

THE MILITANT

Published in the Interests of the Working People

Vol. 32—No. 22

Friday, May 31, 1968

Price 10c



TAKE-OVER AT RENAULT. Some of the 40,000 workers, who seized the huge auto works in suburban Paris, at union meeting May 17. Meeting is being held inside the mas-

sive plant, which straddles the Seine River. Occupations of factories have spread all over France, in greatest general strike the world has ever seen.

FRANCE IN REVOLT

By Joseph Hansen

MAY 24—Before de Gaulle spoke today, it had been indicated by circles close to the Elysee Palace that the general had deliberately deferred his appearance as long as possible despite the enormous pressure on him to do something about what is already being described in the press as a "social revolution."

De Gaulle's strategy, according to these sources, was to "play it cool" in the expectation that time was on his side, that the enormous strike wave would lose its momentum as people grew tired of the paralysis and fearful of what might come next. Thus, choosing the psychological moment, he could appear on the television screens once more as the "savior of France" and thus retrieve the situation.

The general left several items out of his calculations. First of all, instead of subsiding, the strike wave deepened and spread. Some 10,000,000 workers out of a labor force of

The Militant will be giving special coverage to the events in France for the duration of the crisis, including eyewitness reports and analysis by the revolutionary fighters themselves.

just under 15,000,000 are now on strike, more than 2,000 factories being occupied.

On top of this, the farmers moved into action on the very day he appeared on the television screens. In a 24-hour demonstration, they began blocking highways with barricades.

Next, the general's delay gave time to the revolutionary opposition—the insurgent students and workers—to organize a new demonstration in Paris the day he chose to speak. They did this despite pleas from the police for a one-day "armistice" in demonstrations.

Thus, as the general's taped seven-minute speech was broadcast, the radio reported that workers and students had assembled at six different areas to converge in a new massive rally in Paris around the slogan, "De Gaulle resign!"

The roar of the crowd carried much better than the demagoguery of the aging bonapartist ruler.

Finally, de Gaulle overlooked the absurdity of his posture. This is not 1958 when France faced the assault of the fascist-minded generals and colonialists defeated in Algeria. Just who was he saving France from in 1968—de Gaulle?

It of course remains to be seen what effect

de Gaulle's speech will have on the various classes in France. But there appeared to be precious little in it to arouse any enthusiasm among the workers or to inspire them to give up the plants they have taken over, to retire from the streets and once again conduct themselves like sheep.

De Gaulle announced a referendum to be held sometime in June that would give him the power to reconstruct the social structure of France, which he acknowledged must undergo "mutation." Included in the "mutation" would be provisions for the "extensive participation" of workers and students at "the decision level," presumably in the factories and universities.

He also condescended to say that he would open "talks" with the union leaders concerning the demands being voiced by the rank and file workers throughout the country.

What de Gaulle was actually seeking in his highly advertised speech was merely to gain time and to do so without making any concrete promises. If he can get the striking workers and rebellious students to leave everything up to him, and to confine themselves to nothing more than getting out the vote for his projected plebiscite, which actually amounts to nothing more than a vote of confidence, then he will have gained a temporary victory which he may then be able to extend.

The formula he is following is to try to get the political conflict out of the streets and into parliament where it can then be dissipated in "reform" legislation at the cost of some concessions.

The Communist Party, which is followed by millions of workers in France, is playing along with de Gaulle in this game. Instead of pressing for establishment of a workers government committed to the program of socialism, such as the workers in France have clearly indicated they want by taking over the plants and running up the red flag, the CP bureaucrats are merely calling for the resignation of de Gaulle and the formation of a "popular front" and a "coalition government" that would leave the capitalist economic structure in France completely intact.

The Communist Party is bidding, in fact, to displace de Gaulle as the savior of capitalist France.

The de Gaulle regime itself is racked with a deep internal crisis. This is shown by the search for scapegoats on whom to blame the colossal events. Carlyle Morgan, Paris correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, reported May 24 that it was "widely expected . . . that several Cabinet ministers would lose their posts. Among those seen in

danger were the ministers of the interior, of education, and of information."

The head of the minister of information was slated to roll, according to Morgan, because he was responsible for issuing the statement—asccribed to de Gaulle upon his return from Rumania: "La reforme, oui, la chienlit, non." ("Chienlit" is a foul barracks word for someone who soils his bed; in this context it could mean "dirty mess.")

This was picked up by the workers. They responded with placards: "Le chienlit, c'est lui." (He's the chienlit.)

The search for scapegoats ranged farther than that. From the beginning, Premier Pompidou blamed it all on "provocateurs" and "a handful of madmen." The attractive revolutionary-minded Daniel Cohn-Bendit was especially singled out, the Communist Party calling him "the German," and the

fascists, "the German Jew." (He was born in France of German-Jewish refugee parents but took out German citizenship when they went back home.)

This reached ridiculous proportions when the French government, apparently on direct orders from de Gaulle himself, barred him from re-entering the country May 24 after he went to Brussels and then Amsterdam to speak at student gatherings. (In Brussels the police barred him from speaking.) The entire border guard was alerted to watch out for the red-headed student. And he was arrested when, at the head of 1,000 students, he sought to return to France.

The incident provided a gauge of how insecure de Gaulle now feels. He mobilized the entire French border guard to protect capitalist France from an invasion by "Danny the Red!"

Paris on the barricades: an on-the-spot report

By Gisela Mandel

[The current wave of French student protest began Feb. 21, when university and high school students held a mass demonstration and renamed the Latin Quarter the Heroic Vietnam Quarter. Several leaders of the Comite Vietnam National (National Vietnam Committee) were arrested during this action.

[On March 22 a mass demonstration protesting these arrests was held at the University in Nanterre, a Paris suburb. The students occupied university buildings and took over the radio station. The rector closed the school for two days, and there were several clashes with fascist groups.

[On May 2 and 3, Days of Struggle Against Imperialism had been called for Nanterre. On May 2 the rector again closed the university, and on May 3 students of the Sorbonne and a number of high schools demonstrated in the Latin Quarter in solidarity with the students of Nanterre.

[This demonstration was attacked by the police, and the first street battles were fought. On May 6, the Sorbonne was closed and surrounded by police and armored cars. The following day another demonstration, numbering 20,000 students, took place. The Latin Quarter has been the scene of almost continuous demonstrations since.

[The following eyewitness account is an

excerpt from a long article which appeared in the May 27 Intercontinental Press. Copies of this issue may be obtained for 50 cents each from Intercontinental Press, P.O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station, New York, N.Y. 10010.]

PARIS—That same evening (May 9), the JCR (Jeunesse Communiste Revolutionnaire—Revolutionary Communist Youth) held a mass meeting of 6,000 students in the Mutualite, to which Comrades Semmler and Rabelh from the Berlin SDS (Sozialistischer Deutscher Studentenbund—German Socialist Student League) had been invited. When the news came that they had been turned back at the Paris airport, a real storm broke out among the students.

