

RG: Okay, I'm going to ask you Romain Goupil, please, your name and date and place of birth to start

RGo: I was born in Paris on July 12, '51

RG: Yes. What part of Paris?

RGo: In the seventeenth

RG: Can you tell me something about your family of origin?

RGo: Oh beh, the family of origin, if we go back to the grandparents, there is on my mother's side, they come from Italy. That is to say, it is Italian immigration who has no work and who then seeks work in France. So the grandfather is going to meet a young woman from Toulouse, they are going to get married and then there will be my mother. And then my uncles. And on the other side, on my father's side, it comes from ... The grandmother is Spanish, the father is Spanish, the mother is Italian, she is going to die very young so the grandmother is orphaned very quickly . They also come from southern Europe. And on the grandfather's side, they are more from Champagne. The grandmother is rather Spain, Italy, maternal grandmother. On the other hand, the grandfather is rather from Champagne France,

RG: But when did they come to Paris?

RGo: Me, my parents have always been Parisians. They met in Paris at a very young age, and I was always brought up in Paris in a very popular district. Which was the foot of Montmartre, of the Butte Montmartre, between the flea markets of Saint-Ouen, the Porte Clignancourt and then the back of Pigalle, the back of Montmartre. So it's an extremely busy, popular neighborhood. A little less now, of course, but at the time it was very mixed, very lively and Parisian

RG: What was your father doing?

RGo: My father worked in the cinema as an operator. That is to say to the camera, as a cameraman, as an operator. He started out as a photographer, so he was always in the picture. And my mother took care of the three children, so she didn't work

RG: How did the studies go?

RGo: Well, studies ... Rather at the time when high schools were still there, few children had access to high school, to secondary studies. That is to say, it was very quickly separated. At the age of fourteen they went to technical colleges, where they learned wood, iron, and finally manual work, for those who were not apprentices. Grossomodo there were a third of the children who were immediately directed to learning, which stopped at fourteen, after the certificate. Then there were those whose parents pushed a little bit, but still in manual things, who went to technical study centers that was called, or CET at the time. And then the others, who were a quarter, a third, who could go to high school. And of this high school went for a fifth in the faculties. So at the time it was very selective, but not by exams, only by birth. There was very little access for working-class or lower-income backgrounds to secondary and higher education. Almost nobody. It was reserved only for the bourgeoisie or petty bourgeoisie. But at this time, in the sixties, there is the emergence of the new middle classes. So we see high schools explode. But mathematically, geographically, there are plenty of young people. And what will explain the key to the revolt of '68, it will happen in the sixties access for working class or more modest backgrounds to secondary and higher education. Almost nobody. It was reserved only for the bourgeoisie or petty bourgeoisie. But at this time, in the sixties, there is the emergence of the new middle classes. So we see high schools explode. But mathematically, geographically, there are plenty of young people. And what will explain the key to the revolt of '68, it will happen in the sixties access for working class or more modest backgrounds to secondary and higher education. Almost nobody. It was reserved only for the bourgeoisie or petty bourgeoisie. But at this time, in the sixties, there is the emergence of the new middle classes. So we see high schools explode. But mathematically, geographically, there are plenty of young people. And what will explain the key to the revolt of '68, it will happen in the sixties

RG: But you yourself ...

RGo: I am part of the bourgeoisie, the petty bourgeoisie. That is to say, the people who are going ... My father has an excellent job, very, very well paid. My mother is at home and we

are in a very privileged environment. Where parents read a lot, where the people we hang out with are people who are more of an intellectual background: acrobats, actors, the theater ... So it's a very open intellectual environment. So it goes without saying that I will go to high school. There is no problem, it is almost natural. So naturally I go to high school, one of the Parisian high schools, Condorcet, therefore one of the very large high schools in Paris. Who trained and who has always trained since the 1800s part of the elite for the grandes écoles, the hypokhâagne, finally the preparations. They are famous high schools, with extremely harsh discipline. And it is high schools which at the time were not mixed. They are only boys and rather from the same families or the same background. There are very few children of workers and very few children of immigrants. Or there is none elsewhere

RG: And were you a good student or ...?

RGo: No, no. I was an average student

RG: Difficult?

RGo: No, not difficult at all. I never had any particular problems at school. When you look at the newsletters, it's average. That is to say, there is always marked: 'Can do better if it is a little more work or if he was a little more interested'. But that interested me absolutely not. On the other hand I found it boring, I found it silly. I found the repetition ... The education system did not suit me at all. But absolutely not at all. That is to say, I found it uninteresting to learn by heart, to grumble. I was already, there was something that annoyed me in the system of places, in the notes, in the functioning. While I was completely ready to learn a lot. And by my family, and by the people. So J' was rather ahead of many subjects that I couldn't find in high school. Or that I thought they were completely dumb or crazy and they made us repeat bullshit that we did not understand at the time. In fact, teachers have to do the basics, which is a hassle. But since they didn't explain it, we thought it was annoying, that's all. So we were a small nucleus, five, six per class to be completely elsewhere. But not particularly bad students we thought it was annoying, that's all. So we were a small nucleus, five, six per class to be completely elsewhere. But not particularly bad students we thought it was annoying, that's all. So we were a small nucleus, of five, six per class, to be completely elsewhere. But not particularly bad students

RG: But when you say 'us' it was ...

RGo: Rather, they were the smartest, smartest, funniest boys. Who weren't at the top of the class, but who weren't last either. Who were the most open to the outside world. That way we met by affinity, by sympathy. And that's at the very beginning, and inevitably in the years, I really talk about when I was very very young. But from the years '65, when I'm fourteen, fifteen, that is to say when I become a teenager, what will make the difference is those who have a political concern compared to what happens. And there we had barely emerged from the Algerian war. So concerns about torture, concerns about protests. There were huge protests in Paris, but really huge, in '62. I must have been eleven, twelve, it was Charonne. There were five or six hundred thousand people, but all the Parisian people who had come down against the dead from the Charonne metro. Afterwards there are huge demonstrations for Algeria, of course, but after for Vietnam. And especially in the years '65, '66, led by the Communist Party and the Peace Movement. Who ran an organization which was the Peace Movement, which was international. And in this Peace Movement, there were very regular large masses, where we met. And that will make a selection in high schools. That is to say that little by little we will find ourselves, like that, small nuclei. So there are high schools that are very politicized, already at the time. Because of the Algerian war. So it's going to be Voltaire, where there are cinema preparation classes, or IDEC. And then Jacques Decour, who has had a tradition all along, through the writers who have been there, through the Resistance. Which are very hard cores, where there are large classes. So there are almost students. And the students will train the people in their final year, who will take an interest in the youngest.

RG: But Condorcet was politicized like that?

