

# Intercontinental Press

Africa

Asia

Europe

Oceania

the Americas

Vol. 6, No. 24

© 1968 Intercontinental Press.

June 24, 1968

50c

## Revolutionists Defy de Gaulle's Ban



PARIS: de Gaulle's fiends....

### First Lessons of Revolutionary Upsurge in France

....and his foes

**French Communist Party  
Betrayed Historic Chance  
for Socialist Victory**

**Report  
from Spain**



DE GAULLE OUTLAWS REVOLUTIONISTS, FREES SALAN

By Les Evans

The de Gaulle regime -- taking full advantage of the betrayal by the French Communist party in calling off the general strike -- has launched a campaign of repression against the revolutionary students and workers. On June 12 and 13 eleven left-wing organizations were outlawed by the government. Police have brazenly attacked workers occupying factories -- killing two workers at the Peugeot plant in Sochaux -- as well as retaking the Odéon Theater and the Sorbonne from the students June 15 and 16.

The June 17 Paris Herald Tribune reports that seventeen revolutionary French leaders, "mostly Trotskyite," are being held incommunicado by security police. An international campaign of support for these victims of repression is reportedly underway.

At the same time the regime is attempting to cement an alliance with the worst fascist elements of the terrorist Secret Army Organization. The release June 15 of fifty convicted OAS assassins marked a new stage in government preparations for full-scale repression. Among those freed was Raoul Salan, former general commander of the OAS.

While these neofascist thugs were being welcomed back into polite French society, de Gaulle ordered the dissolution June 12 of seven left-wing student organizations. These are the Trotskyist Jeunesse Communiste Révolutionnaire [JCR -- Revolutionary Communist Youth], the March 22 Movement led by Daniel Cohn-Bendit, the Voix Ouvrière ["Workers Voice"] group, the anarchist Revolutionary Group, the Maoist Union of Communist Youth (Marxist-Leninist), the Federation of Revolutionary Students [FER], and the Liaison Committee of Revolutionary Students.

At the same time many foreign students who had taken part in demonstrations were expelled from France. All street demonstrations were prohibited until after the June 30 runoff election.

The next day, June 13, Pompidou declared four adult political organizations illegal: the Parti Communiste Internationaliste [Internationalist Communist party -- PCI], the French section of the Fourth International; the Lambertiste Internationalist Communist Organization [OCI]; the Maoist Communist party (Marxist-Leninist); and an anarchist group.

The organizations are accused of

having created "commando squads," a charge they have denied. They are being banned under a conspiracy law which was enacted in 1936 under the Popular Front government of Léon Blum. It makes it a criminal offense for a proscribed organization to carry on any political activity whatsoever, "directly or indirectly." Violation of this police state decree brings penalties of six months to two years in prison plus fines.

Both the PCI and JCR immediately issued statements that they refuse to recognize the legality of the ban and will fight it in the courts and in the streets.

The government's action was denounced as an outrageous violation of civil liberty by Guy Mollet, leader of the French Socialist party and a spokesman for the Fédération de la Gauche Démocrate et Socialiste [FGDS].

The French Communist party, on the other hand, has refused to denounce the government action, thereby implicitly supporting the victimization of the student militants by the Gaullist government and its fascist allies.

Given the power demonstrated by the workers and students in May, it is highly improbable that the government would have dared such an overt provocation without knowing in advance that its action would be unopposed by the Communist party.

K.S. Karol, the well-known left-wing journalist, writing in the June 7 New Statesman, called attention to the ties of understanding between the de Gaulle government and the CP:

"Behind the smokescreen of public polemics M. Pompidou and France's communist leaders established a secret link at the very beginning of the strikes. Messages were exchanged every day and it is now known who the contacts were and how they operated. The Prime Minister was thus perfectly aware not only that the CP was not preparing an insurrection but was doing its best to contain the mounting pressure from the rank and file, particularly from young workers 'contaminated' by the revolutionary students. Nor was the CP leaders' double game ended by the strikers' rejection of the so-called 'rue de Grenelle agreement', although it was obvious that the CGT, the communist-led union, was shaken by rank-and-file reaction."

This further betrayal by the French CP in not defending the elementary

civil liberties of the revolutionists under attack by the regime fits into their "strategy" of trying to channel the revolutionary upsurge back into "respectable" parliamentary vote-getting.

In the face of the betrayal by the CP, the students could no longer hold such strategic places as the Odéon Theater or the Sorbonne, and had to evacuate them when threatened with a massive onslaught by the police. But the street battles afterward indicated the students have not had their spirits dampened.

Despite the combined efforts of de Gaulle and the CP, more than half a million workers remained on strike, portending new fissures in the grip of the CP on the French working class. It is this struggle for the allegiance of the more militant workers, tied closely with the defense of the banned organizations from the repressive blows of the government, that will shape the period immediately ahead.

These excerpts from a report by Patrick Seale and Maureen McConville in the June 16 London Observer graphically describe the situation at this moment:

"Wednesday Cabinet meeting decided on immediate repression, in the belief that the public, exasperated and frightened, was now ready to support stern measures. On the other side of the barricades, the analysis of the situation is very different. In spite of the ban on them, most of the revolutionary groups view the upheavals of the past six weeks with unconcealed satisfaction. They have succeeded beyond their wildest dreams. They have not demobilised, but gone underground.

"The principal lessons of the revo-

lutionaries -- whether Trotskyist, Maoist, or members of Cohn-Bendit's anarchist-tinged 22 March Movement -- is that the strategy of direct action...has paid off a thousandfold. Western society has proved extraordinarily vulnerable to it. It is a lesson young people have learned right across the Western world.

"Do not be surprised if barricades spring up in black ghettos in the United States this summer," Mary-Alice Waters, national secretary of America's Young Socialist Alliance, told a cheering audience in the Sorbonne....

"The Trotskyists played the most vital part in sparking off the revolution and provide the most coherent analysis of it. In their view, a tiny revolutionary avant garde detonated a large-scale, semi-spontaneous movement of student protest.... The students' fighting example then fired the workers to 'strike and occupy' in turn. This was the next and vital stage....The great strike of nine million workers unfurled across France.

"It is at this point that Trotskyists get really excited. They are not particularly interested in university reform or student power. It is the workers they are after, living docilely under the cane of that prim old governess, the orthodox Communist Party....

"Their thesis is that between 25 and 30 May...the workers could have seized power in France. Revolution was within their grasp. It was only frustrated because of the timidity -- they would say, treachery -- of the French Communist leaders. The Trotskyist objective is to challenge this leadership in every factory, and eventually to break it. The Communists thought they had buried Trotsky. Now, to their horror, he stalks again."

STATEMENT BY THE JCR ON ITS "DISSOLUTION": "THE STRUGGLE CONTINUES"

[Following is the full text of a June 12 statement by Alain Krivine, secretary of the Jeunesse Communiste Révolutionnaire (Revolutionary Communist Youth) on de Gaulle's order for its dissolution.]

\* \* \*

The Jeunesse Communiste Révolutionnaire has been dissolved. The Council of Ministers has decided it has the power to invoke a law passed on January 10, 1936, against "combat groups and private militias."

What combat groups are "provoking armed demonstrations in the streets"? There are such groups -- the CRS [Compagnies Républicaines de Sécurité -- paramil-

itary security police], the Gardes Mobiles [Mobile Guards], to say nothing of their "private" counterparts, the SAC [Sections d'Action Civique -- Civic Action Committees] and CDR [Comités de Défense de la République -- Committees for the Defense of the Republic].

Who are the "private militias" which, for example, attacked the workers at Sochaux for the benefit of the Peugeot family? They are the fascist right wing. We demand the dissolution of these armed bands. A Council of Ministers has spoken, but in whose name? This government does not represent the real power. The real power has asserted itself in the factories, in the streets, by the action of ten million strikers. Nor does the de

Gaule government speak in the name of the Assembly, which has been recognized as powerless and dissolved.

General, who made you president? Whom did you consult in 1958? Whom did you consult at Baden-Baden in May 1968? We demand the dissolution of the government of "armed bands." The ministers and the president have proposed that we "participate." We are not consulted about participating; hence we're not concerned with participating.

The bourgeoisie is offering the elections to the workers. Everyone is supposed to be able to express himself, or almost everyone. The Place de l'Etoile [bourgeois area] tolerates the Place Kossuth [neighborhood of the CP and CGT headquarters] which accepts it, but not the Place Edmond-Rostand [student center in the Latin Quarter], which scares both of them.

If the CPF [Communist party] and the CGT [General Federation of Labor] do not defend these first organizations to be victimized by the repression, who will

stand up to the next moves of the Gaullist government? Will the ballot safeguard all workers organizations tomorrow, all organizations that stand for democratic right and civil liberties?

The choice is not between de Gaulle and Mitterrand, but between the bourgeois elections and the socialist revolution. The power of the workers is in the streets, not in the ballot boxes. The government understands this perfectly.

We were expelled from the UEC [Union des Etudiants Communistes -- Federation of Communist Students] for refusing to support the candidacy of Mitterrand, and the JCR was formed. Today, for having confronted the Gaullist armed bands in the streets, for having participated in the general strike which is still continuing, the JCR has been dissolved by the government.

But the revolutionary movement cannot be dissolved, the socialist revolution remains on the agenda. The need for action has already led to the formation of action committees. It is only the beginning -- the struggle continues.

STATEMENT BY PIERRE FRANK ON THE OUTLAWING OF THE PCI

[The following statement by Pierre Frank, secretary of the Parti Communiste Internationaliste (Internationalist Communist party -- the French section of the Fourth International), was issued June 13. It was received from Paris by telephone.]

\* \* \*

I learned from a press agency that the Parti Communiste Internationaliste [PCI] has been placed on the list of organizations whose dissolution has been decreed by the Council of Ministers. I have had no official notification of this measure but it does not surprise me.

The PCI, it should be remembered, was built in the underground during World War II through the fusion of various Trotskyist groups of that time. It has been active in public life since the liberation. Among other things, since 1946 it has run candidates in legislative elections many times.

Our members were persecuted and arrested during France's war with Vietnam and again in the war with Algeria. The government measure, which has struck at various revolutionary youth organizations

along with us for allegedly organizing commando groups, is a completely arbitrary administrative directive. The government does not dare to present its case in the courts, where it would have to formulate exact charges and present evidence.

The government move coincided with the frenzied campaign which the leaderships of the PCF [Parti Communiste Français -- French Communist party] and the CGT [Confédération Générale du Travail -- General Federation of Labor -- the CP-led union] are conducting against the "leftists." These leaderships have not protested at all against the repression which can turn in their direction in the future.

We are studying the legal aspects of the measure and are reserving our right to challenge it. We are confident that many labor and civil liberties organizations will speak up against the dissolution measures taken by the government against a series of vanguard organizations, and will struggle against these decrees until they are abrogated.

In any case, the Trotskyists, who have undergone many repressions before, will emerge from this attack stronger than ever.

HOW THE WORKERS TOOK OVER IN NANTES AND ST.-NAZAIRE

Paris

[IP -- The following is a translation of a dispatch sent from Nantes by Pierre Bois which was published in the May 30 issue of Le Figaro, a leading Paris daily.]

\* \* \*

The most famous restaurant in Nantes is called the "Duchesse Anne." Ordinarily only a few bourgeois families come there after mass to enjoy something special gastronomically in a leisurely atmosphere. This is now finished. The proprietor is even hesitant about putting up his menu at the door, listing dinner at 32 francs [about US\$6.40]...

The stylish shops have also locked their doors. And the big department stores display broken windows. As for "Prisunic" [the equivalent of the Woolworth chain], it has been occupied and the salesgirls are sleeping in the management's easy chairs.

Everything is deserted and the town appears dead. Appears -- because within a few days one system displaced another. Today the unions hold power completely and the prefect [police commissioner], Mr. Vié, has nothing to govern except a few faithful civil servants and a bailiff who is still there, no one knows why.

Only the girls school run by the Sisters has not lowered its flag. Classes are being continued there without much chance of finishing until summer. Some of the young priests, much more politically conscious, have rallied to the university student movement.

In Nantes, as in all the universities of France, the ideological brew has brought about a certain confusion. The UNEF [Union Nationale des Etudiants de France] announces a demonstration and then just as quickly cancels it. Next an assault is proposed on police headquarters to set the building on fire (173 Molotov cocktails were discovered in some automobiles), but this is given up. Every hour, every day, a band of young people pass by the police headquarters, wander around, look them over, divide into small groups seeking a confrontation. The good fellows in the local police department sigh and also wait. Some of them say: "I have never known such a time, when youngsters come to urinate on the walls of the police station and nothing is done about it." And not knowing what saint to invoke, they put everyone in the same sack.

These youngsters are hoodlums, the

authorities claim. They are young workers who have joined our movement, the students say. Because here, unquestionably, the two have fused. This is thanks to a very particular figure. In articulation, he is a popular orator, but in action he is a formidable tactician. His name is Alexandre Hébert; he is of the anarchist school of 1905 and heads the FO [Force Ouvrière]. A friend of the two Cohn-Bendit brothers, he is in the thick of events and has assembled a considerable number of glowing young apprentices.

The other unions may seem to have withdrawn. In reality they hold the Loire-Atlantique in an iron grip.

