungswissenschaft", herausgegeben von Emil Saupe, Band 3. Osterwieck am Harz, A. W. Zickfeldt, Verlag, 1928, pp. 192-202.

Stern, William. *Studien zur Personwissenschaft. Erster Teil:*

Personalistik als Wissenschaft. Leipzig, Verlag von Johann Ambrosius Barth, 1930.

Stern, William. "William Stern", in *Die Philosophie der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellungen*, VI. Band, herausgegeben von Dr. Raymund Schmidt. Leipzig, Verlag von Felix Meiner, 1927, pp. 128-184.

Strasser, Otto. *Aufbau des deutschen Sozialismus*. Mit Vorwort von Weigand von Miltenberg. Leipzig, Wolfgang Richard Lindner, 1932, 104 p.

4. Articles

Canu, Jean. "Arnaud Dandieu et la jeunesse française contemporaine", in *Revue bleue*, n° 16, 17 août 1935, pp. 555-565.

Chevalley, Claude & Alexandre Marc. "Patrie-Nation-Révolution", in *L'Avant-Poste*, janvier-février 1934, pp. 17-26.

Dandieu, Arnaud. "Philosophie de l'angoisse et politique du désespoir", in *Revue d'Allemagne et des pays de langue allemande*, 15 octobre 1932, pp. 883-891.

Dandieu, Arnaud & Alexandre Marc. "Misère et grandeur du spirituel", Paris, "Documents du C.I.F.E.", nouvelle série n° 34 (reprint from *L'Europe en formation*, n°s 172-173, juillet-août 1974), 12 p.

Daniel-Röps. "Les aspirations de la jeunesse française", in *Revue des Vivants*, juillet 1932, pp. 99-110.

Dupuis, René (Alexandre Marc). "Le 'personnalisme' de William Stern et la jeunesse française", in *Revue d'Allemagne et des pays de langue allemande*, 5 avril 1933, pp. 311-330.

Jean de Fabrègues, ed. "La jeunesse française devant l'Allemagne", in *Revue du Siècle* (Organe des groupes Latinité et Réaction), n° 2, mai 1933, pp. 1-14.

Marc, Alexandre. "Adolf STERNBERGER, Der verstandene Tod. Eine Untersuchung zu Martin Heideggers Existenzialontologie; Karl GROOS, Die Unsterblichkeitsfrage; P. L. LANDSBERG, Essai sur l'expérience de la mort", in *Archives de philosophie*, v. XIII, cahier I, supplément bibliographique n° 1, 1937, pp. 5-6.

Marc, Alexandre. "Droit, Morale, Moeurs. II^o Annuaire de l'Institut International de philosophie du Droit et de

Sociologie juridique in Archives de philosophie, vol. XIII, cahier I, supplément bibliographique n° 1, 1937, pp. 18-19.

Marc, Alexandre. "Ferdinand GONSETH, Les mathématiques et la Réalité", in Archives de philosophie, vol. XIII, cahier I, supplément bibliographique n° 1, 1937, pp. 12-13.

Marc, Alexandre. "Fritz GIESE; Nietzsche-die Erfüllung; Otto REIN, Das Apollinische und Dionysische bei Nietzsche und Schelling; Karl JASPERS, Nietzsche Einführung in das Verständnis seines Philosophierens", in Archives de philosophie, vol. XIII, cahier I, supplément bibliographique n° 1, 1937, pp. 27-28.

Marc, Alexandre. "Hans REINER, Das Phänomen des Glaubens, dargestellt im Hinblick auf das Problem seines metaphysischen Gehalts", in Archives de philosophie, vol. XIII, cahier I, supplément bibliographique n° 1, 1937, pp. 6-7.

Marc, Alexandre. "Johannes VOLKELT, Phänomenologie und Metaphysik der Zeit; Werner GENT, Das Problem der Zeit. Eine historische und systematische Untersuchung", in Archives de philosophie, vol. XIII, cahier I, supplément bibliographique n° 1, 1937, pp. 4-5.

Marc, Alexandre. "Louis LAVELLE, Le moi et son destin", in Archives de philosophie, vol. XIII, cahier I, supplément bibliographique n° 1, 1937, pp. 3-4.

Marc, Alexandre. "Roger MUNSCH, L'individu dans le déséquilibre moderne", in Archives de philosophie, vol. XIII, cahier I, supplément bibliographique n° 1, 1937, p. 16.

Marc, Alexandre. "N. GUTERMANN et H. LEFEBVRE, La Conscience, mystifiée; Georges FRIEDMANN, La crise du progrès; Ramon FERNANDEZ, L'Homme est-il humain?", in Archives de philosophie, vol. XIII, cahier I, supplément bibliographique n° 1, 1937, pp. 14-15.

Marc, Alexandre. "Nicolas BERDIAEFF, Destin de l'Homme dans le monde actuel", in Archives de philosophie, vol. XIII, cahier I, supplément bibliographique n° 1, 1937, pp. 16-17.