RGo: Much less. But there were big classes. So there were pre-student prep classes. So they, already, read the newspaper, were aware of the political problems. And it will be the mixture of the big and the young, and especially the political news, which is only Vietnam, mainly Vietnam, will create groups in the years '66. And there there will be a radicalization in the years '66, '67. Where these young high school students of which I was no longer will accept the Peace Movement, will say: but this slogan of peace in Vietnam is stupid, the Vietnamese must win. So for the victory of the Vietnamese we are on the slogan: 'FLN will win!'. So it is something of combat. There is going to be a break with the Communist Party and the membership in small groups which advocated, let's say, more offensive things. So, either the Maoists, who said: the Communist Party is revisionists, that is to say, they are revising Marxism, they are no longer Marxism. It wasn't my school, it wasn't my thought family. That, this family of thought, was more for the high school students on the left bank: Louis the Great, Henri IV. We were more like Trotskyites. Where there were three groups: Lutte Ouvrière, which still exists with Arlette Laguiller, Lambertists, which are Jospin, the group where there was Jospin, and the JCR, where there was Krivine, which is the current group, always the same group. And this Trotskyist group set up an organization in '66 called the Revolutionary Communist Youth. Who was the heiress of the PC,

RG: So you were part of this Trotskyite group?

RGo: In '66, at the creation. At the JCR

RG: And through contacts?

RGo: Like that, by the demonstrations. And by the fact that we found ourselves the five most agitated of a high school or another high school. And in particular Jacques Decour or Voltaire were always in the lead. And so they came to make distributions at the school. And then we met, we discuss. Children at that age, everyone is talking. If there are some who like music, they will meet up with each other. If there are any who like stamp collections, they'll end up in high school. Well there it was those who were more outside or worn on

RG: But we weren't allowed to meet for that in high schools

RGo: No, no, it was absolutely forbidden. But on the other hand all our families, of all, if we take for example a statistical study of all these boys at the time who are fourteen, fifteen, sixteen years old, all their parents were members of the Communist Party. Or their mothers. Everyone is born, the matrix, the fundamental thing is that all the parents have campaigned and all the parents have stopped campaigning. There are no longer any who militate. They quit in the fifties, '56, after the war. They gave up and they got into some pretty notable positions. But they were all communists

RG: So your father ...

RGo: He was a communist. Not my mother. But my father had been an activist. He was still a trade unionist, but he had been a communist militant until '56, until the time of Hungary

RG: Because we often think of the conflict of generations

RGo: Ah not at all

RG: But we see that children rather follow their parents ...

RGo: Ah yes, we don't at all. So there is absolutely no conflict. Discussions take place in families, in all families. I see the parents of my friends, my friends see my parents, everyone is talking. There is no opposition. There is no opposition at all, even for going out, for freedom, for authorizations. Freer ... There is no reason to revolt against parents. The parents are released, are liberal, are very open. And it is often intellectual professions, so far ahead of the rest of society. No, no, on the contrary, parents encourage us

RG: So the revolt is against society?

RGo: Yes, yes. No, but against ... We are the heirs of the revolt that there has been all the time, and we do not understand why the parents stopped. We want to make the revolution as it was done in Russia. We are the direct heirs of '17. For example, you were discussing with one or the other - well, now it's incomprehensible, absolutely incomprehensible - but for example you said '48, me you said to me '48, necessarily it was 1848. And you shouldn't say 1800. You told me '70 or '71, I knew that it was the war of '70 and that it could not be 1770, or 1570. It doesn't mean anything. '70 or '71, I knew it was the Commune

RG: And this knowledge came from reading, from discussions?

RGo: Parents, discussions, which were everyday. There was no television, or very little. So it was just discussions. And afterwards, from the moment there is this group, the JCR, we will do, we will attend training schools almost every week. And we are about thirty high school students to redo the entire history of the workers' movement

RG: And where was it?

RGo: It took place on rue de Sèvres-Babylone in a small room which was lent by I think the Protestants. Finally a small room like that with a hundred seats. Where the students, who will become all the leaders of the May movement, who are Bensaïd, Weber, Krivine, well everyone, Verbizier, a whole series of students, who, them, had made a break in '65 to UEC, in the Union of Communist Students, they were gone. This is what we called the Italians, where there was Kouchner, where there was absolutely everyone. Even the Maoists from elsewhere were in this group. And from there it exploded into different groups. And the leaders of the JCR, therefore who will create the JCR, who were already members of the Communist Party, finally members of the Fourth International, are going to create the JCR in '66 and will train us. High school students will become the basis of this organization

RG: And the high school action committees date from what period?

RGo: It's later that, it's much later. That's '67, just before '68. The high school action committees were set up because following demonstrations for Vietnam and then a demonstration against the Fouchet law. What we called a reform of National Education, the sixteenth or the twentieth or the thirtieth, I do not know, well, whatever, anyway it had no interest. But we all mobilized to call for a strike, with the UNEF, with the students. And then I was caught at the time of the organization of this strike and I was excluded for three days from high school. And then there was another mobilization where I returned to high school, despite my exclusion. And there I was definitively excluded. Expelled from high school for political activity. And suddenly the meetings to protest, the demonstrations that took place in front of the school, but that with high school students, we were five hundred, six hundred high school students, which is already a lot at the time, created, it gave birth, in February or March (so I had to be excluded in December '67) and in February the CALs, the high school action committees, were born. And the CALs are going to be the spearhead of the crisis of '68. Then it is these high school action committees that will come into contact with March 22, with SNESup, with students and teachers to set up '68. And that explains very well '68. Because in the CALs, there were several trends. There were the anarchists, the Pabloites, who are of Trotskyist tendency, and then the Frankists, who were our tendencies. All the other groups did not exist, there were not the Maoists, there were not the Lambertists. But in March 22 there were, like, the anarchists, the Frankists and the Pabloites, not the Lambertists

RG: But the Frankists and the Pabloites, why?

RGo: Frankists, because Frank was in charge of a section of the Fourth International, which was called Pierre Frank. And Pabloites because Pablo, and Lambertists, because Lambert. Finally, it is leaders within the Fourth International. When it exploded, there are four leaders: Posadas, Lambert, Frank and Pablo. And then we called each group according to the oldest

RG: So you explain that it is your exclusion that provoked the demonstrations and the formation of the CALs

RGo: Well, it was mechanical. That is to say, when I was excluded, all the high schools came together to ask that I be reinstated. As I was not reinstated and I was excluded from high school, we immediately set up a committee, we called it High School Action Committee, for freedom of expression in high schools. So that gave birth to CALs. But we didn't know at all that we were going towards '68 there. We didn't know, but hey, a mass organization was being set up. And there we were everywhere, in the provinces, to create high school action committees everywhere. And we started to put out a high school newspaper

RG: And when you say 'we', who is it?

RGo: Well, it was the leadership of the JCR. There we were a high school management, where we were a representative by high school. And as there were extremely active militants in Carnot, Voltaire, Decour, which was really the nucleus, in some high schools on the left bank, but it was rather the Maoists, and then in Buffon. Grossomodo, in the leadership of the JCR, we were caught in the thirty who attended these training schools. In the thirty, there are ten who will become leaders. Who are a representative per high school. So there is the person in charge of Carnot, the person in charge of Condorcet, the person in charge of Voltaire, the person in charge of Decour. At Decour they were still more, there were at least four or five. And then after each high school. And this high school management, we meet every week, and there we decide actions for the demonstrations, for Che Guevara, for everything. We are a direction of the high school movement

RG: Because you were definitively excluded, so your studies were over?