This began with the gasoline. The Donge refineries are quite close. But the strikers raised a red flag over the exit gates. Not a gasoline truck can leave without authorization from them. The same goes for the only pump in use in town, which has been reserved for doctors only. A picket guards it. The same for water, gas and electricity. And since the police could do nothing about the most urgent problems, a "Comité intersyndical de grève" [Interunion Strike Committee] was set up in city hall. Little by little it has taken over administration of the city.

Thus it hands out vouchers permitting ambulances to be driven and deliveries of bread and vegetables to be made. Thus merchants must stick the following ticket on their show windows: "This store is authorized to open. Its prices are under the continual control of the unions. Signed: CGT [Confédération Générale du Travail], CFDT [Confédération Française Démocratique du Travail], FO. Another example: This morning [May 29], the workers as a whole decided, after a secret ballot, to release Mr. Duvochel, who had been held prisoner in his offices at Sud-Aviation since May 14.

At Saint-Nazaire, 80 kilometers away, the situation is the same. The municipal administration is Socialist, but the mayor's aides are unemployed. The commissioners' offices are almost empty. And everywhere, everywhere, red flags, red handkerchiefs at the throats of boys, children wearing red sweaters, red yarn tied to automobile antennas.

New "inspectors" are in the market, but this time they are unionists, checking prices against lists provided by their economic services. In the surrounding areas, the wives of strikers have organized direct producer-consumer provisioning, while on the highways you are asked in an amiable way to contribute to the funds being raised for those who reject

the "personal regime."

At the Bourse du Travail [job placement office] activity is feverish. From metal workers to fishermen, the word of the leaders is decisive. A new distribution of labor is being organized here.

A CGT unionist from the Chantiers

de l'Atlantique [Atlantic Shipyards] summarized the situation perfectly for me:

"In face of the powerlessness of the officials, we had to take public activities in hand. Today the only use the police commissioner is to us is to send on our decisions to Paris. For us he amounts to nothing more than a mailbox!"

#### FRACHON TELLS IT LIKE IT ISN'T

[On May 27, mass union meetings were held all over France to hear the terms of the agreement negotiated between the government, the employers, and the principal unions. As the proposed settlement fell far short of the workers' demands, the agreement was overwhelmingly voted down in every major factory in France, and the general strike continued.

[One of the principal speakers at the meeting in the Renault plant in Boulogne-Billancourt, just outside Paris, was Benoît Frachon, president of the Confédération Générale du Travail [CGT -- General Federation of Labor], and a member of the Central Committee of the Communist party of France. Extracts from Benoît Frachon's speech were printed in the May 28 issue of l'Humanité, organ of the French CP. It is of particular interest as an example of the manner in which the Communist party is presently attacking the students and workers who are to the left of them. The article that appeared in l'Humanité is translated in full below.]

\* \* \*

After reminiscing about 1936, the president of the CGT declared:

"The results of the discussions with the employers and the government over the demands, which have been raised by all the strikes, are very minimal....

"We have industries where the salaries are very low; job classifications where there are many women; we have some where they hire young workers for wages that are in no way comparable to what you receive here.

"For them there are obvious gains," he continued. "But does that mean we have abandoned your demands?"

"Absolutely not. After what has been obtained, other classifications, other important industries will gain even more...."

Benoît Frachon explained that the working class would have the opportunity

to discuss genuine collective contracts. After emphasizing this point, Benoît Frachon continued:

"In this enormous confusion, in this mobilization of millions of workers who have never participated in the struggle before, sometimes ideas creep in which we have combated before.

"At first, there were some people who wanted to interfere in the decisions of our organizations.

"Who is more capable of leading the working-class movement and the class struggle of the workers than the experienced leaders of the workers?"

"Some people were pretentious enough to try and give instructions to the workers movement which they claimed was badly led by the militants of the CGT. We have appealed to your good sense and we have won this battle. It is the unions who lead and will continue to lead the struggle of the workers in the factories."

Benoît Frachon explained that the CGT had tried to reestablish normal connections with the students and had not succeeded.

To justify his attitude, Sauvageot [Jacques Sauvageot, the vice-president of the Union National des Etudiants de France -- UNEF -- National Union of Students of France] declared that the demands of the unions are not important, that they are not the central thing, that they are outside the limits of the revolutionary movement.

"They want to give us lessons in the class struggle, lessons on how to be 'revolutionaries.'"

"We have acted calmly, surely, and firmly," said the president of the CGT, "but also in full consciousness of the reality of the situation and not on the basis of our own fantasies...."

"They shout 'Down with de Gaulle's government.' We are for that!"

"We were not born yesterday in the struggle against the Gaullist power.

"I remember that in the dramatic circumstances of 1958 we were the only trade-union organization to sound the assembly call, to call for the unity of all the Republican forces, and at the same time, to organize the fight throughout the country.

"We know full well that the government must be replaced. We have never ceased repeating it. But replace it with what and how?

"It is not a question of eloquent discourses or grandiloquent phrases.

"It is not a question of organizing some demonstrations, which could be harmful to the goals we seek, the goals we must reach. The problem today, as in 1936, is to bring together all the Republican forces. We must not isolate a section of the class in some sort of hocus-pocus.

"During the strike the working

class has been intelligent enough to avoid these uncontrollable demonstrations which, in addition, have degenerated and given a pretext for police attacks.

"At the present time in our country there are many people who agitate and flatter the feelings of the youth. Like croaking frogs they echo them. They infiltrate everywhere with well defined motives....

"They want to see a dictatorial regime created here, as in other places.

"Agents of the OAS [Organisation de l'Armée Secrète -- Secret Army Organization], of the American secret service -- we must think about that and build barriers against it.

"The real revolutionary force, the class which shows that it is ready to replace the regime that we are condemning is the working class.

"The clearest indication of that is nine million workers on strike."

#### ANDRE BARJONET DENOUNCES FRENCH CP BETRAYAL

Paris

[The French Communist party's betrayal of the vast revolutionary upsurge of the masses in May has greatly disturbed the intellectuals within the party. The ferment extends into the ranks of the union bureaucracy under CP domination. A striking example of the questioning of the party's orientation was provided by André Barjonet when he resigned from his post of secretary of the Centre d'Etudes Economiques et Sociales (Center for Economic and Social Studies), an organization maintained by the Confédération Générale du Travail. A member of the CGT for twenty-two years, Barjonet had held the post for twenty years. He announced that he had decided to join the Parti Socialiste Unifié (United Socialist party).

[In a statement published in the May 30 issue of the Paris daily Le Monde, Barjonet explained why he had decided to hand in his resignation. The following is a translation of the text.]

\* \* \*

Meeting in Nanterre from June 11 to June 16, 1967, the thirty-sixth congress of the CGT unanimously adopted an "appeal to the workers of France" which remains of great interest: "Hailing the power and the continuity of the struggles conducted for these objectives (economic demands), the congress underlines

the necessity of working for a fundamental change in politics in order to achieve a decisive victory." A few lines further on, the same appeal states that "the considerable progress accomplished along this road, the success of the formations of the left regroupment at the time of the last legislative elections, proves that the progressive forces are on the way to success in taking charge of the destiny of the country."

Thus at a time when the workers struggles, without being negligible in the least, remained nonetheless moderate in extent, the CGT did not hesitate to project the aim of a "fundamental" change in French politics.

Eleven months later, in contrast, when the entire working class (in the broadest sense of the term) and the students, not to mention an important part of the peasant world and any number of other layers in the skills and professions, unleashed a strike of exceptional militancy, the CGT began by flatly proclaiming its determination to hold the movement to purely economic demands.

Naturally I do not underestimate these objectives. For more than twenty years I have sought to show precisely on the economic level that they are both necessary and realizable. No one is going to say that economic demands are unimportant to the millions of workers who

still earn less than 600 francs [US\$120] a month, or the innumerable workers on piece rates or those suffering from a brutal speed-up. For all these workers there is not the least doubt that the protocol for an agreement\* can pave the way to a substantial improvement in their standard of living and working conditions, although without doubt of a passing and precarious nature.

But even if inflation and devaluation do not soon cancel out these gains, the question cannot be posed at all in these terms. The only question that arises is why, when the Gaullist regime was at bay and the demand for a socialist change began to spread among the masses, neither the CGT, nor the other trade-union organizations, nor the PCF [Parti Communiste Français], nor the FGDS [Fédération de la Gauche Démocrate et Socialiste] not only did not attempt anything along these

---

\* The concessions granted by the bosses and the government to the heads of the trade-union bureaucracies for submission to the strikers. It was rejected by the Renault workers on May 27, but subsequently became the basis for most of the settlements of major scope. Besides "protocol d'accord," the proposed agreement is also called the "Rue de Grenelle" deal because of the address of the government building where the negotiators met.

lines, but on the contrary put everything into operation for such a long time to contain the movement within the limits of economic demands.

Doubtless, it is possible on this subject to point to the attitude of the FO [Force Ouvrière], which did not seek to join in the January 1966 agreement of the CGT and the CFDT [Confédération Française Démocratique du Travail]. It is likewise possible to point to the absence of a genuine common program between the FGDS and the PCF.

All this is true but it does not constitute a sufficient explanation. For my part, I will endeavor to seek the explanation in a sociological study in depth of the present structures of French society.

For now, one is compelled simply to state that an extraordinary opportunity for renovation has been lost, that millions of workers have been swindled in their revolutionary aspirations.

It is not a matter of now engaging in sterile polemics or of substituting name-calling for analysis. What must be done, but in the most urgent way, is to work, separate and apart from any quarrels of sects or chapels, for the building of a genuine revolutionary movement in France.

#### BARJONET APPEALS FOR CONCERTED ACTION

Paris

[IP] -- At a forum May 28 which included representatives of various groups and tendencies extending from dissident members of the Communist party to the Jeunesse Communiste Révolutionnaire, the Mouvement du 22 Mars [the March 22 Movement headed by Daniel Cohn-Bendit], and the Parti Communiste Marxiste-Léniniste [Maoist], André Barjonet appealed for common action among all these formations.

Barjonet had just publicly announced his resignation from the post of secretary of the Centre d'Etudes Économiques et Sociales of the Confédération Générale du Travail. A long-time member of the Communist party, he has shifted to the Parti Socialiste Unifié [United Socialist party].

In Barjonet's opinion, a revolutionary process began in France in May, and the CGT did not respond to it. "Because of all kinds of bureaucratic habits," said Barjonet, "the leaders of the CGT were unable to perceive the profound aspirations of the working class. They were unable to perceive the essence: that

the masses want a different kind of life because they reject the society in which we are living.

"The workers want to be men and not just better-paid workers."

The CGT leaders were similarly blind to the aspirations of the students, Barjonet charged.

The former CGT official suggested that the revolutionary movement be extended by building rank-and-file revolutionary action committees and combating the efforts to divert the revolutionary process into parliamentary channels.

He called for a common front of "all the genuine revolutionary forces, of all those whether in the CGT and the French Communist party or in the groups proclaiming themselves to be adherents of Trotsky, Mao, anarchism, or whatever, but who want a revolution."

Barjonet made clear that he was not calling for the formation of a new party, but for the establishment of links



among the existing formations.

Alain Geismar, former general secretary of the Syndicat National de l'En-

seignement Supérieur [National Union of University Teachers], followed up by suggesting that what was required was the "coordination of action by the revolutionary committees on a national level."

"REVOLUTIONARY IN THE GOOD SENSE OF THE TERM"

Paris

[IP] -- [André Barjonet, who resigned from the French Communist party and from his post in the Confédération Générale du Travail because of the efforts of the leaders of these two bodies to disorient the revolutionary process that opened in France in May, has come under attack from his former associates along the lines to be expected from case-hardened Stalinists.

[The following is a translation of a reply by Barjonet which appeared in the June 4 issue of Combat, an opportunistic Paris daily newspaper, under the title, "Révolutionnaire dans le Bon Sens du Terme."]

\* \* \*

In the June 3 issue of l'Humanité, a courageous anonymous author writes that during the time I held my post in the CGT, "it was rather necessary to put a brake on my slipping toward the tendency to take into account classical bourgeois economics in appreciating the orientation of the labor movement." The sentence is stupid at bottom (classical bourgeois economics obviously has nothing to do with the orientation of the labor movement) and I would, of course, pay no attention to it if it was not the prelude to a campaign designed to present my opposition as having secretly been rightist, the proof being -- the rumor has already been circulated -- that I will run in the elections as a candidate...

Perhaps I will be permitted to cite a handwritten letter which Maurice Thorez wrote me June 3, 1961:

"Dear Comrade Barjonet, I don't know how to thank you enough and to complement you on your notable study, 'What Is Pauperization?'

"The presentation, the reasoning, the statistical data you cite, all contribute to clarify the reader on the problem, to firmly reinforce the convictions of a militant. It is excellent. Thanks again. Yours very fraternally."

With regard to my book, "What Is Political Economy?" Maurice Thorez wrote me again July 3, 1962: "You have omitted nothing that a militant ought to know. I



WALDECK ROCHET

am sure that your little book will be widely circulated and I am extremely happy about this. Thanks and my best regards."