Marc, Alexandre. "Propos de Georges Sorel, recueillis par Jean VARIOT", in Archives de philosophie, vol. XIII, cahier I, supplément bibliographique n° 1, 1937, pp. 15-16.

Marc, Alexandre. "Raymond ARON, La Sociologie allemande contemporaine", in Archives de philosophie, vol. XIII, cahier I, supplément bibliographique n° 1, 1937, pp. 17-18.

- Marc, Alexandre. "Sylvio TRENTIN, La crise du droit et de l'Etat; Georges DEL VECCHIO, Leçons de Philosophie du Droit", in Archives de philosophie, vol. XIII, cahier I, supplément bibliographique n° 1, 1937, pp. 19-20.
- Marc, Alexandre. "Principe et méthode de la métaphysique", in Archives de Philosophie, vol. XI, 1935, pp. 85-108.
- Marc, Alexandre. "Problèmes de psychologie", in Archives de Philosophie, vol. XII, 1936, pp. 77-100.
- Marc, Alexandre. "Les forces armées de l'U.R.S.S.", in Dossiers de l'Action populaire, n° 347, 15-8-1935, 12 p.
- Marc, Alexandre. "Les forces armées de l'U.R.S.S. (Deuxième article)", in Dossiers de l'Action populaire, n° 349, 10-10-1935, 16 p.
- Marc, Alexandre. "Misères de la Famille soviétique", in Dossiers de l'Action populaire, n° 354, 25-12-1935, 12 p.
- Marc, Alexandre. "Misères de la Famille soviétique (Suite)", in Dossiers de l'Action populaire, n° 355, 10-1-1936, pp. 13-30.
- Marc, Alexandre. "U.R.S.S. 1936", in Dossiers de l'Action populaire, n° 361, 10-4-1936, 14 p.
- Marc, Alexandre. "La main tendue?... Les faits répondent", in Dossiers de l'Action populaire, n° 377, 10-1-1937, 22 p.
- Marc, Alexandre. "L'état fermé ou l'autarchie", in Revue d'Allemagne et des pays de langue allemande, 5 janvier 1933, pp. 1-19.
- Marc, Alexandre. "Les Adversaires", in Revue d'Allemagne et des pays de langue allemande, 5 avril 1933, pp. 292-310.
- Marc, Alexandre. "Pour un communisme national: La Revue Die Tat", in Revue d'Allemagne et des pays de langue allemande, 15 octobre 1932, pp. 849-867.
- Marc, Alexandre. "L'existence humaine et la raison", in Revue néoscholastique de philosophie. Tome 39, nov. 1936, pp. 518-524.
- Rougemont, Denis de. "Cause commune", in Présence, juillet 1932, pp. 12-15.
- Rougemont, Denis de, ed. "Cahier de revendications", in La Nouvelle Revue Française, décembre 1932, pp. 801-845.

II. Secondary sources

1. Books

***. Le fédéralisme et Alexandre Marc. Lausanne, Centre de recherches européennes, 1974, 240 p.

***. Historia de la literatura argentina. 3 Las primeras décadas del siglo. Centro Editor de América Latina S. A., 1981, 636 p.

***. Le personnalisme d'Emmanuel Mounier hier et demain. Pour un cinquantenaire. Paris, Editions du Seuil, 1985, 256 p.

Adolph, Heinrich. Personalistische Philosophie. Leipzig, Felix Meiner Verlag, 1931, 122 p.

Bernard, Henri. L'Autre Allemagne. La Résistance allemande à Hitler, 1933-1945. Bruxelles, La Renaissance du Livre, 1976, 299 p.

Berlin, Sir Isaiah. Russian Thinkers. Edited by Henry Hardy & Aileen Kelly, with an introduction by Aileen Kelly. New York, The Viking Press, 1978, 312 p.

Billington, James H. The Icon and the Axe. An Interpretive History of Russian Culture. New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1966, 786 p.

Bordeleau, Léo-Paul. Action et vie sociale dans l'oeuvre de Maurice Blondel. Ottawa, Editions de l'Université d'Ottawa, coll. "Philosophica", 1978, 208 p.

Boysen, Elsa. Harro Schulze-Boysen. Das Bild eines Freiheitskämpfers. Zusammengestellt nach seinen Briefen, nach Berichten der Eltern und anderen Aufzeichnungen. Düsseldorf, Komet-Verlag, 1947, 40 p.

Coogan, Timothy Patrick. Ireland since the Rising. New York, Washington, London, Frederick A. Praeger, 1966,

Louis Dupeux. Stratégie communiste et dynamique conservatrice. Essai sur les différents sens de l'expression "national-bolchévisme" en Allemagne, sous la République de Weimar (1919-1933). Thèse présentée devant l'université de Paris I le 28 novembre 1974. Paris, Librairie Honoré Champion, 1976, 628 p.