RGo: No. Because there is a law in France which means that you do not have the right, if the child has not finished his studies, I think it is sixteen years old, and me it fell right there, you

have not the right to exclude him completely from the school system. So they have to find a place for you. And if not, let's admit that I was still excluded, I was obliged to follow in private education at that time. It was impossible to be completely taken out of the school system. So they are going to find me a place in Voltaire. Who was a hard core already from the far left. So I went from agitator of a high school then there quite in my environment, to Voltaire, in another high school. And that's where '68 will kick in. I have no problem, because there I know all the leaders and everyone knows me. That is to say I arrive like an agitator already from another high school

RG: And when did you meet Recanati?

RGo: Recanati, immediately, in the years '65, '66. He's a friend very, very quickly ... He's at Decour, he's a little older than me, he must be a year older or a year and a half. He is much brighter academically, he is an excellent student, but really an excellent student. He's not like us at all, no way, he's brilliant, and he's very politicized by his parents too, of course

RG: Because his parents what are they ...

RGo: They were responsible for the Communist Party, had made the Resistance. It was good officials, but who had been more militant for years. Same, they had to quit in '56

RG: His family was of Italian origin?

RGo: Jewish, everyone was Jewish, I don't know the origin anymore, a Sephardic Jew, but I don't know from which ... No Tunisia, maybe Spanish, maybe Marrano or I don't really know where it came from . And they will be in the Resistance. They are aristocrats. Because there is still a difference, which there was not in my family: the fact of being Jewish and communist rallied to the Bolshevik tradition, then there from further on. But not the Ashkenazi, who are in the leadership of the JCR. For example it is Krivine, Bensaïd, Weber, all come from Poland or Eastern countries or from Jews who are quite used to exile since the dawn of time. That is to say, they are from one country, from another country. A vision, an internationalist conception, or of the world, that

RG: But there have been difficult times for the Jews in the meantime, between the Bolshevik revolution and '68

RGo: But not for the Trotskyites. Because the Trotskyists have always seen themselves as the nucleus which has always been right. So maybe they were liquidated, maybe they were killed, maybe they were murdered, of course there was the Shoah but still, they are elected from among the elect. That is, it is conscious election. It is not at all religious, but absolutely not religious. They are quite secular, but it is an election as a conception of aristocracy, of the avant-garde, of those who set an example

RG: Did you have a cult of the Manouchian group?

RGo: How?

RG: It was the Manouchian group ... in '44

RGo: Those, yes. But these are more about immigration. That is to say, they are not necessarily Jews. It turns out that this was the case with MOI: the leadership of the workers' workforce, were German leaders, who came from Germany, who were Spartacists. But the MOI will be a group more linked, finally linked, or denounced by the Communist Party and the Stalinists who will use it. But he didn't have much connection with the Trotskyites. It was more immigration, let's say. But not necessarily Jews, it was more the Armenians, the Spaniards. They were coming, they were coming from, the Red Poster group, were more from the crushed Spanish Revolution or the crushed German revolution. They all rather came from 1930, failures in Germany and then in Spain. But they were all linked to the Communist Party, not to the Trotskyist groups at all. Whereas we took them as an example, of course. They were taken as internationalists. Of course they were our idols. Because at the time the Stalinists, it is true that now they talk a lot about the Red Poster, but at the beginning, they did not support it. They started the Resistance against the German-Soviet Pact, which made them Trotskyists in thought, but not at all in practice they were not supporting. They started the Resistance against the German-Soviet Pact, which made them Trotskyists in thought, but not at all in practice they were not supporting. They started the Resistance against the German-Soviet Pact, which made them Trotskyists in thought, but not at all in practice

RG: And what was the relationship between your cinematographic interests and your political commitment?

RGo: None, none. At the time none. I think, I don't know at all. I made little films like that, for fun. But I don't have at all a vision of, which moreover has remained, I don't think that cinema should be used for anything. I don't have a utilitarian view. So I am opposed to the Communist Party which makes militant films. I find militant films particularly silly. But even when I was young, I find it stupid. And I'm more, I don't use the cinema. That is to say that, yes, to record, I happen to be filming like that. But more for fun, not with a mink, I have no idea what I'm going to do, things are happening so extraordinary that by reflex I'm going to film them. But I don't have the idea to tell the story. I am not at all fascinated by militant films. It bothers me. I don't know them any more, I know very little. And I'm not at all a film theorist, but not at all! I wouldn't say anything about the cinema, I don't care at all, I go to the cinema to discuss, with friends, but because there are girls, because there are boys, because we are laughing. But I don't care. In addition, I am in this environment, everyone who comes to the house talks only about that. So I know cinema by capillarity, like a sponge, because everyone talks about it. But me, personally, it never fascinated me. Unlike, for example, lots of directors who collected all the books on cinema, newspapers on cinema, who wrote for the cinema. Me, that's me never occurred to the idea, but never! It's not my training at all. I have no theoretical training at all. Nothing moreover, neither in politics, nor ...

RG: And we can't participate and film at the same time

RGo: Plus, at one point, I much prefer the action to the way I tell it. I would rather do things than tell them or say them. I prefer to be in the movement rather than analyze it. And besides I knew very well, being friends with Recanati or with the others, it was part of their job, to analyze. Me, my part in the ... It was more to do things, in the realization, let's say, rather than in the analysis. But anyway it bored me, everything bored me. The meetings bored me, the analyzes bored me. I was okay, but I chose, I was quite capable of choosing that over that, but pfft ... It all bore me, all the time, all the time. I much preferred to go out, go with all the little lovers of the time, all the stories. I put a lot more energy into it than in meetings or reading. While there were plenty of other children, since we were children at the time, or adolescents, who read, but it was unbelievable what ... They knew by heart the history of the Russian revolution, books on Che, discussions on such and such a point of history. While me it never ... Well, no more than that. I know the history, I know the classics, but not a study, not as a dogma. Not like a religion We were children at the time, or adolescents, who read, but it was unbelievable what ... They knew by heart the history of the Russian revolution, the books on Che, the discussions on such and such a point of history. While me it never ... Well, no more than that. I know the history, I know the classics, but not a study, not as a dogma. Not like a religion We were children at the time, or

adolescents, who read, but it was unbelievable what ... They knew by heart the history of the Russian revolution, the books on Che, the discussions on such and such a point of history. While me it never ... Well, no more than that. I know the history, I know the classics, but not a study, not as a dogma. Not like a religion

RG: You spoke a little about girls, while saying that these high schools were not mixed. The Trotskyists, the leaders, were more or less macho, right?

RGo: Yes, that was it, yes

RG: So the role of girls ...

RG: Well, the role of girls ... The girls were in high schools, the same, at the same time. And so we, our great pleasure, as a leader or as a manager, was to go to these high schools. And then to make propaganda, discussions, speeches, or whatever, the creation of CALs or Vietnam committees. And suddenly, within the organization itself, in the group of thirty, there must have been about fifteen young girls and us, about fifteen. And there was a rivalry like that between the fifteen boys for these fifteen young girls who were each prettier than the other or more desirable. But everyone was very young, we were fifteen, sixteen. So it was not easy at the time, it was not easy. But there was a lot of love intrigue, in the platonic sense, finally flirting, at that time. Sixteen-year-olds, seventeen-year-olds, there were a lot of stories, but they weren't love stories. It was dramatic at the time, but it was mostly flirtatious. With young girls who were all absolutely gorgeous. I have very precise memories of that time. The girls were really very very beautiful. So I don't know if it was because it selected, they were the smartest, the best educated, the most ... From background, it's the same, they came from the same background, all from the same background. So is it because it came from there, I don't know, or because they were young. And then it's like that, at sixteen there aren't really any children who are horrible.