Rather than wondering in an invidious way about the revelation that suddenly transformed me into a Messiah (sic), l'Humanité would do much better to address itself to a much less supernatural question: why, when ten million workers were on strike and occupying their plants; why, when 600,000 students were transforming the University in an irreversible way; why, when the police themselves were di-

vided; why, when de Gaulle was at bay, proposing only a derisory referendum; why was nothing done, not only for socialism, but nothing, absolutely nothing, against de Gaulle or even against the administration?

Why? Because the situation, it seems, was not revolutionary! But then, dear comrades, what constitutes a revolutionary situation? Puzzling over this, and involved in what was happening in the streets, I would doubtlessly never have found an answer, if I had not by good luck, read the great speech made by Waldeck Rochet at the "Secrétan" theater. Enriching Marxist theory with a new concept, the General Secretary of the PCF thus let me know that the party to which I belonged for such a long time was really a revolutionary party but "in the good sense of the term"! How polite...

What a difference, naturally, from the unworthy foul language of the German Jew named Karl Marx\* in the "Communist

---

\* Daniel Cohn-Bendit, one of the leaders

Manifesto":

"The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at the idea of a Communist revolution! The workers have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win."

No doubt is possible: Marx was not a revolutionary "in the good sense of the term." He was a revolutionary in the ill-bred sense.

But, after all, as Séguy would say, "Karl Marx, who's he?"

---

of the student actions that detonated the May explosion in France, was called a "German" by l'Humanité and a "German Jew" by the French reactionaries. When Georges Séguy, the Stalinist CGT official, was asked what he thought about the student leader, he replied: "Cohn-Bendit, who's he?"

#### 40,000 BELGRADE UNIVERSITY STUDENTS WIN DEMANDS AFTER EIGHT-DAY SIT-IN

By George Novack

After Czechoslovakia in October and Poland this spring has come the turn of the Yugoslav students to present their bill of grievances to the Communist bureaucrats. And, in Belgrade as in Prague, their strong offensive has scored a smashing victory in direct confrontation with the regime.

For eight days, from June 3 to 11, 40,000 young men and women in the student community of New Belgrade occupied their university buildings. This sit-in of the new rising generation was the first significant spontaneous movement from below since the Yugoslav revolution was consolidated. It required the personal intervention and prestige of President Tito himself to bring the demonstration to a halt.

The unexpected explosion of student discontent was touched off by two bloody clashes with police June 2 and 3 in which more than 130 students were injured. The severest fighting broke out when officials refused to allow a protest parade of thousands of students to enter downtown Belgrade and cops clubbed down students who charged their line at a bridge over the Sava river.

Following this encounter, angry demonstrators shouted down CP officials, who tried to calm them, with cries of "We want action -- enough with words." Then

the boldest among them proceeded to imitate student rebels elsewhere by taking over the buildings of Belgrade University one after another and refusing to leave until their demands were met.

Seven demands were set forth in leaflets distributed by groups of students throughout the city:

- (1) Prompt provision of jobs for graduates so they would not have to go abroad to find work. Job opportunities have shrunk as a result of work-force reductions in many enterprises flowing from the economic reforms. There are 70,000 unemployed college graduates in Yugoslavia today. The students also sought increases in the minimum wage and higher unemployment compensation.
- (2) Suppression of economic inequalities and a program to cut down privileges.
- (3) The establishment of genuine democracy and genuine self-administration of the enterprises.
- (4) Immediate release of all arrested students.
- (5) Dismissal of the federal and Serbian interior ministers and the Belgrade police chief responsible for the brutality against them.
- (6) Convening of the head of the federal parliament to confer with representatives of the students.
- (7) Ousting of all the Belgrade newspaper and radio editors who had given lying reports of the behavior of the students.

There were other complaints regarding bad food, poor living conditions, mice in the dormitories; demands for a greater say in academic affairs; and protests about the admission of fewer and fewer young workers and peasants to the university. Although tuition is free, extra expenses make it difficult for children of poor families to secure higher education.

Thus, starting with grievances about student life, the issues in the conflict expanded to embrace many of the most sensitive economic, social and political questions facing the nation.

The central slogan of the students was "socialism, freedom, democracy." They called for "discussion of social inequities and true democracy in all walks of life," especially in the Yugoslav League of Communists. They insisted that the CP practice what it preaches and "bring daily reality into harmony with oft-proclaimed ideals."

The whole capital became the scene of intense excitement and agitation. The students renamed Belgrade University "the Red University of Karl Marx." As in Warsaw, the Philosophical Faculty was the most militant center of revolt. The students there held all-night teach-ins called "convents." Slogans on the walls read: "We have had enough of the red bourgeoisie"; "Down with the Communist princes"; "No more corruption"; "We want work"; "Don't believe the press." Another proclaimed: "Into the future without those who have betrayed the past."

The Belgrade insurgents were joined by more than 200,000 students all over the federated republic. Workers, intellectuals, editors, artists, CP members and officials attended student meetings during the week and expressed their solidarity. All elements of the population favoring greater democratization in the party and country were with the rebels.

The students organized their initially spontaneous protest skillfully, forming action committees as in France at the height of the ferment and insisting that the Communist authorities negotiate directly with them.

The entrances to the university buildings were heavily guarded, mainly by girl students, and carefully controlled. Only faculty and authorized visitors were permitted to enter. Police and newspapermen who had denounced the demonstrators as anarchists, provocateurs and hoodlums were kept out.

The panicky government and party leaders were nonplussed on how to cope with the unprecedented situation. On the third day of the sit-ins, June 5, the Ser-

bian government offered concessions which the students rejected as inadequate. At one meeting over 2,000 students voted unanimously, with one abstention, to continue the sit-ins.

"We didn't take this [offer] seriously," said a philosophy student, "because it came too quickly and we have heard similar promises in the past. They just want to stop us from expanding our action and getting in touch with the workers."

On June 10, as the political crisis built up toward a showdown, Marshal Tito stepped in to settle the conflict.

In a twenty-minute speech on television and radio, Tito promised satisfaction of many of the reforms requested by the rebels. He blamed himself and the other CP leaders for not taking care of the grievances sooner. "If I am not capable of settling these questions," the 76-year-old president declared, "then I should no longer be in this position."

Although he was noncommittal about the officials condemned by the students, he did agree to call to account anyone who had abused his functions, "no matter who he is." Tito's endorsement of their grievances ended the sit-ins and now the students await the implementation of their demands.

In the same speech Tito denounced "antisocialist" elements who sought to make capital out of the unrest. He specifically mentioned "Djilasites and Rankovicités" [Ranković is the deposed head of the secret police] as well as other hostile elements ranging from the "most reactionary to the most extremist pseudoradicals who echo Mao Tse-tung's theories."

However, the London Observer correspondent Lajos Lederer reported from Belgrade June 8 that when Djilas rushed to the scene of the first demonstration and tried to speak he was brushed aside and booed. While Djilas voiced approval of the protest movement as a blow to bureaucratic conformism, he criticized the student admiration for the revolutionary "dogmas" of Che Guevara and Rudi Dutschke.

Two quite different methods of handling the student dissidents have been displayed by the Soviet bloc regimes. While the East German, Polish and Soviet leaders have cracked down hard upon them, Tito and Dubcek have acceded to many of their demands in order to avert a head-on collision. Despite Tito's greater flexibility in dealing with them, the massive and prolonged student upheaval has stirred the entire population and shaken up the whole official structure. After their defiance, Yugoslavia will never be the same again.

FIRST LESSONS OF THE REVOLUTIONARY UPSURGE IN FRANCE

Paris

[The following statement was issued June 10 by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International, the World Party of Socialist Revolution founded by Leon Trotsky in 1938.]

\* \* \*

May 1968 will enter the history of the class struggle as the month of the biggest revolutionary upsurge yet seen in an industrially developed capitalist country. Ten million workers on strike, all the big and medium-sized plants closed down, the most backward and least politically conscious layers of the proletariat and civil service employees brought into action, the technicians and foremen widely involved, the peasants joining the students and workers in the struggle, broader and broader and more and more militant demonstrations confronting the harried and increasingly demoralized forces of repression, a "strong" government out of control of events and more and more paralyzed for two weeks -- this was the picture of France in this exceptional spring.

The determination of hundreds of thousands of university and high-school students, of young workers, to bring down the capitalist regime exploded in such a glaring way that no one seriously questioned what had happened. The workers, too, demonstrated in just as resounding a way their determination to battle not only for immediate demands and against the Gaullist regime but also to overthrow the rule of the bourgeoisie and capitalism. This determination was expressed in the occupation of plants, railway stations, power plants, post offices, over which the red flag was raised. It was expressed in the slogans calling for "workers power," for "power to the workers," repeated with increasing frequency in chants and on banners in the demonstrations. It was expressed by numerous spontaneous moves to take control of or take over the means of production, by the moves of committees or collective groups of workers and citizens to assume power.

Thus, before the eyes of the entire world, a new power was being born, the power of the future French Socialist Republic, confronting the decaying Fifth French Republic. It was completely possible during the week from May 24 to May 30 to draw a general conclusion from these facts, to cover the country with a network of organs of dual power, to federate them, to take the necessary initiative to topple the tottering Gaullist regime and to bring the revolutionary crisis to a conclusion by the proletariat

taking power in order to build socialism.

If this did not occur, if the bourgeois state was finally able to pick up the reins of power, this was due exclusively to the betrayal committed by the leaders of the workers, particularly the leaders of the French Communist party [PCF] and the General Federation of Labor [CGT], who controlled the great majority of workers. These leaders of the PCF and the CGT did everything possible to isolate the students and the revolutionary vanguard from the mass of workers, turning the strikes and factory occupations toward purely economic aims, blocking a test of strength in the streets where the relationship of forces was eminently favorable to the revolution, paralyzing the reaction to the repressive violence, blocking the arming of pickets and the organization of a student and worker militia, compelling acceptance of elections offered by a power at bay, and splitting and smothering the strikes, until their own irresolute attitude and the resolute speech of de Gaulle brought about the first pause in the movement.

This betrayal is a consequence of their adherence to the Kremlin's doctrine of "peaceful coexistence." The Kremlin views de Gaulle as weakening the position of American imperialism in Europe, and the Kremlin is mortally afraid of the perspective of a revolutionary upsurge in France.

The betrayal is also a consequence of the long years these leaders have spent in electioneering and the parliamentary routine. The refrain "along the peaceful and parliamentary road to socialism" was voiced for years with the excuse that a revolutionary crisis could in no case occur in France. When such a crisis did actually occur, the same reformist strategy was used to dissipate the possibility that was objectively present to take power.

The PCF leadership has lost credit completely with the revolutionary students; its prestige has been broken by and large among the entire vanguard of the youth. This liberation of the youth from the bureaucratic stranglehold has enabled it to enter into action as a new revolutionary vanguard on a scale never before equalled in France.

But within the working class, the PCF and CGT apparatus, although it has been shaken many times over the years, and now again when the workers in the big plants rejected the miserable agreements worked out with the bosses and the Gaullist government to bring the strike to an end, still maintains preponderance and has many ways to stifle workers democracy and free expression of the rank-and-file will. The scattered elements for a new leadership,

which is ardently desired among the young workers, are still too weak and unorganized to be able to assure the building of the organs of dual power on a general scale.

That is why the betrayal committed by the apparatus of the PCF and CGT was able to save French capitalism once again as in 1936 and in 1945-47.

But, in contrast to the outcome of the two preceding revolutionary upsurges in France, the Stalinist betrayal this time was not able to smash the spring 1968 upsurge outright, nor bring about a rapid reversal of the relationship of forces. The revolutionary battles of May 1968 were mounted from bastions like the revolutionary Sorbonne, by forces such as those seeking the right to control the ORTF [Office de la Radio et de la Télévision Française], and bodies like the committees of action. The resumption of work in the plants did not liquidate them. Moreover work was resumed at a much slower rate than the Gaullist regime and the PCF leadership hoped for. Considerable sections of the working class in the big plants displayed exemplary militancy and capacity for resistance.

The bourgeois state could not permit these embryonic forms of dual power to be consolidated and extended. But it did not have the strength to eliminate them with a single blow. Thus a transitional period opened in which the repressive forces are making tests, as in the effort to break the strike at the Renault plant in Flins through the use of police. These sallies could become points of departure for resumption of the revolutionary movement.

In addition, the industrial and economic weakness of French capitalism does not permit it to grant the considerable material advantages which it had to accord to the proletariat in order to assure resumption of work. Price rises, inflation and unemployment will rapidly erode these gains. This, in turn, will set off violent responses among the proletariat.

Finally, the internal crisis in the unions and the traditional workers parties has only begun. This crisis will deepen in coming weeks, particularly after the elections which the PCF is utilizing as the last means to reknit its ranks. The repercussions of this crisis will likewise soon stimulate a powerful resumption of the workers struggle.

All the elements thus exist for forecasting that the dip in temperature that began May 31 will prove to be only temporary, that new explosions and new confrontations are absolutely inevitable. Preparations must be made for these con-

frontations with maximum lucidity and organization. All the lessons of the struggles of May 1968 must be drawn in order to assure assimilation of the gains so that the next wave can begin at a higher level and make it possible to surmount the insufficiencies of the first wave.

