

THE MILITANT

Published in the Interests of the Working People

Vol. 32—No. 23

Friday, June 7, 1968

Price 10c



FLAG AGAINST FLAG—CLASS AGAINST CLASS. Red flags of the international working class (right) are being raised by workers and students in France,

in demonstration of their desire for socialist revolution. Against them (left) members of the right-wing groups hold aloft the tri-color, flag of capitalist France.

INSIDE: 4 PAGES OF REPORTS FROM PARIS

CIVIL WAR IN FRANCE?

By George Novack

MAY 31—General de Gaulle launched his counteroffensive in defense of capitalist rule by threatening civil war against the 10 million workers and students of France who have been on strike for two weeks and have occupied factories and universities throughout the country.

He postponed the national referendum earlier promised for June 16 and dissolved the National Assembly. Under the Gaullist constitution this move calls for a new general election within from 20 to 40 days.

In preparation for a showdown, his government is mobilizing troops for use against the populace. Just before his defiant speech de Gaulle held a secret conference with his military commanders. From West Germany came reports of heavy movements in places where French troops are stationed, as a prelude to their return home.

According to cable dispatches, "reliable French sources today (May 31) said that on President de Gaulle's orders, two tank regiments—each with an estimated 1,000 troops—have moved quietly into the Paris area," reports the New York Post.

Following his warning that he was determined to restore "order" by any means, the President clamped tight controls over the movement of French capital to halt the flight of money which endangers the stability of the franc.

On the civilian front Gaullist forces organized a rally of some hundreds of thousands of their supporters on the Place de la Concorde in Paris to back up the hard-pressed General. This counterrevolutionary crowd shouted such chauvinist slogans as "France for the French" and "send the Communists to Moscow." Officials are trying to make the administrative apparatus all over the country ready for a crackdown on the insurgent masses.

In his radio address de Gaulle sought to justify his contemplated resort to forceful measures by reference to the menace of dictatorship by "a totalitarian Communism." Even the New York Times could not swallow this excuse trumped up to buttress his own personal dictatorship.

It pointed out that Communist union leaders had compliantly negotiated an agreement with Premier Pompidou which the rank-and-file had turned down. This unexpected re-

jection, it explained, prompted de Gaulle's turnaround.

The projected referendum became too risky for him once he and the CP leaders had failed to ram the settlement down the workers' throats. De Gaulle then faced the prospect of a thundering "no" vote. By dissolving the National Assembly and shifting over to Assembly elections, he now hopes to recoup the parliamentary majority his followers lost in last year's balloting.

He feels an urgent need to take stern and desperate measures to prevent power from slipping further from his hands. The relation of forces has been so unfavorable that the government has not been able even to get ballots run off for the referendum because of the printers on strike. Mayors of several cities and towns have served notice of refusal to organize the referendum in their localities.

At the same time his henchmen count upon cooperation from the Communist, Socialist and Catholic union bureaucrats to break up the unity of the workers by settling the strike piecemeal. The CP-controlled General Confederation of Workers (CGT) heads announced today that they would not interfere with the "orderly processes" of the proposed elections.

De Gaulle's success in these maneuvers principally depends upon the reactions from 10 million strikers as well as the rebellious students, discontented peasants and state employees who are at their side.

The workers are ready, able and willing to stand firm until they win their economic, social and political demands, come what may. But their official leaders are looking for some sort of compromise and are disposed to capitulate under the pressures of capitalist reaction.

When the National Assembly broke up after dissolution was decreed, Francois Mitterand, head of the Federation of the Democratic and Socialist Left, cried "Vive la Republique!" Socialists and Communists rose together, echoed the chant and began singing "La Marseillaise." This united chorus of bourgeois and worker deputies proclaimed their hopes for the formation of a Popular Front coalition to replace de Gaulle's tottering regime.

But de Gaulle does not intend to relinquish the power he has wielded for 10 years on

behalf of French big business without a fight. The first reactions of the opposition party leaders acknowledged this.

"It will end in civil war," exclaimed Guy Mollet, the Socialist leader, who was himself once a minister in de Gaulle's cabinet. Robert Ballanger, head of the Communist contingent in the Assembly, described the speech as "a veritable aggression against the working class." The editors of L'Humanite called it a diatribe "that has the odor of civil war."

De Gaulle and the French capitalist class he serves are aware that the workers will resist and the students and farmers are not disposed to yield. They know from earlier experiences in the Algerian war that, under conditions of deep-going social crisis, not even a well-trained conscript army will readily carry out counterrevolutionary repressions against the people.

What then accounts for their menacing move? De Gaulle and his retainers likewise know that the key to preserving their domination is the conduct of the CP leadership. They calculate upon compelling the Stalinists to knuckle under so that the workers and their allies might be held back from contesting for power, withdraw from the struggle in the streets and factories, and rely for salvation on the National Assembly elections.

On the other hand, if the workers find leadership that cannot be bulldozed, and effectively counters the Gaullist aggressions, the army ranks can turn out to be no more "dependable" in the pinch than the other oppositional elements of the nation.

Neither the Socialist nor Communist leaders have called on the workers to take the necessary defensive measures against the projected large-scale use of military and police actions against them. They are behaving in the current crisis as though class tensions will soon subside and everything will calmly flow from now on exclusively through electoral and parliamentary channels. They are staking everything upon this prospect.

However, the turbulent spring flood of revolt that has inundated all France will not be so easily and quickly dammed up or diverted. The more conscious and militant sections of the workers and students are getting set for all eventualities in the developing showdown with the would-be dictator and his domestic "force de frappe."

One expression of their temper came from Pierre Baghi, leader of the General Federation of Workers at Toulouse in southwest France, who declared May 31: "If it comes to a test of strength with the government, the workers are ready to shoulder their responsibilities."

Student spokesmen were still more clear and forceful. Shortly after the general announced the dissolution of parliament, Jean-Daniel Benard, secretary general of the French National Students Union, told a rally of three thousand students at the university of Lyons: "Political power is at stake in the fight that unites us all today. This fight will not be decided in parliament, but in the factories, in the streets and behind the barricades." He summoned the students to be ready to join the workers in the streets in combatting de Gaulle.

These are the authentic sentiments of revolutionary France today.

OUR REPORTERS IN FRANCE

Beginning with our next issue, *The Militant* will feature exclusive, on-the-spot news and photographic coverage from France.

Now in Paris for *The Militant* are Joseph Hansen, Mary-Alice Waters and Helena Hermes.

Currently editor of *Intercontinental Press*, Hansen is former editor of *The Militant*. Mary-Alice Waters is national secretary of the Young Socialist Alliance and former editor of the *Young Socialist*.

Both have previously made extensive visits to France and are familiar with the background of events there as well as with the organizations and many of the political personalities involved.

Helena Hermes is a photographer whose work has appeared regularly in *The Militant* and other publications.

THE MILITANT

Editor: BARRY SHEPPARD

Business Manager: BEVERLY SCOTT

Published weekly by *The Militant Publishing Ass'n.*, 873 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10003. Phone 533-6414. Second-class postage paid at New York, N.Y. Subscription: domestic, \$3 a year; Canada and Latin America, \$3.50; other foreign, \$4.50. By first class mail: domestic and Canada \$9.00; all other countries, \$14.00. Air printed matter: domestic and Canada, \$12.50; Latin America, \$23.00; Europe, \$27.00; Africa, Australia, Asia (including USSR), \$32.00. Write for sealed air postage rates. Signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent *The Militant's* views. These are expressed in editorials.

Vol. 32—No. 23



Friday, June 7, 1968

Popular front versus workers power

The American Communist Party has chimed in with its French counterpart in denouncing the vanguard of the revolutionary students in France. The May 28 issue of *The Worker*, organ of the American CP, approvingly reports an attack upon Daniel Cohn-Bendit ("Danny the Red") printed in the French Stalinist paper, *L'Humanite*.

L'Humanite "accused Cohn-Bendit of insulting the French flag in a speech at Amsterdam," the *Worker* writes. It explains that the French CP paper upheld the honor of bourgeois France by declaring against Cohn-Bendit: "But the working class of our country firmly holds the red flag and the tri-color. The working class has reconciled the Marseillaise with the Internationale."

These two sentences unwittingly reveal the gist of the two-faced policy of the French CP which is so heartily endorsed by the American Stalinists. The "French flag" or "tri-color"—which "Danny the Red" allegedly desecrated—is the flag of capitalist France just as the Marseillaise is its official anthem.

The red flag now flying over the factories and universities is the banner of the world working class and the socialist revolution. Workers and students are reported tearing the white and blue off the tri-color to make red flags as an ensign of their anticapitalist aspirations. Instead of singing the Marseillaise, strikers and young rebels are chanting the traditional anthem of socialist solidarity, the Internationale.

The CP leaders are trying to carry water on both shoulders. They aim to "reconcile" the irreconcilable interests and claims of the bosses, symbolized by the tri-color and the Marseillaise, with those of the workers who have hoisted the red banner of socialist revolution. They first tried to do this on the industrial front through a deal with Pompidou which the strikers peremptorily rejected.

They are planning to do this in national politics through the establishment of a "popular front" government based on a coalition with the so-called "democratic, progressive" sector of "left" bourgeois representatives. Regardless of its radical rhetoric, this political realignment will keep postponing any "socialist" measures in order to maintain capitalism intact. The confusion of the tri-color and the red flag, the Marseillaise and the Internationale is all part of the Stalinists' perfidious game to subordinate the fight of the workers and students for socialism to the preservation of the profit system.

The French Stalinists are striving to foist this line upon the insurgent masses on the pretext that this is the position of the working class. Anyone to their left who objects is stigmatized as a "splitter" of the working class. Thus the May 26 *Worker* charged that "The de Gaulle regime still hopes to break the unity of the French people . . . by encouraging dissident elements. It is being aided in this by a minority among the students, led by Cohn-Bendit, which includes the 1,000-member organization of Trotskyite university students."

WHAT TROTSKYISTS FIGHT FOR

What do the French Trotskyists stand for? They are foremost in opposing the CP policy of class collaboration in industry and politics; they propose a program of working class action directed toward workers control of industry, the conquest of power by the workers and the expropriation of big business in order to begin the building of socialism.

Who actually speaks for the aspirations of the workers today? What do the strikers themselves want? Listen to what the May 28 *New York Times* had to say about the reactions of the workers at the key Renault plant in Paris after they had turned down the inadequate settlement the CP union officials had negotiated with the Gaullists.

"In Paris the defiant workers confronted union leaders who had just come from the negotiating table weary but pleased. Georges Seguy, secretary general of the Communist-led General Federation of Labor, and Benoit Frachon, one of the leading members of the Communist Party Politburo, were booed and whistled at by 12,000 blue-shirted strikers cramped between pieces of equipment at the Renault plant in suburban Boulogne-Billancourt."

The next day, writes the *Times*, "There is a marked change in atmosphere at the Renault factory here, and it is summed up in the two words of a sign over the main gate: Workers Power!"

Teachers used against community

Community control for NYC schools

New York, N.Y.

Your editorial, "A Racist Trap for Teachers" (*The Militant*, May 24), was excellent. However, I was disappointed that nothing was said about the 250,000 Spanish-speaking students in the NYC schools. It is not only the black children that receive an inferior, racially-warped education but also the Latin American children, not to mention the white working-class kids.

The Board of Education has paid lip service to the idea of reaching the Spanish-speaking kids by hiring bilingual teachers. In the main those teachers have been kept in an inferior status in the schools and used against the Spanish-speaking community. They have been used to intimidate, trick and disorient the parents about the true picture of NYC education. Most of those parents came to this country because they felt that here their kids might better themselves economically. For that reason they are suffering in the worst-paid jobs and in the lousiest slums.

The fact of the matter is that many of those parents are beginning to realize that the educational system is turning their children into illiterates in English and Spanish, and that they are not being prepared for decent jobs or careers. In addition the bilingual teachers, the most militant ones at least, recognize that the black community is fighting their fight and are trying to link up with that struggle.

On May 26 the ultraconservative Spanish language daily, *El Diario-La Prensa*, reported an interview with some bilingual teachers who were speaking out in favor of decentralization. Part of what they said was: "The bilingual teachers owe their existence to the 250,000 Spanish-speaking students in the school system, and to contribute to the perpetuation of the present school system, which has been rejected by the community, not only goes against the best interests of the pupils but also is an affront to our position." After citing their grievances they say: ". . . We ask all Spanish-speaking teachers in New York to support community control of the school in order to create the proper conditions for a system of education that answers the necessities and interests of the children and provides quality education for all."

I think *The Militant* should be more conscious about pointing out the common struggles of the minorities, because the bourgeoisie and its agents are so consciously trying to keep them apart and set them against each other.

Richard Garza

Pacifist McNamara

New York, N.Y.

I thought I would send along this "Headline Joke of the Year": McNamara Will Publish Book Urging Nuclear Disarmament. It appeared in the May 12 *New York Times*.

R. J. W.

Left-wing fascism?

Union City, N.J.

On WBAI radio, after the Columbia student uprisings, Ayn Rand read statements by a student group defending property,

and the rebels were referred to as "fascists."

They were compared to Hitler's storm troopers.

In the May issue of *The Catholic Digest*, which originates in Minneapolis, Minn., the territory of Senator Eugene McCarthy, there is an article about student rebels, and they too are called "fascists."

What has happened to the old "communist" tag?

L. W. B.

For pennies a day

New York, N.Y.

I am in general agreement with Herman Chauka's proposals for putting heart transplants on a workable, businesslike basis (*Militant*, May 24). But I think he overlooked one problem.

Since time is of the essence in delivering the heart, you may sometimes find clients who do not have the cash on hand at the moment they need the product. Certainly, with their very life in jeopardy, we would not deny them a heart. What's needed is an installment plan setup ("Live Now, Pay Later"?).

Such a deferred payment system would provide for a fair rate of interest and, of course, where the customer becomes delinquent on payments, the right of the owner to immediate repossession.

H. Anillo

Black people fight St. Paul land grab

Minneapolis, Minn.

On Tuesday, May 21, the St. Paul city council voted 6-0 to approve the Housing and Redevelopment Authority (HRA) early land acquisition program. The vote enables the Housing Authority to take away homes and land occupied and, in many cases, owned by the black community. The valuable land, close to downtown St. Paul, will be turned over to developers.

One of those lined up to get land for profitable development is the director of the St. Paul Human Rights Commission, Louis Ervin. How he is to look after the human rights of those whose land he is

taking for his own profit has not been explained.

In voting unanimously to approve the land grab, the city council said they had heard no significant opposition to the plan. Yet on the preceding Friday, 400 area residents gathered in the Central High School auditorium to voice near unanimous and vehement opposition to every aspect of the program. The Rev. Walter Jones, chairman of ACTION, after successfully demanding dispersal of the armed police at the rear of the auditorium, called the HRA's program "Black Removal." He challenged the mayor and HRA to name one urban renewal program that had benefited black people. There was no reply. Maurice Boyce of Attendants to the Common People drew long and loud applause when he called for black people to stay where they are and unite. Following Boyce and Jones, a steady stream of opposition speakers appeared at the microphone. Elderly people, slated to lose homes representing the work of their entire lives, voiced their fear of being packed into high-rises. A young resident of the renewal area told Mayor Byrne and HRA to "stop worrying about the black man and start worrying about white landlords exploiting the black man and forcing him to live in these slum houses."