RG: But you didn't find a certain gap between this political movement, which was serious, macho, etc., and then on the girls side, the cultural revolution, the sexual revolution?

RGo: No, no, not at all. Because we were in youth groups. So to have created CALs at the JCR, we were not at all, well of course we belonged to the Fourth International, to the history of communism, of Trotskyism, but we did not care! We were sixteen. So we are all

the dough that explains '68. That is to say, it is thanks to these young people who did not take the whole story into account. And then there was a movement of revolt and it fed on young people who did not have knowledge of all the texts, who were not in the dogma. So what made it extremely funny and likeable was that people were seventeen, eighteen. And that explains a lot of things about '68 by the way

RG: So how did you experience '68?

RGo: Oh beh '68 it was quite something ... We were so immersed in the history of the workers' movement that we found it quite normal that the first reaction, as soon as there was had the students ... Well, already my exclusion, to make demonstrations. Afterwards, when there were the arrests in Nanterre, well we mobilized. And then after when those who mobilized were arrested, well it is to make a wider mobilization. Complitley normal. The first movements will start to demand the release of our comrades. And then the police react badly and the government reacts very badly and suddenly we will decide to hold and obtain this release. So to do what is called a sit-in. And the sit-in takes such proportions that we decide to stay all night and that there, quite naturally, as if that posed no problem, we build barricades as if we had built them all the time. But as if we were, what I was telling you earlier, in 1830, 1848, 1871, 1968, all we have to do is build barricades and there you go. So we all lived like insurgents. Whereas it was, of course afterwards when we look at the hindsight and the history, of course that we were in the simulacrum, in the repetition. But we were still in the rehearsal. It's true that it wasn't serious, but we were still rehearsing something serious. And it would have been enough if there was a drama, that is to say that the police shoot for example, which fortunately very intelligently they did not. Because they too had the same memory. By saying: if there is ever a dead person, it will be an insurrection in Paris. So they waited five in the morning, six in the morning, and then they left. Instead of shutting down like in the police system, of locking everything up and people being, well after a while you have no more solution, or you get drunk, or you are suffocated, or you are arrested, finally good c is terrible. There they had left a very, very large part, towards the Goblins, open. So much so that they drove people away quietly. Of course we fought, we fought, but in the end we all had to leave. They were not waiting for us on the other side, shooting at us like at the time of the Commune or at other historical moments. So the police were very smart. However, in the street at that time, it was their children too. We were all sons of. That is to say, it was still difficult to shoot all the sons of ministers, or the sons of civil servants, all the sons of party officials.

RG: Who were you with at the time in particular?

RGo: Everyone, we were all the youth. There we were ten or fifteen thousand. But those fifteen thousand children of seventeen or eighteen were all the children of. That is to say there would have been the slightest death in there, it was necessarily someone. He was not a worker. They weren't kids, it wasn't like now in the suburbs. There you kill someone from that background, high school students, it was necessarily you kill one of the children of a minister, a president, whatever. But it was really the class, it was all the same the revolt of a whole class which was the bourgeoisie

RG: But for you at the time or the Trotskyites, what was the relationship with the workers' movement and the strikes?

RGo: Ah well there we were doing ... It's religious. It was believed that these demonstrations would trigger workers' mobilization and that we would overtake the Communist Party and create a new revolutionary Communist Party and end in insurrection and overthrow. As in 1917. We were going to make the Bolshevik revolution. We were only doing all this agitation to become the new revolutionary Communist Party. So we thought that the students were petty bourgeois, that it was an interesting movement of revolt, but not decisive. For that to be decisive, we had to build the revolutionary party. And they're going to write a book called From Revolt to Revolution or May '68, dress rehearsal. For us May '68 was a rehearsal of what

RG: But all the same in May '68 there were workers' strikes,

RGo: Yes, okay, but hey, we weren't approaching! A leftist approaching a factory, he had no chance. It was held by the CGT, by the Communist Party. There is only in Nantes where the Lambertists, who were another group, not ours, they had a few militants at Sud-Aviation. And they succeeded in the city of Nantes to have contact with the working class. But for us leftists, well I was really a leftist, we had no contact with. And we were kept at a distance. No student approached, no high school student approached a factory. The Communist Party was very strong at the time, it represented millions of union members and then millions of voters. And the leftists were denounced as provocateurs, sons of policemen, Trotskyists

RG: Was there a Trotskyist presence in Flins?

RGo: No, no. In Flins there were the Maoists who had tried to put. So the Maoists had made another tactic. They had put people, in the years '67, established, to go to the factories. So they, from the largest schools, students, had voluntarily returned to factories. And it turns out that in a few factories, when there was the crisis of '68, at the end of '68, in Flins, there were two or three of their militants who were in the factories. At Renault, at Flins. Well, it was ridiculous, absolutely ridiculous. And that will lead to disasters anyway, this system too. It was the line 'serve the people', that '

RG: Because you were the avant-garde?

RGo: We were the vanguard. So everyone pretended to be smarter than the people, which was true (RG laughs) and that we were going to show them the direction. While they, they put themselves more stupid than the people to say, by example, since we are near you, since we are next, and therefore it gave nothing but horrors. People who read more, who listened to more music, who pretended to be. While the goal is not to be a worker in life, it is precisely that there is no more work. The communist ideal would be for there to be no more exploitation of man by man. So what was the best way to get there? In any case it is sure that it was not the Maoists, and certainly not with the example that they were giving. Because if we push the Maoist example a little bit, it simply gives the Khmer Rouge. That is to say that after a while all the intellectuals, all the people who think, who do not work, who are not in the factory, we kill them, because they are not part of the people. So it's a horror. Well, there weren't many. And they really almost, in the '70s and '71, slipped into armed action. Well yes, as long as we do, since the people are right, they are the people, and then there is more than to kill the bosses. What they did in Italy, what they did not do in France for a moment all the intellectuals, all the people who think, who do not work, who are not in the factory, they are killed, because they are not part of the people. So it's a horror. Well, there weren't many. And they really almost, in the '70s and '71, slipped into armed action. Well yes, as long as we do, since the people are right, they are the people, and then there is more than to kill the bosses. What they did in Italy, what they did not do in France for a moment all the intellectuals, all the people who think, who do not work, who are not in the factory, they are killed, because they are not part of the people. So it's a horror. Well, there weren't many. And they really almost, in the '70s and '71, slipped into armed action. Well yes, as long as we do, since the people are right, they are the people, and then there is more than to kill the bosses. What they did in Italy, what they did not do in France Well yes, as long as we do, since the people are right, they are the people, and then there is more than to kill the bosses. What they did in Italy, what they did not do in France Well yes, as long as we do, since the people are right, they are the people, and then there is more than to kill the bosses. What they did in Italy, what they did not do in France

RG: But what was your take on violence?