The first wave revealed the extraordinary weakness of neocapitalism under the apparent stability of the "consumer society," "economic expansion" and the "strong state." The development of the productive forces, the rise in the level of culture and technical education of the masses, the deep industrialization of the country, the explosion in size of the universities, the drop in average age level of the population -- all these changes which the capitalist regime congratulated itself on as merits and signs of modernity, turned definitively against it. This was so because under the capitalist system every development of the productive forces increases the economic and social contradictions. The masses felt by instinct that the immense possibilities to satisfy their fundamental needs were being wasted, cut off or shunted aside under the reign of profit-making and private property.

The youth no longer took it for granted that there should be close to 1,000,000 unemployed while a workweek of thirty hours for everybody was clearly in sight. The students, the highly skilled workers, the technicians, no longer felt obliged to accept the dictates of the bosses, management, or specialists in the pay of capital on how they had to work, what they had to produce and what they had to consume. In the same way the workers have become less and less tolerant of the lack of rank-and-file control in their organizations and of the rule of an authoritarian bureaucracy.

The Fourth International has worked out a transitional program that corresponds to these essential needs of the masses. This program will be further elaborated and concretized in the light of what has been learned from the explosion of May 1968. Some of the elements can be outlined as follows: the sliding scale of wages; workers control over production; opening of the bosses' bookkeeping system; workers control over hiring and firing; the outlawing of banking secrets; publication of how all the big companies calculate net costs and profit margins; registration of the holdings of the landlords; the democratic elaboration of a plan for the economic development of socialist France by a Congress of Workers called for this purpose; completely free medical care, drugs, urban transportation, education and school supplies; wages for all high-school and university students beginning at the age of sixteen; administration of the universities by the entire university community; nationalization of all the big companies, private

banks, and all credit institutions; elimination of all the representatives of big capital in the administrative boards of the nationalized enterprises; recasting of the government budget by eliminating the nuclear armaments program and drastically reducing military expenses while simultaneously sharply increasing expenditures for cultural and social equipment (hospitals, low-cost housing, construction of highways, sports areas and leisure centers).

These planks culminate in the demand for a workers government based on the representative organizations of the working class -- today the unions, tomorrow democratically elected committees. Unquestionably this demand is equivalent in the immediate future to calling on the big workers' parties, in association with the unions, to take power; they still enjoy the support in actuality of the majority of the working class. But these parties show no desire whatsoever to take the road to winning power through extra-parliamentary means. The deeper and more extensive the revolutionary crisis becomes, the more these traditional parties will be outflanked by the masses and the more the slogan of a workers government will acquire for the masses the meaning of the workers themselves organized in committees, taking power.

To promote and to inspire the revolutionary activity of the masses along the road of resuming the struggle of May 1968, the first task is to reinforce the revolutionary vanguard. This must be carried out on several levels, among others the broad vanguard, by force of circumstances regrouping diverse tendencies and organizations around solid unity in action based on precise common revolutionary objectives and observance of workers democracy.

On another level, the revolutionary Marxists themselves must seek to move as rapidly as possible toward the building of a revolutionary party which already has a hearing among the masses. The United Secretariat of the Fourth International points to the admirable way in which the members of the Jeunesse Communiste Révolutionnaire [Revolutionary Communist Youth] and the Parti Communiste Internationaliste, the French section of the Fourth International, have met the test of May 1968. We express our conviction that they will play a capital role in carrying out this double task, without

which the French socialist revolution cannot win.

The revolutionary process in France is of supreme importance to the entire world and to the forward march of the world revolution. May 1968 released the brakes on the political situation throughout Europe, bringing the student struggles to a higher level in Italy, Spain, Great Britain, Belgium, and Sweden, stimulating the resumption of the workers struggles in various countries, unleashing the process of the European revolution. May 1968 has already exercised a profound influence in unleashing the student struggle in Yugoslavia, and is contributing to preparing political revolutions in all the bureaucratically degenerated or deformed workers states. May 1968 will assure to the new vanguard now forming in these countries a high level of revolutionary Marxist consciousness. It will compel imperialism to redeploy its forces on a world scale and thus constitutes important aid to the Vietnamese revolution, the Latin-American revolution, and the entire colonial revolution.

But the primary importance of the May 1968 movement was to bring the proletariat of a highly industrialized country into the center of the world revolution for the first time in more than twenty years. This fact has already swept away a whole series of prejudices, of false conceptions, of revisions of Marxism fostered by the subsiding of the European revolution after 1948.

It has cleansed the atmosphere by raising the demand for one-hundred-percent workers democracy from the very beginning of the revolutionary upsurge. It has assured the present phase of the world revolution a higher political and theoretical level than in the past, a revival of the best traditions of the revolutionary, internationalist workers movement.

On this foundation it has created conditions propitious for a rapid development of the international Trotskyist movement and the Fourth International to which the revolutionary Marxist militants are duty bound to respond at once in view of the completely new possibilities which have now been opened up.

Long live the French socialist revolution!

Long live the world socialist revolution!

#### THE "TERRORIST" SEASON IN FRANCE?

The New York Times headline-writers' endemic fear of "outside agitators" led them into an embarrassing slip June 2. The Times early edition reported,

"Flow of Terrorists Into France Is Resuming as Tension Eases." "Terrorists" was corrected to "tourists" in the later edition of the paper.

GREATEST OPPORTUNITY IN HISTORY FOR SOCIALIST VICTORY  
BETRAYED BY FRENCH COMMUNIST PARTY

By Joseph Hansen

Paris

JUNE 7 -- The headlines in the bourgeois press proclaim that the situation in France is rapidly reverting to "normal." The metros and buses are again operating in Paris, the trains have begun running, the post office has opened, most of the industries -- with a few stubborn exceptions -- are resuming production, or are about to, and the few weeks in which it seemed that at any moment the country could go socialist are now receding like a "nightmare" which can promptly be forgotten or left to the historians and sociologists for leisurely analysis.

The central organ of the Communist party, l'Humanité, is not much different from the other daily papers. In banner headlines it boasts that the workers are hurrying to end their strike and rushing back to work, conscious of the "great victory" they have won. The triumphant shouts of the French CP leaders make a harmonious counterpoint to the great sigh of relief from all sectors of the capitalist ruling class in France. For the bosses and the Stalinist bureaucrats alike, the situation has been saved -- at least temporarily.

However, for the revolutionary vanguard, which has greatly increased in size in the past month, the return to "normality," when a socialist victory was so tantalizingly close, does not seem normal at all. They are still living the days when the working class took fire from the sparks cast by the students, when consciousness expanded and deepened, when years of ordinary existence were compressed into days and even hours, and when the nearness of a new order, the coming order of socialism, was so close that everyone could catch a glimpse of it. These days were felt as the genuinely "normal" life, or at least a taste of it.

How could this opportunity for an immediate socialist victory, the most promising in all history, be lost and dissipated within a single day? This is the question now preoccupying the French vanguard as it assesses the events.

The facts are absolutely clear. On May 29, the entire French economy was paralyzed by the most solid general strike ever witnessed in the country. Ten million workers, two-thirds of the working force, had occupied the plants. Not a wheel was turning in public transport. The workers stood by at the switch of the public power system -- and they pulled the switch occasionally to show their

readiness to stop this most vital service.

The distribution system was similarly frozen tight, all the big stores being occupied. Food supplies were under strict control of the unions.

The farmers, solidly behind the general strike, set up their own barricades here and there to indicate how they understood the situation.

The students had already taken the lead. It was their battles on the barricades in Paris, in fact, that had electrified the workers. Throughout France, universities and high schools were shut down, many of them occupied by students.

A liaison had been set up between the students and the young workers in the plants, despite obstacles placed in their way.

Strike committees and broader Committees of Action were mushrooming on a national basis. In many places they began to take over public functions, resembling nothing so much as the soviets that were formed at the beginning of the revolutions in Russia in 1905 and again in 1917.

The capitalist ruling class, reeling from the speed of events, floundered helplessly. Their daily press, printed only by courtesy of the Communist party, openly described the situation as "revolutionary."

The de Gaulle regime was caught in a deep crisis, many of the government figures preparing like rats to abandon ship. Premier Pompidou, upon rushing back to France from a trip abroad, was said to have told the police that the situation at that point was "prerevolutionary."

Everything that the ministers did seemed wrong. Measures which in "normal" times would have worked, now seemed only to make matters worse, concessions as well as repressive measures only heating up the rebellion still more. De Gaulle's offer to hold a "referendum" was like throwing gasoline on a fire.

Disaffection began to appear in the very ranks of the police, and the army was uncertain.

On May 29, against this background, the Communist-led unions staged a giant demonstration in Paris. At least 800,000 workers belonging to the Confédération Générale du Travail [CGT -- General Federation of Labor] paraded from the Place de

la Bastille to the Gare St. Lazare. Even this march was a limited one, the CP leaders having repulsed the other big labor federations and the students, and they ended the march without a rally.

Yet this march brought the movement to a new level politically. The marchers demanded an end to the "scarecrow" de Gaulle regime and the workers expressed what they wanted by carrying thousands of red flags and singing the "Internationale." The demonstration had an enthusiasm and a fervor that required little to transform it into the clinching action that would have brought down the regime and opened the socialist revolution in France.

That was how things stood on May 29. The next day the "scarecrow" government pulled a surprise. The 77-year-old de Gaulle made a four-and-one-half-minute speech over the radio. His words abruptly altered the situation.

It was as if the French working class had risen like a giant, stretched out an arm to sweep away the scarecrow in its way, and then, hearing a recorded voice coming from the bundle of rags, had fallen back in confusion.

The bourgeois statesmen throughout the world gave thanks with a fervor unusual for people so long accustomed to restraining their enthusiasm for de Gaulle. The consensus among them was that the unexpected outcome was due to the "magic" of de Gaulle's personality and his understanding of how to choose the right psychological moment.

The true explanation is more complex.

The revolutionary outburst, as is generally the case in social upheavals of such scope, caught everyone by surprise. Above all the French capitalist class. In view of France's relative prosperity, to them it appeared completely incredible that a revolutionary situation had been brewing in the country.

Even more incredible to them was the fact that the chain reaction leading to such an explosion had been touched off by students.

Unable to understand what had happened, relying on devices that had become worn out during the ten years in which the bonapartist de Gaulle regime had held power, the government lost control of events. It seemed but a matter of days until it would be swept aside.

Threshing about for ways and means to gain time as the regime foundered, sectors of the French bourgeoisie sought to put together a "transition" government,

a government that would seek at least a brief life by making major concessions to the social forces in revolt. If time could be won or bought, a more lasting solution might then be found.

The key problems for the bourgeoisie were how to get the strikers to give up the plants, return them to the capitalists, go back to work, and transfer their struggle from the factories and streets into parliament where it could be safely channeled and eventually reduced to harmless proportions.

The bourgeoisie by itself was incapable of accomplishing this. The parliamentary machine along with the parliamentary parties had been eroded by Gaullism, which itself had now reached the point where the clamor for the general's resignation was universal.

Only the Communist party, the party with the largest backing in the working class -- some 500,000 -- was capable of solving these problems in the interests of the French bourgeoisie; only the CP bureaucracy could save French capitalism in its hour of dire need.

With Waldeck Rochet in the lead, the French Stalinist bureaucrats responded in a way fully up to the standards of the school they were trained in.

In the beginning, when the student movement first began to take on size and momentum, they sought to block it by slandering its leaders and aims and thus prejudicing the workers (and the Communist party rank and file) against it. They refrained from backing the students against the ferocious attacks of the police. The student demonstrations were described as "provocations." The most militant tendencies were labeled as "anarchist" (in the bourgeois sense), "Maoist," and "Trotskyist." The student leader, Daniel Cohn-Bendit, was sneered at as "a German."

When the police brutality reached levels not seen since the torture of captured Algerian freedom fighters in the 1954-62 period, the CP leaders had no choice but to participate in the protest demonstration and one-day strike that was organized in Paris May 13. But that was as far as they wanted to go. The last thing they had in mind was the mighty upsurge which the May 13 demonstration and the occupation of the universities by the students then touched off.

As always, the workers began by presenting their grievances against the system in the form of immediate demands relating to the job -- pay, hours, vacations, conditions... These grievances had been accumulating for ten years and were therefore considerable. In this they paralleled the students, who were also



moved into action by the pressure of daily existence under long outmoded conditions.

The movement rapidly developed toward a political expression of these demands. The students above all raised the question of the regime and the capitalist system as a whole. Their understanding of what ought to be done had every chance of quickly permeating the ranks of the strikers occupying the factories.

The Communist party bureaucrats did everything possible to block this. Repeated efforts by the students to talk with the workers in the plants were turned aside by the CP through their control over the CGT. The student efforts to form a united front in action with the workers were either received very coldly or rejected outright as "provocative" or as playing into the hands of the government.

Very consciously and very deliberately, the CP strategists sought to prevent the radicalized students from uniting with the workers. They sought to keep the movement divided. They played the role of professional splitters.

Meanwhile they frantically sought to keep up relations with the de Gaulle regime while at the same time making a show of being in opposition. Thus they pushed a motion of "censure" in parliament against de Gaulle even as they negotiated with his lieutenants on the concessions that were required to buy time for French capitalism. And in l'Humanité they clamored for "haste" in making the concessions.