When one speaker asked Byrne for a pledge not to use force or violence to take away the homes of the poor, he sat in silence and finally mumbled in response to calls from the audience, "There is no answer to the question." Byrne earlier defended his much-protested decision to keep three M-16 rifles in St. Paul by saying that the guns would be useful in case some criminal "barricades himself into a house."

Resistance to black removal and dispossession of the poor continues, despite the cynical vote of the city council. Signs saying "HRA—WE SHALL NOT BE REMOVED" appeared on the lawns of the elderly and the poor shortly after the vote was announced. In a meeting on May 25, black leaders resolved unconditional support to each resisting resident in whatever means he chose to defend his home.

David Thorstad

Meet Socialists in Your Area

(If you are interested in the ideas of socialism, you can meet socialists in your city at the following addresses.)

CALIFORNIA: Berkeley-Oakland: Socialist Workers Party (SWP) and Young Socialist Alliance (YSA), 2519A Telegraph Ave., Berkeley 94704. (415) 849-1032.

Los Angeles: SWP and YSA, 1702 East Fourth St., L.A. 90033. (213) AN 9-4953.

San Diego: San Diego Labor Forum, P.O. Box 2221, San Diego 92112.

San Francisco: Militant Labor Forum and Pioneer Books, 2338 Market St., S.F. 94114. (415) 522-1632.

Santa Rosa: Young Socialist Alliance, Stefan Bosworth, 808 Spencer.

DELAWARE: Lloyd Summers, Box 559, Dover, Del. (302) 674-9842.

GEORGIA: YSA, P.O. Box 6262, Atlanta, Ga. 30308. (404) 872-1612.

ILLINOIS: Carbondale: YSA, Bill Moffet, 406 S. Washington.

Chicago: SWP, YSA and bookstore, 302 S. Canal St., Rm. 204, Chicago 60606. (312) 839-5044.

Champaign-Urbana: YSA, Michael Hanagan, 56 Townsend. (217) 332-4285.

INDIANA: Bloomington: YSA, Russel Block, 207 East 2nd St., Bloomington 47401. 339-4640.

MARYLAND: Baltimore: YSA, Toby Rice, 4300 Springdale Ave.

MASSACHUSETTS: Boston: Militant Labor Forum, 295 Huntington Ave., Rm. 307. (617) 876-5930.

MICHIGAN: Detroit: Eugene V. Debs Hall, 3737 Woodward Ave., Detroit 48201. (313) TE 1-6135.

MINNESOTA: Minneapolis-St. Paul: SWP,

YSA and Labor Bookstore, 704 Hennepin Ave., Hall 240, Mpls. 55403. (612) FE 2-7781.

MISSOURI: St. Louis: Phone EV 9-2895, ask for Dick Clarke.

NEW JERSEY: Newark: Newark Labor Forum, Box 361, Newark 07101.

NEW YORK: Albany: YSA, Carol French, 272 Lark St., Albany 12210.

New York City: Militant Labor Forum, 873 Broadway (near 18th St.), N.Y. 10003. (212) 982-6051.

OHIO: Cleveland: Eugene V. Debs Hall, 2nd floor west, 9801 Euclid Ave., Cleveland 44106. (216) 791-1669.

Kent: YSA, Roy S. Inglee, 123 Water St. N., Kent 44240. 673-7032.

Yellow Springs: Antioch YSA, Rick Wadsworth, Antioch College Union, Yellow Springs 45387. (513) 767-7862.

PENNSYLVANIA: Philadelphia: SWP and YSA, 686 N. Broad St., Phila. 19130. (215) CE 6-6998.

TEXAS: Austin: YSA, James E. Gardner, 607 W. 31-1/2 St. (512) 454-6143.

Houston: YSA, David Shroyer, 1116 Columbus St., Houston 78703. (713) JA 9-2236.

UTAH: Salt Lake City: Shem Richards, 957 E. First Ave., Salt Lake 84103. (801) 355-3537.

WASHINGTON, D.C.: YSA, Tana Hicken, 15 7th St. N.E., 20002. (202) 546-2092.

WASHINGTON: Cheney: YSA, Ann Montague, 5223 Dryden Hall, Cheney 99004.

Seattle: SWP and YSA, 5257 University Way N.E., Seattle 98105 (206) 523-2555.

WISCONSIN: Madison: YSA, 202 Marion St. (608) 256-0857.

Some still available in hard cover

CHE GUEVARA SPEAKS

"Incisive and luminous selections"—The *New York Times*

\$4.50 (paperback, 95c)

MERIT PUBLISHERS 873 Broadway New York, N.Y. 10003

Young people in forefront of revolutionary struggle

By Pierre Frank

Pierre Frank is a leading member of the French section of the Fourth International, and a member of the united secretariat of the Fourth International.

PARIS, May 22—To act on the mighty mass movement sweeping France and assure its victory it is well to begin by placing it in historical perspective. The crisis of French capitalism, which from the second most powerful in the nineteenth century dropped to a second-rate status, has taken the form of gigantic convulsive swings from left to right from 1934 to the present. The dates are well-known: 1934, 1936, 1940, 1945, 1958, and now 1968.

On the right, the French bourgeoisie has never been strong enough to achieve a fascist solution, not even when Hitler's armies occupied the country. On the left, the masses have never lacked energy but the leaderships—reformist, Stalinist, or post-Stalinist—have so far by their default and betrayals blocked the socialist solution to the crisis, the creation of a socialist republic of France. This is still more apparent in the May 1968 upsurge than in previous ones.

The present movement is at least as strong numerically as those of 1936 and 1945-47 but on a much higher political plane. Let us sum up the evidence which testifies to this. Each time the mass mobilizations and notably the factory occupations came in the train of events which played the role of detonator.

In 1936, it was an electoral victory—the victory of the Popular Front. In 1945-47, it was the military victory over Nazism. This time, the role of detonator was played by the vanguard movement of university teachers and students and high-school students, which culminated in the barricades of May 10. That is not all.

In 1936 and 1945-47, the masses followed the leaderships with confidence. In 1936, it was the Socialist Party and the CP; and in 1945-47, primarily the CP. At present, these leaderships, including the CP, no longer enjoy their former prestige and authority. This does not mean, however, that the people no longer follow them, for at the moment there is no alternative leadership. Unquestionably, the student movement's prestige is great and the sympathy of the workers for it is real, but it cannot take the place of a leadership—even a minority leadership—emerging from the workers movement.

And these are not all the changes which have occurred on the leadership level. In 1936 and 1945-47, the revolutionary groupings were not only numerically weak (they are not much more numerous now) they were quite isolated. They were then literally "group-lets," whose essentially propagandistic activity elicited no response. Today these groupings have gained a response from a minority which is neither numerically nor qualitatively inconsiderable—quite the contrary. The overwhelming majority of the university youth, a great majority of the high-school youth, and a growing number of young workers have followed the lead of these "group-lets," or "dozen or so wildmen," depending on whether you pick the term used by l'Humanite or that of the minister of education.

And this is not a transitory response. This part of the youth has become conscious—its demonstrations show this—on a series of essential political questions: the need for a socialist revolution; the hopelessness of peaceful and parliamentary roads; the harmfulness of the "peaceful coexistence" policy; the need for democracy and struggle against bureaucracy in the workers movement.

The break between this vanguard and the CP leadership has proved very deep. The present upsurge has made it starkly clear to this vanguard that the basic problem for the victory of socialism in France is to rid the working class of the ultrareformist CP and CGT (Confederation Generale du Travail—General Federation of Labor) leadership. In pursuance of paltry maneuvers, this leadership has adopted formulas placing it to the right even of the FGDS (Federation de la Gauche Democratique et Socialiste—Federation of the Democratic Socialist Left—an amalgamation of petty-bourgeois democrats and rightwing social democrats) and the CFDT (Confederation Francaise et Democratique de Travailleurs—French Democratic Labor Federation—the former Catholic trade union).

This vanguard clearly lacks the organizational forms which would enable it to multiply its effectiveness. It is now seeking such forms. It is striving to promote committees in the plants on the model of those created in the universities, elementary

schools, and high schools, which represent in embryonic form a type of organization similar to the soviets of 1917 in Russia. It is also striving to break the bureaucratic straitjacket imposed by the CP and CGT leadership, which is still stifling workers democracy in a revolting manner.

And finally there is the problem of the revolutionary party, whose solution depends primarily on the Trotskyist movement. This movement at the time this mobilization developed was divided essentially into three organizations (the Parti Communiste Internationaliste—Internationalist Communist Party, the Union Communiste—Communist Union and the Organization Communiste Internationaliste—Internationalist Communist Organization). Two youth organizations were under its influence: the Jeunesse Communiste Revolutionnaire (Revolutionary Communist Youth); and the group around the journal *Revoltes*.

In the course of the upsurge, the OCI and the youth organization under its sway had a disastrous political line. However, the others carried out spontaneously converging actions and have now created a permanent coordinating committee. It may be hoped that this step forward will further the reunification of the Trotskyist movement without undue delay.

* * *

In this article, which does not propose to answer the questions arising day by day (it is the business of daily leaflets to deal with these questions), I want to point out some important points which have already emerged in the course of the current mobilization.

The role of the high-school students cannot be overstressed. These 14-to-15-year-old youths have shown a remarkable courage and most of all a political maturity which has astonished older militants. Nothing has ever been seen like it. The origins of the high-school movement date back to the end of 1967 and it offers the brightest promises of a vibrantly developing vanguard in the next years in which the decisive battles of the period beginning in Spring 1968 will be waged. It is the greatest hope the French revolutionary movement now has.

I leave aside here the international repercussions of the current movement, but it must be mentioned that it has helped to revive the struggle for proletarian revolution in Europe. This struggle has been paralyzed, frozen, since the end of the second world war, to such an extent that a defeatist attitude toward the workers in the economically developed capitalist countries had become dangerously widespread in politically advanced circles. This mobilization, which has immediately had powerful reverberations in all of West Europe, will sweep away the pessimistic "theories" based on this defeatist attitude and will give new impetus to the spread of revolutionary Marxism to much broader strata than ever before.

Moreover, this movement has exhibited an internationalist spirit of a very high order. If l'Humanite ever made a monstrous "mistake" it was when it used the expression "the German Cohn-Bendit" in the attempt to discredit a man who has more than honorably served as one of the leading spokesmen of the Paris students. On May 22, l'Humanite hurled infamous slanders against him, and the same day the government expelled him from France. Here also, the CP leadership has entered into complicity with the government against this young revolutionist.

It can be counted on also that this movement before long will have reverberations beyond West Europe. It will certainly be understood in the Soviet Union and East Europe that this movement is very different from the picture of it presented in the bureaucratic press.

The CP and CGT leadership has shown a frantic fear of attempts at a worker-student rapprochement not under its control, or, in fact, of any rapprochement going beyond generalities. This leadership knows that such a linkup would revolutionize the workers movement and break its control over it. All the doubts which have been developing for years among the militants would be more than reinforced; they would go over into a merciless critique of the neo-reformist policy conducted in the postwar period.

The action which the CP has launched to prevent this linkup, to prevent papers and leaflets, and most of student delegations from getting into the factories, has been the most intense part of this organization's operation during the upsurge. At Renault, on Friday, May 17, a column of students



RED FLAGS. Student demonstration May 23 to protest government order banning Daniel Cohn-Bendit ("Danny the Red") from France. Cohn-Bendit dyed his hair black and slipped back into Paris despite them.

who had walked about six miles from the Sorbonne to the factory arrived to find the gates more vigilantly barred by a hand-picked team of CP marshalls than by the plant guards in normal times.

Here is another example: When UNEF (Union Nationale des Etudiants Francais—French National Student Federation) organized a demonstration on May 22 to protest the government's expulsion of Cohn-Bendit, the secretary of the CGT, Seguy, called this decision (not the government's move) a provocation and broke off the CGT's relations with UNEF.

Thus, the post-Stalinist leadership prefigures the role that the bourgeoisie will expect it to play when it turns the government over to it—a role that it is ready and willing to play, the role of policeman. But in the conditions which have developed in the course of this mobilization, an element is taking shape which though it cannot change the nature of this leadership can weaken its power—in the course of this upsurge itself, which is still on the ascendant as I write these lines and in which new leaps could occur.

Criticisms of the leadership's default have begun to arise in the rank-and-file CP bodies, of its delay, its failure to understand the student movement, its hostility towards it, its chauvinism. This is happening while the party members are applying themselves to their daily tasks, which are more numerous than ever.

It would be surprising if on the outcome of this mobilization, these criticisms were not repeated and raised to the level of a challenge to the CP's general policy. It would be surprising if they did not culminate more or less rapidly in a crisis in the CP of completely different dimensions than those which proceeded from the "de-Stalinization."

Two principal elements are tending to produce such a crisis. First is the bankruptcy of the CP policy toward the youth. For more than six years, first at the time of the Algerian war and then in the campaign for Vietnam, this leadership has driven any sort of "leftist" out of the organizations and demonstrations which it controlled. It has used its marshalls squad against them, which has not fought against the police for many years.

An now these "leftists" are returning at the head of tens of thousands of youth, after vigorously confronting the forces of bourgeois order in the streets. The CP leadership's policy in the youth has resulted in a bankruptcy identical to that of the Gaullist government in the same sphere.

Moreover, a number of CP and CGT militants cannot be insensible to the widespread feeling that the mobilization in progress poses the question of power, that the problem of the seizure of power could be easily solved

if the leaderships wanted to do so. Indeed, in these days when an unproclaimed general strike is in effect, it would be possible to force de Gaulle's departure and to impose a CP-FGDS government by nonparliamentary but peaceful means. For, indecision now reigns among the forces of order. The police themselves are considering going on strike. There is news from the army of ferment in the ranks. The fascists, backed by the Gaullists, have only been able to mobilize tiny groups of demonstrators who want primarily to make trial runs in preparation for the future.

At a time when everyone can see that "the power is in the streets" these CP and FGDS leaders are calling on the National Assembly—this discredited parliament, most of whose members are a motley crew of opportunists elected on de Gaulle's coattails—to censure a government which de Gaulle must considerably change anyway if he wants to stay in power.

Many CP and CGT militants see here also their leadership's incapacity to seize on a situation still more favorable than the Liberation. It cannot even point now to the presence of American troops on French territory—there are only Yankee diplomats negotiating with the representatives of victorious Vietnam. And this is the second essential element of a profound crisis in the CP in what cannot be the too distant future.

* * *

At the time of this writing, this mobilization must be pushed as far as possible. It cannot go too far. The gains achieved will serve as the point of departure for succeeding waves. Repression will only become a serious threat later, on the occurrence of a decline. It will be aimed primarily at the vanguard (with the tacit complicity of the CP and FGDS leaderships). But if this vanguard has a clear view of the situation, of the relationship of forces, of the relationship between the vanguard and the masses and between the masses and the leaderships, if it demonstrates the political capacity to keep one or two steps ahead of the masses, without getting too far ahead, such a repression will neither be able to decapitate it or make any deep inroads into it. To the contrary repression might act as a stimulus and enable the vanguard to reinforce its mass influence.

We are out of the stagnation. The class struggle has entered a period of battles to be fought. The conditions at the outset are much more favorable to the vanguard than in the past. For the first time, the vanguard has real opportunities. The majority of the Trotskyist movement is off to a good start. The road before us will be rough and filled with pitfalls, but we are confident that we will follow it to the end.

How French CP sold out after WWII

By Dick Roberts

On May 27, according to the New York Times, 12,000 strikers in the Renault plant of suburban Boulogne-Billancourt greeted Communist Party leaders Georges Seguy and Benoit Frachon with boos and whistles. This unprecedented repudiation of Stalinist policies is rooted in a long record of misleadership and betrayals of the French working class.