RGo: Ah well we were hyper-violent, more than violent, since we were Bolsheviks. We believe that violence has an importance in history, but relying on the masses. But not minority violence. Except in the event of Nazi occupation or dictatorship, where yes, everyone is for terrorism in the extreme left or communist groups. But as communists, or as Trotskyists (but it's the same thing), for us it was the same ideology: as communists we are for violence, of course. Only violence can advance history. But it has to be violence that is not a minority. We need violence that is mass violence. Okay as much to say an impossible thing. It's impossible. It is a vision. We were for violence, theoretically. But in practice, we did of course take violent actions, but very limited ones. As soon as we went too far, either the management stopped us, so that we did not go into terrorism. Either the police would arrest everyone. There was a very clever game in France between an extremely intelligent political police, because of the OAS, the fight against the OAS, against right-wing extremism, against the Algerian war, on torture. They were very developed in France. So they very quickly stopped any terrorist or pre-terrorist nucleus. While in Italy or Germany, the police were not used to this, they had been liquidated, since they were fascist police forces, they had been purged. While in France the fascist police still existed, the political police, Gaullist, existed. And when they saw the leftists arrive, very quickly they followed them, infiltrated, arrested them. Not tortured, of course, it rhyme to nothing

RG: Did they infiltrate you?

RGo: There was, I don't know ... The police said that their goal was not what they had, but their goal was one in two. That is to say that one in two, it was a policeman

RG: Really?

RGo: No, but as an informant, not a policeman paid by the police. But their goal ... And I think in extreme left groups they succeeded in that. For example in Direct Action

RG: And among you?

RGo: Among us we had plenty. Yes of course. But we let them

RG: They weren't purged?

RGo: No, no. At all. Because if we purge them, there is another one that happens. So we left them, that way we were quiet, we knew that they were informing the police. We used them, we gave them false information. But as the police also knew ... Anyway, it's a game as old as rebellion movements exist. But their job, their theoretical goal, was to infiltrate, to have the perfect knowledge of all the groups, of all the leaders. But in the end it's not more complicated than that, because it was only a few hundred people. It was not very complicated for a device. Police officers are paid and they work around the clock. It never stops. While the activists ... (RG laughs) Between love stories, work, the here, the that. Of course we campaign, but we don't just do that. While a normal, democratic police apparatus, I'm not talking about a fascist apparatus, they are paid and they work all the time, every day, every day. After a while, if every day you fill out forms, you make connections, after a while you know a lot more than we do.

RG: But for you too '68 was the dress rehearsal, the big night, the theater ... How was it?

RGo: Ah beh the image, or the goal, or the representation that we had was the Bolshevik revolution. It was Ten Days That Shook the World and John Reed's Book. That was it. Finally, in the myth

RG: Because the movement continued in the seventies

RGo: Yes, of course. The movement continued, but there it separated very severely. With those who said (the Maoists): we must go into the factories, we who said: we must create a workers' organization, a Communist Party. And then the anarchists or the sympathetic Trotskyists, let's say, those who had made '68, who say: but no, we must make a great anti-authoritarian movement. A great youth movement. Which is based on social movements: the struggle for free transport, feminist movements, homosexual movements. Finally, let's say, grossomodo, the movementists. What we will understand later

RG: Like Long Live the Revolution

RGo: That's it. Long live the Revolution, it is they who will be the spearhead. And we don't. We are in a completely classic perspective of building a classic Communist Party. Finally Trotskyist, but classic. While VLR, it is the trend really stemming from '68, movementist. And the maos, they are completely crazy, they are for ... They will explode in the years '72, but for two years they will try to set an example by serving the people. That is to say to be in the homes, to be in the factories, to serve the people, to really be, a very Maoist position. Finally, it's going to be three big movements, three big trends after '68. But we are going to stay very classic by saying: well, beh, it was very good '68, but it didn't work out. And it didn't work because there was no party, there was no leadership. So we're gonna set the direction

RG: And the Trotskyists had a particular influence in the high school environment with the high school movement?

RGo: Ah yes, huge. In high school and student circles. Trotskyists, all groups included, between LO, the JS (it was the Lambertists) and then the League, eighty percent led the movement. And the high school student movement at the time, it must have been around fifteen thousand people, fifteen, twenty thousand activists. Which is a lot, that's a lot in college. And if there are roughly around that, I think, a maximum of fifteen thousand militants, it is afterwards to mobilize, for the demonstrations, there can be a lot of people

RG: So the big moments, the big events, what were they?

RGo: Good bah, there will be huge demonstrations for the Paris Commune in '71, there will be demonstrations against the extreme right, in '71. Against the death of Pierre Overney in '72, there are two hundred or three hundred thousand people. And then after the very big demonstration, which will be the last, against the extreme right, Le Pen, in '73. And there everyone will be banned, all organizations from May '68 will be banned. And this is the last demonstration, very violent, in Paris, and important. But let's say that the most important in terms of number, or number, is the one on the funeral of Pierre Overney, but already symbolic, because it is for someone's funeral. It's like the end of a movement at the same time. Let's say that is the last time leftists took so many people to the streets. It must have been two hundred thousand. So there was in the years '73, there was also Lip, in Besançon. It was already almost the other movement, more already the movementists who won, the self-management, the PSU and the beginning of the PS. But it was over with the League. Finally, the organization that I knew myself, grossomodo ended in '73. The movement that I knew in the years '66 ends in '73. The historical movement. And most of us, we'll take it

easy from that. '72, '73, '74. There is no argument or shouting at all. People leave like this. While in the other groups, among the Lambertists, there are exclusions, settling of scores, well it is terrible. Among the Maoists it's horrible too, with criticism, trials, a terrible mess. Among the anarchists not at all, because it is a tradition, each one does what he wants. But with us, in this group, which was of course the most important group of leaders, or even of militants, people leave without drama. Go on tiptoe, like that

RG: In '73

RGo: There are many who have left, yes

RG: Is there no debate that you have been banned?

RGo: None. Never political disagreement. Nobody said, did not try to ... There were trends, but there was not a group that said: we made mistakes, we made mistakes, and we are going to leave, we are going create something else. No. People, they have had enough, they leave, they stop. But individually, not in a group. Or then some take part in the creation of VLR or groups like that, in disagreement, but on completely minority things. But en masse, like that, no. People were leaving. We would say: oh yes, then there is more, we see him more, and we could see him again three months later, or six months later, at a demonstration, or at a rally. There was no big break, what. People left like that, quietly. And there's a tiny little kernel that remained, but really a really tiny kernel

RG: Did they realize that the years of protest, of dissent, were over?

RGo: Yes, yes. But they weren't against them. They were for implantation in the serious working class. Small bulletins in ... A bit like Lutte Ouvrière. So there was also a turning point even within the JCR. Who no longer existed, but the Communist League which became a workers' organization. Finally, with a working-class vocation, let's say. So they too were fed up with all this leftist, high school, revolt stuff. It didn't interest them either. So everyone quietly separated like that, saying: the period is over. The period of turmoil ended quietly

RG: And you, have you taken your life back?

RGo: Well me anyway I started working in the '69, '70. So I had started working in the cinema as a technician. Then there I made several pieces of film. And then after that I learned my job as an assistant. So I continued to see them, they were still friends, I was always aware of what was happening at the political level, but let's say that I started to work too

RG: With directors in particular?