- Hellman, John. *Emmanuel Mounier and the New Catholic Left 1930-1950*. Toronto, Buffalo, London, University of Toronto Press, 1981, 360 p.
- Institut für Marxismus-Leninismus beim Zentralkomitee der SED. *Deutsche Widerstandskämpfer 1933-1945. Biographien und Briefe, Band 2*. Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1970.
- Isaacson, José & Carlos Enrique Urquia. *40 años de poesia argentina 1920/1960. Tomo I (1920/1930)*. Buenos Aires, Editorial Aldaba, 1962, 320 p.
- Kabermann, Friedrich. *Widerstand und Entscheidung eines deutschen Revolutionärs: Leben und Denken von Ernst Niekisch*. Köln, Verlag Wissenschaft und Politik, 1974, 419 p.
- Lafrance, Guy. *La philosophie sociale de Bergson.. Sources et interprétation*. Ottawa, Editions de l'Université d'Ottawa, coll. "Philosophica", 1974, 148 p.
- Lipiansky, Edmond & Bernard Rettenbach. *Ordre et Démocratie. Deux sociétés de pensée: De l'Ordre Nouveau au Club Jean-Moulin. Préface de Jean de Soto*. Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, "Travaux et Recherches de la Faculté de Droit et des Sciences Economiques de Paris, série 'Science Politique'", n° 10, 1967, 176 p.
- Loubet del Bayle, Jean-Louis. *Les non-conformistes des années 30. Une tentative de renouvellement de la pensée politique française*. Paris, Editions du Seuil, 1969, 496 p.
- Mohler, Armin. *Die konservative Revolution in Deutschland 1918-1932. Ein Handbuch. Zweite, völlig neu bearbeitete Fassung*. Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972, 554 p.
- Percas, Helena. *La poesia femenina argentina (1810-1950)*. Madrid, Ediciones Cultura Hispanica, 1958, 740 p.
- Reed, Douglas. *Nemesis? The Story of Otto Strasser and the Black Front*. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1940, 274 p.
- Rigby, Andrew. *Initiation and Initiative. An Exploration of the Life and Ideas of Dimitrije Mitroinovic*. Boulder, East European Monographs, no. CLXIV, 1984, 218 p.
- Roemheld, Lutz. *Integraler Föderalismus. Modell für Europa. Ein Weg zur personalen Gruppengesellschaft. Band 1: Geschichtliche Entwicklung*. München, Verlag Ernst Vögel, "Politik und politische Bildung", herausgegeben von Theo Stammen und Heinz Rausch, 1977, 336 p.

Savard, Pierre, ed., Guy Frégault (1918-1977). Actes du colloque tenu au Centre de recherche en civilisation canadienne-française de l'Université d'Ottawa le 7 novembre 1980. Montréal, Editions Bellarmin, 1981, 96 p.

Schüddekopf, Otto-Ernst. National-Bolschewismus in Deutschland 1918-1933. Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, Wien, Verlag Ullstein GmbH, 1972, 576 p.

Theau, Jean. La philosophie française dans la première moitié du XX^e siècle. Ottawa, Editions de l'Université d'Ottawa, coll. "Philosophica", 1977, 208 p.

Vermeil, Edmond. Doctrinaires de la Révolution allemande (1918-1938). Paris, Fernand Sorlot, 1938, 394 p.

Wohl, Robert E. The Generation of 1914. Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1979, 308 p.

2. Articles

Herte, Robert de. "Du nazisme au communisme", in *Eléments pour la civilisation européenne*, n° 59, Été 1986, pp. 61-63.

Herte, Robert de. "Erratum", in *Eléments pour la civilisation européenne*, n° 60, Automne 1986, p. 58.

Marc, Alexandre. "Le colonel Mayer et de Gaulle", letter to the editor of *Le Nouvel Observateur*, n° 1044, 9-15 novembre 1984.

Marc, Alexandre. "Personnalistes, unissez-vous", in *L'Europe en formation*, n° 260, avril-juin 1985.

Sigoda, Pascal. "Charles de Gaulle, la 'Révolution conservatrice' et le personnalisme du mouvement 'l'Ordre Nouveau'", in *Espoir* (organ of the Institut Charles de Gaulle), numéro 46, mars 1984, pp. 43-49.

Sternhell, Zeev. "Emmanuel Mounier et la contestation de la démocratie libérale dans la France des années trente", in *Revue française de science politique*, volume 34, numéro 5, décembre 1984, pp. 1141-1180.

Steuckers, Robert. "Henri de Man", in *Etudes et recherches pour la culture européenne*. Revue théorique publiée par l'association G.R.E.C.E. n° 3, 1984, pp. 35-47.