The Stalinists played a key role in rescuing French capitalism on the eve of the second world war. In June 1936, seven million workers seized the major industries of the nation and stood poised to take power. But the Communist and Socialist Party misleaders ruined this opportunity through their "popular front" alliance with the liberal bourgeoisie.

The French workers were dragged into the second world war and experienced Hitler's conquest of their country in a dispirited and dejected state. However, the Resistance revived their fighting spirit and prepared them for two further tests of power, one in August 1944 on the heels of the German retreat, and the other in the winter of 1947. Both times the Stalinists proved to be the decisive factor in staying the arm of revolution.

Their strategy flowed from Moscow's policy of "peaceful coexistence." This policy had been adopted at the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International in 1935, in response to Hitler's seizure of power in Germany. Before the war, the policy was directed toward aiding the imperialist "democracies" to arm for the battle with Hitler. Communists were ordered to abandon the road to socialist revolution in order to encourage their capitalist rulers to be "friendly" to the Soviet regime.

The Stalin-Hitler pact, which raised the curtain on World War II, was terminated by the invasion of the Soviet Union and replaced by the wartime alignment of the Big Three against Germany. The diplomatic consequence of this military alliance was the division of the world into "spheres of influence" in the secret pacts between Stalin, Roosevelt and Churchill at Yalta and Teheran. In return for giving Stalin a free hand in the Eastern European nations occupied by the Red armies, Stalin agreed to permit the rebuilding of capitalism in the Western European nations.

It was stated in press dispatches at the end of the war that a mere telephone call from the French CP leader Maurice Thorez could suffice to end capitalism in France and install a workers' government. But that phone call required a prior one—from the Kremlin to Thorez—and Stalin had promised the "Allies" something else.

Gen. de Gaulle's fond memories of CP leader

In 1964, on the death of Maurice Thorez, long time chairman of the French CP, de Gaulle sent a letter of condolence to one of Thorez' sons.

In the letter he stressed he had "not forgotten" Thorez' key role in diverting the French workers from revolutionary measures during the mass upsurge at the end of World War II. The letter read as follows:

"I offer you and your family my sincere condolences in your grief over the death of your father. For my part, I have not forgotten that at a decisive time for France, President Maurice Thorez—whatever may have been his actions before and after that—in response to my appeal and as a member of my government contributed to maintaining national unity. Please accept, Sir, my deepest regards." (Thorez was Vice President in de Gaulle's postwar "reconstruction" government.)

In his memoirs, entitled *Le Salut*, de Gaulle has the following to say:

"Inasmuch as in place of revolution, the Communists seek preponderance in a parliamentary regime, society runs less risk. . .

"As for Thorez, while trying to advance the affairs of Communism, on many occasions he was to serve the public interest. On his return to France, he helped put an end to the last vestiges of the 'patriotic militia' whom some people obstinately sought to maintain in a new underground. Insofar as the gloomy, hard rigidity of his party permitted him, he opposed the attempts at encroachment of the liberation committees and the acts of violence which the overexcited groups turned. Among the workers—they were numerous—particularly the miners, who listened to his harangues, he did not stop advocating the slogan of working to the utmost and of producing, cost what it might. Was this simply a political tactic? It's not my business to figure it out. It was enough for me that France benefited."

The France of mid-1944 was a nation utterly devastated by the war and four years of Nazi occupation. It was, the bourgeois press reported, a nation slowly dying of starvation, malnutrition and disease. While 60 percent of the population was declining into anemia because of undernourishment, a New York Times correspondent wrote March 17, "the black markets provide almost anything that money—lots of money—can buy. Hunger and extravagance are the two extremes under which the people live, depending on the state of their purses."

The capitalist rulers of France were extracting a last hectic moment of enjoyment from dying Paris before the waves of revolution would rise over their heads. The revolution—no one had any doubt—would be led by the vast popular movement of the anti-fascist Resistance, already calculated to number over half a million persons. The French Forces of the Interior (FFI), over 40 percent composed of Communist and Socialist militants, would rise up against the ruling-class collaborators of Hitler headquartered at Vichy and threaten to end capitalist rule once and for all.

That this perspective was feared by the Allied powers was evident from their policies both to the FFI and to the exile government of Gen. Charles de Gaulle, stationed in Algeria and bidding for Anglo-American recognition as the future head of France.

Churchill and Roosevelt withheld recognition from de Gaulle and refused to give arms to the Resistance. There were two reasons, the New York Times explained as early as January: "One is fear of the violent revolution which appears to haunt the molders of foreign and military policy in Washington and London, in the special case of France; another is a natural legacy of the Vichy policy. To some Vichyites who, while appearing to collaborate with the Nazis, also served the purposes of our liaison-with-Vichy policy, the United States and British governments seem to feel a certain obligation that an armed French underground might not share."

Shrugging off this responsibility, Roosevelt declared "he was not prepared to say whether anybody outside France knew what the French people wanted."

While Washington and London procrastinated, the French Stalinists and de Gaulle worked out policies which coincided in their intentions of neutralizing the Resistance struggle and elevating de Gaulle to power. In essence, the Stalinists applied the "popular front" tactics of the 1935-37 period to the Provisional Government of Charles de Gaulle.

Preaching that the general was the "liberator of France," the Stalinists obtained ministries in his Algerian shadow cabinet along with representatives of the Socialist Party and the bourgeois Radical Party—the same Popular Front retinue which had held the French masses down before the war. Just as before, the Stalinists proclaimed that the major issue of the day was the defeat of fascism by the "French nation"—meaning French capitalism—and they abjured any intentions of leading a socialist revolution which might "divide" this struggle.

Already foreshadowing Moscow's postwar foreign policies, one of the "terms" of the Communist Party's participation in the Provisional Government was to "Develop the role of France in the United Nations bloc, for the foundation of the independence of our country and the restoration of her greatness. . ."

But there were important differences between de Gaulle's Provisional Government and the Popular Front of 1936 which made the role of French Stalinism in 1944 all the more perfidious. Although weakened by economic crisis and the strike wave, the French ruling class remained fundamentally unified during 1936-37 and was sustained by the illusion of a large part of the nation in the future ability of capitalism to provide a stable social and progressing economic system.

By 1944, the French bourgeoisie had been totally discredited. Its power had collapsed under the onslaught of the Nazi armies; most of it had supported the Vichy government in collaboration with Hitler; the nation had been agonized by war; tens of thousands of worker militants were in Vichy head Petain's concentration camps.

De Gaulle's bourgeois "government" lacked the support of the metropolitan French bourgeoisie (and this is why the "Allies" were slow to recognize it). It was a handpicked selection of capitalist politicians and military men with a light sprinkling of social democrats, liberals and Stalinists, none of whom had been elected. It even recruited former Vichyites.

While the Stalinists were trying to sell this



MEMBERS OF FFI. Resistance fighters arm themselves with guns and ammunition captured from Nazi troops in first days of 1944 uprising.

assemblage of opportunists to the French Resistance, the rank and file of the FFI pushed far ahead of its leaders. On Aug. 19, 1944, five days before the "Allied" armies marched onto Paris, the FFI launched a powerful offensive from underground.

In a massive display of strength, the FFI grabbed arms and munitions from the retreating Wehrmacht and attacked the remaining forces of Nazi and Vichy police. It occupied the factories, established democratic factory committees, and without the directives of official FFI leaders, dispensed its own justice to collaborators. More than one commentator pointed out that the hatred of the masses for the French collaborators far exceeded any hatred shown to the German occupational armies.

"Go to your place of work," urged a leaflet circulated by the Trotskyists. "Everywhere at the same time, in the factories, the offices, the yards, launch the General Strike! As in June 1936, get together in the factory and elect your delegates. Let them constitute the Factory Committee. . . Join the Workers' Militias of the factories and districts. . . Arm yourselves by disarming the cops, the fascists and the SS, taking over arsenals and badly-guarded stocks. . ."

A Trotskyist correspondent described a meeting of factory delegates in a Paris suburb: "An official of the CGT intervened and declared that the meeting has no authority. . . Whereupon one delegate, not belonging to any party, jumped up and exclaims: 'And who the hell do you represent? I represent—the factory. I was elected by so and so many workers. Who elected you? I have paid my trade union dues for 15 years and the CGT has done nothing for us at all.'"

New York Times correspondent Harold Callender cabled from Algiers, "Local leaders precipitated the uprising and battle in the capital without awaiting the approval of either Gen. Charles de Gaulle or the Allies, who had hoped to avoid that battle. [De Gaulle] has long urged against mass uprising anywhere in France." In the midst of the Paris battles, de Gaulle's representatives in the Resistance, Georges Bidault and Alexander Parodi, negotiated an armistice with the German command enabling it to withdraw all the heavy rolling equipment, tanks, trucks and big guns from Paris so that they would not fall into the hands of insurrectionary workers.

The general strike lasted six days, ending with de Gaulle's entry into Paris and its occupation by the "Allied" armies.

The crushing of the workers insurrection did not end with the imposition of an armed truce in Paris. On one side stood the fraudulent government of de Gaulle with no base in the masses, resting on the military arm of Anglo-American imperialism. On the other side stood the armed might of the FFI.

By mid-September France was in full revolutionary ferment. Alexander Uhl of PM newspaper cabled from Paris, "Today. . . relations are worse between the French workers and 'patronat' as the French call the people who own the factories, the mines, the great commercial firms. For a good share of the 'patronat' got along with the Germans too well and made too much money out of the war to suit the taste of the kind of people who went down to the barricades."

The crucial counterrevolutionary role of disarming the Resistance and subjecting it to de Gaulle's regime was undertaken by the Stalinists. At the first open meeting of the Communist Party in Paris, CP general secretary Jacques Duclos proposed that members of the FFI be incorporated in the French imperialist army.

In Lille, the capital of the industrial north, de Gaulle announced a "new" program for the creation of a new economic system. It will "take over the direction of the great sources of common wealth," he promised, but did not exclude "the stimulus of just profit and initiative."

De Gaulle "took over" the French coal mines to avert a threatened general strike. The Renault plant in Paris was similarly seized by de Gaulle. By late October de Gaulle proclaimed that the carrying of arms was illegal as well as the carrying out of arrests without his authority. The "Allies" recognized de Gaulle's regime, Stalinist ministers included, and as a result, the New York Times announced, "The government now thinks that it must boldly assume police powers in the country purely on its own authority. . ."

The French workers were in retreat and de Gaulle moved steadily rightward, strengthening his police forces and establishing press censorship. In December, he could defend a member of his cabinet accused of supporting Vichy—"many who were there believed that they were serving their country in their own way." On Jan. 11, 1945, three officers of the FFI were given heavy prison sentences because they had executed two collaborators whose death penalties had been commuted by de Gaulle.

The moment for revolutionary triumph had temporarily passed. French workers had to bow to the yoke of capitalism because the Stalinist leaders had sacrificed their cause in the interests of Kremlin diplomacy. The incipient French revolution of 1944 was the victim of "peaceful coexistence" and that insidious policy of class collaboration which cut off so many potential bids for power in the aftermath of the second world war. This is the same bankrupt line that the Communist Party is trying to foist on the upsurge of the French masses today.

Issues behind purge attempt in the SMC

By Harry Ring and Lew Jones

MAY 30—Elsewhere on this page we have reprinted an exchange of letters between Linda Morse and Howard Petrick in which Petrick explains why he cannot accept an offer to become a staff member of the Student Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam.

The letter relates to the political and organizational crisis that has erupted in the Student Mobilization Committee as a result of moves to bar members of the Young Socialist Alliance from participating in the SMC staff. The offer to Petrick was designed to cloud over the attempt to exclude the YSA.

Last week we reported that the Working Committee of the SMC had bureaucratically fired Kipp Dawson and Syd Stapleton from the staff of the student group because of their membership in the YSA. Dawson and Stapleton had played a key role in organizing the extremely successful student strike of April 26.

They were originally fired on the basis of a motion which stated that only "independents" could be members of the SMC staff. This motion was able to gain passage because it had the support of the Communist Party-DuBois Clubs and the radical pacifists. Both groups, along with the YSA, have played a key role in the coalition around which the SMC was built.

Because the motion so blatantly violated the SMC's policy of political non-exclusion, those responsible for its adoption decided to rescind it. They did so at a subsequent meeting at which Dawson and Stapleton were re-fired—this time without any stated reason! At the same meeting the bloc between the CP and pacifists and some unaffiliated figures, also defeated a motion to add to the staff Lew Jones of the YSA.

At an earlier informal meeting organized by Liberation editor Dave Dellinger, Linda Morse, pacifist and executive secretary of the SMC, along with other members of her exclusionist caucus had agreed to propose that Jones be added to the staff.

BROKE AGREEMENT

However, after consulting with the CPers and with other members of their exclusionary caucus, they reneged on their agreement and led the fight to reaffirm the firing of Dawson and Stapleton and not to place Jones on the staff.

Then, in an attempt to cover up this crude act of political discrimination, the motion was passed to hire Petrick even though it had been made plain that he was not presently available.

Further, the group then voted down a motion by Kipp Dawson to convene a full conference of SMC. This deliberately flouts a unanimously agreed-to decision of the past conference of SMC, held last January, that another conference be held in six months and that it be in a central area of the Midwest to ensure maximum attendance.

From this maze of organizational maneuvers, a number of basic political issues emerged that are at the root of this conflict.

The Communist Party and some of its allies—e.g., Art Goldberg, a spokesman for the exclusionary caucus—are now suggesting that in pointing to the CP role in this development, opponents of the exclusionary move are engaging in red-baiting.

It requires a generous amount of brass to make such an assertion. The YSA has consistently stood for inclusion of the Communist Party as well as all other groups opposed to the war in spite of differences. It is the CP which has supported the exclusion of YSAers, not the other way around. Members of a revolutionary socialist organization are excluded from their posts in a movement because of their political beliefs. When, in response, they point to those responsible—including the Communist Party members and supporters who voted for their exclusion—this is twisted into "red-baiting." The victim, as Malcolm X once observed, becomes the criminal and the criminal the victim!

It's particularly hypocritical for the CP and its friends to assume this hypocritical stance since there is nothing "red" about their political position.

As the present events in France are once more demonstrating, the implacable political line of the Moscow-oriented CPs is to do

everything possible to thwart a genuine revolutionary development—to bend every effort to steer such movements into reformist, class-collaborationist channels.

The American Communist Party joins in attacking the revolutionary forces in France who helped spark and develop the present inspiring anticapitalist struggle there. By the same token, they oppose the revolutionary policies of the Trotskyists in this country, most particularly in building the antiwar movement.

As with the French CP—which calls for a "coalition" government as opposed to a socialist one—the CP here wants to get the student movement off the streets and into a variety of forms of "peace politics"—primarily into the Democratic Party.

That's why, from the outset, the CP has been at best a reluctant participant in the antiwar coalition and has always sought to divert it from focusing on the war to becoming a "broader" formation that could more easily be sucked into "lesser evil" politics.

BIG DEAL

The CP feels particularly impelled to move in this direction today. For them the election period offers the big chance for a "coalition" with one or another "progressive" sector of the American ruling class through such figures as a McCarthy, perhaps a Kennedy, or—who knows—maybe even a Humphrey. After all, for them LBJ was a "peace" candidate in 1964!

A mass movement that centers on actions demanding that the U.S. get out of Vietnam is obviously a hindrance to the electoral line of those like the CP.