RGo: Yes, yes. There will be a whole series of films that I will make as an assistant with directors like Polanski, or Chantal Akerman, or Godard. Yes, yes, very prestigious people. In the contacts or the ... But it must be said that we had been imagining (those who came from the extreme left movements), we were ten times smarter, faster and intelligent, really intelligent, compared to those who were coming out of schools. Because we had already made all the demonstrations, the fights. So when you're a movie assistant, you're asked to solve a real-life thing, it's very, very easy, like we've been in the organization. I have always been in organizational matters. So I had no problem being an assistant. And it is why it was very very fast, I could choose what I wanted. That is to say, to be with one director rather than another. Because at the work level, it was not complicated. It was a period when there was a lot of work in the cinema. By that I mean it was a generational renewal. That is to say the parents started to be older, and the younger ones arrived. So we came to a time when it was the baby boom. So now it's more complicated for the young people, because we are not yet old enough to make room for them (RG laughs), so it gets stuck a little bit. But it was the same problem. That is to say that we have just arrived at a period of transition between one generation and another.

RG: And politically?

RGo: Politically we remained, well as far as I am concerned, I rather remained on the left, then more of the extreme left, but of a radical left. And after an analysis of the errors linked to dogma, dogmatism, Stalinism, Trotskyism. And suddenly I will gradually move towards a much more reformist vision. For the change of society, but more classic, socialist

RG: Socialist Party outright?

RGo: No, no, not at all. I have never been attracted to the Socialist Party. But it happened to me to be completely in agreement with the functioning or at the level of votes and positions, it was more my family. I was never militant, but I was rather, yes, more ... I became closer to the reformists than to the extreme left. Little by little

RG: And the girls, did it go on?

RGo: Ah yes, yes, all the time! Finally I got married, no I did not get married, but I was living as a couple myself, very quickly. I was alive ... But that did not prevent parallel stories from each other. As much for my partner as for me, it is a completely liberated period. So of course that caused a lot of problems, but in fact no, not so much for that matter! Where everyone lived through stories based on their encounters and then ... I don't know, we were twenty, twenty-five. So we did not ask ourselves the problem of children, we did not ask ourselves the problem of the couple, well we did not have any problem elsewhere. We were completely free and quiet. Of course it was not without problems, but it was not dramatic. And it's always been like that, yes. A very great desire, desire, appetite for meetings, stories, love stories. Or not even love, not even passion for that matter. I was extremely suspicious of anything that was too much of the order of pathos or definitive stuff. Yes, I had stories, and then it was okay. I could be with a girl, and then with another, and then after another ... It had no dramatic consequences, I was never too drawn to the story of a love that would be unique, fusional, passionate . Yes, of course, I've always lived with someone all the time, ten years with one, ten years with the other. Or always had couple relationships. But I never really believed in a functioning ... We were also quite close to communist teaching of the classic type, well libertarian. Libertarian communist, communist. Because in all socialist countries abortion was widely authorized, well before France. There was a relationship to the body that was different from Catholic morality or sin and everything. A kind of communist morality, which made us free

RG: And to come to your film, *Dying at thirty*, was it your friend's death that caused the film?

RGo: Yes, the film should never have existed, should never have been made. It is at a given moment, when I learn of this disappearance and that the confirmation of his death ... This is what I tell in the film. Really the film, I tell how it was made. I am so shocked that he is missing and that I have proof there that he is dead, that decides to tell his story. But in fact, to tell my story. This is why I speak to the first people, saying 'I'. This was not done at all in revolutionary movements, because we don't talk about 'I' when we talk about the

revolution. We say 'we', 'them'. And we never talked about ourselves: we never talked about money, we never talked about personal problems. We never talked about our stories elsewhere, girls and all. It was 'us', it was something collective. And there, for the first time, I was speaking in the first person. So, it's a little more complicated than that. That is, when I say 'I', it's not 'I' in fact. It's not me. Me when I say 'he', it's me. I hide behind the fact that he is dead and I say 'he', 'he', 'he'. Since he's dead, no one can check. It's me speaking. When I say 'I', it's a kind of collective 'I' for young people. Let's say I'm lying, I still find a way. It's not really a confession movie. I say what I want, I don't tell the stories. In addition I was very suspicious of a lot of friends who continued to campaign. So this film is still very careful. I tell, it's critical, but it's not very violent. I remain quite close all the same ... In any case, if there was a balance to be made, I remain closer to those who are revolted than to those who have always been close to power. So I don't have to share my stories with people who still consider enemies, at the time anyway, in the eighties I stay closer to those who are revolted than to those who have always been close to power. So I don't have to share my stories with people who I still consider enemies, at the time anyway, in the eighties I stay closer to those who are revolted than to those who have always been close to power. So I don't have to share my stories with people who I still consider enemies, at the time anyway, in the eighties

RG: But what message did you want ...?

RGo: Critical. It is a critical message. It's not a lyrical film, it's not a romantic film. It's a fairly critical film ... Yes?

[Someone comes in]

He's the editor of the film we're working on. So on the film and then the operation of the film, it is sure that it is still denunciation. On the madness of Bolshevik-type organization, as if I were asking myself the question - and I always ask myself - about a sentence by Marx who says: 'Events always happen twice. Once in tragedy and once in comedy'. But you take, what is the event which is the first? For example, is '70 the comedy of '48 or is it tragedy? So there, given the number of deaths, we can say: OK, it's tragedy. After that, what will happen in the years, at the time of liberation, is the comedy of the Commune? And so on. Is '68 the start, or the tragedy, or the comedy of something? In any case, he is alluding to very precise events, but he was actually dating them in time. But while having fun at that, we experienced the comedy, finally the simulacrum or the staging of revolutionary events. But not at all, quite simply a youthful revolt. And what is dramatic is that a friend, or a relative, an intimate like Recanati could not at one point make the difference between what was a farce, and then he took it tragically. So there are a lot of elements in his personal life that

make it fueled by dramas about everything he says in the letters about his origin or the fact that he was an unadopted child, but d 'a first marriage, or that it was her stepfather and that he did not tell her right away

RG: Because at one point he says: 'I don't have a father'

RGo: That's it. At the beginning, for eighteen years, he did not understand, although he felt very well, that his stepfather was not his father, therefore that his brother was his half-brother. But at the time I don't know why this family made that mistake of telling him nothing, because in fact in the personal discussions with him, what I noticed is that he, since the age five, he knew. Because he had been, like all children, rummaging in drawers and he had seen the birth certificates very well, so he had not been able to understand at five, but he had seen that there was something weird. They were not the same names in the birth certificates, in the family records. So they're completely stupid not to have told him, because he knew. And when they told her, it was too late. It led to a whole series of settling of scores that eventually led to this suicide drive. But I consider that it is ... Well, I was aware of it, he had told me about it and all. Already I did not understand at all what he was telling me. Finally, how could this matter of father or not father be a problem? As a communist, as a revolutionary, I did not understand, I did not see at all what he was talking to me about. And then after that, suicide is still something relatively ridiculous. Because he wouldn't have thrown himself under that train, we would be there talking and everything. It's a fraction of a second. So the fraction of a second, is it worth the life? I don't think so. I believe if someone had held it back and he was not dead, we would be there discussing it. Or that if someone, we have retained him and he starts again five minutes later or a year after and all, well beh okay, everyone is free, and fortunately, to be able to kill themselves. But there I really believe that it is a drive. What a silly thing. After that, what was there as a more complicated intimate drama that I wasn't aware of, which were his obsessions, his madness and all, that every individual, I don't know, why? at some point we commit suicide. He was hyper-intelligent, hyper-smart, hyper-sympathetic. So for me it's absurd, it's still ridiculous. But then maybe there was so much suffering that ... it starts again five minutes later or a year later and all, well beh okay, everyone is free, and fortunately, to be able to kill themselves. But there I really believe that it is a drive. What a silly thing. After that, what was there as a more complicated intimate drama that I wasn't aware of, which were his obsessions, his madness and all, that every individual, I don't know, why? at some point we commit suicide. He was hyper-intelligent, hyper-smart, hyper-sympathetic. So for me it's absurd, it's still ridiculous. But then maybe there was so much suffering that ... it starts again five minutes later or a year later and all, well beh okay, everyone is free, and fortunately, to be able to kill themselves. But there I really believe that it is a drive. What a silly thing. After that, what was there as a more complicated intimate drama that I wasn't aware of, which were his obsessions, his madness and all, that every individual, I don't know, why? at some point we commit suicide. He was hyper-intelligent, hyper-smart, hyper-sympathetic. So for me it's absurd, it's still ridiculous. But then maybe there was so much suffering that ... what was there as a more complicated intimate drama that I wasn't aware of, which were his