After meeting behind closed doors with the representatives of de Gaulle and the bosses, the CP bureaucrats brought a package deal to the strikers. At the Renault plant where Séguy presented this "proposed" settlement May 27, he was shouted down before he could even finish.

Much worse than the low price for which Séguy and his fellow bureaucrats were willing to settle was their insistence that the strike movement was merely for economic demands -- that it had nothing political about it although it had shaken the country to the bottom and the regime was ready to topple.

Very consciously and very deliberately, the CP strategists sought to prevent the upsurge from becoming political, from moving toward power and the establishment of a workers state in France. They refrained from calling the general strike a general strike, proceeding as if the concerted strike action consisted of scattered and unrelated involvements.

Their concern about terminology in this instance was well motivated. To have admitted that what was involved was a general strike (which they never initiated



GEORGES SEGUY

and never wanted) would have implied a general settlement. But this in turn would have at once posed the question of government power since only the government could lay down the terms of an overall settlement. And only a workers government could make it possible to really meet the demands of the workers and the students.

Despite the CP, the question of government power came more and more to the fore. The bourgeoisie themselves talked openly of dumping de Gaulle. This made it increasingly difficult for the CP to maintain the framework of dealing with the de Gaulle regime as if it were something so sacrosanct that no other framework could even be imagined within

which to settle the great social conflict that had erupted.

When the bourgeoisie became specific and began talking in terms of a "transition" government headed by Mendès France or Mitterrand, the CP bureaucrats had to shift, too. If a new regime was being prepared, then they had to put in their bid for a place in it. The demonstration they called in Paris May 29 had this purpose as well as the objective of remaining at the head of the masses and preventing the burgeoning revolutionary vanguard from outflanking them from the left.

But demonstrations in the streets have a logic of their own. The new dynamic leaders among the students and young workers were being brought increasingly to public attention. They were gaining invaluable experience at an extraordinary rate. The masses were becoming more and more fired up. A revolutionary union between the students and the workers was inherent in the situation. The capitalist structure both socially and politically, it was plain to see, was a most rickety structure despite the chrome trimmings of the "society of abundance."

This was when de Gaulle moved. He flew first to consult with the heads of the army to get assurances from them that they would obey his orders. Troops and armored forces were put into motion. Then he went on the air.

He stated that he was not resigning. He was keeping the despised Pompidou, too. He postponed his previous "concession" of a referendum. He dissolved the National Assembly and called for elections.

He threatened the use of force and he appealed to all the most reactionary elements in the country to mobilize.

On the same day, May 30, the Gaullists staged a demonstration to give point to the speech. This had been well prepared, participants being brought to Paris from other areas to give it greater size. Among the key components were former Algerian colons and similar riffraff. The tone of the demonstration can be judged by the slogan, reported in Le Monde and also in the London Guardian [June 3], "Cohn-Bendit à Dachau" ["Send Cohn-Bendit to Dachau"].

How the armed forces would have acted had the revolutionary struggle become still more intense is, of course, speculative. It is nevertheless significant that the generals, according to the press, told de Gaulle that while they would remain loyal to any "legal" regime, the troops could not be depended on to break the general strike.

The CP bureaucrats made the record with some indignant remarks about de Gaulle's attack on Communist "totalitarianism" and his allegations about a plot for a Communist takeover in France. Within a few hours after the speech, however, they revealed their true sentiments by accepting with both hands the proffered new election.

The election gave them exactly what they needed -- no doubt as de Gaulle had divined or been informed -- in the way of fuel for a back-to-work movement and the transfer of the struggle from the streets and plants to the safe confines of parliamentary politicking.

In short, in return for 10,000,000 workers on strike, de Gaulle offered the CP leaders the opportunity to roll up 5,000,000 votes in an election. They snapped to attention and saluted the tricolor. Yes, by all means, the French Communist party was accepting de Gaulle's generous offer.

This meant, of course, also accepting de Gaulle as long as he cares to stay in office. And Pompidou, too.

The bourgeois hero, Mitterrand, much admired by the CP, who had been suggested as the head of a "transition" government, at once retired back into the wings, as did his rival, Mendès France.

The CP bureaucrats were equally quick on their feet. They stopped the nonsense about demanding de Gaulle's immediate resignation. L'Humanité is campaigning now on something much better -- the preparations to meet de Gaulle's "challenge" on the electoral level. To help the preparations for the electioneering and parliamentary horse trading, the CP daily is stepping up the pressure to get everyone back to work.

The CP has gone about this, naturally, with the customary Stalinist finesse, playing up the gains made by the workers in the form of concessions from the government and the bosses. To be noted, however, is the formula advanced by the CGT. The workers in any bargaining unit are to go back whenever they feel that their demands have been "satisfied." Everything is split up and divided so far as the workers are concerned, and the government and the bosses are given maximum opportunity to bring pressure to bear on the weaker or more backward sectors to end their strike.

In addition, L'Humanité is running daily warnings about "provocateurs" who are said to be trying to prolong the strike action.

The bosses have become so emboldened that they are now testing out the

use of police to break strikes. At the Renault plant in Flins, early in the morning of June 6, between 3,000 and 4,000 CRS [Compagnies Républicaines de Sécurité], the special riot police, were brought in. They forced out the strikers guarding the plant during the night.

The CFDT [Confédération Française Démocratique du Travail -- French Democratic Federation of Labor] which also has members in the plant, called for a protest demonstration in Paris the same evening. Not only did the CGT leaders refuse to join in this demonstration, they denounced it as "adventurist" and implied that it was a "provocation."

The extent of the betrayal committed by the French Communist party bureaucrats must be gauged in relation to the extraordinary opportunity for a socialist victory in France made possible by the massive mobilization staged by the students and workers themselves. But it would be a serious error to conclude from this that nothing was won in the battles of the past weeks.

Pompidou, for instance, issued a decree making the minimum wage in France three francs an hour [about US\$.60]. This signified a 35 percent jump for industrial workers in Paris, 39 percent in most of the provinces, and 62 percent for the agricultural workers.

Wage gains are running generally from 10 percent to 20 percent. In some instances (railways, public utilities) full pay has been granted for the days lost on strike. For some categories, the workweek has been reduced a little.

The gains are actually modest since wages were below those in other major countries in Europe. The reduction of the workweek from 48 hours to 40 hours at no loss in pay, one of the primary demands when the general strike began, was not won.

But there is no doubt that the French workers feel a new self-confidence as a result of what they did win, despite an abysmal leadership, through their concerted action.

It seems certain, too, that the grip of the CP bureaucrats will turn out to have been loosened by the upsurge. The workers are well aware that the gains they made resulted from their own initiative and not that of the union brass, who functioned mainly as messenger boys, and largely as messenger boys for the de Gaulle regime.

This rise in consciousness now becomes a permanent new element of instability for French and European capitalism.

It will not be easy, for instance, to take away the wage gains through inflation without setting off fresh convulsions.

The main gain in the upsurge is the shakeup in the political field. On the capitalist side the crisis has just begun. Whatever breathing spell is granted the de Gaulle regime, it is clearly doomed. The construction of a bourgeois alternative is no easy matter.

On the side of the workers, a fresh perspective has opened. A new revolutionary force numbering in the tens of thousands, composed mainly of students and young workers, has appeared on the scene. This is centered at the Sorbonne where activity is seething. In this "soviet" the most varied currents are debating and discussing and organizing into tendencies that have yet to become clearly delineated but which are running in the general channel of revolutionary socialism.

The Trotskyist movement, particularly as represented by the Jeunesse Communiste Révolutionnaire [JCR -- Revolutionary Communist Youth] and the Parti Communiste Internationaliste [PCI -- Internationalist Communist party], the French section of the Fourth International, has won great prestige and is listed on all sides as one of the sources of revolutionary inspiration that helped touch off the entire May movement. The size and influence of the Trotskyist movement in France and Europe are bound to increase at an impressive rate in the immediate period ahead.

What the next turn in the situation may offer can scarcely be predicted. The upsurge in France is so deep-going, however, that not even the CP with its decades of practice in betrayals can deflect it for long. In fact, one of the first coming developments may well be a shattering crisis in the CP itself.

In the rest of Europe and, for that matter, the rest of the world, the repercussions have only begun. What the French students and workers have done is to again put on the agenda for consideration by revolutionists everywhere the problem of the proletarian revolution as something actual.

The colonial revolutionists, too, who have been looking to the peasantry in recent years as the prime source of movement, will now, one may well assume, want to make a closer examination of the revolutionary possibilities in the cities in their countries. The French events certainly offer lessons that can be applied in those social powder kegs.

PICTURES OF TROTSKY AND CHE GUEVARA CARRIED IN COPENHAGEN MARCH OF 10,000

Copenhagen

It has become a tradition in Denmark, as in many other European countries, to hold a march of protest once a year against the evils of imperialism: nuclear arms, aggression against the Vietnamese revolution, oppression of the Afro-Americans, etc. In Denmark this annual march takes place at Whitsun and Monday after Whitsun; this year it was dominated by the call for solidarity with the Vietnamese revolution.

More than 10,000 people participated in the June 3 march, which ended in a rally before the American embassy here. Among the speakers at that rally were representatives of the Communist party and of the newly formed Left Socialist party.

Livio Maitan, secretary of the Italian section of the Fourth International and member of the United Secretariat of the FI, who happened to be in Copenhagen at the time, was also invited to speak.

All this would not be special; it

is now routine for the new revolutionary vanguard in a dozen European countries. But a striking feature of this year's Whitsun march in Copenhagen was the fact that the demonstration was entirely dominated by pictures of Leon Trotsky and Che Guevara. Although there were numerous banners and slogans carried by the demonstrators, there were hardly any other pictures carried than those of these two great revolutionaries whose message dominates our epoch.

And this fact had an unforeseen result. The Communist party paper, Land og Folk ["Land and People"], traditionally publishes large photographs of the Whitsun march, which is the big annual event of the extreme left in Denmark. However, Land og Folk couldn't discover any section of the march without a Trotsky picture in it. It was thereby forced to print on the front page of its June 4 issue the picture of the founder of the Red Army.

This is perhaps the first time in forty years that this picture has appeared in any official CP newspaper in Europe.



"THE YOUNG FIREBRANDS"

[Following is the full text of an article by Malcolm Southan tracing the recent development of the radical student movement in Europe. It appeared in the June 7 issue of the London Sun.]

\* \* \*

The student revolt which now challenges Western Europe began -- as nearly as anyone can put a date on it -- in October, 1966, in the big Belgian industrial town of Liège.

Several thousand representatives from the increasingly vocal student organisations of Europe had gone there to march against the Vietnam war and NATO.

Among the bodies represented there were the British Vietnam Solidarity Campaign, later to shock this country with their Grosvenor Square demonstration; the French JCR (Revolutionary Communist Youth), highly influential in last month's Paris riots; and others, equally determined, from Sweden, Italy, Holland, the United States, Canada and Spain.

But back in October, 1966, nobody really thought the meeting would have lasting effects -- not even the Belgian Young Guards, who say one reason they organised the protest was because they were feeling rather isolated within Belgium at the time.

After the Liège demonstration there was an informal conference. Here, for the first time, the young hotheads of Europe, the students from the movements who were soon to matter, got down to business.

To their surprise all but two or three of the movements -- who were quickly to drop from the scene -- found that they had much in common.

The loose organisation which emerged from that meeting has been called the Vanguard Youth Movement or, more commonly, the Brussels Conference.

Since Liège in '66, two other large-scale formal meetings of the Conference have already taken place. The first was in Brussels in February, 1967, and the latest was three months ago in West Berlin, staged by Rudi Dutschke's famous SDS (German Socialist Student Organisation) who joined the Brussels Conference last year.

Equally important, an international ad hoc committee of student and youth leaders was established, and they still meet at two or three-monthly intervals in Paris, Brussels, Frankfurt, Berlin

and other European cities.

The organisations' leaders plan to hold their next meeting in Strasbourg in a few weeks.

As a result of all this, the German Dutschke, who was almost killed a few weeks ago by an assassin, is constantly in touch with Alain Krivine, the composed extremist who heads the French JCR.

French and German students keep in contact with Belgian firebrands and also with Tariq Ali, the highly literate Pakistani who headed the Grosvenor Square demonstration. Though never present at the ad hoc committee meetings, Tariq came to prominence among the revolutionaries with an impressive speech at the Berlin conference.

The links developed have proved lasting and highly effective.

During crisis periods, agitators are constantly on the move. It does not cost much. Revolutionary students live rough.

Hundreds of foreign students, particularly German SDS members, have been in Paris recently. At the same time, at the height of the Parisian crisis, Krivine despatched one of his key agitators, Daniel Bensaïd, to speak at a Brussels café, Le Maillot Jaune (The Yellow T-Shirt), to some of the students who were to play a key part in the takeover of Brussels University.

At the Grosvenor Square protest in March, when police battled with demonstrators, Krivine made a raspingly aggressive speech and the demonstration itself was strengthened by 70-odd German SDS members.

One of these German students told me last week: "Your police were so gentle, it was like a holiday for us. And your immigration officers let me through wearing a Vietcong badge and a helmet ready for the demonstration."