The radical pacifists have tended more and more to adapt to the pressure of the forces that want to get the movement into capitalist politics. This was evidenced, for example, when the pacifists led in carrying a motion in the New York Parade Committee to withdraw an invitation to SWP presidential nominee Fred Halstead to speak at the Committee's April 27 rally after McCarthy and Kennedy declined similar invitations.

Some surprise has been expressed at the idea of a bloc between the radical pacifists and the CP. But this is not something new. There was such a bloc at the 1965 founding conference of the ill-fated National Coordinating Committee to End the War in Vietnam and, more recently, at a Chicago-area conference last March where there was an aborted attempt to convert the National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam into some kind of an adult SDS-type multi-issue formation.

Both of these blocs constituted a blow at the effectiveness of the antiwar movement which we will discuss in a future issue.

Because of the steadily diminishing appeal of the philosophy of nonviolence, the pacifists seem intent on carving out some new multi-issue movement where they can play a significant role. They would apparently like the SMC to evolve in that direction.

RAIDING OPERATION?

The efforts to convert SMC from a coordinator of campus activities against the war and around war-related issues into a multi-issue organization would set it into needless rivalry with such movements as SDS. Also, proposed draft counselling activities would set the SMC against The Resistance and other similar groups.

And, equally important, it would pit SMC against these groups from the right. SMC is a coalition of diverse tendencies, whose component parts are really agreed only on opposition to the Vietnam war. To impose a multi-issue program on such a heterogeneous coalition would result in an adaptation to the more conservative forces in the coalition whose position on such social issues, for example as black power is far less advanced than their stand in opposition to the war.

And such an adaptation to the right is precisely what some people in SMC's exclusionary bloc are out to achieve.

That kind of right-wing perspective was blurred out recently by Art Goldberg. Hired by the New York Parade Committee and SMC to do public relations work, he is now a voting member of the Working Committee of the student group and appears to be a significant figure in setting policy for the exclusionary bloc in SMC. (He thought it was a mistake to even formally rescind the original May 8 exclusionary motion.)

Goldberg did an "inside" story for the May 30 New York Free Press purporting to tell what's happening in SMC. In a coming issue we'll deal with some of his departures from fact and what they unwittingly reveal. At this point we would simply note a significant political view which he states quite

May 17, 1968

Dear Howard:

As you may know, Student Mobilization is planning a summer of intensive GI organizing. We plan to work with Rennie Davis' "Summer of Support," and establish many projects of our own.

Since you have had wide experience in the field, we would like you to work on the project, specifically to be the field coordinator. We understand that you are now on a national speaking tour, but will be available in several weeks.

Please contact us as soon as possible, so we can talk about you working with us this summer. In addition to the summer project, we are sure that, with your capabilities, you can work on general administrative staff functions.

We hope also that you would be able to work with us following the summer on whatever fall and winter projects develop out of our conference next fall.

Sincerely,

Linda Morse

Executive Secy

Student Mobilization Comm.

May 27, 1968

Dear Linda,

I just received your letter of May 17th inquiring into my availability for the staff of Student Mobilization Committee, and explaining that you are considering work with GIs as part of future SMC programs.

My own experience in the army convinced me that this kind of project could be very productive and is an indispensable part of the movement to bring the troops home now. The young men who are forced into the army by the draft or their own social situations are being killed and forced to kill in a brutal and aggressive war. They not only deserve our sympathy and active support but will also respond to its manifestation. As the section of young people who feel the effects of U.S. intervention in Vietnam most directly and dreadfully, they certainly have the right to know all the facts about it and to express their opinions on it. I'm convinced that the GIs will become a key force for bringing the war to an end.

I am presently fighting an undesirable discharge from the Army, and I am looking forward to continuing my work with GIs. At some time they are bound to express their opposition to the war as visibly and sizeably as the students in the massive International Student Strike organized by the SMC.

However, I must tell you that I'm deeply dismayed and disgusted by the actions taken by a group, including yourself, in the New York Working Committee of the SMC. First, Kipp Dawson and Syd Stapleton were fired from the staff of Student Mobilization where they had worked for over a year—and played a central part in building the biggest student action we've seen in this country!

They were fired because they are members of a political organization, the Young Socialist Alliance. Then after overturning the principles of nonexclusion and consensus on which SMC is based, the same people in New York refused to hire Lew Jones, not because of any lack of personal qualifications, but because he is a leader of the YSA.

Now this same grouping has also disregarded the decision of the last SMC conference to hold another national conference within six months in a central part of the country.

Two of my comrades have been fired and a third not accepted for the staff, simply because they hold views which are not necessarily different from the rest of the antiwar coalition but are apparently offensive to a group of 15 or so people who happen to be on the Working Committee. How could I

baldly.

If SMC adopts his multi-issue approach, Goldberg confides, it will be able to "reach out to those students whom SDS cannot, because of its extreme radicalism, reach." Obviously, to build such a movement to the right of SDS, you first have to get rid of the Trotskyists.

Yet this man who is trying to convert SMC into a body that would compete with SDS from the right leads in asserting that Young Socialists should be excluded from the staff of SMC because they are not carrying out its policies! What gathering of SMC ever approved or even heard spelled out such policies as Goldberg now publicly declares in the pages of the Free Press?

There is an additional important issue involved here. While they carefully refrained from putting it into their motion, the exclusionists assert they fired Dawson and Stapleton because they were carrying out YSA policy, not SMC policy, and that YSA policy is in conflict with that of SMC.

If that were actually the case—which it isn't—the SMC would have the right to say YSA should not participate in carrying out SMC policy. The principle of non-exclusion means that those who agree with the aims

be expected to work under the threat of similar organizational penalties against me and the GIs I work with, if or when my ideas "crossed" this grouping in the Working Committee in New York? How could you expect me to function as window-dressing for a grouping that has introduced political discrimination and exclusionism into the antiwar movement?

Not so long ago my organization, the YSA, was in a minority in the antiwar movement when it declared that GIs could be very important in the fight against the war. Since that time a majority of the antiwar movement has come to agree with that view. But under the new gag-rule regime in SMC, I might have been fired at that time for speaking out for something that rubbed a section of the New York Working Committee the wrong way.

I had enough of being victimized by the Army brass while I was at Fort Hood, not for what I did, but for what I thought and said. I fought for the right to express my views there, and I won't compromise that right now.

I was given an undesirable discharge from the Army for my ideas because the brass were afraid that those ideas might "infect" the other guys—as if they need "infection" by anyone else to be against this war. Although they admitted I was a "good soldier" and didn't disobey direct orders, they finally had to dump me as a YSA'er.

I wasn't in New York and frankly don't know all the details about the charges and countercharges. But I did read the Mobilizer that Syd edited and used it to get support in the Army, I did read the correspondence that Kipp sent out to build the Strike, and I did see the results of this work and the effect of the Strike on GIs! I also know that if witch-hunting and exclusion are brought back into the movement it will kill it—and this is a hell of a time to do that.

The war, as every GI knows, is still going on. During the last two weeks, despite the "negotiations," there have been more deaths in Vietnam than in any two previous weeks of the war.

When I appeared at the SMC conference in 1967 as a GI on leave, I was speaking to the central organization that drew together the various groups and individuals in the student antiwar movement. Huge actions against the war were built on that basis.

While on national tour speaking for my case I had the chance to talk to many GIs from various posts across the country. It's clear that a growing number of GIs are looking for ways to express their opposition to the war. In San Francisco, the April 27 march was led by a contingent of GIs. The SMC now has the possibility of involving increasing numbers of GIs in the struggle against the war.

It is tragic that the moves of the Working Committee have endangered the unity and future of the Student Mobilization Committee just when its activities are so badly needed. Any such measures that threaten the existence and success of the antiwar movement must be promptly reversed.

The first thing to be done is that Kipp and Syd must be reinstated. Then a full national conference of the SMC must be set for a central part of the country to allow young people (including interested GIs) to discuss the general policies of SMC, democratically review all actions of the Working Committee, and decide on what to do next in strengthening the ongoing fight against the war.

I hope all these things will be done as soon as possible; we have an enormous responsibility to the Vietnamese and American victims of the war.

Sincerely,

Howard Petrick

of a movement have the right to participate, regardless of their beliefs or associations. It doesn't mean that those who are opposed to the aims of a movement have the right to implement its policies.

DEMOCRATIC PROCEDURE

To charge that a group cannot participate in the leadership of SMC because of a conflict of aims is a very serious matter and such a verdict should be reached only on the basis of a democratic discussion where everyone—particularly the accused—can be heard.

A decision of such import should certainly not be decided on by an accidental, unrepresentative formation such as the largely appointed Working Committee members of the SMC.

Such a charge should be heard and decided on by the fullest and most representative gathering of the movement, specifically a national conference of all SMC activists.

The fact that those who are working to exclude YSA are trying to avoid such a conference, even though one was mandated by the last conference, is the clearest indication that they know they can't make their charges stick in a full, open debate before the entire movement.

Lessons of the developments in

By George Novack

Truly awe-inspiring is the popular upheaval engulfing France these May days. Overnight, virtually without warning, the mass movement has risen up like a fiery volcano from beneath the ground, covering the length and breadth of the country with its lava flow. From the disturbed dignitaries high above to the participants down below, everyone has been astonished by the extent and elemental force of the outburst.

Wave upon wave of protest has rolled on to encompass every significant segment of French society apart from the ruling bourgeoisie. One layer of the people after another has responded "present" to the summons to demonstrate their discontent with de Gaulle's played-out authoritarian regime.

The students gave the signal. After them came the workers. Then the state employees and small farmers fell into line behind them—and even the police unions have expressed sympathy with the strikers!

The general strike of ten out of fifteen million workers has paralyzed all sectors of the economy. It is the most massive, the most unanimous walkout in the history of the world working class.

This magnificent mobilization is more than a general strike. It is the spontaneous outpouring of an entire nation, declaring in a single voice: "Ten years of Gaullism is more than enough; now things must change." As Premier Pompidou prophetically told the National Assembly on May 22, just before the Gaullist government narrowly escaped a censure vote: "Nothing will ever be exactly the same."

He is right. A manifestation of mass power of such magnitude subjects all theories about the main motive forces and trends of contemporary society to the rigorous tests of practical experience. It serves to confirm or disprove the validity of the programs and positions of all political formations, above all those which claim to lead the way to a post-capitalist society. The collision of ideas with the realities of the class struggle and the laws of its operation ruthlessly destroys fictions and illusions.

What, then, do the colossal events in France this May already reveal about the worth of the views advanced by the diverse tendencies of the Left? What do the confrontations to date have to teach the young rebels—and remind their elders—about the cardinal issues of our time?

They have strikingly verified in life the basic tenets of revolutionary Marxism and the perspectives issuing from them.

The social crisis that has gripped France shows that all the major capitalist powers of this era are not so strong and stable nor so immune to shocks and convulsions as may appear. It further shows that the crucial question of which class will be master of society can be posed without the onset of a severe economic depression. On the eve of upheaval France was comparatively calm, prosperous, and free from entanglement in costly colonial adventures.

Nevertheless, its social equilibrium turned out to be so precarious that it was upset by clashes between the authorities and the students. It was as though the dislocation of a few pebbles let loose an avalanche.

Indeed, the momentum of that landslide quickly exposed the underlying weakness of de Gaulle's government and the domination of the capitalist class. The myth that authoritarian regimes can indefinitely keep the workers housebroken was shattered. For all its mystique, concessions and repressions, ten years of Gaullism did not succeed in reconciling the working class to capitalism let alone breaking its will to resist. Once the opening presented itself, the antagonism of the toilers to the rule of the rich burst out with irresistible vigor.

Their display of strength ought to dispel

much of the skepticism so rife these past years in radical circles like the American Students for a Democratic Society regarding the revolutionary potential of the workers in the highly industrialized countries. The fallacious theory that the wage workers had been thoroughly seduced by the consumer culture and inseparably integrated into the capitalist structure was philosophically formulated by Professor Herbert Marcuse, among others. He asserted that the central conclusion of Marxism that the industrial working class was the antithesis, the main adversary, and the predestined gravedigger of capitalism was no longer tenable and that other, more marginal social layers would have to step into the place vacated by the Western proletariat.

Thus, in his popular work on *One Dimensional Man*, and still more categorically in a symposium at the University of Notre Dame in April 1966, Marcuse stated that "in the advanced industrial countries where the transition to socialism was to take place, and precisely in those countries, the laboring classes are in no sense a revolutionary potential."

Over a year later, in a reassessment of Marx's theory of the role of the industrial proletariat at the Third Socialist Scholars Conference in New York City, Monthly Review editor Paul Sweezy, propounded the proposition, foreshadowed in his work on *Monopoly Capital*, that, in sharp contrast with nineteenth century conditions and the contemporary Third World, the progress of modern technology and its enormous productivity tend to shape a proletariat which is less and less revolutionary in a developed capitalist country.

Rounding out this roster of disqualifiers of the anti-capitalist capacities of the industrial workers were Social Democrats like George Lichtheim and liberals like David Bazelon. After proclaiming that Marxism was all wrong in looking to the workers as the prime agency of social transformation, these thinkers have reassigned that leading role to the managers, technicians and intellectuals who in their eyes are better equipped and situated to supplant the capitalist owners as the new directors of "post-industrial society."

The prolonged, steadfast general strike of the French workers attended by their takeover of factories, shops and offices should indicate where the new social power and political rulership must come from. The red flags hoisted over occupied plants, the singing of the "Internationale," the calls for sweeping change betoken their conscious break with the existing order and their resolve to find the way out of its evils. Far from being complete and corrupted captives of capitalism, they want to abolish it in favor of socialism.

What the short-sighted academicians failed to understand was that the passivity of the proletariat over the past two decades was not a permanent but a passing phase. After setbacks and disappointments, they needed time to reorient themselves and recharge their energies. Their revolutionary capacities were built up little by little until these could be transformed from a potential to an active state when the appropriate circumstances and occasion arrived.

The stalemate was broken through the initiative of the new generation of young workers and students who were not bowed down by the betrayals of the past twenty years or conservatized and depoliticized by economic prosperity.

The nationwide upsurge in France likewise exposes the limitations of the prescriptions for the strategy of the world revolution emanating from Peking and shared by others. This scheme proceeds from the twin premises that for a long time to come the proletarian revolution is postponed in the imperialist countries and that the center of the revolutionary movement will continue to be exclu-

sively confined to the colonial world.

This outlook is in turn tied up with the tacit prospect of a prolonged stabilization of the internal structures of Western imperialism.

This set of propositions has now been put in doubt by the resurgence of the French proletariat in the heart of Europe. As Pompidou has said, "nothing will ever be exactly the same," after this. Those strategists who have too hastily written off the revolutionary capacities of the workers in the imperialist centers should listen to this useful warning from a spokesman of the enemy class.


The workers are obviously the dominant and decisive force in the present revolutionary offensive. But they are not the only element in active opposition. They were preceded by the students who were the first to challenge the state authorities and raise the banner of revolt.

the necessity for the construction of the revolutionary party."

After what happened in France where the workers responded to the combats of students with the police by overcoming the resistance of their own officials, these injunctions were obviously out of step with the march of events and articulated a defeatism masquerading as proletarian intransigence.

Against both varieties of one-sidedness, the Marxists have consistently adhered to a dialectical conception of the interplay between the ranks of labor and other dissident elements like the students. This is based upon the inevitably irregular mode of development and readiness for action among the diverse participants in the anticapitalist struggle.