obsessions, his madness and all, that every individual, I don't know, why to a given moment we commit suicide. He was hyper-intelligent, hyper-smart, hyper-sympathetic. So for me it's absurd, it's still ridiculous. But then maybe there was so much suffering that ... what was there as a more complicated intimate drama that I wasn't aware of, which were his obsessions, his madness and all, that every individual, I don't know, why to a given moment we commit suicide. He was hyper-intelligent, hyper-smart, hyper-sympathetic. So for me it's absurd, it's still ridiculous. But then maybe there was so much suffering that ...

RG: But was he talking about his suffering after '68?

RGo: Yes, yes, of course. Afterwards, in the letters and correspondence that he recounted in Dying at thirty, saying that he always had, to compensate for a kind of fracture, or injury, pretended to. That is to say, he always tried to be the strongest, the one who ... He always played the comedy. What already in the general comedy of '68, he also played the comedy because he knew that there was something of weakness. That there was a loophole somewhere. Perhaps. I don't really believe in it. I think he explains after the fact, I think he was completely, that he was one hundred percent in what he was doing and then there you go. He was scared, yes okay, everyone was scared. It's true that I I always felt in Michel in the physical stories, he was always a little worried. He was more of an intellectual, let's say. And so it's true that since we were always fighting, at some point he had to take on more than me. Whereas for me, it seemed quite natural to go ... Even what I said at the beginning: all the discussions bored me and all the action amused me. So I was more of a man of action, or an adventurer, whereas he was more of an intellectual. So it's true that when he explains after he forced himself to appear as brave, the strongest, I didn't have to force myself at all. I loved being on the front line (Laughs from RG), taking risks. Of course I was scared like everyone else but scared for a second, then no one is scared anymore. Once it's triggered, we think too much about it. But it is true that there is at a time, necessarily. Without that, it would be absurd, if people weren't afraid, if we weren't afraid, there wouldn't even be any stake. If we're stupid enough not to think this could go wrong, I don't see where the point is. So yes, of course, we are afraid, but by reflection, by intelligence, it is normal to be afraid. And he put this fear down to ... Well, I think he analyzed badly all his life. He was wrong, he was wrong about his whole existence. So the problem would not be at all dramatic, but there it had dramatic consequences, because he simply killed himself. And he was never more than thirty, not even.

RG: But at the beginning of the film you talk about two or three people who are ...

RGo: All who died, who killed themselves. So that was the beginning, but that's nothing! It's absolutely nothing compared to what happened afterwards. That's in the years afterwards,

the seventies. There have been a few suicides, but assumed. That is to say, people who jump out of the window, who take a gun, who kill themselves. Or accidents. But after the film, in the years '85, '86, then it was absolutely terrible! It's nothing what I say at the beginning of Dying at thirty compared to what happened afterwards

RG: Why, what is happening at this time?

RGo: Beh, this is drugs and AIDS. And there it will have consequences for this whole generation, where we will lose half of our friends. All. When the four or five suicides that I quote in Dying at thirty, it is nothing compared to the ten thousand that we are. But after that, if out of ten thousand you have three thousand who die, that's enormous! There is nothing in history, apart from epidemics or wars, there have never been stories like that, where parents are forced to bury children, and we continue. Because there are overdoses, there is AIDS, because there are accidents. It's incredible. In the eighties, from '85, it was absolutely amazing

RG: Did you know Hocquenghem?

RGo: Of course. Guy was a very close friend. And he began, it was he who began with his homosexual and militant activity, started the terrible ball of all those who are going to die of AIDS, their practices, their functioning. And then there will be with the drug, it's incredible, well sometimes it will be the two mixed besides. Plus the accidents, it's gonna be amazing

RG: How do you explain that?

RGo: Ben, a generation that was there for once very enthusiastic, well out of reality let's say, we all lived in a kind of dream. If we accept Freud's explanation of the pleasure principle and the reality principle, we have been in the pleasure principle until thirty years old. Which nevertheless never happened. Finally, it happens for individuals, but not a generation. So a generation that is in a completely unreal thing until the age of thirty, when it comes to having reality, that is to say bumping into reality, well they will do everything. Either in the homosexual over-activist, or in the over-activity of drugs, or in the over-activity of travel, to take risks and die. To put ourselves in a situation as we used to. VS' that is to say as anyway we did not die, given the pleasure principle, we were eternal, and everyone took a lot more risks than generations where parents teach you, or where anyway we see the dead. We

have never seen any deaths, because we are the first generation in the history of humanity where there is no war. It never happened like that. So we are completely ... Everything is possible. And so everything is possible that we are in a completely irenic principle of pure pleasure. Which was perfect. I am not at all for the exemplary nature of the ... It was perfect like that, we had a lot of fun! But by the way, the price to pay is extremely heavy. But that said, blah, peace to their souls. Everyone has ... As we say this image of having burned the candle on both sides, so there was no hesitation! On many of us, it burned down like that. Life lasted thirty years rather than longer. Anyway, I find it absurd now from the position I am in, but I completely understood at the time. I was quite ready to die too, I didn't give a damn. Through all the experiences: the cam, the saws, we tried everything! With a terrible, absolutely terrible sort of unconsciousness. At the time of AIDS, if I haven't caught AIDS, I don't understand why. Because between experiences, sexual adventures, drugs, everyone was shooting. There was, everyone passed their syringe, that went without saying. Well, we're not going to have fun going and taking a syringe for yourself and everything, so that's it for me no wonder everyone is dead. But me, what surprises me is that I am not dead on the other hand. In that period it was normal, it went without saying, we had fun, we continued to have fun, let's say like the teenagers who want to continue. Besides, everything was fine, we had money, no worries. And it was still the full, the culmination of the consumer society, or waste. Futility, bands, fun, cars. It was all easy, but really easy. So after yes, it's like butterflies Besides, everything was fine, we had money, no worries. And it was still the full, the culmination of the consumer society, or waste. Futility, bands, fun, cars. It was all easy, but really easy. So after yes, it's like butterflies Besides, everything was fine, we had money, no worries. And it was still the full, the culmination of the consumer society, or waste. Futility, bands, fun, cars. It was all easy, but really easy. So after yes, it's like butterflies

RG: And when you look at this period from now, what are your thoughts?