It would be too crude to claim that the Trotskyist Fourth International -- the 30-year-old revolutionary organisation who have headquarters in Paris -- are behind the present European student unrest.

But everywhere I have been in Europe their influence has been obvious.

The Fourth International were founded by Leon Trotsky, the one-time Russian revolutionary leader who broke

with Stalin and was eventually murdered on his orders. Dedicated to workers' control and truly international revolution, contemptuous of the Russian Communist regime which they regard as bureaucratic and complacent, this uncompromising outfit have for many years been shrugged off as having little more than nuisance value.

The French organisation, headed by Pierre Frank, once Trotsky's personal secretary, and based in the working-class district near the Gare de l'Est, have this instruction pinned on the inside of their door: "Very important. Look through the spyhole before opening."

Despite this melodramatic stuff the organisation have been making progress. They have made contact with the young hotheads of Europe.

In France, many members of Krivine's JCR are members of the Fourth International.

Here in Britain, regarded on the Continent as the baby of the protest movement, Tariq Ali says he has recently joined the Fourth International.

Pat Jordan, a middle-aged veteran of the political scene and another leading light in the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign, says quite frankly that he is secretary of the International Marxist Group, an organisation associated with the Fourth International.

And, indeed, immediately below the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign's rickety-looking office in London's East End, an organisation known as the Pioneer Book Service sell Trotskyist literature.

Furthermore, many organisations in the European protest movement -- though not joined to the Fourth International directly -- are Marxist-Trotskyist in tone.

These include the German SDS and

yet another organisation in Britain, called International Socialism, who have close links with British universities.

The Trotskyists' success lies in their ability to harness both the idealism and the unrest of the students.

At present many students believe not only that their universities are being run in an archaic way but also that the Western countries' conduct on race, on Vietnam, and in their whole relationship with the underdeveloped world, betrays the inherent selfishness of capitalism.

As always, as in the Europe of the 1930's, it is ideas which excite students and move them to action.

The ideas which have arrested the minds of the young militants of Europe come not only from Trotsky's texts and the office of the Fourth International in Paris.

They come from left-wing writers of many leanings -- Che Guevara, the Argentine-born hero of the Cuban revolution; Frantz Fanon, the powerful anti-colonialist writer from Martinique; the Belgian political theorist, Ernest Mandel; Régis Debray, the 27-year-old Frenchman now imprisoned in Bolivia for his pro-revolutionary sympathies; Herbert Marcuse, the German-born professor from the U.S. who brilliantly blitzes the rat race of Western society; and from earlier periods -- Marx, Engels and Rosa Luxemburg.

The net result is a generation more impatient than any before, disdainful of wordmongers who are not prepared to fight in the streets for change. A generation hungry for revolution.

A generation which exists not only in the strife-torn student centres of the Continent, but in Britain.

#### JAPANESE STUDENTS AND WORKERS STOP TRAIN CARRYING U.S. AMMUNITION

About 250 students and union men blocked a train carrying U.S. military explosives in Kitakyushu, Japan, for nine hours on June 11 before being dispersed by riot police.

After first holding a short rally in front of the station, about 100 of the demonstrators charged into the station compounds when the freight train arrived carrying explosives to the U.S. Forces Yamada ammunition depot. The rest of the demonstrators sat down in the path of the train, forcing it to stop. Some of the students entered the locomotive, accord-

ing to a report in the June 13 Manichi Daily News.

The demonstrators reportedly included Sampa Rengo [Three-Faction Alliance], Zengakuren students from Kyushu and Kitakyushu universities, together with members of the Kitakyushu Socialist party chapter.

The June 12 Japan Times reported that the students and workers were informed of the approach of the munitions-bearing train by members of the National Motive Powers Workers Union.

Report from Spain

NEOCAPITALISM AND THE "WAR OF THE SPANISH SUCCESSION"

By Alberto Cardona

Only days after the enthusiastic statements by Franco and various ministers about the "strength of the peseta" [60.07 pesetas = US\$1] and the miraculous Development Plan, whose designated period is already just about up, the devaluation descended. It can be said that the only surprise was the date. The inexorable deterioration in the balance of payments and the continual rise in the cost of living were already sufficiently threatening omens.

At first the English devaluation was used as a pretext. But after a few days this argument was dropped, inasmuch as in addition to the devaluation, the government took a series of stabilization measures (which added up to a new development plan). The anarchic economic growth of these last years, which the existing plan was incapable either of controlling or forestalling, made it necessary to impose violent curbs on the economy. The reasons for the devaluation and the complementary measures accompanying it arose then not from the international conjuncture but from the disorders within the Spanish economy.

From 1961 to 1967 the cost of living increased by 55 percent and the deficit in the balance of payments went from \$389,200,000 to \$2,337,200,220 in 1966 -- which is an indication of how competitive Spanish industry is. In 1963, agriculture showed its first deficit, which was 6,135 million pesetas; in 1966 the deficit had reached 17,070 million. At the same time surpluses were piling up (wheat and wine in particular) which had to be sold at a loss.

The average growth of agricultural income in the four years of Development Plan I was one percent below not only the 4.1 percent which it seems that Development Plan I aimed at but also -- as Ya pointed out on March 19, 1967 -- below the level judged satisfactory by the report of the World Bank or the UN Food and Agricultural Organization [FAO].

Public consumption costs (i.e., those expenditures not involving productive investment), which were supposed to increase 5 percent annually according to the plan, rose 7.3 percent in 1964, 15.6 percent in 1965, and 21.5 percent in 1966 (!).

It is evident then that the Spanish bourgeoisie takes great liberties with its own guidelines when it constructs its "guideline" plans. Such lib-

erties are clearly a manifestation of the more or less chaotic and anarchic character of capitalist development in general. They represent "free enterprise's" underlying tendency to chase after profits wherever they may be found, in defiance of all discipline.

But in the Spanish case this is also indicative of the distance still separating the Spanish monopolies from "neocapitalism." And this gap is not a result of technical incapacity. This backwardness exists, but linked to it and aggravating it are also, as we will see later, an incoherence in the political line to be followed and a lack of the decisiveness needed to take the steps required to modernize the economy. In particular, the requisite decisiveness is lacking to carry through a deep-going reform of the technical and political structures of a state ill-adapted to meet the newly arising needs. While adequate to the tasks of a former time, this outmoded state machine has now become an encumbrance.

For all these reasons, the Spanish bourgeoisie -- or rather its monopolistic sectors whose influence is decisive -- has been resorting to what might be called makeshift solutions, which, while perhaps not very original, get them out of their immediate difficulties and enable them to shift the burdens to those who always bear them.

What is the ultimate meaning of this devaluation? It means Spanish goods will be "cheaper" for foreigners, and foreign goods more expensive for Spaniards. Some of these foreign goods are incorporated in the Spanish productive process as raw materials, semimanufactures, machine tools, etc. Their added cost will "affect" (as it is euphemistically put) the prices of Spanish industrial products, whose prices will then rise on the Spanish market. And there is no doubt that the prices of foreign goods coming directly onto the Spanish market will also rise.

Thus the things that the workers buy will be more expensive; that is, they will cost more labor time. And so, losing its scientific mystery, the devaluation means essentially cutting the cost of the labor power of all Spaniards as a whole, increasing the intensity of their exploitation. This includes the white-collar workers, who thanks to the ties their bosses let them adorn themselves with, will be the last to wake up to it.

But devaluation is nothing more than

the reverse side of an inflationary process. The currency in circulation keeps increasing and its worth keeps going down. This means that a part of wages and savings is skillfully drawn off into the hands of the one who prints the money, i.e., the capitalist state.

This represents a tax or a form of capitalist accumulation through the state -- a statist form of capitalism -- which makes possible a "headlong" development of the means of production. And the owners of these means of production, as only a few obtuse patriots addled by the mystique of development can fail to see, are the capitalists.

Obviously inflation has its dangers and ultimately an unstable currency will introduce considerable confusion into accounting, commodity circulation, and investment. What is necessary according to the economists is to keep this inflation within controlled limits by using anti-inflationary measures as a check.

Naturally, the first anti-inflationary measure the Spanish government took was to freeze wages for 1968. A series of contracts in the process of negotiation -- which had been interminably delayed by the bad faith and cajolery of the bosses -- were suspended until the beginning of 1969. It can be estimated that these measures cost a million workers an amount equivalent to 20 percent of their present wages. And the wages affected are precisely the lowest, those oscillating around the minimum wage level.

To compensate for these measures the government made a "commitment" that the cost of living would not continue its rise, and that -- by another "economic miracle" -- it would probably drop. In reality, the cost of living rose already in January 1968 by .28 percent, which makes it reasonable to suppose that the annual rate will not be under 3 percent. The plenum of the Sección Social Central del Sindicato del Metal [Central Social Department of the Metal Workers Union] felt compelled to declare March 9 that it considered itself released from the "obligation to respect the Decree-Law of November 27, 1967, since the price-wage freeze has not been put into effect."

#### To Change or Not to Change

Probably one of the most difficult questions to answer at the present time is who governs in Spain -- if governing is understood to mean something other than presiding over ceremonies and occupying the first page of the papers. All activity is dominated by the principle of supine "waiting."

This is true not only in the economic sphere, where it is shown by the

fact that for want of anything better they prolonged the life of the former plan (it seems at least that it had a life once). In all sectors of the state administration, measures and projects are endlessly put off in the face of the contradictory and suspicious maneuvers of pressure groups whose thoughts are completely absorbed in the question of Franco's immediate successor.

Most recently, as the disarray has increased in the top circles, and political development -- from whatever angle you look at it -- has stagnated, the influence of the most reactionary groups has mounted: that of the Falangist bureaucracy, the Franco camarilla, and all those for whom a change in the façade would mean being put out to pasture.

Freedom of the press -- which was allowed solely to permit a clarification of the various tendencies and interest groupings within the bloc of victors in the civil war -- is steadily shrinking. The press which advocates democratization of the European type, as distinct from the incoherent evasions of the government's "evolutionists," has been especially cut back. Thus, blows have fallen on Destino, Cuadernos para el Dialogo, and threaten to strike even Madrid and Europa Presse.

Watching Franco age, the Spanish bourgeoisie is tormented with a Hamlet's doubts. Change? If so, what? Why? Hold tight? For how long? These questions assume their most dramatic aspect in the face of the resistance to "changes" on the part of the state apparatus itself. This resistance reflects the bureaucracy's tenacious attachment to its privileges, habits, and inertia. However, it also expresses the nervousness of very diverse strata of the bourgeoisie for whom freedom and its commotions seem too great a threat to order.

To the most apprehensive and narrow-minded, the less agile and sharp-witted, "liberalization" seems a Pandora's box. From it arises a whole series of specters which hold exaggerated terrors for a bourgeoisie used to the cozy, comfortable peace of the period of the fascist terror.

The big bourgeoisie is racking its brains trying to find, to develop a solution, a successor to the Generalissimo's providential but not eternal regime. The difficulties of this situation inevitably give rise to wavering, contradictions, and tensions among the different political sectors identified with the bourgeoisie. And such indecision, which is the reflection of a certain lack of confidence on the part of the bourgeoisie, reinforces the hidebound elements. The repressive moves by these ultraconservative sectors obviously complicate the task of the "extremely flexible" sectors -- the Christian Democratic groups headed by Ruiz Jimenez, or the Social Democrats led by Tierno.



On the one hand, repression might radicalize the student and workers movements, making it more difficult for such political elements to insinuate themselves into them.\* On the other, the organization and the development of the political network of these bourgeois-progressive sectors has been, if not halted, delayed and impeded by the repression.

Doubtless, the bourgeoisie has set as its ultimate goal political solutions like those which the liberal sectors are trying to formulate. But such solutions do not seem to be immediately applicable and the bourgeoisie has put them aside for the moment as solutions to be held in reserve, as alternatives, for a more distant future.

The deferential reception which the Spanish press in general accorded Servan-Schreiber [editor of the liberal French weekly, L'Express], the traveling salesman of European neocapitalism, shows that the Spanish bourgeoisie knows how to value his wares.

The fact that he was labeled as a representative of the "European left" was simply an attempt to hide the real significance of his political postures, to make them more attractive among the petty-bourgeoisie and in the little world of some professions, technicians, and intellectuals. But the question is by what road these goals may be attained at the least possible cost.\*\*

---

\* In his interview with Mundo on the situation in the universities (October 2, 1967), Aranguren explained: "Indeed the fact that those professors opposing the official status quo and point of view were removed seems to me to be crucial for an understanding of the subsequent development of the unrest in the universities.

"After all, before these measures were resorted to, the university opposition, while not centralized, was shaped by the attitude of certain responsible persons. And by means of these persons a certain control could be kept over things. Today, with the absence of these individuals who had exercised a moral control, the situation has become more diffuse, becoming generalized unrest without important centers of responsibility. In brief, it must be recognized that this unrest cannot be easily controlled, while the previous situation enabled the government to pinpoint the centers of activity shaping this opposition which had been created de facto."

\*\* The weekly magazine SP has made an inquiry among the lawyers in the Cortes [the fascist "parliament"] about their attitude on questions like strikes, the agrarian problem, the Common Market,

There is no doubt that these ideas have not yet been enough thought about among the bourgeoisie. Nonetheless, the interest aroused by the visit of the former queen of Spain and the pretender, the Count of Barcelona, seems significant.