As a rule, the separate social forces do not come upon the arena of open combat all at



Picha in *Le Special*, Belgium

That honor cannot be taken from them by the "Stalinist creeps" at the head of the French CP who condemned the audacious initiative of the students and denounced their leaders.

The developments of the protest movement go far to clarify the controversy that has been conducted in many places over the relations and respective roles of the students and the workers in the struggle against capitalist power. They should effectively dispose of two counterposed conceptions which are equally incorrect.

One was the line of thought set forth by such mentors of the New Left as C. Wright Mills, Marcuse and Paul Goodman that, in view of the bankruptcy of the "labor metaphysics" of Marxism and the definitive default of the industrial proletariat, students and intellectuals would assume the front rank as the principal vehicle of revolutionary action and social reconstruction in our time.

On the other hand, Communist bureaucrats of both East and West, who are adamantly opposed to the student rebels, and certain pseudo-Marxist ultra-left doctrinaires have refused "on principle" to accord any progressive vanguard role to the young activists from the universities and high schools or recognize the change in their social weight and composition over the past two decades.

One of the more ludicrous and instructive examples of such dogmatism was provided by the polemic against Rudi Dutschke and the student demonstrators of the German Socialist Student Federation which appeared in the April 20, 1968, Newsletter of the London-based Socialist Labour League.

It denounced the SDS actions as "nothing more than an idealistic militant form of protest. Merely to carry placards in West Berlin saying 'after the students come the workers' is totally inadequate," the Newsletter remarked. Feeling that this diatribe was likewise "totally inadequate," these sectarians went on to say: "Such 'solutions' now create very serious problems within the working class movement because of their ineffectiveness and the ease with which they are broken up by the police and the state. They strengthen conservative, right-wing tendencies who use each defeat suffered on the streets as a means to keep the workers quiet and hesitant of struggle within the trade unions." And the lecturers triumphantly conclude: "The demand that after the students come the workers is in essence revisionist [!] because it excludes

once or en masse but one after the other and in successive detachments. In the revolutionizing process students, intellectuals, oppressed minorities, peasants, and other oppositional layers actuated by their own grievances, can set the ball rolling and take on the authorities before the mass of workers are ready or able to move. Their first steps, their encounters, their calls for support can spur the heavy battalions of labor into action on their own account.

That is precisely the kind of chain reaction that has taken place in France. What the students started set the stage for the entry of the workers. Younger workers were the link between the two sectors in the sequence of developments. In the early Latin Quarter demonstrations they came out to contact and aid the students, fought side by side with them against the cops, and then transmitted to their fellow workers in the factories the spirit of resistance and mood of solidarity against Gaullism. They acted as a conduit through which the workers became aligned with the students despite the reluctance of the union bureaucracy.

The mighty upthrust of the workers lifted the anti-Gaullist protest to the level of revolt because they alone possess the power and are in a position to carry the popular offensive to its logical ends: the overthrow of capitalism, the conquest of power, the construction of a new social order.

In order to perform these historical tasks now staring them in the face, the insurgent French workers and their allies require the proper leadership. Their mighty strike has sprung the Gaullist regime into midair where it dangles like a corpse bereft of reliable or substantial support anywhere in the masses. With the present relation of forces in the country, with Gaullism in *extremis* and the ultra-right reaction isolated, with the peasants on the march and the middle classes in opposition, the political and economic props of capitalism could be dismantled and disposed of in short order.

This little scene, reported in the May 25 New York Times, shows how favorable the situation is for a clean sweep of the old rubbish not only in the cities but in the provinces. "The gendarmes peeped out from the entrance of the central administrative building of the Gers Department—once the Archbishop's palace here in Auch—as more than 2,000 peasants and workers marched past the moss-covered building freshly daubed with slogans



"Mirror, mirror on the wall, who's the most hated of them all?"

Cummings in the Daily Express, London

in France

How the general strike spread in the factories

such as 'Everything is rotten—Revolution!' Some marchers bellowed out parts of 'The Internationale,' the Communist anthem."

The workers can be counted on to embark on a concerted struggle to assure control over the factories and secure command over the state—once they are given the lead. At present such a struggle could win with a minimum of civil strife and the least number of casualties.

However, between the workers and the prospects of power stand the cowardly and conservative leaderships of the traditional parties and union organizations. Foremost among them are the heads of the Communist Party. The full strength of its apparatus and influence has been flung into the breach to slow down and hold back the workers so that French capitalism can once more be protected and rescued from their socialist aspirations. The CP is trying to split the workers from the students.

The role of the CP is the most important political factor in the further evolution of the present revolutionary situation in France. In a desperate last-ditch effort to preserve his Bonapartist functions, President de Gaulle has asked for a referendum in June to renew the national mandate for his personal rule.

To his request for full powers, the answer of any working class leadership worthy of the name would be: "No power to the General or any other representative of the ruling class! All power to the workers! Forward to a Socialist Republic based on the workers, farmers and students committees!"

But nothing of the sort can be expected from the Stalinist betrayers. They have no intention of mobilizing the masses for an assault upon the bourgeois state or of expropriating big business. They envisage and propose nothing more than a shift from the extra-parliamentary rule of de Gaulle to the restoration of a bourgeois-democratic government. Under the aegis of the "Popular Front" Communist ministers are to help administer the affairs of state on behalf of a decaying capitalism in disregard of the welfare and wishes of the workers, just as they did in the French government from 1944 to 1947. Except that this time they hope to displace the Socialists as the central faction on the Left in the horsetrading of the National Assembly.

Although they have different ends in view, the Gaullists and Stalinists are each following a common strategy of gaining time. Both bank on letting the revolutionary ardor of the workers ooze away while they haggle over paltry reforms which can be whittled down or snatched back by the bosses and their government with the next turn of the tide.

The question is: Will the French CP once again be able to squander and spoil the immense revolutionary possibilities opened up by the vast movement of the masses?

That will depend in large measure on two factors of a different order. One is the dynamic force and the resistance the workers can exert to counteract the array of adversaries and misleaders who will work with might and main to cripple and crush their offensive. The other relates to the chances of creating an alternative authoritative revolutionary leadership and a mass Marxist party in the sharpening conflicts with the bourgeoisie and the bureaucrats which lie ahead.

The reflexes of the CP tops have freshly demonstrated the incapacities of the Stalinists to take advantage of the most propitious opportunity to settle accounts with capitalism in Western Europe since 1944-1945. On the other hand, the French Trotskyists, and especially its youth contingent in the Jeunesse Communiste Revolutionnaire (JCR), have displayed an exceptional ability to offer guidance to the militants in the factories, in the streets, on the barricades and in the universities and high schools.

As the London Observer correspondents on the spot in Paris testified on May 19: "It can claim to have provided the chief inspiration and political direction of the insurrection of the past two weeks, which may justly be described as the greatest success the Trotskyists have ever achieved in Europe."

These young revolutionary Marxists have shown that they are attuned to the temper of the masses and the pace of the present critical stage of the struggle. They are presenting a program of political and industrial action and organization designed to steer the promising beginnings of the movement toward the conquest of power by the workers.

If these two factors—the revolutionary will of the proletariat and the cadres of the Trotskyist vanguard—can be fused together in time over the coming period, the emergent revolution can be saved from the bankrupt policies of the Stalinist and reformist leaderships. Victory in France will have to be worked for and fought for. Such an outcome would change the whole course of European and world history.

May 26, 1968

By Pierre Frank

PARIS, May 19—The immense May 13 demonstrations ended without any other direction from the union leaders except to disperse. The vanguard which met on the Champs de Mars decided to continue the SNES (Syndicat National d'Enseignement Supérieur—National University Teachers Union) and UNEF (Union National des Etudiants Français—French National Student Federation) strike. However, no decision was made for the workers.

On Tuesday the 14th the workers went into the factories with a higher consciousness and a clearer conception of their power. What would they do? On Wednesday it was learned that an airplane factory, Sud-Aviation in Nanterre, had gone on strike and that the workers had occupied the plant and shut the manager up in his office.

Early Thursday morning, a strike and factory occupation broke out at the Renault plant in Cleon (in the department of Seine-Maritime), then in Flins, Le Mans, and finally, in the late afternoon, in the big factory in the Parisian suburb of Billancourt, the pilot plant for all France, which has about 30,000 workers.

From then on the movement could not fail to spread. Big metallurgical, automobile, and airplane factories followed suit. On Saturday, the trains stopped, along with mail and telegraph service. The postal savings office struck, and the subway and bus lines in the Paris area stopped one after the other. The strike hit Air-France, shipping, the mines, etc.

On Sunday the 19th the Paris sanitation services went on strike. The Paris Opera was occupied by its personnel. On Monday the workers were preparing to strike many other industries and services. This week will see a general strike throughout the entire French economy.

Thus, the determined struggle of the university students and teachers broke down the barriers and unleashed a movement surpassing 1936 and the Liberation.

By its dimensions and power this movement naturally poses the question of power and challenges the system. In a radio broadcast where the CGT (Confederation Generale du Travail—General Federation of Labor—the Communist-led union) and the CFDT (Confederation Francaise et Democratique du Travail—French Democratic Federation of Labor) leaders were asked questions by people calling in, most of the questions were of this type: "What is it you want?" "Where are you headed?" And when these leaders answered only by listing demands for higher wages and more fringe benefits, their questioners replied: "But what about the political issues? What is your position on the government?"


Friday and Saturday the CGT and CFDT leaders thought they could get by with only economic and social demands (wage increases, reduction of the work-week, lowering of the retirement age). By Saturday, however, it proved difficult to hold the line there. The CFDT moreover pulled a small fast one on the CGT on trade-union rights in the plants and, in confused terms, workers' participation in management, which in turn forced the CGT to make a slight left turn.

On the political front, after several days, the FGDS (Federation de la Gauche Democratique et Socialiste—Federation of the Democratic, Socialist Left) called for the government's resignation. The CP leadership, however, limited itself to calling on the FGDS quickly to establish a common program with it. Here also the CP leadership hesitated to put forward political slogans, for example to declare itself on the question of the government.

Seeking to prevent the strikes from taking on too dangerous a character for the bourgeois order, the CGT leaders moved abruptly to block the students from going into the factories. The workers, they said, had no need of tutelage—except of course from the bureaucrats. They waved the scarecrow of police intervention, but in reality what they feared was linkup between the revolutionary intellectuals and the workers in the factories.

The bureaucrats saw the students occupy the Sorbonne and initiate running debate and workers' democracy, letting all political groups display their publications in the Sorbonne courtyard. Pictures of Lenin, Trotsky, Che, Fidel, and Mao were pasted on the walls. And over the Sorbonne floated the red and black flags alongside the flag of Vietnam. Comparisons come easily to mind, the Commune, Smolny, . . .

It was enough to see how the bureaucrats received the students Friday evening to comprehend the magnitude of their fear. A column of 2,000 to 3,000 students headed up by a



SEIZE RENAULT PLANT. Workers at gates of Renault automobile factory after 40,000 workers struck and took over giant works.

red flag and singing The Internationale marched from the Sorbonne to the Place Nationale in Billancourt, about six miles.

When they arrived in front of the Renault gate guarded by CP stalwarts they were greeted by a CGT official who delivered a colorless little speech:

"We thank you, here are our demands . . . and we have decided for this and that reason not to let anybody enter the factory." He did not even offer the microphone to the students for them to respond to this greeting.

After about ten minutes, the UNEF leader spoke. He saluted the strikers, expressed revolutionary views, and then called on the students to march around the factory. A line of workers and students formed, two or three times stronger than the column which had come to Billancourt, and it marched around the factory, chanting the slogan "Workers to Power!" It was greeted by the strikers in windows and on the factory walls.

On Saturday evening the pressure was so strong that the CGT leaders began to move toward blocking the movement. They proposed a joint meeting of the CP, the FGDS,

the CGT, the CFDT, FO (Force Ouvriere—the social democrat, pro-American union), and FEN (Federation de l'Education Nationale—the National Teachers Union) to discuss the situation. It was obvious that they wanted to find a common formula of agreement to keep the movement from taking them too far.

Where will the movement go? What will be the results? Will de Gaulle be forced to resign? Or will he replace the Pompidou government by an interim cabinet that will hold elections, which inevitably, under present conditions, will produce an FGDS-CP majority?

The situation will evolve from day to day and some days even from hour to hour. A crucial stage has already begun. In any case, the end of Gaullism as well as an FGDS-CP coalition government are on the agenda.

Fascist reactions or army intervention is not likely considering the relationship of forces and the fact that discontent is great even among the police (there has been talk of the possibility of a police strike).

"The Internationale"

By Robert Langston

The Internationale resounds once more through the streets of Paris. More than any other song, it is saturated with the experience of the modern struggle of the oppressed against tyranny and misery. The words were written immediately following one of the greatest achievements and most terrible defeats of the working class: the triumph and destruction of the world's first workers' government, the Paris Commune.

Eugene Pottier had been a leader of the French section of the First International and, during the revolution of 1871, of the Paris Commune.

While the firing squads of the reaction were still slaughtering the workers of Paris, Pottier, in hiding, composed his great poem of defiance and of affirmation.

Many of the crucial themes that have shaped revolutionary thought and action are imbedded in the song. There is the insistence that the emancipation of the oppressed can only be the work of the oppressed themselves:

We want no condescending saviors,
To rule us from a judgment hall,
We workers ask not for their favors,
Let us decide for all.

There is the declaration of war against oppressors and of solidarity among the workers of all nations:

"Peace among us, war on tyrants."

There is the denunciation of legal "equality" of the bourgeois state as a cover for social injustice and oppression:

The law oppresses us and tricks us.

Taxation drains the victim's blood;
The rich are free from obligations,
The law the poor delude.

There is the assertion of the unity of the oppressed in their common struggle through the party of labor:

Toilers from shops and fields united,
The party we of all who work. . . .

Finally, and above all, there is the call to the oppressed to liberate themselves, there is the proclamation of the end of the old miserable order of the world, and there is the vision of the world transformed in the first verse.

The Internationale

Following is the first verse and chorus of The Internationale.

Arise, ye prisoners of starvation!
Arise, ye wretched of the earth,
For Justice thunders condemnation,
A better world's in birth.
No more tradition's chains shall bind us,
Arise, ye slaves; no more in thrall!
The earth shall rise on new foundations,
We have been naught, we shall be all.

(chorus)
'Tis the final conflict,
Let each stand in his place,
The International Party
Shall be the human race.

What is the JCR?

By Elizabeth Barnes

In its scanty coverage of the revolutionary events in France, the May 26 issue of *The Worker* picked out for special attack the revolutionary student vanguard which has spearheaded repeated mass demonstrations in the streets. In particular they single out student leader Daniel Cohn-Bendit ("Danny the Red") and what they call the "1,000 member organization of Trotskyite university students." Cohn-Bendit and the Trotskyists are charged with being "dissident elements" and "provocateurs" who want to split the movement.

Again in the May 28 issue, *The Worker* attacks Cohn-Bendit, this time quoting from *L'Humanite*, the French Communist Party newspaper. Bendit is called a "rabble-rouser" who not only has slandered and insulted the French Communist Party, but who has, among other things, "insulted the French flag!"

Who is this Cohn-Bendit and who are the 1,000 Trotskyist students to which the French and American CPs are so resolutely opposed?

Cohn-Bendit, who has been a leading participant throughout the present upsurge, is head of the March 22 movement, a student group named after the date of the student revolt at the Paris University Annex of Nanterre which initiated the entire current wave of student struggles. The student actions in Paris which sparked the general strike originally began as demonstrations in solidarity with the students at Nanterre.