RGo: Great. Great to have fun like this. Great not to have blood on my hands as far as I'm concerned. Not to have led anyone on an adventure or to have been responsible myself for a drama on someone. So that's a miracle, but really a miracle. After on myself, delighted not to have died in the process, like many of us and to be able to continue to watch, to enjoy, to travel. And then to be a little more in the pleasure and less in the sequence, in the madness of these years of youth. But for the classic question: if I had to redo with its mistakes, yes of course, I would do it again. But if I am asked: was it better? I say no. There is none, it was not at all the golden age, it was perfect to have lived it like that, but I find it better now (laughs from RG). But I totally understand the youngest people who say: 'Ah, but you're pissing off with '68 'and all. They are right, except that we had a lot of fun as they will never have fun (laughs from RG). Everything was possible for us. It's still great to put up barricades, to throw stuff at the cops, to throw molotov cocktails, to fight non-stop in the street ... Well, I find that absolutely brilliant. And they are unlucky. To study, to learn, to have diplomas to work and all, it's still no luck. Me on my own children ... (RGo laughs) They missed something anyway 'Ah but you piss off with '68 'and all. They are right, except that

we had a lot of fun as they will never have fun (laughs from RG). Everything was possible for us. It's still great to put up barricades, to throw stuff at the cops, to throw molotov cocktails, to fight non-stop in the street ... Well, I find that absolutely brilliant. And they are unlucky. To study, to learn, to have diplomas to work and all, it's still no luck. Me on my own children ... (RGo laughs) They missed something anyway 'Ah but you piss off with' 68 'and all. They are right, except that we had a lot of fun as they will never have fun (laughs from RG). Everything was possible for us. It's still great to put up barricades, to throw stuff at the cops, to throw molotov cocktails, to fight non-stop in the street ... Well, I find that absolutely brilliant. And they are unlucky. To study, to learn, to have diplomas to work and all, it's still no luck. Me on my own children ... (RGo laughs) They missed something anyway it's still great to build barricades, to throw stuff at the cops, to throw molotov cocktails, to fight non-stop in the street ... I think that is absolutely brilliant. And they are unlucky. To study, to learn, to have diplomas to work and all, it's still no luck. Me on my own children ... (RGo laughs) They missed something anyway it's still great to build barricades, to throw stuff at the cops, to throw molotov cocktails, to fight non-stop in the street ... I think that is absolutely brilliant. And they are unlucky. To study, to learn, to have diplomas to work and all, it's still no luck. Me on my own children ... (RGo laughs) They missed something anyway

RG: How old are your children?

RGo: Twenty years old and then the last one is seven years old. There are twenty to seven. They are still small. Twelve years ago, and then lots of little kids and things. There are plenty of them, but grossomodo we had a lot of fun anyway. It's true that it was a bit of a crazy thing, but it was more normal compared to the story in general. I think all the generations, my parents, my grandparents, by the Spanish revolution, by what happened in Italy, by the resistance, by the Spanish flu, by the first world war, by the second world war, by the French revolution ... Well, all the time it was agitated, and there it is a little boring for the young people. When you want to train, take action, meet a destiny and all, it's a bit ... Well, I prefer anyway, even if it was in the fun. And maybe that's why, by the way, it didn't have a tragic side that all previous historical experiences have had. We're fine, there hasn't been any death of a man, apart from two or three unfortunate people. It's okay, it's not at all tragic. So we can completely talk about this period, have fun, laugh, and then as long as we do, which will be the period for everyone, in any generation and even now of course, the youth is when even funnier than when you have to work and bother for most people. So they all dream of when it was recklessness. We mixed that period with the encounter of a historical moment. So for the youngest, those of now, they still have more luck on the story with a capital 'H', because the fact that there was the Berlin Wall, the historical cycle on a real change. Whereas we were confined to a thing of peaceful coexistence and the cold war. Which was preventing everything anyway, the story moving forward. And there, of course, with all its risks and perils, finally everything we know of the period, for someone who wants to move, that is to say is not content to stay in this country, confined, either in Switzerland, or in France, in western or rich countries, I think that history is starting up again as before the second world war. Tipping over. So for anyone who wants to get involved in

the things of the world, history is on the move. There she's really on the move right now because the fact that there was the Berlin Wall, the historical cycle on a real change. Whereas we were confined to a thing of peaceful coexistence and the cold war. Which was preventing everything anyway, the story moving forward. And there, of course, with all its risks and perils, finally everything we know of the period, for someone who wants to move, that is to say is not content to stay in this country, confined, either in Switzerland, or in France, in western or rich countries, I think that history is starting up again as before the second world war. Tipping over. So for anyone who wants to get involved in the things of the world, history is on the move. There she's really on the move right now because the fact that there was the Berlin Wall, the historical cycle on a real change. Whereas we were confined to a thing of peaceful coexistence and the cold war. Which was preventing everything anyway, the story moving forward. And there, of course, with all its risks and perils, finally everything we know of the period, for someone who wants to move, that is to say is not content to stay in this country, confined, either in Switzerland, or in France, in western or rich countries, I think that history is starting up again as before the second world war. Tipping over. So for anyone who wants to get involved in the things of the world, history is on the move. There she's really on the move right now the historical cycle on real change. Whereas we were confined to a thing of peaceful coexistence and the cold war. Which was preventing everything anyway, the story moving forward. And there, of course, with all its risks and perils, finally everything we know of the period, for someone who wants to move, that is to say is not content to stay in this country, confined, either in Switzerland, or in France, in western or rich countries, I think that history is starting up again as before the second world war. Tipping over. So for anyone who wants to get involved in the things of the world, history is on the move. There she's really on the move right now the historical cycle on real change. Whereas we were confined to a thing of peaceful coexistence and the cold war. Which was preventing everything anyway, the story moving forward. And there, of course, with all its risks and perils, finally everything we know of the period, for someone who wants to move, that is to say is not content to stay in this country, confined, either in Switzerland, or in France, in western or rich countries, I think that history is starting up again as before the second world war. Tipping over. So for anyone who wants to get involved in the things of the world, history is on the move. There she's really on the move right now Which was preventing everything anyway, the story moving forward. And there, of course, with all its risks and perils, finally everything we know of the period, for someone who wants to move, that is to say is not content to stay in this country, confined, either in Switzerland, or in France, in western or rich countries, I think that history is starting up again as before the second world war. Tipping over. So for anyone who wants to get involved in the things of the world, history is on the move. There she's really on the move right now Which was preventing everything anyway, the story moving forward. And there, of course, with all its risks and perils, finally everything we know of the period, for someone who wants to move, that is to say is not content to stay in this country, confined, either in Switzerland, or in France, in western or rich countries, I think that history is starting up again as before the second world war. Tipping over. So for anyone who wants to get involved in the things of the world, history is on the move. There she's really on the move right now either in France, in western or rich countries, I think that history is starting up again as before the second world war. Tipping over. So for anyone who wants to get involved in the things of the world, history is on the move. There she's really on the move right now either in France, in western or rich countries, I think that history is starting up again as before the

second world war. Tipping over. So for anyone who wants to get involved in the things of the world, history is on the move. There she's really on the move right now

RG: Okay. I think we can stop there. Thank you very much for your testimony