The monarchist publicity offensive reached its height with the arrival in Madrid of the last queen of Spain and her son, Don Carlos, who is again emerging as a candidate trying to be the common denominator of all the bourgeois tendencies, from Castiello to Tierno Galván. The maneuver was unquestionably successful and the best proof of this was the rage of the Falangist press, which discovered that the Spanish bourgeoisie is not relying on them for the future.

Of particular importance were the private audiences which the pretender accorded to high army officers on this occasion. For the first time clear symptoms of political ferment have appeared in the army. Up until now this institution has been immersed in an attitude of reserve and loyalty to the Generalissimo.

Now for the first time this crucial -- because it is armed -- part of the state apparatus (everyone knows that the army is our country's most important police force and as such the guarantor of the existing order and the arbiter of all change in it) seems interested in some kind of political revolution.

Most of all the army wants to extricate the "Movimiento Nacional" [National Movement] from its perpetual stagnation. And monarchy, above all if Don Juan is chosen as king, has the advantage that it can be presented at one and the same time as a continuation of the Movement and a break with it. It can be offered as a type of political change guaranteeing social conservatism.

The royal family divided their

---

church-state relations, etc. In spite of the small percentage of replies, the answers obtained point up the existence in the Francoist Cortes itself of a neocapitalist-oriented current.

R. Calvo Serer's opinion in Madrid is still more significant: "Incidents like those produced by the trip of the editor of L'Express must not be used to obstruct the democratic evolution made possible by the prevailing legality. And Servan-Schreiber's activity in Spain is a good demonstration of this: first, because it is a good thing for freedom of association and expression to thrive, and, above all, because the country's new consciousness and its structural changes demand social, economic, and political democracy [sic!]."

smiles and favors with exquisite calculation between the tomb of José Antonio and the bourgeois opposition. Don Juan is further from Franco than his son and seems therefore to be the "hereditary oppositionist" promising satisfaction to all, including the Soviet bureaucracy -- to the great irritation of Mundo Obrero [the organ of the Communist party]. Mundo Obrero was disturbed and worried by the "flexibility" and light-mindedness of the Izvestia commentator.

As was to be expected, the bourgeoisie's abandonment -- for the moment -- of its most advanced sectors (Ruiz Jimenez, Tierno, etc.), and the resultant hardening of the "Neanderthaloid-Francoists" who are devoted to the immutability of the Movement, put the regime's "liberalizers" in an uncomfortable position.

The strength of the "liberalizers" derives from the impetus of the bourgeois opposition. Their merits (from the standpoint of the bourgeoisie) lie in their intent and desire to rejuvenate Francoism by giving it a shot of liberalism, by endowing it with the flexibility it lacks. But with the bourgeois opposition blocked and the road of liberalization closed, what do these people have to offer?

The "evolutionist" foreign minister, Castiella, is trying to hang on to his favorite hobbyhorse, the unreal Gibraltar problem. At the same time, however, the crude boasts [by government figures] that the agreements with the United States [regarding American military bases in Spain] might be fundamentally "reconsidered" were dropped in favor of a more realistic attitude once it was seen that the state of the Yankee treasury would not allow such generosity.

Naturally, the essential question of eliminating the perilous American bases in Spain is not even being raised. But SP, going further in its blackmailing ambitions -- it thought that besides getting the U.S. to pressure Britain to present us with Gibraltar, the United States could be prevailed upon to get Spain into NATO and the Common Market -- let pass such important questions as the judicial status of American military personnel.

There is no doubt that the treaty with the U.S. will be extended for a new period in return for some paltry concessions about flags\* for the sake of the "honor" of the Spanish army. As a demonstration of independence Castiella might mount an effort to regularize diplomatic relations with the countries of the Eastern bloc.

\* Return of Spanish battle flags captured by the U.S. army during the Spanish-American war.

Since the national spirit is declining -- the mystique of the fatherland together with religion are two ideological weapons which must be continually resharpened -- it seems that campaigns are in preparation to revive them.

After the failure of the defenestrated Christ\* -- religious fanaticism has been so exploited that it has lost its stimulant effects on the minds of the Spanish middle classes -- Pueblo announced that a big campaign of repression was being readied against the ETA [Euzkadi to Askatasuna -- the Basque Nation and Liberty]. This is the Basque nationalist organization which seems as determined to defend the claims of Euzkadi [the Basque Nation], as the PNV [Partido Nacionalista Vasco -- the Basque Nationalist party] seems intent on huckstering them away to the Christian Democracy (so that they can get together to see what they can both do for the big banking and industrial monopolies).

Everybody knows that the Castilian petty bourgeoisie gets into an excited state whenever it hears Basque spoken or the anthem "Gernika'ko Arbola" ["The Tree of Guernica"] sung "euskalcunen artean" [among Basques]. There are, then, hopes of reviving "its cooperation with the national cause" with stories about separatism. In Spain, where unlike Central Europe there are no Jews, the bourgeoisie must search for the equivalent. The Basque nationalists, at times as little subversive as any respectable Jewish merchant or clerk, thus seem destined for the pillory.

To the extent that those who uphold the Basque national cause are able to combine their demands with the social struggles in Euzkadi and Spain, to the extent that they can detach themselves from the Christian Democracy, or the (national) Social Democracy, to the extent that they can link up their cause with the Basque proletariat\*\* as a revolutionary class antagonistic to the bourgeoisie, the left wing of the ETA will have the pleasure of seeing both the Spanish chauvinists and broad sectors of the Basque bourgeoisie itself united against them. Some will pillory them as separatists, others as "reds."

This left wing will find (to its surprise?) that the revolutionary resolve of a good part of the Basque petty bourgeoisie, including members of ETA, is severely limited by their respect for the good counsel of the good parish priests

\* An attempt by the police to discredit the student movement by throwing a statue of Christ out of a university window and blaming the students.

\*\* That is, with those who work in Euzkadi, either immigrant or native, Basque-speaking, Spanish-speaking, or any other.

and for the social order -- as distinct from the political and administrative one. It will find that for these petty bourgeois, self-government for the Basque people has nothing in common with "Workers Councils of Euzkadi."

However, the national demands of Euzkadi can only be achieved via this revolutionary road or one very much like it. The Basque petty bourgeoisie which claims to support these demands but refuses to fight for them by following this path only reveals its inability to offer or find solutions for its country's problems. Thus, it reveals its ambivalence, and in the last analysis its subordination to those forces which are preparing the neocapitalist stage of Spanish centralism: the Christian Democracy, the "modern" Socialists, the bourgeois democrats of all stripes.

### The Student Struggle

It is no secret that the Spanish government's disrepute has reached its lowest depths. After the devaluation, practically no one believes any of its statements. (And of course the leaders' insecurity and the imbroglia in economic policy do not increase what meager confidence may be placed either in them or their policy.) But open struggle shows up primarily in the universities and in working-class strata.

For the moment, the focus of the most violent contradictions remains the universities -- in part because of the inadequacies of the workers movement but also because of the character of the student demands. The demands of the students are more compatible with neocapitalist perspectives and closer to the aspirations of broad sectors of the middle classes. As a result these demands stir less resentment in the ruling classes and can be voiced more widely. But this is no reason to underestimate their political content and potential.\*

The following stand out among the immediate causes of the discontent in the Spanish universities:

---

\* We are witnessing dynamic student agitation in many countries led -- as in Spain -- by small political groups with radical positions. Often such movements are produced not just by purely student demands but by the discontent of the youth more generally, by the malaise and problems of society which they feel with special acuteness. Algeria, Egypt, Italy, France, Germany, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Poland, the United States, Brazil, and Japan have been the theater of student demonstrations which have almost always shown an advanced political content.

(1) The particularly anachronistic character of our universities and the poor quality of teaching in them. Since the barriers which for years isolated most students from the outside world have disappeared, the contrast between what they are taught and what "is going on in the world" has become glaringly evident to them. As a result, a real crisis of confidence in the institutions of higher learning has developed.

(2) The increase in the number of students has not been followed by an expansion in buildings and other material facilities, or by an increase in the number of professors. This has made the Spanish universities' inadequacy to their tasks still more manifest.

(3) The Spanish economy has shown itself incapable of providing jobs for a large part of the youth leaving the universities. There is abundant evidence of unemployment, underemployment, as well as emigration among university graduates.

These are the immediate causes of the agitation. However, they are only the concrete consequences of the inability of the Spanish state and ruling classes to respond to the needs of the students and the petty bourgeoisie from which they come. (And there is no reason to think that they would go much further in meeting these needs even if they did adopt a neocapitalist style.)

For this reason, the students' demands take on a political character of overall hostility to the regime. This gives rise to a situation where the agitation conducted by the most radical student groups gains widespread support.

Nonetheless, no illusions should be harbored about the base of the radical groups among the mass of students or that the students as a whole identify with their positions. There is no question that general agreement exists at a much lower level, and that agreement at this level -- or at least a certain convergence -- also exists with the professors and extensive sectors of the petty bourgeoisie who are favorable to a whole series of bourgeois-democratic demands. In places like Barcelona [in Catalonia], these bourgeois-democratic demands of the students and petty bourgeoisie are buttressed by national feeling and the population's general hostility to Madrid's centralism.

Thus, while the activity of the socialist-oriented student groups has extended and sharpened the student unrest, their attempts to link this unrest to the workers movement have had only limited results. They have only been able to achieve limited success in taking this unrest beyond petty-bourgeois limits or in getting even a fraction of the students out of this framework.

Moreover, the difficulties inherent in this situation have often been aggravated by wrangling among the groups and at times by the sectarian and hysterical postures of some of them. At other times, the situation has been complicated by the climate of "reconciliation" (and conciliation with "reconciliation") promoted by the Spanish CP. This attitude has held back more highly political moves that have developed in connection with Vietnam, Che Guevara, etc.

However, the total absence of responsible students able to defend the existing system has been demonstrated by the APE adventure and the shady character of the Defensa Universitaria [University Defense -- the only group unconditionally supporting the regime]. This organization was disavowed even by the Falangist students, who have been obliged to move with the current and change their "style" (everybody knows that these people never had anything but "style"). And the government's repressions have only stepped up the student protest and promoted solidarity among the various elements of the university population.

#### The Workers Movement

The ferment is continuing among the workers but without overcoming its sporadic, uncoordinated, and spontaneous character. The working-class revival which we have seen for some years now is continuing but the fraction of the class taking part in the struggles still represents a minority (there are about eight million workers in Spain).

The Comisiones Obreras [Workers Commissions], which are still the most promising organization in the workers movement, are suffering from the pressure exercised on them by embryonic bureaucracies. These elements are quick to try to absorb the Comisiones as trade-union appendages under their control. They seek to manipulate them in their bargaining with the bourgeoisie and to empty them of their content of workers democracy. Such tendencies could eventually undermine the workers' confidence in the Comisiones.

At the same time a tendency can be noted for the Comisiones to be converted into semitrade-union bodies. For obvious reasons, the Carrillists, the Social Christians, etc., are working to reduce the Comisiones to second-rank bodies. They are trying to promote the traditional distinction between trade-union action and political action.

The bureaucracies [the "progressive" labor leaders] are trying to make politics their private preserve. They look with an understandable suspicion on the possibility that workers bodies might develop spontaneously which sooner or lat-

er could intervene in politics directly on behalf of the working class.

Such a development would be a great blow to those who aspire to be deputies or intermediaries within the framework of bourgeois democracy -- who are presently supported by the workers bureaucracies.

All this causes strife and tensions which create disgust, distrust, and demoralization among the workers. The antagonism between the workers movement as a whole and the workers parties, between the mass of workers and those who seek to be their leaders, continues to be important. This antagonism has repercussions moreover on the coordination of workers struggles because the interests of the bureaucracies tend to prevail over those of the workers even in the Comisiones themselves.

This explains the limited response to the day of protest on October 27, which was projected in abstract terms as a day of protest against "the high cost of living." There was no preparation. There was no buildup to this day of protest to make the workers feel the need to use the occasion to bring their collective pressure to bear. On the contrary, the leaderships were unable to use even the extraordinary example of the Basauri laminating plant strike to create an atmosphere of working-class militancy on a regional or national level. They were unable to use this example as anything more than an occasion for collections and demonstrations of sympathy.

Because of this gap between political action and working-class struggles, the devaluation of the peseta occurred without arousing anything more than verbal reactions. And in some cases, these verbal reactions were imbued with a confusion which seemed destined to widen the gap still farther between the workers economic struggle and political action.\*

---

\* The AST [Acción Sindical de Trabajadores -- Workers Trade-Union Action] printed a leaflet in which the devaluation was correctly analyzed as an instrument of capitalist exploitation. The role of the state both in the devaluation and in capitalist exploitation more generally was also correctly analyzed. However, this analysis concluded:

"As we have said on previous occasions, the capitalist class (using the state as its most dependable tool) is alleviating its problems at the expense of the workers. It is trying to shift the effects of the current crisis onto their shoulders.

"The attitude of the capitalists, which is certainly nothing new, compels us to struggle, not for demands of a political character but to defend our living standard which they want to reduce (my emphasis)."