On May 10 at 6:30 p.m., 35,000 university and high-school students gathered at the Place Denfert-Rochereau. The high-school students, who had struck that day, showed up two hours earlier and had a good time, singing songs of the French revolution and the Paris Commune along with the "Internationale." At 6:00 p.m. the students formed up in front of their different institute and university buildings and marched with banners from all directions toward the assembly point.

(Continued on page 4)

THE MILITANT

Editor: BARRY SHEPPARD

Business Manager: BEVERLY SCOTT

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

Vol. 32—No. 22



Friday, May 31, 1968

Red flag flies in France

The takeover of the factories by the French workers indicates the depth and power of the massive, spontaneous revolutionary upsurge now gripping France.

By occupying the factories the workers have raised the question of who the plants belong to—the capitalist bosses or the workers? Whose interests does the economy serve—the handful of capitalist exploiters or the working masses, the vast, overwhelming majority?

These questions immediately raise another: what about the government? Will the capitalists use their government with its police and armies to re-establish their authority in the factories and maintain the system of exploitation the workers are revolting against? Or will the workers, basing themselves upon the foothold they have gained in the occupation of the factories, move forward to kick out the whole gang of capitalist politicians and the capitalist government, replacing it with a workers government, which could open the way for the building of socialism?

The workers are demonstrating in action what they want: a complete takeover. That is indicated by the occupations themselves. It is also indicated by the red flags the workers have raised on the plants they are occupying—in their minds the red flag stands for socialism or communism. And, the workers have demonstrated for all to see, they have the power and the fighting capacity to do the job.

The chief obstacle on the road to victory for the French workers is the bureaucratized and Stalinized Communist Party, which has demonstrated its capacity to save the capitalist structure in moments of extreme crisis down through the years. Its first such performance on a major scale was in 1936 when France witnessed a working-class upsurge comparable to the one now taking place. They did it again in the 1944-47 upsurge. And they are now the great hope for the French capitalists once again.

The New York Times, expressing this hope, shared by capitalists on this side of the Atlantic, too, pointed out on May 19: "If the Communist Party has managed to take over the movement, then ironically, the institutions are safe and the political contest is likely to move back into the National Assembly with votes of confidence and votes of censure and traditional speeches—and sooner or later a new election."

The Communist Party bureaucrats sought to assert leadership over the spontaneous movement by going along with it after having failed at an earlier stage to block it. Thus they put the trade unions they control [the General Confederation of Labor] in the forefront of such demonstrations as the one on May 13. At the same time they shouted about the danger of "provocations." What they meant by this was shown by the dispatch from Paris May 20: "To reduce the risk of violence, it [the General Confederation of Labor] banned parades and demonstrations outside the plants, and in nearly all cases it obtained the release of plant managers sequestered by enthusiastic workers."

The CP aim is transparent. It is to get the workers out of the plants and out of the streets, and convert the struggle in which power is really at stake, into the shadow play of parliamentary politics. Hence the CP demand that de Gaulle "resign." (They have the power to remove him with a flick of the finger.) Hence the CP appeal for a new Popular Front.

By "Popular Front" they mean unity with the "progressive" or "democratic" sector of the capitalist class, on the basis of maintaining capitalism. A workers government, and the perspective of socialism, is "postponed" for the immediate future (see article, page 5). This policy, as it did in the thirties and forties, would guarantee the dissipation of the revolutionary upsurge and the preservation of the rule of the monopolists. Whatever concessions won by the workers could then be taken away at a later date.

Will the CP succeed once again in imposing its disastrous policy on the workers? This remains to be seen.

The truth is that the CP has been cut off to a considerable degree from the younger generation, who set up the barricades in the Latin Quarter and touched off the entire current upsurge. This generation now has an excellent chance to outflank the CP bureaucrats from the left. This possibility itself constitutes a source of pressure on the CP that did not exist in 1936 or 1947 and which could compel these bureaucrats to go even further than they themselves dream or would desire.

The role of the Trotskyists, and particularly the Jeunesse Communiste Revolutionnaire, has been mentioned repeatedly in the press for what they accomplished in the first stages to set the class struggle in motion. There is great ferment and discussion going on among the students and workers on the role of the CP, the nature of the "popular front" and related issues. This all augurs well for the revolutionary period now opening up in France.

'My brother is a GI in Vietnam'

Facing court-martial for refusing combat

San Francisco, Calif.

I am sending a copy of an open letter that I wrote to the Army officer who has been assigned to defend my brother. My brother is a soldier in Vietnam who is refusing to do combat.

* * *

To Capt. Smith, U.S. Army:

I am writing with regards to the case of Pfc. Lony J. Hanna. I am his brother. I have been informed that you have been assigned to defend Lony. . . .

Lony has been in contact with me by letters since he went into the Army. When he was called to the Army, he was confident that the U.S. policy of war with Vietnam was correct. He was inspired to do his part like many young Americans at his age without serious considerations about the war. He was proud to be in the Army and tried very hard to qualify for the 101st Airborne. His success in becoming a part of the 101st Airborne made him very happy.

After he arrived in Vietnam he told me about his training in jungle school and his letters reflected anticipation of confronting the NLF in battle. When he was sent into combat, his unit scored some successful ambushes. He told me about the many killings his unit made. But something new was added; he was very emotionally concerned about the casualties in his unit.

He stated many times, "There is nothing pretty about a dead GI." Concern for his own life was secondary to his concern for his buddies. He also revealed that he no longer believes the NLF is the enemy. He arrived at the conclusion that the U.S. involvement in Vietnam was not worth the deaths of his buddies or his own sacrifice.

He tried to solve his problem by refusing to do combat. Taking into consideration the circumstances, he is guiltless of any actions he takes to avoid combat. . . .

Officials of the U.S. government question the legality of this war. People of the U.S. and the world recognize that the U.S. is using every war crime in the book to exterminate the Vietnamese.

There is an increasing amount of military personnel who cannot justify their participation in this war on Vietnam. There are very few people left who are willing to stand behind the present administration in the war effort. . . . It is clear that the U.S. is trying to deny independence and self-determination to Vietnam. This war was created by the actions of the U.S. government without the will of its people and beyond the control of Lony. . . .

Lony may receive a court-martial and serve prison time. . . . He does not deserve this. He should be rewarded for his efforts. This situation is not his fault but the fault of U.S. aggression on Vietnam. The only just and moral answer to this case is to discharge him honorably and bring him home immediately.

Thomas A. Hanna

Warsaw Ghetto

Los Angeles, Calif.

When the April 27 march of the Los Angeles Peace Action Council came to its rallying point, the marchers were met by a group of American Nazis who wore swastika armbands, carried racist posters, shouted racist slogans, and attempted to provoke a riot. These racist provocateurs were driven off by the blacks they attacked.

Such resistance to the fascists' attack recalls the uprising in the Warsaw Ghetto which occurred 25 years before.

Because there was not unity between all oppressed and progressive forces, because there were misleaders inside and outside the

Jewish community, and because the Jews were separated from those who could have been their allies, the Nazis nearly achieved their "final solution to the Jewish problem."