The "1,000 member Trotskyist organization" is the JCR, the Revolutionary Communist Youth (*Jeunesse Communiste Revolutionnaire*). The JCR has been in the forefront of the student street demonstrations and actions in France from the very beginning, and they have helped give political direction to these actions.

As the May 19 London Observer put it, "In Paris, scratch any one of the proliferating Sorbonne committees and you will find their (the JCR's) man. Their directing hand is at work in the March 22 Movement, the May 3 Movement, and also in the CAL (*Comites d'Action Lyceen*). the secondary school action committees, which are leading the attack on the baccalaureat—and which, if successful, could plunge France into a crisis even graver than the university revolution."

By organizing continual mass street actions around revolutionary slogans, the JCR, working along with and through other revolutionary youth groups, has been decisive in moving the whole workers upsurge to the left, and in bringing forward the demand for socialism and workers power.

Most important, because of the lessons being learned in the heat of struggle by millions of French workers, students and farmers, the JCR is in a position to play a key role in bringing together the forces needed to lead a revolutionary struggle for power in France.

Although the JCR is still a small organization it has been able to play a role which most people would consider out of proportion with its present size. This is due, in part, to the political education which its members have received in a whole series of struggles over the past years.

The origins of the JCR go back to the late 1950s when a group of students within the French Communist student organization began to organize underground support for the Algerian National Liberation Front, and to build demonstrations within France against the right-wing French Secret Army Organization (OAS).

In order to carry out these activities the students had to go against the Communist Party bureaucrats' stance of giving no aid or demonstrations of support to the Algerians. (In the 1950s the CP went so far as to vote in the French Assembly in favor of appro-

priating war funds to fight against the Algerians.)

After the Algerian war ended the left-wing within the Communist students continued to carry out activities which went counter to the policies of the CP leadership. They rallied to the support of the Cuban revolution, and did what they could to aid revolutionists from Santo Domingo and other Latin American countries.

When the international antiwar movement grew up against American intervention in Vietnam, it was these growing left-wing forces within the Communist students (and not the CP leaders) which organized the first demonstrations against the war in Vietnam.

The fight which grew up over these questions between the left-wing students and the party bureaucrats came to a head in 1965 when the CP decided to support Mitterand, a pro-capitalist politician, in the general elections. The students responded by distributing a leaflet demanding that Mitterand state his position on the Vietnam war.

As a result of this leaflet, several leaders of the Communist students were expelled from the Union of Communist Students and the entire Sorbonne section was dissolved.

It was these expelled students who, with support from other dissident communist youth, including Trotskyists, formed the JCR. Since its founding convention April 2, 1966, JCR chapters have been formed in over 30 different French cities and the JCR has grown to become the largest socialist youth group in France.

The JCR was the chief organizing force behind the French demonstrations in solidarity with the series of International Days of Protest Against the Vietnam war. Members of JCR helped spearhead the bringing together of socialist youth from all over Europe to the Brussels Conference of Vanguard Youth held in 1967, and the 20,000 strong all-European student demonstration against the Vietnam war held in Berlin last February.

As might be expected, since the expulsions in 1965, the Union of Communist Students experienced a series of splits and fissures which have left it weak and isolated. Thus, when the current upsurge of the students began, it had already lost its influence.

The students involved in the current upsurge cut their political teeth on struggles which demanded an internationalist outlook: support for the Algerian, Cuban and Vietnamese revolutions. They are not interested in the narrow nationalist outlook of the ossified French CP. It is these students who have been most serious about supporting Che's call for "two, three, many Vietnams," and they intend to make France one of these "Vietnams."

While *L'Humanite* has used the fact that Cohn-Bendit is half German, and not a French citizen, in a chauvinist attempt to discredit him, the students have responded to de Gaulle's attempts to keep Cohn-Bendit out of the country as an "undesirable alien" with chants of, "We are all aliens! We are all German Jews!"

It is this revolutionary and internationalist outlook, and independence from the Communist Party, which have made the students so bold in their actions and such an important part of the current revolt. As in 1965, when left-wing students opposed the election of Mitterand, a growing number of revolutionary students today are resolutely opposed to settling for a government headed by a Mitterand, or a Mendes-France, or any such capitalist politician. They want a socialist France. More and more students are joining the JCR so that they can fight for this, and as each day goes by, more and more workers are beginning to agree with them.

Are you with the revolutionary socialist youth of France?

Join the same kind of political movement here—the Young Socialist Alliance!

In France, the Revolutionary Communist Youth (JCR) has played a central role in the barricades struggles of the French students and workers.


Here, the Young Socialist Alliance, American counterpart of the JCR, basing itself on the same program, is organizing and fighting for the same socialist goal.

If that's what you are aiming toward—if you support: black power, Cuba, the Third World, Vietnamese freedom fighters, the antiwar movement, the fight for socialist democracy in Eastern Europe, revolutionary socialist candidates, a socialist America

Then you belong in YSA. If that's where you want to be, clip coupon.

Young Socialist Alliance
P. O. Box 471, Cooper Station
New York, New York 10003

Name _____
Address _____
City _____
State _____ Zip _____



cover of Italian magazine

SOCIALIST FUND

An appeal to our readers

By Evelyn Reed
Fund Director

Three weeks before the deadline, \$17,472 has been collected toward our \$26,000 goal for the Spring Fund of the Socialist Workers Party. The money will be used to build the SWP and spread its program of revolutionary socialism to ever larger sectors of the American people. The drive ends on June 15.

As the scoreboard shows, Twin Cities has already fulfilled its quota, ahead of time, and stands in first place with 100 percent. New York, which accepted the largest quota of \$6,400, is a close runner-up with 82 percent paid in. All the other regions of the country expect to complete their quotas in full and on time by the end of the drive.

However, the "General" category presents a problem which we are going to ask YOU, our Militant readers, to help us resolve. We need about \$500 to bring this quota up to the mark.

Did you read about Mr. Mott, the wealthy General Motors heir, who has impartially donated \$50,000 to Republican Rockefeller and another \$50,000 to Democrat McCarthy? Unfortunately, the SWP has not received a cent from any millionaire for its candidates, Fred Halstead for President and Paul Boutelle for Vice President. So we must turn to *The Militant* readers for assistance. How many of YOU can help us with special donations to make up the \$500 required to complete our \$26,000 Fund?

Are there five individual readers of this column who can afford to send \$100 each? Or, are there ten individuals with \$50 each? Or—fifty individuals with \$10 each?

You don't have to be a General Motors heir to make any of these three contributions! Hoping to hear from you by return mail, I am gratefully yours. . . .

Fund scoreboard

Branch	Quota	Paid	Percent
Twin Cities	\$1,800	\$1,800	100
New York	6,400	5,263	82
Detroit	1,800	1,287	72
Boston	1,450	855	69
Chicago	2,200	1,375	63
San Francisco	1,700	1,050	62
Los Angeles	4,700	2,884	61
Cleveland	1,500	900	60
Oakland-Berkeley	1,700	1,000	59
Seattle	300	150	50
General	965	438	45
San Diego	350	150	43
Allentown	135	50	37
Newark	200	55	28
Philadelphia	800	215	27
Totals	\$26,000	\$17,612	68%

International Socialist Review

A bimonthly journal of revolutionary socialist theory, the *International Socialist Review* covers the most important topics in world events of the day.

Still available, the March-April 1968 issue covers: the Reuther-Meany split—a close look at the 1967 settlement at Ford by a veteran

trade unionist; third parties in American politics; the U.S. dilemma in Vietnam; current trends in American trade unions; a new look at Marx's theory of wages.

Our next issue will focus on French events.

A full year subscription—6 issues—is yours for \$2.50. Single issues 50c.

Name _____
Address _____
City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Send to *International Socialist Review*, 873 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10003

The Reuther-Meany split

By Tom Kerry

May 21—The Reuther-Meany conflict culminated in a definitive split last week after Walter Reuther, president of the United Automobile Workers had jockeyed George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, into suspending the 1.3-million-member UAW for being over three months in arrears in their per capita dues payments to the federation.

The split became inevitable when the UAW, at its recent Atlantic City convention, voted to withhold any further dues payments pending the calling of a special AFL-CIO convention to deal with Reuther's demands for structural reform and policy revision. Meany had previously agreed to hold such a convention providing Reuther would commit himself in advance to abide by its decisions. Reuther summarily rejected any such commitment and castigated it as a demand for a "loyalty oath."

This is the second major split since the reunification convention of 1955 united the AFL and CIO into one national labor federation. In 1957 the 1.7-million-member International Brotherhood of Teamsters was expelled from the AFL-CIO for refusing to answer charges of being under corrupt influences. The UAW and Teamsters are the two largest unions in the country.


The suspension of the UAW raises a number of questions. Will the rupture follow the pattern set by the Teamsters of a semisplit in which jurisdictional warfare was eschewed by both sides, collaboration below the na-

tional level was more the rule than the exception, and the Teamsters in many cases retained their affiliation to state and local central labor bodies?

This will not be the case in the split with the UAW, which is more definitive, goes deeper, and will have much wider repercussions. The Teamsters leadership had no aspirations beyond the narrow framework of pure and simple trade unionism. They did not aspire to lead a crusade to reform the AFL-CIO. They were on the defensive from the beginning and fought the government and its labor lieutenants in the AFL-CIO for the right to select its own officials and run its own affairs.

The social forces which triggered the assault on the Teamsters in 1957 were much different from those which are today exerting such enormous pressure on Walter Reuther and his co-thinkers in the labor bureaucracy. The 1950s was a period of rampant reaction which witnessed the eruption of McCarthyism. The union movement was the object of a ferocious witch-hunting attack by the employers and their government on a national, state and local scale. Where crude red-baiting did not suffice, other means were employed to weaken and undermine union power and authority.

In fact, the reunification of the two rival union federations, AFL and CIO, in 1955 was in large part a defensive move against the antilabor offensive. However, instead of



abating, the antiunion campaign was further accelerated.

In January 1957, Senator Joseph P. McCarthy introduced into the Senate a resolution to set up a "Select Committee" to investigate "labor racketeering"—a term the labor-haters applied to all union activity. This was the origin of the infamous McClellan Committee on which McCarthy served until his death. The McClellan Committee made the Teamsters its major target.

It was under the pressure of reaction run amok that Meany and his cohorts on the AFL-CIO Executive Council engineered the expulsion of the Teamsters. They hoped thereby to appease the labor-haters and ward off the blows aimed at the organized labor movement as a whole. Futile hope! The McCarthyite decade ended with the enactment in 1959 of the Kennedy-Landrum-Griffin "killer law" which further straitjacketed the unions by the imposition of new restrictions and government controls.

From the viewpoint of the union bureaucracy, George Meany was the ideal "leader" of the reunified AFL-CIO in the era of McCarthyism. His reputation as a conservative "labor statesman" was impeccable. In a speech following his elevation as AFL-CIO president, he boasted that he never called a strike, never organized a strike action, and never walked a picket line. In addition, Meany really believed—and still does—the McCarthyite myth of a worldwide "communist" conspiracy threatening the "free world."

To Meany "communism" is the main enemy. His thinking and outlook have never progressed beyond the simplistic mythology of the McCarthy era. He still sees "communists" under each bed and behind every bush. In domestic politics he occupies a position to the right of Lyndon Baines Johnson. In the world labor movement, the AFL-CIO is recognized as a crude instrument of American foreign policy, somewhat to the right of the CIA.

While this may have been considered the epitome of "labor statesmanship" in the 1950s, it just won't do for the latter 1960s. New social forces are at work which make Meany sound like a Neanderthal man—with, moreover, the intelligence quotient of a retarded ape—and his company is proving extremely embarrassing to Walter Reuther both at home and abroad.

Reuther faults George Meany as "the complacent custodian of the status quo." If by this he means to say that for the past 13 years Meany has remained mired in the cesspool of McCarthyism, Reuther is right on target. The Afro-American revolt erupted just one year after the unification of the AFL-CIO. The Montgomery bus boycott in 1956 sparked an explosive chain of events which completely transformed the consciousness of the black community. The revolt of the black freedom fighters drew into its orbit a growing number of idealistic students and intellectuals disgusted by the Jim Crow system.

This process of radicalization was accelerated, first by the Cuban revolution and then by the revulsion engendered by Johnson's escalation of Washington's dirty war in Vietnam. Throughout this entire period, Meany has clung tenaciously to the coattails of the Texas demagogue in the White House. This has earned for the AFL-CIO the dubious distinction of being an integral part of the "establishment." It has succeeded in alienating the black community, the radicalized youth, a large section of the liberals, intellectuals and the academic community. The splintering of the Johnson "consensus"

and his rejection by the electorate is an unmistakable sign of political ferment and social change. That these facts of political life have failed to penetrate the thick skulls of the Meany-led mossbacks on the AFL-CIO Executive Council has infuriated Reuther and led him to take drastic action.

Reuther is shrewd enough to realize that the jerry-built coalition that constitutes the Democratic Party is threatened with disintegration. Johnson's decision to withdraw from the presidential race was largely motivated by a desire to "save" the Democratic Party. McCarthy threw his hat in the ring to further the same aim and with the additional purpose of getting the young antiwar militants off the streets. Kennedy quickly followed suit.

Although Reuther is also greatly concerned over the future of the Democratic Party, he has his own nostrum for its ills which goes by the name of "realignment." He aspires to create a "genuine" two-party system by bringing all the "liberals" into the Democratic Party and forcing all the conservatives into the Republican camp. To accomplish this reshuffle it is necessary to hold together the present coalition, with the exception of the Dixiecrats, and win over whatever "liberals" there are from the Republicans.

The policy of "realignment" is doomed unless the process of Democratic Party disintegration is halted and reversed. Reuther sees as his major role the creation of a "new image" which will permit the organized union movement to play a leading role in cementing the fractured coalition and "saving" the Democratic Party. It is this basic political aim that distinguishes the Reuther-Meany split from the previous split of the 1930s and from the expulsion of the Teamsters in 1957.

In accordance with this objective, top-level policy spokesmen for the UAW have announced they were proceeding to organize "community action councils" as a substitute for state and city central labor councils of the AFL-CIO. When Reuther speaks of "organizing the unorganized," he has this broader concept in mind. His goal is to gather those social forces now in revolt against the "establishment" under the umbrella of a "liberalized" labor movement, get them off the streets, harness them to a new coalition committed to the policy of "realignment," and rescue the capitalist two-party system.

Given the ferment in the body politic, it would seem that Reuther has embarked upon a stormy political voyage—with not much chance of reaching snug harbor.

Black Liberation Notes

In a surprisingly honest series of articles on black GIs in Vietnam, Washington Star reporter Paul Hathaway wrote, "In a month of interviewing hundreds of Negro soldiers all over Vietnam, from the Mekong Delta to the demilitarized zone, this reporter found strong disaffection among black soldiers with the war and their role in it."

According to Hathaway, "Eighty to 85 percent of those interviewed expressed negative feelings about the purposes and objectives of the war or about the military's treatment of Negroes or about both. Usually it was both."

To underline what he meant by "negative feelings," Hathaway quoted a black paratrooper in Pleiku: "You go back and tell LBJ that if he extends our tour of duty over here, the brothers are gonna riot."

According to Hathaway, many of the black GIs he talked with made disparaging remarks about the Vietnamese people. But, at the same time Hathaway says, "many of these same GIs believe—or would like to believe—that the enemy sees the black man as a potential ally."