APPENDIX: A ROTHKRUGIAN VIEW OF EUROPEAN HISTORY

The following is an attempt at a synthesis of Lionel Rothkrug's theories about the origins and development of European civilization. The author has taken it upon himself to weave some of their various strands into a coherent picture of world-history as it appears in the light of Professor Rothkrug's doctrine. Yet it is but a broad outline of it that is provided here, one that neglects many details, and is also very selective about what particular aspects are highlighted, as this essay is meant to be used as an exposition of the methodological framework for this Master's thesis, and is therefore geared towards issues of particular relevance to it. To fill in the blanks left in this sketch of Professor Rothkrug's theories, the reader might consult the special issue of *Historical Reflections* devoted to them in the spring of 1980, which, though out of print, is still available from university libraries. Other than this sample of the book Professor Rothkrug has been working on for a number of years, the author has used mostly transcripts of some of his public lectures and notes taken at private ones, as well as recollections of personal conversations with him. One might take exception to the relative obscurity of such sources; but the author would contend that this very obscurity is all the more reason to disclose their tenor in an essay like this one, as the importance of Rothkrug's theses is such that they cannot be ignored.

It lies mainly in that they go to the roots of historical phenomena by relating them to the roots of human experience --to the very sense of the world and of self proper to man, one that is at once physical and psychical, and changes over time by a process which Professor Rothkrug has undertaken to describe. This implies that human nature is not something that is given, universal and immutable, but is instead inextricably interwoven with particular circumstances of all orders, and is deeply informed by them. The concept of "plasticity" or *Bildsamkeit* that is to be found in the "system of critical personalism" of William Stern, a German psychologist and philosopher of the beginning of the century, is helpful in understanding this:

Plastisch ist der Mensch sowohl auf körperlichem, wie auf seelischem, wie auf dem ungeteilt psychisch-physischen Gebiete. Die leibliche Ernährung, der Aufenthalt in bestimmten klimatischen und meteorologischen Verhältnissen, die Ausführung gewisser Bewegungen -- all dies schlägt sich nieder in dauernden Körperformungen, Körpergewohnungen, Körpergeübtheiten; und ebenso führen seelische Erlebnisse, Eindrücke und Leistungen in der Form des Gedächtnisses, der geistigen Übung, der seelischen Bereicherung ein dauerndes Nachleben und wirken auf die seelische Verfassung der Person bestimmend und umstimmend. Wenn z. B. ein Mensch in empfänglicher Jugendzeit mehrere Jahre in völlig fremdartiger -- klimatischer, sprachlicher, nationaler, sozialer -- Umgebung zugebracht hat, so verbinden sich die seelischen und körperlichen Wandlungen, die seine Persönlichkeit dauernd durch jene Einflüsse erfahren hat, zu einem einheitlichen Gesamtbild psychophysischer Plastik.¹

This "unitary wholeness of psychophysical form" was especially strong and cohesive in traditional societies, for there

mind and body were hardly distinct, as a complete presence to the world was required when survival depended immediately on taking an active part within it -- or rather, in being a part of it, that is of society, nature and the cosmos in general. One might object that this may not have been the case with the leisured classes of these societies, as their day to day survival was surely a less immediate concern. But they were still part of what Rothkrug calls the collective sensorium, i. e. the network of common perceptions that emerges from primitive conditions of society, where people's existence is bound up with concrete tasks and specific modes of behaviour that have meaning only as organic functions of a community which is the sole framework for survival. In other words, it is only as part of an organic whole that traditional man can exist. His activity within that whole is naturally coordinated with that of his fellows, being learned through the body in a non-cognitive, non-reflective manner, since there is no distance between himself and his activity; "and the bodies that learn together develop shared or collective responses [...]"² to the environment, because "if in the act of cognition we embody the thing we know then we neither remember nor forget what we know. For we can neither remember nor forget to be; we simply are."³ In that sense, pre-literate peoples do not merely act in the world, they literally are the world as part of which they live. "They do not set themselves off from the environment. Instead, they deal with it by participation. They come to know the world only when

they have soaked it up sufficiently to think they somehow embody it."⁴ To them, that alone can be considered real which can be grasped with body and mind at once through physical contact and concomitant emotional involvement, both of which are so deeply imbedded in the collective sensorium that they are as functions of a collective person who incorporates the common experience of its individual members. "In sum, the corporeity of knowledge and the organic character of society were two sides to the same coin."⁵

As a result, collective (and as such meaningful) perceptions did not extend beyond the reach of the local community -- that is unless they were brought there by means of a focus of experience shared by a number of communities. In the European context, this was provided by pilgrimage sites. There, worship brought people together on a regional or transregional scale as it did within their own communities. For it is in worship that the collective person of the community came into its own through the focussing of the collective sensorium of its members as they purposely gathered "'to hear' or 'to see', that is, to come into contact with the divine while united to one another in a single auditory or visual mode", where they were "unable to distinguish their heightened sense of perceptual and somatic intersubjectivity from a holy presence experienced collectively as one person [...]"⁶. In other words, it is an organic community's very awareness of itself as a collective sensorium that used to form

the better part of the traditional experience of the sacred.