The Warsaw Ghetto uprising has lessons for us today: Blacks who are now prime targets of the American racists will be herded into ghettos where their uprisings will be destroyed. They must learn that not all blacks will be their allies, that not all whites are their enemies, and they must learn to resist now.

The Warsaw Ghetto uprising on April 19, 1943, marked the first effort of a civilian population to fight the Nazis and brought honor to a humiliated people threatened with annihilation.

N. H.

Antimarihuana laws

San Francisco, Calif.

The Socialist Workers Party should call for the repeal of the marihuana laws. A Gallup Poll in the November 1967 Readers Digest said 6 percent of the college students use it. Gallup, in the May 1967 San Francisco Chronicle, said 61 percent of the students oppose expulsion from college of any students caught using it.

The antimarihuana laws violate the Ninth Amendment: "The enumeration in this Constitution of certain rights is not meant to denigrate or deny others retained by the people."

Washington and Jefferson both grew it (knowing it as hemp). I do not think they smoked it. Probably they grew it for the fibers in the stalks. But the point is that they possessed it.

The government no longer claims marihuana is dangerous. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice wrote in its report, "The Challenge of Crime to a Free Society," ". . . the Commission believes that enough information exists to warrant careful study of our present marijuana laws and the propositions on which they are based." (p. 225)

Thousands, nay, tens of thousands are arrested yearly as violators of these antimarihuana laws.

Leonard Brenner Glaser

Letters From Our Readers

This column is an open forum for all viewpoints on subjects of general interest to our readers. Please keep your letters brief. Where necessary they will be abridged. Writers' initials will be used, names being withheld unless authorization is given for use.

Brutal police attack on marchers in Miss.

Brookhaven, Miss.

The enclosed clipping is from the Jackson Daily News regarding the inhuman treatment of the Mississippi Highway Patrol against members of the Poor Men's March on Washington at Marks, Miss. The big money interests want to keep the poor down so that they can continue to exploit them both economically and socially for their own gain, and the Mississippi Highway Patrol is using neo-Nazi police state tactics to carry this out.

Mississippi has long used fascist tactics clothed in the guise of "States' Rights." Regardless of how brutal a member of the MHP is, he is never discharged.

Reader

\$500,000 Suit Filed In Delta

CLARKSDALE, Miss. (AP) — Five teen-aged Negro girls filed a half-million dollar lawsuit in Federal court here Monday, charging that police in Marks, Miss., used unnecessary force in breaking up a sit-in demonstration on the Quitman County jail lawn last week.

Miss Brown, Miss McAdory and Miss Henderson said they had been struck with rifle butts swung by highway patrolmen. Miss Heags said she was pregnant, and had been kicked in the stomach by a highway patrolman. Miss Jamison said she was kicked in the side by Pride.

Meet Socialists in Your Area

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Chicago: SWP, YSA and bookstore, 302 S. Canal St., Rm. 204, Chicago 60606. (312) 939-5044.

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

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

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

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

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

MINNESOTA: Minneapolis-St. Paul: SWP,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Political exclusion in Student Mobilization

By Harry Ring and Lew Jones

MAY 23—A political and organizational crisis has erupted in the Student Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam. A grouping within the SMC has taken the first steps to impose a policy of political exclusion on it and to divert it from its present course as an organizer of mass student actions against the Vietnam war and the related issues of the draft, racism, and campus complicity with the war effort.

Through a series of bureaucratic moves carried through in the New York national office of the organization, Kipp Dawson and Syd Stapleton, two leading builders of SMC, were fired from the staff of the organization because of their membership in the Young Socialist Alliance.

The exclusionary action came within days after the SMC-led student strike—the most successful of its kind so far—of which the two Young Socialists were the principal national organizers. Kipp Dawson is a national coordinator of SMC and Stapleton was editor of the SMC Mobilizer.

The move to oust them for their political beliefs was sparked by a bloc that appears to have been established between a grouping generally described as radical pacifists and the Communist Party and DuBois Clubs.

The term radical pacifist embraces a grouping of advocates of nonviolence who regard Liberation editor Dave Dellinger as their principal spokesman. Linda Morse, executive secretary of the SMC, is associated with this grouping.

The first move to oust the YSAers came at a May 8 meeting of the SMC working committee, a largely accidental grouping, appointed in part by Linda Morse, and not genuinely representative of SMC thinking on a national basis.

Exclusionary Motion

At this meeting a motion was rammed through that flatly violated SMC's policy of political nonexclusion. The motion, supported by the CP and the pacifists, stated: "The staff shall be composed entirely of independents in order to relieve some major tensions in the office."

To implement this motion, it was conceded, it would be necessary for a screening committee to process all applicants for staff positions to ensure they were not members of any proscribed organization. Shades of the attorney general's subversive list!

The practical effect of this motion was to eliminate Kipp Dawson and Syd Stapleton from the staff. It also meant the elimination of Phyllis Kalb of the Communist Party, but she indicated this two-for-one deal was quite agreeable to her, and the Communist Party and DuBois Clubs vigorously supported the motion.

In discussing the motion, it was made perfectly plain that the entire intent was to get rid of Stapleton and Dawson. The claimed motivation was the baseless charge that in organizing the student strike (no one argued they had not played the key role in organizing the action), they had carried out not SMC policy but YSA policy. It was argued, equally without basis in fact, that YSA policy on the strike was in conflict with SMC policy.

It is a matter of record that YSAers were among the principal initiators of SMC policy, as formally agreed on in conference, and that the YSA has given consistent political support to this policy.

In reality, this exclusionist bloc is accusing the YSA of the very thing the bloc is guilty of—that is, of trying to bureaucratically overturn SMC policies behind the backs of the members.



APRIL 15, 1967. Kipp Dawson speaking to crowd of 75,000 in San Francisco. He was West Coast executive director of demonstration, and is now a national coordinator of Student Mobilization Committee.

What they are heading for, some very consciously and some unconsciously, is the conversion of the SMC into some kind of a nebulous multi-issue organization whose main focus will not be the struggle against the Vietnam war. And in attempting to do so, they are trampling on the policy of non-exclusion that has contributed so much to building the antiwar movement and to combating McCarthyism.

Immediately following the meeting where this exclusionary motion was shoved through, the makers of the motion were told by their more experienced advisers that the form of their action—that is, a blatantly exclusionary motion—was politically indefensible.

Trick Move

So, at the next working committee meeting, May 16, the motion was rescinded and one was adopted piously reaffirming the abstract principle of nonexclusion. Then, with the formalities attended to, a motion was passed firing the two Young Socialists, this time without any reason at all included in the motion! (To maintain the fiction that the action was not aimed exclusively at the YSA, Phyllis Kalb's "resignation" was accepted.)

Further trampling on conference decisions, the CP-pacifist bloc are insisting on an SMC continuations committee meeting in New York June 29. This flouts another decision made by the national conference of the organization last January, namely that another national conference be held in six months to set policies, chart activity and select officers. The attempt to substitute a continuations committee meeting, which can be more easily packed, is intended to avoid a membership decision on the crucial issues now dividing the SMC.