"Scores of unconfirmed stories circulate among black soldiers in which the enemy treats the Negro either as a friend or a neutral party." The stories are strengthened by NLF leaflets telling black soldiers, "We don't want to fight you. Your fight is against the white man at home."

During the trial of H. Rap Brown in New Orleans, government prosecutor Louis Lacour insisted to the very end that the case was not political, that the government is not jailing Brown for his ideas.

After Brown was sentenced to five years, the maximum possible, Lacour raised his voice to a near shout as he bellowed out in the courtroom, "This is a nation of laws, not men. Everyone in this country—black and white—must obey its laws."

What did Brown do to deserve this maximum sentence? He unwittingly went against a little-known fire arms law which says you cannot carry a gun between states if you are under indictment.

At the time he supposedly committed the offense he did not even know he was under indictment on charges of inciting to riot in Cambridge Md., a charge which the President's "riot commission" has admitted he is not guilty of.

The fact that Brown's case represents a crude government attempt to harass and silence him was seen most clearly when he was restricted to a small area around New Orleans City after being released on bail. This meant that he was unable to fulfill any of his speaking engagements around the country.

The travel restriction, along with \$15,000 bond, still holds during his appeal of the recent New Orleans decision.

After a black student was assaulted by whites at Vailsburg High School in Newark, thousands of black students responded with wholesale walkouts from school and mass rallies in which they put forward their demands for adequate protection and decent education. At one rally at the Newark armory, 3,000 black students were present.

Over the past weeks, Newark has seen a whole series of attacks against Afro-Americans. The main instigator is the racist North Ward Citizens Committee, whose chairman, Anthony Imperiale, has organized a paramilitary group which sends out carloads of whites who cruise around, stopping and questioning "suspicious" black people.

The viciousness of this vigilante group was seen recently when a small group of nuns, priests and black students came to a meeting at Vailsburg High where Imperiale was speaking.

According to one of the priests, when he tried to defend the black students from an attack by the crowd, "hundreds of adults and teenagers tried to get at us. They began throwing bricks and rocks." Finally the nuns, priests and students were evacuated in a patrol wagon before anyone was seriously injured.

Elizabeth Barnes



H. Rap Brown

FOR BOOKS ON:

**Vietnam
Black Struggle
Colonial Revolution
Socialism**

Send for free

Catalogue

MERIT PUBLISHERS

873 Broadway

New York, N.Y. 10003

Support the workers of France

(The following appeal to the workers of France, Europe, and the world was issued May 20 by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International. This is the World Party of Socialist Revolution founded by Leon Trotsky in 1938.)

The barricades of May 10, 1968, in Paris have opened the way for a victorious advance of the socialist revolution in Europe. The West European capitalists thought that they were forever rid of the specter of communism. Because of the failures of the traditional leaderships, the workers' movement in Europe experienced nothing but political stagnation. A long period of prosperity produced many illusions that so-called neocapitalism had succeeded in overcoming the classical contradictions of the system which Marx disclosed. The mass workers' organizations and above all their leaderships were more and more poisoned by reformist gangrene.

In many cases, Social Democratic parties formally renounced the articles in their constitutions defining them as workers' parties and committing them to replacing capitalist society by a socialist one. Wilson and Willy Brandt, who came to power when the first symptoms of economic difficulties were appearing, did nothing but implement an anti-working-class policy.

The mass Stalinist parties (France and Italy), guided by the policy of peaceful co-existence in the international sphere and of peaceful, electoral and parliamentary roads in the domestic arena, joined in the reformism of the social democrats and were ever watchful to stifle any current or grouping, inside the CP or to its left, that advocated the slightest militancy. The very minimal "de-Stalinization" which followed Stalin's death had no other effect for the leaders of these parties than to accentuate the reformist character of their policy. Insofar as possible they maintained the monolithism of their organizations. There was no room for workers' democracy in the groups they controlled.

The Social Democratic and Communist leaders did practically nothing to aid the colonial peoples in liberating themselves from imperialism—when they did not participate in governments organizing the repression of national liberation movements.

But neither the years of economic "prosperity" nor the meager improvements in the living standard of the West European workers in any respect altered the exploitive nature of the capitalist system. In this prosperity, broad layers of workers, above all young workers, enjoyed only marginal means of subsistence. The advance in the standard of living, the level of skills, and culture made still more odious in their eyes a system whose absurdity and inhuman character took on new dimensions at a time when technological progress made possible abundance and the flowering of every human potential.

Imperialism conceded formal independence to most colonies but has continued its exploitation in neocolonialist forms. The courage of the Cuban revolutionists, the impetuosity of the black youth in the United States who have thrown themselves into a struggle for freedom, and the heroism of the Vietnamese people in unswervingly continuing their revolution against the most powerful aggressor army in the world have increasingly inspired a new youth vanguard. And this new vanguard has been wresting the banner of active solidarity with the revolution of the colonized peoples from the hands of the traditional opportunist organizations.

At the first signs of a slowdown in the capitalist economy, of advancing technological unemployment, and increased unemployment among the youth, the contradictions of this artificially stabilized society burst into the open. Neocapitalism imagined that it had a limitless future. The bourgeois, reformist, and neoreformist politicians carefully followed the polls to ascertain what slogans would enable them to gain a few percentage points of the vote. The sociologists and other official pedants put the computers to work to describe the society of the 1980s, the 1990s or of the year 2000. But what neither the capitalists, the rulers, nor the apparatus men of the workers' organizations foresaw, came to pass. Revolt surged up spontaneously from the student youth which, in Paris and throughout the whole of France, was immediately supported by the high-school youth and an important part of the young workers.

There has been much talk in recent days of the Gaullist government's errors. Even if it had displayed a little more "finesse" in these May days, the explosion which was gathering force would have occurred sooner or later.

And what a magnificent explosion! This youth whose elders had given it no political example of militancy in the last 10 years spontaneously rediscovered all the old lessons of the proletarian revolutions. The red flag was its banner. It had no other. It literally tore the red-white-and-blue flag of the French bourgeoisie to pieces, to leave nothing but the red of socialist revolution. It created committees elected by all the participants in the struggle, without having studied the meaning of the famous "soviets" which, starting from Russia, went round the world a half a century ago. It quite naturally instituted the broadest workers' democracy, allowing all tendencies to speak. It rejected all the slanders used to stifle the voice of the revolutionary Marxists. It made its judgments on the basis of program and concrete proposals alone, rejecting all carry-overs from the monolithic heritage of Stalinism. This youth showed those who denigrated the romanticism of "grouplets," of this "dozen or so wildmen," to quote the now historic

to the program of soviet democracy, of management of the state and the economy by democratically centralized workers councils, and active solidarity with the advancing world revolution.

We warmly salute the new revolutionary vanguard arising in the workers' states which, despite a repression of mounting harshness, raises the banner of revolutionary socialist democracy. We salute Comrades Kuron and Modzelewsky, who are again in prison. We salute the Soviet comrades who have appealed to progressive and revolutionary opinion in Europe. We pledge to them our support and declare to them that their cause will be taken up by the new revolutionary vanguard in West Europe, that it is in solidarity with them.

II

The student uprising and the factory occupations have opened the road to the revolutionary ascent in France. But it must be understood that the battle is not yet won, that maneuvers to cheat the masses of their

The objective role of this government—whatever the intent of this or that grouping within it—would be to break up the working-class bloc which has today arisen against the regime, to appease the petty bourgeoisie and the most conservative layers of the working class, to isolate the student and worker vanguard from the broader masses—in sum, to assure the recession of the revolutionary movement, thereby to destroy the masses' acquired confidence in their own strength, and then to unleash a repression against the isolated vanguard.

It is only on these conditions that the impetus can again be broken as it was in 1936 and 1944-46. The revolutionary upsurge would then give way to a period of confusion and retreat. And this time the threat of a dictatorship whose ferocity would mirror the fear which now grips the bourgeoisie would almost certainly shape up.

But, contrary to 1936 and 1944-46, there is a new factor in this revolutionary upsurge: the existence in Paris and many provincial



THE AFTERMATH. Guy Lussac Street in Paris May 11, after all-night battle between police and students in the Latin Quarter. Student struggle sparked massive worker strike and occupations.

expression of a cynical and disillusioned French minister of education, that at certain times the role of the vanguard can be decisive and that, far from being a thing of the past, barricades can rise anew.

Paris rose up with an irresistible power, just as representatives of American imperialism and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam were beginning their talks. Governments whose conceptions smack more of James Bond than of a historical outlook of the slightest seriousness saw in these events a machination to block the negotiations. Paris and the French working masses are not "neutral" diplomats; they are for the victory of the Vietnamese revolution. By responding to the government's provocations and to the attacks of its repressive forces, they have opened the way to realization of the essential precondition for real peace in Vietnam.

The barricades of Paris have broken down the barriers which had contained the socialist revolution in Europe. The call of the barricades will be heard in all the big cities as it was 25 years ago. Students in Berlin, Frankfurt, Copenhagen, and London have organized solidarity demonstrations. In Rome the cry has rung out, "Create two, three, many Paris." In Great Britain, the Netherlands, and Belgium, students have extended their struggle against the bourgeois university, the bourgeois state, and capitalist society.

The factory occupations by the French workers will spur similar actions in several European countries. The struggle against the vicious "emergency powers" laws in West Germany will broaden toward direct action by the workers.

The barricades of Paris and the French factory occupations will also find echoes in the bureaucratically deformed or degenerated workers' states of East Europe. They will show that there is only one alternative to these detested conservative bureaucratic regimes and that it does not lie in a "liberalization" and progressive adaptation to the social-democratic and "neutralist" mentality of the rising technocratic strata but in a return to the ideas of Lenin and Trotsky, a return

victory will multiply, that the bourgeoisie still has considerable forces at its disposal to once more prevent the revolutionary energy of the people from finally overthrowing the bourgeois state and the power of capitalism.

Thus far a crushing defeat has been inflicted only on the Gaullist "strong state," from which it indubitably will never recover. But now the question is posed of what will replace it. The French bourgeoisie, one of the most astute in the world, was momentarily disconcerted by the student movement, whose breadth and revolutionary potential it failed to understand. Now it finds itself faced with a mass strike. It will ply its wits to pull all the classic maneuvers to divert this movement, in which it was so successful in 1936 and 1944-46.

One can be sure that the most intelligent bourgeois strata will be ready to make concessions in regard to the purely social demands (higher wages, shorter work week, broader rights for social delegations). The crime of the CGT and the CP is that they also seek to divert the movement toward new "Matignon agreements" (made between the unions and bosses under Blum's Popular Front government in 1936), to which the employers will accede once they are sufficiently frightened by the profound upsurge sweeping France.

On the political plane, the Pompidou government is no more than a corpse whose burial has been temporarily delayed. Whether it is overturned in the Assembly, dismissed by de Gaulle, driven from power by new street demonstrations, or ousted by the anticipated elections, its days are numbered. With it, or shortly following, will collapse the whole "strong state" which emerged from the military coup d'etat of May 13, 1958.

But its replacement is already on the scene: a new popular front government based on the FGDS (Federation de la Gauche Democratique et Socialiste—Federation of the Democratic Socialist Left) and the CP. This government would put a legal stamp on the social concessions and the few neocapitalist reforms that the bourgeoisie would grant to calm the discontent of the working and student masses.

cities of an extensive and resolutely anticapitalist young vanguard which the traditional social democratic and CP apparatuses cannot recapture in the immediate future. The revolutionary Marxist component and influence in this vanguard are growing rapidly.

In these conditions, there is a real chance that the revolutionary upsurge will not be quickly broken. This depends essentially on two factors: first of all that in the initial ascendant phase positions are taken that remain like so many time bombs in the disintegrating system, and which not even the evacuation of the factories, the workers' resumption of labor, and the fall of the Gaullist government and new elections could disarm. In brief, elements of dual power must be created in the factories and neighborhoods, in the form of committees assuming the powers acquired de facto in the present phase of the struggle, and which the government cannot take away in the immediate future without provoking a test of strength that would lead to a new broadening of the revolutionary upsurge.

These rights on the political plane must be supervised by the French radio and television broadcasting network to assure objective reporting; supervision of the telecommunications system, the central postal bureaus, the telephone and telegraph system, radio communications; control of the high-school, technical-school, and university systems by the students themselves; the creation of nuclei of armed workers' and students' popular guard units to protect the offices occupied by the masses against police repression. A major political objective must be the dismantling and dissolution of all the repressive police forces, odious in the eyes of the people, such as the CRS (Compagnies Republicaines de Securite—Republican Security Companies—an elite military security force) and the Gendarmes Mobiles (Mobile Paramilitary Police), the parallel and secret police, etc.

In the economic sphere, the rights which must be secured are workers' control of production; the right of veto by workers' committees of all proposals to close plants

France!

Politics of the French struggle; The London Observer's report

or lay off personnel; the opening of the company books; the elimination of banking secrecy; the formulation of an economic and social development plan for a socialist France which would guarantee full employment and radical alteration of the consumption standards based on the expropriation and collective appropriation of the major means of production, to be democratically managed by the producers themselves.

To this end, these committees must federate as quickly as possible at the local, regional, and national levels in a national congress of factory committees and people's committees in the schools and neighborhoods. This will be the core of the future Socialist Republic of France.

This congress must launch and appeal to all the workers and peoples of Europe to begin the socialist revolution and to actively demonstrate their solidarity with the French socialist revolution in progress. All attempts by international finance to strangle the revolution economically, or by NATO to crush it militarily, can be thwarted only if this international solidarity functions in a deepgoing way and aims at the establishment of a Socialist United States of Europe.

The other prerequisite for thwarting the maneuvers of the bourgeoisie and the traditional apparatuses of the workers' movement, which have been coopted into bourgeois society, is a rapid coalescence of all revolutionary Marxist forces into a powerful revolutionary vanguard party based on a revolutionary Marxist program. The de facto unity in action of various revolutionary currents which is emerging in the struggle is a promising step in this direction. But provisional accords on fragments of a program do not suffice for the victory of a revolution. Clarity must be shed on all the great strategic and tactical problems posed today for the revolutionary movement. Helped along by experience in action, this clarification, which is in progress, can and must culminate in the amalgamation of all revolutionary militants into a united party of the French socialist revolution.

The United Secretariat of the Fourth International appeals to all the vanguard militants and to all the workers and students of France and calls on them to display the maximum revolutionary daring. **Never forget Saint-Just's words: "Revolutionaries who make revolutions only halfway are bound to dig their own graves."** Do not let the fruits of your victory be stolen from you as in 1936 and 1944-46.

There is still a large gap between the revolutionary maturity of the youth vanguard and the level of consciousness of the workers. But with a correct political orientation and a constant exertion in action, organization, and agitation, this gulf can be bridged; the majority of the working class can detach itself from the neoreformist line of the French CP which it still reluctantly follows. It can, in its turn, move into revolutionary action. You have a unique chance to assure the breakthrough of socialism in Europe. Do not let this chance slip through your fingers.

The United Secretariat of the Fourth International reminds all vanguard militants and workers in Europe and throughout the world of their historic responsibility. The tocsin of socialist revolution has begun to sound in France. Let us assure that its reverberations will long be heard in all countries.

Long live the French socialist revolution!
Long live the United States of Europe!
Long live the world socialist revolution!

(Following are excerpts from an article, datelined Paris, that appeared in the May 26 London Observer. It is signed by Observer reporters Patrick Seale and Maureen McConville. The liberal weekly sees a dim future for de Gaulle, but sees new revolutionary forces, rather than the Communist Party, bringing him down.)