Moreover, the more concrete was the focus of collective attention, the more intense was the experience of the actual presence of the sacred within the community. This is why "relics were the most important feature in the religious landscape"⁷, so that collective perceptions in certain areas of Europe crystallized around relic worship, whereas the lack thereof in others also had far-reaching consequences. "The division of Europe into areas of strong and weak relic worship stands at the origin of the gulf that separated the two halves of Latin Christendom -- the West and Germany -- throughout the Middle Ages and, in some respects, even down to the present day."⁸ This is why the central problem in Lionel Rothkrug's approach to European history is "to explain how regional diversities in religious practices led to corresponding differences in the formation of national traits in France and Germany [...]."⁹

It is therefore to the Early Middle Ages that we must turn if we want to understand how they arose, as their roots go back to discrepancies in the Christianization process of the various peoples of Europe. "All Germanic tribes [...] buried grave-goods with their dead. But never having espoused the Arian creed, the Franks did not claim the practice was Christian."¹⁰ This allowed "the Roman Catholic Church, beginning in the sixth century, [...] to transform Frankish grave-goods into ex-voto

gifts""to abbots and bishops 'elevated' from (the Franks') own tribesmen"¹¹ as local saints on whose intercession with God they became dependent. But in 754, "when the papacy transferred the biblical attributes of Merovingian saints to the Carolingian institution of kingship", "to replace the biblical holiness taken from the elevated tombs of Merovingian abbots and bishops, Rome shipped north of the Alps large numbers of genuine martyr relics; that is, parts taken from the bodies of early Church martyrs."¹² They commanded such veneration among the French, because relic-worship had for so long played a central role in their lives, that "people from every category of the population travelled on pilgrimage circuits made famous by shrines dedicated to celestial patrons worshipped throughout Christendom. In this way pilgrimage circuits helped to expand regional sentiments of cultic and community consensus created by the Peace Councils to the national plane. They imparted to all subjects of the realm that sense of religious and civilizational unity which alone explains why Frenchmen from Louis VII to Saint Louis continued to believe in France's national mission to deliver the Holy Land."¹³ It also explains why Joan of Arc, "a peasant girl from the very fringes of the realm", could say that "all those who war against the sacred kingdom of France do battle against King Jesus."¹⁴ It goes to show that, in the words of a reviewer of Colette Beaune's recently published *Naissance de la nation France*, "in the XVth century the 'majority discourse' is already 'national' (and 'French') although in the preceding centuries it

was already 'official' (at the Court and in the Church) and favorably received by a steadily growing number of people, notably in the country and among artisans [...]."¹⁵

This was because transregional pilgrimages had generated what Rothkrug calls an upward displacement of loyalty and sacrality, as they had caused the collective sensoria to open out unto a larger whole of which the King was the pinnacle. Getting personally involved in the network of transregional devotion that held their Kingdom together spiritually, the Kings of France started sponsoring the cult of certain relics, and to heal people by their touch when they went on pilgrimage to their shrines. As a result, an interesting confusion arose in people's minds in the course of the XVth century. "Until then", reports Marc Bloch, "the thaumaturgical power of the kings of France had been generally considered as a consequence of their sacred character, expressed and sanctioned by the unction; from then on people got into the habit of thinking that they owed it to the intercession of Saint Marcoul [...]."¹⁶ The holiness and the legitimacy of kingship were now derived from its being the repository of the sacrality inherent in the network of transregional devotion tying all Frenchmen together beyond the strictly local, face to face relationships whence it proceeded. Communities had started giving way to society, which found a new focus with "the monarchy's appropriation of the religious qualities that had hitherto bound all French dead in *saecula saecula*

lorum."¹⁷ These qualities were embodied in "the king's effigy, juxtaposed as it was to his cadaver" in royal funerals of the Renaissance, for it "was the crown made flesh. The funeral ceremony joined Frenchmen to the immortal, transfigured body of the king -- just as the Mass joined the faithful to the body of Christ -- to form what they called '*un corps mystique*' or, from today's perspective, a proto-national *corpus mysticum* -- an appellation also appropriate for the emerging Gallican Church."¹⁸ All the more so because the latter came to represent the Kingdom as opposed to the King after Louis XIV purported to absorb into his own individual body the external, eternal body portrayed in effigy as the transpersonal essence of kingship -- to wit the apocryphal saying by which he is remembered: "*L'Etat, c'est moi.*" By sponsoring the Gallican Church, he had sought to use the sense of the Nation's sacrality as a weapon against Rome. But this strategy backfired on his successors: royal Gallicanism eventually turned against the King, because "it so impersonally conceived of the monarchical state, -- not always sharply distinguished from the 'nation' -- as to leave little room for flesh and blood monarchs who were 'nothing but its administrators' "¹⁹ (Dale van Kley).