The decision to hold the meeting in New York (where, conveniently, the Communist Party will be gathering for a convention the following weekend) also ignores the wishes of the membership. The decision of the last conference also specifically stated that the next one be held "in a relatively central part of the country."

A variety of reasons, all specious, have been offered for not carrying out conference mandates. But the real reasons are political.

This became clear when an attempt was made to mediate the dispute. Two meetings were held. Participants included Dave Dellinger, Linda Morse, pacifist Eric Wein-

berger, SMC staff members Irwin Gladstone, Brent Garren and Jane Baum, Fred Halstead and Harry Ring of the SWP, Lew Jones of the YSA and Kipp Dawson and Syd Stapleton.

Tactical Switch

At this meeting Linda Morse stated that it was their intention to withdraw the indefensible exclusionary motion but said they would not reverse the practical result of that motion, the staff firings.

In discussion, it was insisted that the firings were not intended to bar all YSAers from serving on staff, but only Dawson and Stapleton who, they asserted, were "insensitive" to the thinking of "independents" and hewed rigidly to the YSA line.

While in no way whatsoever accepting the validity of this claim, the SWP and YSA participants in the meetings proposed that, since the issue was posed on an individual basis rather than on that of excluding a political tendency, the working committee could clearly demonstrate its adherence to nonexclusion by reinstating the fired staff members. It would be rather meaningless, it was explained, to rescind the wording of the exclusionary motion, while leaving the practical results of the motion—the firings—untouched.

If this was done, it was proposed, Dawson and Stapleton were willing to withdraw from the staff. In their place, it was proposed that Lew Jones be added to the staff since it was generally agreed that he was a particularly easy and "sensitive" person to work with.

At first the exclusionists balked at this idea. Brent Garren blurted out that it was no help to get rid of Dawson and Stapleton and get Jones. This he asserted, would only deepen the SMC's "image" as a "Trotskyite front." (This, too, was later described as an unfortunate formulation that had no relation to the firings.)

However, after recessing for a caucus meeting, the group said they would accept the proposal provided Lew Jones would take an official leave from his post as national chairman of the YSA. This was agreed to. It was also generally agreed that when he became available at a later date, Howard Petrick, the YSAer discharged from the Army for his political views, would also join the staff.

However, the group did not live up to the agreement they had entered into. That night, at a second meeting of the SMC, they led the fight to continue the exclusion of the YSA. For a variety of differing, contradictory reasons, they insisted that Jones, like Dawson and Stapleton, was unfit to work on SMC staff.

Demagogic Move

In a demagogic effort to cover their tracks, the bloc then adopted a motion purporting to "reaffirm" their belief in the principle of nonexclusion and offered a staff position to Petrick who they knew was not presently available. (He is on a national speaking tour, raising support to fight his case against the Army.)

This action, coupled with their efforts to block the national conference mandated by the past one, makes it clear that they are out to grab bureaucratic control of the SMC in order to convert it from an antiwar movement into one more multi-issue organization.

From the outset, the CP-DuBois Clubs wing of the movement has resisted building a broad coalition movement capable of organizing mass actions against the war. To each proposal for such national actions they have falsely counterposed local "community" or campus organizing, apparently unwilling or unable to grasp the fact that periodic national mass actions, far from being antithetical to local organizing, have proven the very best stimulus for developing continuing local campus organization and action.

Further they have taken such issues as the draft and racism and attempted to twist them so that they are not issues related to the struggle against the war but somehow separate activities.

Their efforts in this direction have apparently appealed to the pacifists who have found the mass actions undertaken by the movement increasingly running counter to the individual forms of resistance which they favor. For them and the CP, individual resistance to the draft, for example, is more important than organizing mass resistance to it.

For the CP there is the additional factor of the advent of the 1968 presidential elections and their desire to get the movement off the streets and into some form of reformist politics, "inside and outside" the Democratic Party, as they like to put it.

Political Roots

It is political issues such as these, and not alleged "personality" problems, that explain the move to oust the two YSAers right after the student strike.

In a letter to members of the Student Mobilization Committee, Kipp Dawson and Syd Stapleton have urged student antiwar activists and groups to take the following action in protest against the undemocratic moves taken in the working committee of the Student Mobilization Committee:

1) Protest to the SMC national office, 17 East 17th St., New York, N. Y. 10003, the attempt to impose a policy of political exclusion on the organization and the attempt to scuttle the decisions of the national conference.

2) Demand that, in accordance with the decision of the last conference, a full national conference be held in the midwest the weekend of June 29.

They have asked that copies of such communications be sent to Kipp Dawson, 316 East 11th St., Apt. 4A, New York, N. Y. 10003.

For those who genuinely favor mass action, the international student strike could not be considered anything but a spectacular success that went beyond anyone's hopes or expectations.

Nearly a million U.S. students were involved, with a significant response on many campuses where previously only scattered individuals had joined in actions. In addition, the world response to the SMC call made it the first real international student strike organized yet.

In the face of this accomplishment, to which everyone agrees Dawson and Stapleton made a decisive contribution, Steve Cagan, an officer of the DuBois Clubs, offered a motion (later withdrawn) that the two Young Socialists be fired for "obstructing" the work of the SMC!

To this Mike Zagarell of the Communist Party added that he favored firing the YSAers because by their work they had succeeded only in "narrowing" the coalition. How this assertion squared with the breadth of the strike and the growth of SMC as a campus force, he did not say.

While they all demagogically insisted that they favored mass action, working committee member Leslie Cagan explained that "students don't like mass mobilizations."

The action of this grouping is a blow at the movement against the Vietnam war. A major factor in organizing opposition to the war in the past three years has been the fact that the movement has decisively repudiated the witch-hunting policy of political exclusion that had been practiced by some of the old movements. The second major factor in building the opposition to the war has been the successful welding of a coalition capable of organizing such national actions as the Student Strike, the April 27 protest, such previous huge actions as the mass confrontation at the Pentagon last October and the previous April 15 mobilization of a half million, and sparking the growing international actions against the war.

LBJ's Game

Today the Johnson administration is trying to disarm the antiwar forces with its crooked negotiations game. By dragging out the "peace talks" while continuing and even escalating the war, it hopes to gull both the Vietnamese freedom fighters and American peace proponents into believing that it is genuinely seeking an end to the conflict.

Because of this, even more intensified efforts by the conscious antiwar forces are now needed. Anyone who strikes at the very things that have built the antiwar movement is committing a terrible disservice to the American and Vietnamese people.

In every struggle within the movement there are charges and countercharges and it is often difficult for those not directly involved to determine all the facts. In this dispute there is a particular question that is worth special probing to determine the root of dispute.

The CP-pacifist bloc charge that Kipp Dawson and Syd Stapleton built the student strike on the basis of the YSA line, not the SMC line. True, Dawson and Stapleton poured their energies into building the strike on the basis of the YSA line of making it the most massive student antiwar action ever and the first national student strike since the 1930's.