(Our correspondents in Paris warn, however, that reports of urban "guerrillas" such as contained here are exaggerated and possibly provocative.)

* * *

A new revolutionary power, born and grown to manhood in three weeks, has brought to its knees the most majestic Government in Europe. General de Gaulle still battles pitifully on—for how long?—but Gaullism has been slaughtered, like a horse, beneath him. . . .

If the crisis of the past fortnight means anything, it represents a violent liberation of the French mind from official control. De Gaulle could think of nothing better than to ask for a renewal of his old sweeping mandate. Shouts of astonished derision greeted his speech broadcast to the demonstrators in the streets. Suddenly, before everyone's eyes, he seemed a tired and bankrupt politician.

What is being decided in France this weekend is not whether de Gaulle should go, but how he should go. The old bastions of opposition—the great trade unions, the Socialists, the Communist Party itself—all clamour for his departure, but they want the transfer of power to be effected by constitutional means. But there are younger men who run faster and hit harder.

With bewildering speed, these political guerrillas have been hurled into politics by an anonymous surge of student unrest. By taking to the streets, they have set themselves against every organised political force in France. Both Government and Opposition last week tried desperately to contain them. Both failed. . . .

The guerrillas have introduced a violent, sinister and unpredictable element in French life, and no one at this early stage can be sure what French politics will look like when the fighting dies away. What is certain is that a revolutionary political force is taking shape on the extreme Left which makes the official French Communist movement look as staid and unadventurous as a Victorian tea party.

This extremist movement is formidable for two main reasons. Firstly, because it cannot be clearly identified. One or two tiny factions work at its heart—their leaders, due to the new tell-all television of these revolutionary days, are now better known than most French politicians—but the movement as a whole has no name, no formal structure, and no detailed programme. It is difficult to get to grips with. It is raw explosive power.

Secondly, it is strong because the students by their revolt detonated a massive unsuspected charge of Gallic rebelliousness, crossing boundaries of class and generation, and ranging over the whole of French life. . . .

There is a traditional hostility in France for the police—the hated flics. The more fiercely the regime deploys those truncheons and shiny black maces, the more opposition hardens. On Wednesday the Government, surviving a vote of censure, regained a measure of confidence. Police repression then escalated. Terror bred counter-terror.

Daniel Cohn-Bendit, the student leader, was last week banned from France as an un-



JCR CONTINGENT. French revolutionary youth group marching in Berlin demonstration of European youth against the war in Vietnam on Feb. 18.

desirable alien. The protest was immediate. 'We are all aliens,' chanted the demonstrators. 'We are all German Jews,' young Algerians were even heard to shout.

Cohn-Bendit's chief supporters are a small, highly organised and fanatically militant group called the Jeunesse Communiste Revolutionnaire (JCR)—a sort of Trotskyist political commando, led by Alain Krivine, a former history teacher, now full-time agitator, and still under 30.

The whole JCR strategy is to mount short, sharp revolutionary operations to jolt society, shock by shock, down the road to socialism. Across this path stand the Communist Party and the Communist-led unions. Last week JCR tactics were to stampede these cautious, lumbering elephants by infecting the younger workers with the virus of rebellion.

They want the students to set an example of militancy which the working class will eventually follow. The irony is that these violent young men have struck a chord of idealism and morality.

The attempt to head off this Trotskyist challenge has caused a grave malaise inside the French CP, even the threat of a split. From the moment Cohn-Bendit raised his unruly red head, the Communist Party has tried to cut it off. But younger party members—and some on the Central Committee itself—are now violently critical of the timed, blinkered way the party has kept him and the rebellious students at arm's length. In similar protest, a leading party member, Andre Barjonet, resigned on Thursday as Economic Adviser to the Communist-dominated Trade Union Federation, the CGT. . . .

The behaviour of the Communists has been fascinating to watch. From the beginning of the crisis they have been more concerned to crush the guerrilla challenge on their left than to overthrow M. Pompidou's Government. The CGT paralysed the country by a great wave of strikes to wrest the initiative from the student extremists. Georges Seguy, the powerful CGT boss and Politburo member, locked his workers inside the factories to protect them from the revolution stalking outside. On Friday the party felt forced to match the students' demonstrations with a couple of their own.

The students have made clear that their object is to overthrow the Government and in this cause they have battled all night. The CGT does not share these aims. Its immediate objective is the economic betterment of its members. Far from overthrowing M. Pompidou, it agreed to negotiate with him and with the French Employers' Federation.

But under intense pressure from the guer-

rillas, the Communists are being driven step by step away from this cautious position in the middle of the road. They have not yet fought at the barricades, but their public statements denouncing de Gaulle's referendum and demanding his departure have become so insistent as to be almost indistinguishable from those of the extremists.

This is the measure of the students' triumph: they have shifted the whole spectrum of French politics to the Left. They have given people a taste for direct extra-parliamentary action. . . .

Young French fighters get a grudging tribute

(The following are excerpts from an article which appeared in the May 26 issue of the London Observer, written from Paris by Patrick Seale. The article was datelined May 25, the day following bloody street fighting which broke out after de Gaulle spoke to the French people.)

About 1,500 were wounded in Paris alone, and the great courtyard of the Sorbonne was turned into a field hospital. One lecture hall was marked "surgery," another "gas cases." Ambulances screamed back and forth through the ravaged streets until well after dawn. It was the worst night of civil disturbances Paris had seen since the late 1930s. Appeals for antibiotics were still being broadcast at midday.

Today Alain Krivine, among the most revolutionary student leaders in Europe and head of the Jeunesse Communiste Revolutionnaire (JCR), told the Observer: "It was a near insurrection. We gained valuable experience in the tactics of revolutionary warfare in advanced capitalist countries." . . .

Several JCR leaders were picked up by the police, and spent the night in the cells. Krivine himself was shadowed by plain clothes men, and thrown into a police van but was eventually released.

The JCR, a hard-core militant group of Trotskyist inspiration, in partnership with Daniel Cohn-Bendit, provided much of the political direction of the revolutionary student movement which has swept France in the past three weeks.

Krivine outlined last night's objectives as: 1) to demonstrate that only direct action pays, and it must be mass action; 2) to provide in the student insurrection a model for a wider workers' rising.

"Yesterday," he claimed, "was a decisive day. The vast demonstrations we rallied proved beyond question that the students did not stand alone, but had been joined by large numbers of workers."

Krivine's extreme left-wing movement is directed as much against the French Communist Party and unions as against the Government. He predicted that a strong minority of workers in the Paris area would not obey any call for a return to work issued by the CGT (the Communist-led trade unions who were at today's talks with Pompidou). . . .

In its new mood of apprehensive toughness, the Government is likely soon to move against the JCR and other extremist movements. M. Pompidou is known to have a fat file on the JCR leaders and Daniel Cohn-Bendit, with information alleging that funds were transferred from Germany to finance insurgency in France.

----- clip and mail -----

Special to New Readers

If you would like to get better acquainted with THE MILITANT, you may obtain a special, introductory four-month subscription for \$1. (If you're already sold on the paper, you can help out by sending a regular one-year subscription for \$3.)

- Enclosed is \$1 for a 4 month introductory subscription.
- Enclosed is \$3 for a 1 year regular subscription.

NAME

STREET

CITY STATE ZIP

Send to: The Militant, 873 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 10003

CALENDAR

BERKELEY

Two Young Socialist classes on the events in France. Sundays, 8 p.m., June 9 and 16. 2519A Telegraph.

NEW YORK

"SOCIALISM and DEMOCRACY IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA," Speaker: George Novack, author, The Origins of Materialism, An Introduction To The Logic of Marxism, and other Marxist studies. Friday, June 7, 8:30 p.m. 873 Broadway, near 18th St., Contrib. \$1. Ausp. Militant Labor Forum.

Move to deny minority parties equal air time

By Jon Britton

A proposal to hand over a monopoly of free broadcast time this fall to the capitalist presidential and vice-presidential candidates including white supremacist George Wallace is being energetically pushed by the broadcast networks. According to a May 24 UPI dispatch the network proposal was discussed during a "secret and often stormy session" between the presidents of NBC, CBS, and ABC, and members of the Senate Commerce Committee.

The May 26 New York Times reported that a deal was worked out at this meeting which "would basically provide Mr. Wallace, a third-party candidate, and the major party contenders with opportunity to present their views in a three-part series."

The broadcasters demanded as the price for their providing this "opportunity" the suspension of the equal time rule contained in Section 315 of the Federal Communications Act. Section 315 requires that if broadcast time be given a legally qualified candidate for any public office equal time be granted to all other such candidates for that office. Since 1959 news programs have been exempted from this requirement. The equal time requirement was suspended once before, in 1960, for the "Great Debate" between Kennedy and Nixon.

On May 27 the Senate Commerce Committee acceded to the broadcasters' demands and approved suspension of the equal time provision beginning August 31.

The proposed suspension of equal time is patently undemocratic. On top of the large amount of absolutely free campaign coverage provided on network and local news programs, the capitalist candidates, being multimillionaires themselves or backed by same, buy millions of dollars worth of time on radio and TV for bombarding the electorate with everything from "spot announcements" to half-hour "interviews" and "family chats."

Even if the current equal time provisions were strictly enforced minor party candidates would get a miniscule amount of radio and TV coverage. The proposed suspension of equal time would eliminate even this.

The broadcasters are not satisfied with

merely suspending the equal time provisions. Their objective is to repeal Section 315 completely and thereby freeze out minor party candidates permanently.


This is openly acknowledged by the network heads. For example, John Herbers writes in the New York Times of last July 19 that "Julian Goodman, president of the National Broadcasting Company, in (Congressional) testimony called for outright elimination of the equal time requirement and allowing broadcasters to allot time as they saw fit."

In recent propaganda aimed at brainwashing the public on this issue the broadcasters and their allies in Congress have called the equal time rule "negative," "repressive," "inequitable," and "idiotic" because, they say, it requires them to give valuable broadcast time to "frivolous" candidates of "the lunatic fringe."

In fact, it isn't "frivolous" candidates they are worried about. The truth is that the spreading political radicalization in the United States generated by the war in Vietnam, the struggle for black liberation, an international financial crisis, and now the revolutionary developments in France is causing considerable nervousness in the ruling circles of this country. The political stability of the two-party system is being shaken by mass antiwar actions and ghetto uprisings.

Under Section 315 of the Federal Communications Act candidates of the revolutionary socialist and black liberation movements are legally entitled to a small amount of free time on radio and TV to present their views to the American people. For example, the national and local election campaigns of the Socialist Workers Party utilize radio and TV time to win people to socialist ideas and to aid the struggles to bring the GIs home from Vietnam and for black control of the black community.

Partisans of civil liberties should protest this proposed suspension of equal time. All candidates for public office, including Kennedy and McCarthy, and their supporters should be put on the spot as to where they stand on this question.



BERKELEY SCENE. Socialist bookstore Granma, a few blocks from University of California campus.

Bay Area socialists conduct campaign on French events

By Peter Camejo

BERKELEY, Calif. — The Bay Area Young Socialist Alliance and Socialist Workers Party are campaigning to win support for the French students and workers. Large-scale sales of The Militant, with its special coverage from France, is the focal point of the campaign.

Incomplete returns showed some 1,500 copies of the May 31 issue of the paper sold in Berkeley and more than 700 in San Francisco.

Leaflets have been distributed on the campuses explaining the role of the French working class in the present struggle. Although clear on such issues as the Vietnam war, many students have accepted the myth that the working class is incapable of fighting for social change. The French events are making it easier to win students to a perspective of social transformation in the United States.

The YSA is also asking students to help them reach workers in the area with the truth about what is happening in France. Special leaflets addressed to unionists and other workers are being given out at major plant gates.

The Militant is also being sold at political meetings, shopping centers, in the ghetto and in white working-class neighborhoods.

Sales are also being organized at some plant gates. First results have been gratifying. At a Shell plant, 60 workers bought copies and 20 more were sold on a return visit.

Collection cans have been placed in radical bookstores and elsewhere to raise funds for the embattled French student movement.

The socialist bookstore, Granma, has a banner out front urging support to the French struggle. The store window features news bulletins on France and special literature related to the events.

Inside, every customer purchasing over a dollar receives a free copy of The Militant and everyone who buys a subscription to The Militant gets a 10 percent discount on his other purchases.

Red flags, posters and buttons are being made available.

Classes on the meaning and background of the French events have been initiated and several rallies planned. A demonstration

by several groups was slated at the French Consulate.

On Tuesday, May 4, at 12 noon, the YSA will sponsor a rally in support of the French workers. It will be held at Bancroft and Telegraph. Peter Camejo and others will speak.

Black Panther suit reveals cops wrote fake 'confessions'

By Susan Harris

After the April 6 police attack on the Oakland Black Panther Party in which Panther treasurer Bobby James Hutton was murdered by police, Bay Area newspapers reported that some of the Panthers who were arrested in the confrontation had made confessions of guilt.

According to the April 26 San Francisco Chronicle, the cops claimed that one Panther had signed a statement saying, "I don't know exactly what we all were going to do that night. All I know was that we were going out to do some shooting."

Statements to the effect that the Panthers were going out to shoot cops were then presented by police to the Alameda Grand Jury hearing April 24 which indicted the Panthers on trumped up charges of "attempted murder."

After the statements appeared, Panther Chairman Bobby Seale explained: "The pigs wrote the statements. The brothers didn't even see the statements they were supposed to have made."

Now the Black Panther Party has filed a suit against the City of Oakland which exposes the highly illegal and forceful methods used by the cops to divide the arrested Panthers from each other, and to break them down so they would sign the fake statements.

The suit includes notarized testimony by the Panthers which reveals that the cops pulled guns on Panthers as they talked to them.

According to Warren Wells, one of the Panthers whose confession was quoted in the papers, "They (the cops) told me that if I did not cooperate with them and give them the statement that they wanted, they had the power to see that Eldridge Cleaver and I would be convicted of the murder of Bobby Hutton and that we would both be sent to the gas chamber. . . The officers took the statement, wrote it themselves, and then asked me to sign it, without letting me read it and without reading it back to me."

Panther Charles Bussey testifies in the suit that "two plainclothesmen were there (in my room) and one told me if I didn't make a statement they would beat me to an inch of my life."

Along with the testimony about the treatment of Panthers in jail, the suit against the city of Oakland lists a whole series of "consistent and systematic actions" by the Oakland cops to deprive Black Panthers of their constitutional rights.

A unique subscription offer

\$1 will get you a three-month subscription to The Militant, plus six months worth of the magazine, the Young Socialist.

Both are currently featuring on-the-spot reports and political analysis from France.

ACT NOW and your subscription will begin with the June Young Socialist featuring a fascinating political interview with Huey Newton, imprisoned Oakland, Calif., Black Panther leader facing a frame-up murder charge.

Send your subscription and \$1 to The Militant, 873 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 10003



NAME
STREET
CITY STATE ZIP

S.F. State students Battle for rights

SAN FRANCISCO STATE COLLEGE, April 27—Five hundred students occupied the administration building here this afternoon, culminating five days of continuous demonstrations. The students are demanding cancellation of the college's ROTC contract and full amnesty for all demonstrators.

Through negotiations with the administration following the previous demonstrations—which included nondisruptive sit-ins in the administration building—the SF State students had already won three major demands. These were: the rehiring of a faculty member fired for political reasons; the admission of 400 additional students from minority nationalities; and the hiring of nine additional professors of minority nationality.