Having shed their stone effigies, which had been cosubstantial with the Nation, the last Kings of France soon found out that the Nation had a life of its own, untamed by the dictates of an arbitrary *raison d'Etat* emanating from a sovereign who no longer

embodied it. By allowing the body politic to be suffused with the sacrality they had soaked up from relics, their predecessors had created a monster, and it eventually went its own way over Louis XVI's dead body. It came into its own in the Republic of Virtue, whose forerunners Montesquieu and Rousseau "agreed that civil society possessed virtue only to the extent that its own unitary volition expressed the will of all its citizens."²⁰ For some time people had no longer been conceived of as the mere members of a locally based collective person, but as independent units abstracted from their context and judged according to the conformity of their behaviour, manners and thoughts with an objective, transregional, indeed universally valid code of civility. This ethical code had evolved from the thinned out and slowly secularized devotional patterns. It defined and also sprang from relationships that were no longer face to face and somatic, but established at -- or as from -- a distance, in a verbal frame of reference where cross-modal expression was rampant. By this term, Lionel Rothkrug refers to the language of synesthesia and metaphor, which had for the better part of the Middle Ages been "reserved largely for mystical discourse"²¹, as it implied the free handling by the individual of the collective perceptions of the community. "The age of metaphor, the triumph of rhetoric in the Renaissance points, therefore, to a period when, for the first time, Europeans consciously pursued the ideal of an integrated self within a shared, verbalized framework of affective meaning."²²

A cognitive, individual sensorium had replaced the non-cognitive, collective one; it was now a matter of harmonizing its distinct and autonomous personal manifestations. The framework for this was civil society, to which clung the sacrality left over from the vanished collective sensorium. The term "civil society" itself appeared in the middle of the XVIIIth century²³, when "the Wars of Religion had largely dislocated the confraternal and corporate context for the cult of kingship which, in turn, changed from *la religion royale* to *la religion et la civilisation royale et française*."²⁴ "In *la religion royale*, [...], sanctity and honor [had] overlapped." But "movement away from cult objects" into the orbit of the Crown had, "disseminated sanctity from honor", so that "*la religion royale* declined as honor supplanted cult objects as a principle of social differentiation and social integration." Also competition for honor led people to quarrel more and more about who or what to esteem, therefore, fewer and fewer Frenchmen ascribed sanctity or, by 1758, even honor to the Crown, much less to the well-born²⁵ from whose ranks this preoccupation with honour had seeped down to permeate the minds of most Frenchmen. This was also the case with the notion of civilization which, even though the word itself took on its full contemporary meaning in the 1770s²⁶, was clearly derived from the *moraliste's* identification of polite society (where honour was so important) with "*la société civile* -- sometimes called *le monde*, *le public* or even *la nation* -- and

since he also supposed reform or improvement of society meant making more people more civil he thought the advancement of reform would inevitably cause greater numbers of people to behave like each other or, in the case of foreigners, to act more like Frenchmen. The progress of civility would transform strangers into friends, for increasing numbers of people would behave more and more like each other. Moreover, since France was the source of all civility it followed that France had a mission to civilize peoples everywhere. Late sixteenth and early seventeenth century texts abound with statements proclaiming France's civilizing mission on earth.²⁷ So does most French political discourse, whether liberal or conservative, down to General De Gaulle's "*une certaine idée de la France*". But this specifically French attitude is doubtless epitomized in the Republican definition of the Nation by a Universal Declaration of the Rights of Man, which made a French citizen of every freeman on the globe, and a traitor of any Frenchman who did not wholeheartedly support the Republic. This was so because the latter was conceived of as a set of institutions resulting from the free association of individuals abstracted from their native context; as such, it was co-substantial with the Nation as the mystical body constituted by the aggregation of these discrete units through a social contract which made them free participants in a non-local collective entity by the coordination of their autonomous wills into a hypostatized *volonté générale*. Thus, the old impulse towards communal devotion found a new outlet in Republican fervor for Nation as

society, the wellspring of this popular crusading spirit which so impressed Goethe at Valmy, and characterized the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars.

*"En Allemagne, c'est plutôt au pays natal (Heimat), à la terre des ancêtres (Vaterland) que s'adresse la faveur populaire."*²⁸ Collective perceptions there were not gently extended beyond the scope of face to face relationships through wider and wider circles of popular devotion, as they were in the West. For Germans had few saints of their own, having started out in Christendom as heretics, and their Holy Roman Empire being constantly anathematized by the Church, which made it impossible for them to produce martyrs in crusades that were usually directed against themselves. This was doubly true in non-Romanized Germany, where heathens were converted by the sword. As a result of this peculiar dearth of indigenous sanctity, Germany did not provide a fertile ground for the development of those transregional networks of popular devotion which lay the basis for a moral community encompassing an entire nation. And since a mystical body did not take shape, its sacrality could not spill over to the body politic. Religion could sustain its emotional force, therefore, at only the very local level. The regionalization of piety institutionalized a separation of the affective, the emotionally bonding aspects of religion from its public or constitutional dimensions."²⁹ Hence Luther's insistence that *"Gott stehet in der Gemeinde"*, as opposed to the institutional Church,

let alone society at large, which, unlike what happened in the West, remained unhallowed. It did not pick up the sacrality that had dwelt in worshipping communities when these started to fritter away as the medieval order collapsed. Instead, starting in the thirteenth century with the beguines and the Rhineland mystics, "regionalization gave way to the privatization of devotion"³⁰, which came to a head with the German Reformation and "its unique separation of religion from society"³¹. Idealist philosophy only followed in its footsteps, for "conceiving moral life to originate in sources outside the sphere of social and cultural fact, Kant describes an autonomous moral will -- it determines itself entirely within itself -- that imposes upon the individual an absolute duty to transcend his own social environment in pursuit of the goals of universality, completeness and totality."³² It is in this respect quite similar to Nietzsche's will to power, as it is a product of the same German mindset. This "concept of duty [...] has the same function in Kant's moral philosophy as grace had in Luther's theology. It situates the source of human obligation in an inexorable will whose purpose remains at once hidden and intensely personal -- a concept as congenial to the thirteenth century beguine as it was to the eighteenth century Protestant Gelehrte"³³, or to Meister Eckhart as to Nietzsche.