In doing so, they knew they were also carrying out the line of the SMC as decided at the conference that initiated the action.

The fact that those who fired them cite their role in building the strike as the reason makes it plain that, no matter what they say, what they are really opposed to is that kind of mass antiwar activity.

Black Liberation Notes

Several hundred black students at Pennsylvania State University in University Park, Pa., marched to the dean's office and forced him to retract a racist statement. He had said: "We at Pennsylvania State University can't have a student demonstration as bad as that at Columbia University because we are not contaminated by Harlem."

Along with the apology, the students demanded that 2,000 additional black undergraduates be added to the student body by 1970.

The Black Student Association at Illinois Institute of Technology in Chicago is protesting plans by the school administration to build a fence that would wall the institute off from the surrounding black community.

In addition they are demanding an end to police harassment of black people crossing the campus. While white students are seldom asked to show proof that they have business on campus, black students are constantly asked to show their ID cards.

Hostility to the Institute is growing in the black community where the slum dwellings in which black people are forced to live contrast sharply to the campus buildings enjoyed by the predominantly white student body.

Instead of walling off the campus from the community, the black students are demanding that the school open up its facilities to the community and begin a crash program in neighborhood high schools to recruit more black students to the IIT student body.

Over a thousand students boycotted schools in Newark, N.J., recently in protest against an attack made by white racist students on some black students.

Boycotts have also taken place at Crane High School in Chicago, and at five high schools in Yonkers, N.Y., where black and Puerto Rican students are demanding more classes about Afro-American and Puerto Rican history and culture.

— Elizabeth Barnes

...Paris on the barricades

At that point, a broad, open discussion on where the march should go was held. Representatives of the most diverse tendencies were invited to climb up on the monument, a lion, and voice their opinions. After a half hour's discussion, two opposing proposals were put to a vote: that they march into the working-class district of Paris to discuss in groups with the workers; that they demonstrate in front of the Ministry of Education and demand the minister of education's resignation. The majority voted to go to the Ministry of Education. However, they decided to take a route through the working-class district.

While discussion was still going on among individual leaders, the march started quite suddenly and began moving along the Boulevard Arago in the direction of the Sante prison, in which several of the students' arrested comrades were imprisoned. The discussion was over; suddenly they were all united. Quickly long lines of marshals formed to the right and left of the march, shielding the demonstrators from both sides.

The police were nowhere to be seen. Since neither the route of the march nor its destination had been disclosed, the police deployed their forces around the university and closed off the bridges over the Seine.

Already that day still more companies of militarily armed and trained CRS (Compagnies Republicaines de Securite—Republican Security Companies) and the so-called Gendarmerie Mobile (Mobile Gendarmes, or paramilitary police) were concentrated around the Latin Quarter. The Sorbonne had been heavily ringed by police since its closing. The demonstration was followed by helicopters moving very high above the demonstrators, like insects.

After roughly a quarter of a mile, the students reached the prison. There they chanted their solidarity with the prisoners as victims of the bourgeois state and demanded the immediate release of their imprisoned comrades. Then they moved on, to the left, onto the Avenue des Gobelins and the Rue Monge.

On the Boulevard Arago, the people looked askance at the demonstrators. But once they entered the working-class district around the Mutualite, spontaneous demonstrations of applause broke out from the onlookers. The students responded with jubilation and calls to join them on the street.

Now, the shout, "Join us in the street!" was answered spontaneously from the windows and sidewalks with the cry "We're with you in the street." The students and bystanders sang the "Internationale" together. The march was slowing down, drawing near the first dense police cordons in the Latin Quarter. From the Rue Monge it turned left onto the Boulevard St.-Germain and then left again to take the Boulevard St.-Michel and move over the Seine to the Champs-Elysees. There the demonstrators were blocked for the first time.

The Boulevard St.-Michel was closed off in the direction of the Seine by hundreds of heavily armed CRS with shields. Behind the police cordon were three rows of armored cars deployed across the street. Thus, the march was forced to the left on the Boulevard St.-Michel and had no alternative but to retreat into the Latin Quarter. Once the marchers had passed, the CRS followed on their heels and closed off the side streets, pushing the 35,000 to 40,000 students deeper into the heart of the Latin Quarter.

At 10:00 p.m., after a deafening clamor from the horns of motorists, the bridges were again opened to traffic, and the police retreated into the Latin Quarter. For 23 hours, the demonstrators and the population of an entire district of Paris were so tightly blockaded by thousands of police that no private motorist or individual pedestrian was able to get in or out.

The police tactics were obvious. They drove the demonstrators into the Boulevard St.-Michel, the Rue Soufflot, the Rue Gay-Lussac, the Rue Royer-Collard, the Gare du Luxembourg, the Rue Monsieur le Prince, and the Place Edmond Rostand, and encircled them. Then they drove back all approaching spectators with clubs, clearing a space of roughly 700 square feet, and waited.

The police calculated that about midnight the tired and demoralized students would ask to be let through the cordon to go home in small groups. They would let them shiver and stew a little and then let them pass to the accompaniment of a few club blows and loud laughter.

The CRS erred in betting that it would soon get too cold for these "mama's boys," "privileged ones," and "nice boys." The action began when the students began writing "Against Police Violence—Street Violence," and "Long Live the Paris Commune!" on the walls of buildings lining the blockaded streets.

At 11:00 p.m. the JCR opened the first headquarters in the besieged district. A family made its apartment available. Loudspeakers were set up on the windows and a radio apparatus was installed to follow the news on the negotiations which had begun between three representatives of the UNEF (Union National des Etudiants Francais—National French Student Association) and the rector of the university.

At 11:00 p.m. the building of barricades began. The negotiations with the rector of the Sorbonne had run their course without producing any results.

By 11:30 50 barricades were going up. With the help of a megaphone and a city map, the students divided up the mass of demonstrators into companies of a few thousand each. The cobblestones were loosened in professional style with picks, grubbing hoes, and shovels provided by people living in the area. At every barricade four to six lines, each including about 50 people, passed cobblestones from the work sites and up onto the barricades.

This work was carried on to the singing of the "Internationale." Street signs were used to reinforce the barricades and as guide posts. Eight-foot paving stones formed the foundation of every barricade. On top of these were piled cars, gasoline-soaked wood, branches of trees to block the CRS troops' view into the street, and as much wire as could be found.

Now in all parts of the occupied area chants went up calling for support from the workers. In the meantime the rumor had spread that hundreds of workers had gathered in front of the CP headquarters to demand that the party leadership extend solidarity to the students.

Earlier in the evening, the CP leadership, which had harshly condemned the student movement from the outset, was still describing it as a "small minority of adventurers, anarchists, and Trotskyists." The university rector topped this off, calling it "une dizaine d'enrages" (a handful of madmen).

Some 30,000 young revolutionists were now calling for the support of the workers. Shortly after 2:00 a.m., the first announcement came over the loudspeaker that the CP had just declared its solidarity with the students. This news was received with great jubilation. It was late in coming, but it came!