Upcoming struggles and demonstrations under the auspices of the Comisiones Obreras will serve as a measure of the ability of their leaders. And these will also test the Comisiones' influence, the tendencies prevailing within them, and whether they are determined to tackle political questions or conversely to immerse themselves in apolitical trade unionism. They will test their character as representative democratic workers organs and show whether or not they are simply transmission belts for the political bureaucracies of the "left" parties (abstention of the unions from political struggle could be a policy imposed by one of these).

Political approaches can vary greatly among the mass of workers or the organized groups. Some limit themselves to seeing trade-union freedom and "universal suffrage" as the essential aim of the workers struggle. Others see these simply as means to advance the struggle further.

The possibilities and difficulties of the Spanish workers movement in the present stage are linked to its organizational problems. In the first place, the Comisiones Obreras must be impelled forward as democratic and unifying bodies.

"Democratic" means that these must organically emanate from the class. Their representativeness must be based on the most extensive use of democratic election and recall, and a real identification with the working class by means of genuine working-class control and not just acceptance. These commissions must be democratic so that their decisions can effectively reconcile the diverse viewpoints arising within the Comisiones and within the working class as a whole.

"Unifying" is meant in the sense that these bodies must not only organically unite the class, not only coordinate its activity in the entire sphere of the Spanish state. They must also take on, in an overall way, all the tasks facing the working class in its struggles. This means

---

Here, the artificial distinction between trade-union and political struggle is introduced in direct contradiction to the analysis which precedes it. Should such incoherence be considered accidental or rather a manifestation of their deliberate desire to limit themselves to "dialogue" with the bosses over wages? And this is a dialogue, moreover, which will be interminable as long as there are bosses, who take back with one hand what they appear to give with the other -- as the example of the devaluation itself shows. It must be made very clear that independence of the trade-union movement from the political bureaucracies must not mean abstention from political struggle.

not only taking up the workers' elemental economic demands (wages, etc.) or the democratic demands bound up with them (the freedom to strike, freedom of association); it means also adopting more deep-going political-economic demands tied to an overall strategy of opposition to capitalism. It means taking up demands aimed at developing the workers' determination to take control over production (beginning for example with taking the right to "stick their noses" into the company books when questions of wage policy arise).

But it is obvious that the development of the Comisiones in this direction will run up against all sorts of obstacles. Such a course will run into all the direct obstruction of bourgeois repression as well as the obstacles which derive from this repression: political and trade-union bureaucracies that may either aim at completely integrating the workers movement into bourgeois society or simply be conciliationist and opportunist, as in the case of the "Carrillist" current.

It is evident that in order to counter bourgeois repression and bureaucracy in the workers movement and their baneful influence, the most advanced section of the working class must attempt to function in a coordinated way. That segment of the working class with the clearest vision and the most definite objectives must strive to organize a party independent of and counterposed to these bourgeois and bureaucratic tendencies.

This advanced element, which is thrown up by the workers struggles themselves and which is distinguished by its consciousness of the basic organizational and theoretical requirements for success in these struggles, must build the revolutionary workers party.

However, the coalescence and coordination of this vanguard -- the construction of the party -- can be facilitated to the extent that the small revolutionary Marxist groups now existing succeed in giving impetus to the workers struggles, in clarifying the real laws which govern them, and in opening up organizational and theoretical perspectives. In order to do this the revolutionary Marxist groups must be in close contact with real struggles. This contact must enrich the workers movement and raise its level of consciousness; and at the same time it must free the Marxist groups from purely theoretical exertions and abstract schematism.

The revolutionary Marxist groups will only be able to accomplish these tasks to the extent that they are able to overcome their disunity and coordinate their work. However, they will not become more effective simply by combining their efforts. Their increased effectiveness will be a reflection of the clarity and agree-

ment on which their unity is based.

Formal unity is no remedy for their division as long as clarity and agreement are lacking. The various groups would only cancel one another out. The result would be superficiality and confusion. The motley group so created would inevitably be drawn into the wake of the conciliationist and opportunist currents because it would be unable to define its perspectives firmly and clearly enough and it could not make any basic criticism of the opportunist and conciliationist currents.

But on the other hand, unreal perspectives or a doctrinaire attitude divorced from reality could never attract the working-class vanguard (there is no lack of sectarian grouplet-parties of this sort either).

Thus, the workers movement's advance proceeds according to a complex evolution in which the various aspects interact. The growth and development of the Comisiones Obreras can serve as a stimulus to the broad workers movement. Produced

initially by the needs of the upsurge of the workers movement, the maturing of the Comisiones could generate the demand for a revolutionary workers party among large numbers of advanced workers. With these reinforcements, this party, initiated by the Marxist groups, could then act as a catalyst in the further progress and development of the Comisiones and the broad workers movement. This would make possible the construction of a mass revolutionary party.

The constitution of this party moreover will depend on the formulation of a program -- of organizational and theoretical perspectives -- fruitfully combining the immediate practical experience of the working class with the class's generalized historical experience, embodied in the socialist theory originated by Marx and Engels.

Thus, successes and failures at any level of this process will inevitably affect the whole and determine the degree of development and maturity that the Spanish workers movement may attain.

#### PAUL BOUTELLE MAKES SPEAKING TOUR OF BRITAIN

By Ernest Tate

London

Paul Boutelle, the Socialist Workers party candidate for vice-president of the United States, concluded a two-week speaking tour of Britain with a rally in London's Hyde Park, at the famous Speakers Corner.

Boutelle was in Britain the last week in May and the first week in June as part of his campaign to take news of the black struggle in America beyond the borders of the U.S. and to obtain information from black people in Britain about their conditions.

The large meeting in Hyde Park of more than 1,000, mainly black people, heard Boutelle describe the conditions faced by the black population in the U.S. and outline a history of the liberation struggle and the role black nationalism played in that struggle.

"The United States government is today the main enemy of all mankind," he said. "Not only does it show it in Vietnam where it carries on a criminal war, but it shows it in its policies towards black Americans."

"It is a racist country," he said, "just as England is a racist country -- I've been traveling this country for the

past two weeks talking and listening to black people, and I don't see much difference."

To loud applause, he told the crowd: "You've got the same problems we've got. It's the same rotten system. We've got the same enemy. British imperialism is the front man for American imperialism, the junior partner. It's not as strong as it once was. Once they used to say that the sun always shone on some part of the empire -- now the sun has difficulty finding it!"

Boutelle drew shouts of approval from the audience when he referred to the case of Michael X who had been one of the first people arrested under the race relations act passed by the Labour government.

"I understand they put our brother Michael X, otherwise known as Michael Abdul Malik, in jail for saying that white people were 'monkeys, devils and bastards.' Well, if white people would not behave like monkeys, devils and bastards, then we wouldn't have to call them that."

Speaking of the election campaign in the United States, he said he was sorry Robert Kennedy was assassinated. "Assassination and individual acts of terrorism don't solve anything. In fact they are used as a pretext by the ruling class

to take action against its opponents. It's the system that has to be destroyed. I'm especially sorry because many people had illusions that Kennedy, a capitalist politician, was on the side of black people. I'm sure he would have been exposed very quickly if he had been elected."

The audience, which included most of the leaders of the black militants in London, were especially interested to hear Boutelle's comments on the black power movement in the United States.

"A large majority of black people in America still vote for the Democratic party," he said. "To counter this, we in the SWP advocate the formation of an independent black political party -- this proposal is a central issue in our campaign." Pictures of Boutelle speaking in Hyde Park appeared on the national BBC TV news.

Boutelle's visit to Britain came at a time when there is a great receptivity to black power ideas in the black community as a result of the recent upsurge of racism in Britain.

Paul Boutelle's speaking tour of Britain took him to the main industrial centers outside London, such as Birmingham, Sheffield and Nottingham, where large immigrant communities live. He had long discussions with the community leaders in these areas. He also spoke at over ten colleges and universities where he aroused considerable interest among many colonial students resident in Britain.

In Glasgow he addressed a meeting of over ninety people at the main trade-union center, sponsored by the Marxist monthly, International. At a meeting in Edinburgh University, his barbs against the British queen came under editorial attack in the Scottish Daily Express. He had referred in passing to the queen as being a "parasite who should be put to work washing floors."

At Newcastle University a quickly organized meeting by the Socialist Society received good support -- 130 people in the middle of exams -- with coverage on TV and in the local radio and press.

While speaking at a teach-in on student power at Sheffield, Boutelle received a taste of the sectarianism which infects elements of the British left when it comes to such questions as colonialism. He was attacked by Nick Spence of the Keep Left Young Socialists and the Socialist Labour League who accused Boutelle of "confusing the black working class, playing into the hands of the black capitalists" and encouraging apartheid. Spence insisted that the only progressive course for black workers was a unity with the white working class.

Boutelle replied that the idea that black people should cease to organize their independent struggle until such time as the white working class joined them was reactionary. He added that when he arrived in Britain he had challenged the Socialist Labour League to a debate on the topic of black power, but they had not replied to the challenge.

While in Sheffield, the vice-presidential candidate met with many representatives of the West Indian community.

Boutelle's tour of Britain began with a packed meeting in Caxton Hall, London, organized by the International Marxist Group, which supports the United Secretariat of the Fourth International. The meeting was chaired by Tariq Ali, one of the leaders of the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign.

News of Boutelle's visit to Britain spread rapidly throughout the black community and the rally in Hyde Park was preceded by a series of quickly organized meetings in London's immigrant ghettos. A meeting in Islington, sponsored by the Campaign Against Racial Discrimination, was chaired by Oscar Abrams, a leading black militant in the area.

On Saturday, June 8, Boutelle was the featured speaker at a special meeting in central London to commemorate the ideas of Marcus Garvey, organized by several black power groups under the title of Black United Action Front.

Among those present were Obi B. Egbuna, a leader of the United Coloured People's Association and one of the most articulate spokesmen for black power in Britain. On the platform were Franie Dymond of the Racial Adjustment Society, and B.C.Ghose of the UCPA.



Photo by Shannon

PAUL BOUTELLE, Socialist Workers party candidate for vice-president, speaking at meeting sponsored by West Indian Student Association at Ruskin College, Oxford.

GEORGE TSAROUCHAS BEATEN TO DEATH BY GREEK POLICE

Cedric Thornberry, writing in the London Guardian of June 1, states that confirmation has been received of a May 14 report that George Tsarouchas, a former deputy, was beaten to death by Greek police after he was arrested near Salonika May 8. The police claimed that he had died from a heart attack.

Tsarouchas was arrested together with Vassilis Mastoras, Costas Meletis, and Meletis' fiancée. Nothing is known of their fate or of another former deputy Alex Papalexiou. It is thought that Tsarouchas was on his way to a meeting of the Patriotic Front, an underground organization.

According to the news received in London, the police dragged Tsarouchas from the car in which he had been traveling and began beating him. "He died from a blow on the back of the head from a pistol. The following day his wife was summoned to Salonika police headquarters. She was told that he had died and his

body was at the mortuary."

The family was forbidden to take the body home and a ban was also placed on opening the coffin. Police remained on guard to enforce the order to keep the coffin closed.

"Then," continues the Guardian, "Katy, Tsarouchas' daughter, at one stage seized the visiting coroner, demanding that the family be told how the father had died. She invoked the oath which as a doctor he had sworn to tell the truth. The coroner would only reply, 'the Asphalia (security police) will tell you.'"

"At 7 in the evening Tsarouchas was buried -- still without the coffin having been opened. As it was lowered into the grave Katy threw herself in after it. Tearing it open, she saw her father's face swollen and bruised. His head was covered with blood, his clothes with mud, and his hands were manacled."

In this issue

Page

PHOTO: Paris police attack student demonstrator .....	577
De Gaulle Outlaws Revolutionists, Frees Salan -- by Les Evans .....	578
Statement by the JCR on Its "Dissolution": "The Struggle Continues" .....	579
Statement by Pierre Frank on the Outlawing of the PCI .....	580
How the Workers Took Over in Nantes and St.-Nazaire .....	581
Frachon Tells It Like It Isn't .....	582
André Barjonet Denounces French CP Betrayal .....	583
Barjonet Appeals for Concerted Action .....	584
"Revolutionary in the Good Sense of the Term" .....	585
DRAWING: Waldeck Rochet .....	585
40,000 Belgrade University Students Win Demands after Eight-Day Sit-In -- by George Novack .....	586
First Lessons of the Revolutionary Upsurge in France [Statement by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International] .....	588
The "Terrorist" Season in France? .....	590
Greatest Opportunity in History for Socialist Victory Betrayed by French Communist Party -- by Joseph Hansen .....	591
DRAWING: Georges Séguy .....	593
Pictures of Trotsky and Che Guevara Carried in Copenhagen March of 10,000 .....	596
PHOTO: From the front page of the June 4 "Land og Folk" .....	596
"The Young Firebrands" .....	597
Japanese Students and Workers Stop Train Carrying U.S. Ammunition .....	598
Neocapitalism and the "War of the Spanish Succession" [Report from Spain] -- by Alberto Cardona .....	599
Paul Boutelle Makes Speaking Tour of Britain -- by Ernest Tate .....	606
PHOTO: Paul Boutelle speaking at Oxford .....	607
George Tsarouchas Beaten to Death by Greek Police .....	608