This is because in Germany the collective sensorium had not opened out onto society as it had in the West. When it started to fall apart at the seams during the Late Middle Ages, it had

nothing to fall back on; there was no larger frame of reference where collective perceptions could settle and the striving for community could manifest itself within the sphere of society. Instead, the very vacuum into which the collective sensorium gave out when it could no longer rest on the solid ground of medieval culture became the new focus around which it would strive to find a new balance. An apophatically described holiness came to replace the non-cognitive sense of community that had long been indistinguishable from that of the sacred. It filled the gaps of this felt community and found there its locus in the individual. It left him to face God alone, with no saints to intercede in his favour, as there had been so few in Germany to begin with. This shortage of saints to "cushion" contact with the divine had two important consequences. On the one hand, by making Germans especially sensitive to the incommensurability of God, it predisposed them to conceive of the Absolute and of the Good in terms of grand abstractions. On the other hand, it removed any social context for the divine.

Thus, in Germany, the upward displacement of loyalty and sacrality followed an arrow-straight vertical axis, undeviated by the lateral tangent that in the West would make them ultimately settle in society. Whereas for the *philosophes* and the positivists, reality lay in the cognitively apprehensible and verbally describable phenomena of the empirical world, for Kant it rested in the unknowable noumena of a transcendental world.

Whereas for the *philosophes* and the French socialists, people made society go through higher and higher stages of civility, for Hegel History was but the process through which the divine Idea descended unto humanity. The former non-cognitive experience of the sacred in the community was sublimated into an abstract notion of the Absolute by the individual, one which revealed itself to him from on high out of any social context except that created by the multiplication and simultaneity of such individual experiences. Already "Luther located the encounter between God and the faithful in a common auditory perception directed away from the world. [...] But God communicates only through an 'inner word'. [...] The Lord's silent speech, not civility, brings us into the true company of men."³⁴ When it became less immediately discernible as the Modern Period wore on, the categorical imperative and other such devices of idealist philosophy could hardly be expected to replace it, steeped as they were in a cognitive mode of experience which the German mentality could not truly reconcile with a sense of the community and the sacred. Hence the Romantic longing for the in-dwelling sacrality of an organic community, which informed much of German thought and sensitivity down to the Third Reich. There, it took the paroxystic, paradoxical form of an attempt to reestablish on the scale of a "nation" defined only by bloodties (a *Volk*) the cohesiveness of an almost tribal community (*Volksgemeinschaft*), even if it meant abolishing all that was left of true local autonomy through *Gleichschaltung*, which made utter subservience to

the arbitrary will of the Führer the only true source of social existence.

Such resurgences of primal longings for community were not however confined to Germany. They lie at the root of most revolutionary movements of the first half of the XXth century in Europe, be it in art or in politics, whether from the Right or from the Left, especially when they tended to transcend these modern categories. It is the very *malaise* caused by the artificial dichotomies with which the triumphant industrial world was fraught that provoked those spasms. As Michel Despland puts it:

*Les êtres du XIXe se découvrent happés de toute part par des expériences de séparation, de désunion, d'exil. [...] Leurs poèmes expansifs, lyriques ou épiques, leurs utopies, leurs discours et projets politiques, leurs pèlerinages en chemin de fer, leurs sanctuaires et monuments sur les montagnes peuvent passer pour des effets faciles, mais ils témoignent d'une énorme énergie tendue vers le but de mieux vivre ensemble. [...] Les individus et les collectivités (le dix-neuvième est aussi le siècle des nationalismes) sont lourds des sentiments d'existence qui doivent s'exprimer.*³⁵

These existential feelings were the disjointed remnants of the psycho-physical wholeness of experience natural to traditional man in an integrated collective sensorium. It had been so deeply ingrained in the very fibre of human nature over the course of millenia that it simply would not die out as its original social and cultural conditions faded away. Instead, it migrated to the forefront of the new emerging conditions, as in an effort to shape them so as to make them replace the ones

where it grew. Thus, modern civilization was largely an attempt at recreating the unity of medieval culture using as building blocks its shattered remains: the individuals. The attempt was obviously futile; but it never was a rational process in the first place, even though it involved the triumph of that very Reason it was about coping with. It was an impulse that ran far deeper than any conscious intent on the part of individuals.