Through their actions, the students had now won the support of the workers. Not long after the CP call for solidarity with the students, the trade unions, headed up by the CGT (Confederation Generale des Travailleurs—General Confederation of Labor), which is backed by the majority of the workers in France today, called a general strike for May 13. The students had won a

political victory.

From the Establishment's point of view, however, this was only the beginning of the red night of the Latin Quarter. And now it was also a question of time. The traffic would start at 6:00 a.m.; the streets blocked by the CRS and the students lay in the heart of Paris. The police had four hours left to clear the streets.

At 2:30, the CRS troops were ordered to remove the barricades but "to avoid" contact with the demonstrators "as much as possible." An eerie stillness spread over the Latin Quarter. The barricades stood. And they were, as the radio so nicely put it, "no laughable barricades." On them stood hundreds of young demonstrators, some armed with Molotov cocktails. Between the barricades were tight rows of university and high-school students, a third of them girls. All stood silently. They were waiting for orders from the marshals.

The police attack began at 2:40 at the corner of Gay-Lussac and Royer-Collard streets on the Boulevard St.-Michel. Tear gas and smoke bombs were fired over the roofs onto the street directly into the mass of demonstrators between the barricades.

The people of the district, who had already helped with hundreds of cups of coffee, water and sandwiches, now showered sheets, rags, and plastic sacks out of their windows for those demonstrators without goggles. Rags soaked in sugar were distributed. Those directly hit by bombs were taken into the buildings. And the students held their ground. Students and some doctors called on the people through megaphones to dump water out of their windows in order to neutralize the gas which was standing in dense clouds in the narrow streets surrounded by high buildings. And warm water promptly rained out of the windows.

After 20 minutes it was clear that the tear gas and smoke bombs would not drive the students out. The barricade front was manned by 200 students, who were continuously rotated.

Now a new action began. The police fired chlorine gas over the roofs into the front ranks behind the first barricade. Within seconds a yellowish-brown smoke merging into blue-green made it difficult to breathe. The students on the first barricade and directly behind it had to retreat.

They did not do so, however, until they had set fire to the barricade in order to prevent the police from directly attacking the mass of students, who could only slowly retreat behind the second barricade. They had to gain time.

Some smoke and tear gas bombs exploded against the venetian blinds of a cafe on the corner of Gay-Lussac and Royer-Collard streets, setting them on fire. This gave the students more time to make a partial retreat behind the second barricade and block the space between the first and second barricades with automobiles—they had carefully avoided damaging them up to now—that were parked along the street. They placed these cars across the street.

An hour later, a little after 3:00 a.m., the police took the first barricade. The space between the first two barricades was now saturated with chlorine and tear gas. Despite the water continually rained from the windows and sugar-soaked rags which the people kept throwing out, it was no longer possible to breathe. The students withdrew in close order behind the second barricade.

Meanwhile the police had split up and redeployed their forces. Besides the frontal attack along the Boulevard St.-Michel and the Rue Gay-Lussac, they attacked through the much narrower side streets, which had also been blocked off with barricades by the students. The news spread like wildfire. By means of a megaphone and a little delivery truck the marshals ordered the students to regroup their forces.

It had become clear by this time that the Red Cross was unable to break through the police cordon from the outside and that there were too few medical personnel in the occupied area. A number of medical students were then supplied with Red Cross armbands and assigned to basic first-aid work. Red crosses were painted or stuck on a few cars which were prepared for transporting the wounded. The population supplied blankets and paint.

Meanwhile a pitched battle had developed around the second barricade in the Rue Gay-Lussac. Police in gas masks had penetrated into the area between the two first barricades, which had been cleared with chlorine and tear gas, and had advanced to the second barricade. Now they fired smoke bombs and chlorine and tear gas directly into the mass of students.

But the demonstrators were determined to defend this barricade no matter what until

The London Observer of revolutionary y

The revolutionary upsurge flooding over France is marked by a total openness to discussion of ideas and programs. The debate is never ending, as various tendencies compete for the loyalty of students and workers. Out of this unceasing debate and activity, a new leadership is arising. The London Observer of May 19 wrote:

"All this fever is not wholly spontaneous and undirected. The organization best known to the public is Daniel Cohn-Bendit's Movement of March 22. Cohn-Bendit, short, stocky, 23, with flaming red hair, is a born leader, a mob orator of real talent. He is an anarchist, but at this moment belongs to no political party. His fief is the Paris University annex of Nanterre, his followers students.

"A second, less well-known organization, is the Movement of May 3 (like March 22 named after a turning-point in the recent crisis) made up mainly of rather older militant research students and teachers, often former members of the CP. They provide intellectual stuffing and political experience. Like March 22, they are also Paris based.

"These two groups are in loose alliance with the two principal students' and university teachers' unions, UNEF and SNESUP. "Behind these organizations lies one further body, the only really political movement among them.

most of the students could withdraw behind the next one. They launched their first counter-attack. In tight ranks, with helmets, goggles, and with rags over their mouths and noses, armed with paving stones, they waited for the police. The CRS advanced slowly because of the burning cars and opaque smoke.

The population made a renewed effort to clear away the toxic gas behind the second barricade as quickly as possible by throwing hundreds of buckets of water out of their windows. However, even before the police breakthrough many younger comrades had been overcome and had to be taken into the buildings.

When a doctor noted the first signs of chlorine poisoning in the unconscious students, and hundreds of others complained of burning mouths, throats and lungs, a newsman asked a company of police whether they were using chlorine. He was knocked unconscious and had to be immediately hospitalized.

The prefect of police still denies that chlorine was used. Unluckily for him, the hospitals where the wounded were taken revealed that they were unquestionably suffering from chlorine poisoning. Furthermore, an unexploded chlorine gas shell was dismantled by the comrades. It turned out to have been made in the USA.

After the police moved into the student-occupied district, they found themselves becoming involved in a two-front struggle. Facing them were the students defending themselves and around them was a hostile population. Here and there people threw stones at the police from their windows, but mostly they denounced them in the strongest terms.

With the help of the notorious concierges (building superintendents who cooperate with the police), who were upset by the proceedings, by about 5:00 a.m. the police were able to occupy a few roofs and from there shoot tear gas, smoke bombs, and chlorine gas directly in the crowds below.

But the comrades did not panic for an instant. They continued to follow the instructions of the marshals, who kept an eye on all the barricades. The sidewalks were kept clear for the messengers' motorbikes, which were marked with red rags.

At 5:30, the second barricade on the Rue Gay-Lussac fell. One hundred and fifty were wounded in the battle. Some were severely wounded, but only a few of these could be directly taken to hospitals (directly meant only within a half to three-quarters of an hour). For the others, appeals were made to people in the area for help, which they willingly gave. Wounded policemen, of course, were immediately hauled away by the Red Cross and given professional treatment.

In the meantime, the front barricades in other places had been taken by the police. After companies of police had occupied part of the overlooking roofs, squads of students were likewise sent onto the roofs. They attacked the police from above with rocks and bricks. This caused the first serious injuries among the CRS troops.

The police were now given the order to stage an "all-out assault," using all means—except guns. All of the student-occupied streets were hit from the surrounding roofs with a rain of various gas grenades. It became impossible to breathe. The students tried to break out on all sides and everywhere came



MORNING AFTER. Cops stand waiting on other side of barricade built by students, on morning of May 11, after all-night struggle in Latin Quarter.

Friday, May 31, 1968

Friday, May 31, 1968

The London Observer reports role of revolutionary youth group

The revolutionary upsurge flooding over France is marked by a total openness to discussion of ideas and programs. The debate is never ending, as various tendencies compete for the loyalty of students and workers. Out of this unceasing debate and activity, a new leadership is arising. The London Observer of May 19 wrote:

"All this fever is not wholly spontaneous and undirected. The organization best known to the public is Daniel Cohn-Bendit's Movement of March 22. Cohn-Bendit, short, stocky, 23, with flaming red hair, is a born leader, a mob orator of real talent. He is an anarchist, but at this moment belongs to no political party. His fief is the Paris University annex of Nanterre, his followers students.

"A second, less well-known organization, is the Movement of May 3 (like March 22 named after a turning-point in the recent crisis) made up mainly of rather older militant research students and teachers, often former members of the CP. They provide intellectual stuffing and political experience. Like March 22, they are also Paris based.

"These two groups are in loose alliance with the two principal students' and university teachers' unions, UNEF and SNESUP.

"Behind these organizations lies one further body, the only really political movement among them.

"It is the Jeunesse Communiste Revolutionnaire (JCR), the French branch of the world Trotskyist movement, under the unified secretariat of the Fourth International. It can claim to have provided the chief inspiration and political direction of the insurrection of the past two weeks, which may justly be described as the greatest success the Trotskyists have ever achieved in Europe.

"In France they are estimated to have some 1,000 hard-core members spread over 30 cities. In Paris, scratch any one of the proliferating Sorbonne committees and you find their man. Their directing hand is at work in the March 22 Movement, the May 3 Movement, and also in the CAL (Comites d'Actions Lyceen), the secondary-school action committees, which are leading the attack on the baccalaureate [the outmoded and upper-class-biased university entrance certificate]— and which, if successful, could plunge France into a crisis even graver than the university revolution.

"The JCR believes that revolution is war. Like Trotsky, its prophet, it is fascinated by military strategy. Its members are inflamed by the twin themes of the ills of bourgeois society and what they call 'colonial revolution' like the Vietnam war. They provide the principal French link with the German League of Socialist Students (SDS) led by Rudi Dutschke.

Observer reports role of primary youth group

ing over
ness to
The de-
encies
ts and
ate and
g. The
aneous
known
Move-
stocky,
leader,
an ex-
gs to
Paris
flowers

ization,
rch 22
recent
older
s, often
provide
erience.
based.
lliance
niver-
ESUP.
further
vement

"It is the Jeunesse Communiste Revolutionnaire (JCR), the French branch of the world Trotskyist movement, under the unified secretariat of the Fourth International. It can claim to have provided the chief inspiration and political direction of the insurrection of the past two weeks, which may justly be described as the greatest success the Trotskyists have ever achieved in Europe.

"In France they are estimated to have some 1,000 hard-core members spread over 30 cities. In Paris, scratch any one of the proliferating Sorbonne committees and you find their man. Their directing hand is at work in the March 22 Movement, the May 3 Movement, and also in the CAL (Comites d'Actions Lyceen), the secondary-school action committees, which are leading the attack on the baccalaureate [the outmoded and upper-class-biased university entrance certificate]—and which, if successful, could plunge France into a crisis even graver than the university revolution.

"The JCR believes that revolution is war. Like Trotsky, its prophet, it is fascinated by military strategy. Its members are inflamed by the twin themes of the ills of bourgeois society and what they call 'colonial revolution' like the Vietnam war. They provide the principal French link with the German League of Socialist Students (SDS) led by Rudi Dutschke.

up against the CRS troops.

Automobiles and barricades burned, set on fire partly by the comrades and partly by the police grenades. Meanwhile many demonstrators used garbage-can lids to protect themselves from the stones being thrown by the police. Both sides alike used rocks and roof tiles as weapons.

Wounded students who had been taken into the doorways of surrounding buildings had to be taken out again to avoid arrest.

The streets became the scene of sickening sights. The CRS really went all out. Following an internationally tested tactic, they tried to single out individuals to beat up and arrest. Since this was almost impossible in view of the comrades' excellent organization, they fell on their prisoners and the injured who could not defend themselves or who could not be quickly enough shifted from the front to the rear ranks. They dragged some prisoners into building entrances and beat them, afterward dragging them half unconscious to the police vans.

No sooner did new protests come from the windows of the surrounding buildings than the police fired gas shells in reply and sent companies of 10 to 20 men into the buildings. There were hundreds of eyewitnesses to all these events, but few pictures. Newsmen had either left out of fear, been turned away by the police, or arrested.

These thousands of university and high-school students had no unified political leadership; they did not belong to different factions within a single organization. Most of them belonged to no organization at all.

However, in the face of a solid front of Establishment repression, since their goal in the last analysis is the same—a workers' university, overthrow of the bourgeois state, a socialist France and a socialist Europe—they put aside their disputes over the various tactics and ways of reaching this goal and spontaneously accepted the revolutionary discipline of a united action.

How popular frontism led to betrayals and defeats

By Dick Roberts

"The world political situation as a whole," Leon Trotsky wrote in 1938, "is chiefly characterized by a historical crisis of the leadership of the proletariat." This indictment of the role of the Communist, social democratic and trade union bureaucracies in holding back the revolutionary momentum of the world working class has held true for decades.

Their misleadership, more than any other factor, accounts for the survival of imperialism into the latter half of the twentieth century.

Nowhere has this been more conspicuously demonstrated than in France itself. Two times in the course of the last four decades, and once again today, the French working class has been massively poised to topple its capitalist rulers. But in 1936-37 and in 1944-47, the Stalinist-reformist partnership steered these gigantic revolutionary upsurges back into the channels of capitulation to capitalist power.

They are attempting to do the same thing right now. By advancing the slogan of a "popular front" government, the French Communist Party offers to trade the imminent prospects of installing a workers' government and overthrowing capitalism, for the resignation of de Gaulle and his replacement by another coalition with the "liberal bourgeoisie" based on maintaining the capitalist system.

But there is this crucial difference: Workers in occupied factories throughout France today are deeply questioning the "popular front" concept and subjecting the long record of Stalinist betrayals to close scrutiny. Moreover, together with the insurgent students, they are listening to the ideas of a young Trotskyist movement, the Jeunesse Communiste Revolutionnaire, to help them understand this history. The central issue under discussion is "popular frontism" and capitalism—or the road to revolution and socialism.