For it pervaded both body and mind at an intersubjective level, as the afterglow of their old unity with a cosmos that was at once embodied and animated by man. This unity simply could not be forgotten, nor even remembered, as it had been learned by the body, so that like it it simply was, and perdured at the core of human personality, as a vague yearning for something essential that was somehow no longer there, and whose absence was felt like a strange restlessness that could not be stilled by the reflex actions that it impelled.

Lionel Rothkrug has an apt simile for the predicament of modern man: it is like that of someone who has quitted smoking but keeps fidgeting around with his hands, unconsciously going through garbled versions of motions which have lost their purpose, but which the body cannot shake off by itself after having practiced them for a lifetime. This person is *physically* missing something which he or she cannot consciously place. In the same way, modern man has sought an all-encompassing new order where he could belong with his whole being, just as his ances-

tors did in the primitive traditional order. The somatic memory of the immediacy of experience characterizing the latter has been transmitted to modern man through generation after generation, each impressing upon the next the slightly altered body knowledge absorbed from the preceding one, which would always include the sense of the lack of a special quality of experience of self and world, one that should be regained. This sense became especially acute when the humanist assumption that a society could be made out of atomistic individuals was exposed by the alienating conditions of the industrial society where it had led. In a veritable gut reaction, those regions of Europe whose distinctive devotional patterns had not lent themselves to an extension to society of the in-dwelling sacrality of a locally based collective sensorium rejected the liberal institutions imported from the West, which reacted less radically to the shortcomings of a system that had arisen out of religious circumstances peculiar to itself. It could still live with a society which it had been trained by centuries of religious practice to think of as an acceptable substitute for community. Even if it did nonetheless produce its fair share of communal yearnings, they had a far less significant impact than in Eastern Europe and especially Germany, where no deep-seated confidence in the moral worth of society could dampen them. There, these distant voices from a by-gone age found an echo that proved devastating, ultimately drowning them in sheer noise and making them undistinguishable from the ambient din of the modern world.

FOOTNOTES

1) William Stern. Person und Sache. System des kritischen Personalismus. Zweiter Band: Die menschliche Persönlichkeit. Dritte unveränderte Auflage mit einem Begleitwort zu Band I, II, III. Leipzig, Verlag von Johann Ambrosius Barth, 1923, S. 158.

2) Lionel Rothkrug. Modes of Perception in Religion and Culture. The James A. Gray Lectures, Fall 1986, Lecture One (First Draft), p. 2.

3) Ibid. pp. 3-4.

4) Ibid. p. 2.

5) Ibid. p. 4.

6) Id.

7) Lionel Rothkrug. Religious Practices and Collective Perceptions: Hidden Homologies in the Renaissance and Reformation. Special issue of Historical Reflections/Réflexions historiques, Vol./Tome 7, No. 1 Spring/Printemps 1980, p. 9.

8) Ibid., p. 7.

9) Ibid., pp. 149-150.

10) Ibid., p. 13.

11) Id.

12) Id.

13) Ibid., p. 35.

14) Cited in *ibid.*, p. 31 from Joseph R. Strayer, "France: The Holy Land, the Chosen People and the Most Christian King", in *Medieval Statecraft and the Perspectives of History*. Princeton, 1971, pp. 300-314.

15) Jean Varenne. "Une certaine idée de la France", in *Panorama des idées actuelles*, 9, novembre 1985, p. 6.

16) Marc Bloch. *Les rois thaumaturges*, Paris, 1961, pp. 282-283, cited in Lionel Rothkrug. *Religious Practices and Collective Perceptions*. p. 32, note 121.

17) Ibid., p. 153.

18) Ibid., p. 33.

19) Dale van Kley. "Church, State, and the Ideological Origins of the French Revolution: The Debate over the General Assembly of the Gallican Clergy in 1765", in the Journal of Modern History 51 (December 1979), pp. 636-637.

20) Lionel Rothkrug. Religious Practices and Collective Perceptions. p. 192.

21) Lionel Rothkrug. Modes of Perception in Religion and Culture. p. 16.

22) Id.

23) Lionel Rothkrug. Religious Practices and Collective Perceptions. p. 167.

24) Lionel Rothkrug. From Sanctity and Heresy to Virtue and Corruption: The Ideological Backgrounds to the French Revolution. Prepared for the Thirty-Second Annual Meeting of the Society for French Historical Studies, Quebec, P. Q., 20-23 March 1986, p. 10.

25) Ibid. p. 12.

26) Lionel Rothkrug. Religious Practices and Collective Perceptions. p. 167.

27) Ibid.. p. 189.

28) Jean Varenne. op. cit. p. 5.

29) Lionel Rothkrug. Religious Practices and Collective Perceptions. p. 41

30) Id.

31) Ibid. p. 183.

32) Ibid. p. 187.

33) Ibid. p. 199.

34) Lionel Rothkrug. Modes of Perception in Religion and Culture. p. 19.

35) Michel Despland. Faut-il parler d'esthétisation de la religion au XIXe siècle? Manuscript, pp. 48-49.