This same choice confronted the French nation during the 1930s. Every capitalist country had been wracked with economic crisis: massive unemployment, depressed wages, extensive poverty and a rise in the revolutionary expectations of the populace. Only the Soviet Union, with a nationalized and planned economy, escaped the havoc. By 1933, fascism had triumphed in two of the European powers, Italy and Germany, and was threatening Austria, Spain and France itself.

France was the last of the big capitalist nations to be hit by the post-1929 depression. Toward the end of 1933 sporadic strikes dotted the nation; millions of workers began to flow into the Communist and Socialist parties and the General Confederation of Trade Unions (CGT). A rabidly reactionary fascist movement was in the making.

The French ruling class, like its German counterpart before it, wavered indecisively between the alternatives of a "strong" state, suspending parliamentary rule and utilizing police repression against workers, and outright fascism. The French working class, however, had no doubts on this question. Hitler's Germany stared it in the face and it drew revolutionary conclusions from the destruction of democracy and the catastrophic defeat of the workers there.

When a fascist gang staged a show of strength against parliament and clashed with the workers Feb. 6, 1934—with no attempt by the government to stop them—the French workers responded with a gigantic general strike on Feb. 12. Between this initial outburst of workers' power and mid-1938, four years later, when Daladier rolled back the workers' offensive with harsh decrees, French capitalism teetered in permanent revolutionary crisis. It was rescued by the Popular Front.

This policy, which was concocted in Moscow after Hitler's coming to power, flowed from Stalin's policies of "peaceful coexistence" and "socialism in one country." According to these "theories," Communist parties were duty-bound to sacrifice any revolutionary perspectives in their own countries that might "jeopardize" "socialist construction" in the Soviet Union. While Moscow would build "socialism," the job of Communists outside the Soviet Union was to encourage their respective capitalist governments to leave the Russian bureaucracy in peace.

In reality, revolutionary triumphs in any capitalist power, let alone all them, could only be of the greatest boon to Soviet Russia and its defense. But Stalin's turn toward the imperialist democracies went unquestioned by the Communist leaderships around the world, which wheeled into line behind Moscow. Most of them haven't fundamentally departed from that policy since.

The immediate product of applying the "peaceful coexistence" policy to France was the "Stalin-Laval Pact" of May, 1935. Stalin put his stamp of approval on the re-arming of a national capitalist army; the French Communist Party was ordered to propagandize for the pro-capitalist "Anti-Fascist Popular Front." Here is how this flagrant betrayal of revolutionary socialist policies was described in the French Communist Party newspaper, L'Humanite, May 16, 1935:

"Above all, the duty falls upon them, in the interest and maintenance of peace, not to allow the means of their national defense to weaken in any sense. In this regard, M. Stalin understands and fully approves the national defense policy of France in keeping her armed forces at a level required for security."

The Communists were ordered to make an about-face: They had been campaigning against war and against the re-arming of imperialist militaries. Now they must campaign for the French imperial army and support the heavy war taxes that would be levied on the masses to finance it.

Popular Front politics in France took the form of a coalition between the Communist and Socialist parties which subordinated itself to the strongest bourgeois party in parliament, the "Radical Party." A massive socialist vote in 1936 unexpectedly swept Socialist Party leader Leon Blum into the premiership. On July 14—Bastille Day—Radical Party leader Daladier, CP leader Cachin and Blum locked arms to lead a gigantic Paris celebration. But events proved that the enthusiasm of French workers went far beyond the reforms envisaged by the Popular Front.

Encouraged by the mighty socialist vote, workers had already launched a terrific battle against the rulers of industry. In June of 1936 as many as seven million workers occupied plants, as militantly as they are doing today. Red flags flew from many plant mastheads; and factory committees, the embryos of soviets, were in control of important industries.

Blum made rapid and significant concessions to this massive display of power. The "Matignon Accords" guaranteed workers recognition of the right to form trade unions; the principle of the "collective contract," that is, essentially centralized negotiations and agreements between the workers as a class and the employers; the institution of elected worker delegates; and important wage gains.

But this restricted response of the Popular Front leaders did not measure up to the high hopes of the workers who had suddenly taken cognizance of their colossal power. Stalinist and Social Democratic trade union bureaucrats countered the scope of the workers' revolutionary aspirations with a puny program settling for "immediate demands." "Comrades, comrades, we must know how to call off a strike!" cried Maurice Thorez, secretary general of the Communist Party.

"The perspective of the Popular Front," Trotsky answered, "is for immediate demands. . . . Under present conditions, in order to force the capitalists to make important concessions, we must break their wills. This can be done only by a revolutionary offensive. But a revolutionary offensive, which opposes

one class to another, cannot be developed solely under slogans of partial economic demands. . . ."

The workers' committees, he explained, needed only to be solidified and linked together on a city, departmental, and national scale: Such a front could bring capitalism to its knees and clear the way for workers' power. But the Popular Front answered by crushing the strikes as—"Fascist inspired."

Meanwhile another event of immense historic import was taking place south of the Pyrenees. No sooner had Blum's government taken office in France, than the fascist uprising led by Franco precipitated civil war in Spain. Spain too was governed by a popular front which had permitted the fascist generals to prepare their uprising with impunity.

Blum's regime, supported by the Stalinists, played as treacherous a role in regard to the Spanish struggle as it had in regard to the incipient French revolution. The embattled Spanish workers needed arms and reinforcements. Such aid could have helped turn the tide against Franco.

But Blum, in agreement with the English and American imperialists and with the complicity of the Stalinists, refused to supply the needed arms. The ensuing defeat of the Spanish workers not only brought fascism to power there but facilitated Hitler's preparations for the second world war.

The wave of factory occupation that swelled in France in the summer of 1936 receded only to rise again in the winter of 1937. But this time the weakened workers were hit even harder. The Stalinist and Socialist "leaders" once again cajoled the workers to leave the occupied factories, and now the ruling class began to nibble away at the concessions it had granted—chiseling on contracts, wriggling out of agreements, and calling in Popular Front spokesmen to check worker resistance.

Beginning toward the end of Blum's term in office and reaching a climax under Daladier's premiership, wages and salaries were slashed; direct and indirect taxes were raised as the French ruling class set about to build up its military machine.

By the end of 1937, French labor saw gain after gain lost. It was puzzled about how it had been tricked and began to grow cynical.

Blum resigned in 1937 when the cabinet refused to grant him further decree powers; he was followed by the Chautemps cabinet in 1937 and the Daladier government in 1938. The same Daladier who had locked arms with Cachin on Bastille day of 1936—the Popular Front statesman who had been backed by the Stalinists with the slogan of "Daladier to Power!"—subjected the French workers to near slave-labor legislation!

The notorious "Law of July 11" held that workers could not change employment or be absent from it, or late to it, without penalties of from six months to five years imprisonment; wages were frozen for the "duration of hostilities" no matter what the change in the cost of living. Prices rose 50 to 100 percent by the spring of the same year.

The "popular front," which Communist Party head Waldeck Rochet proposes to bring back today, first put a straitjacket on the revolutionary French workers in 1936; it helped choke the Spanish workers in their fight against Franco; and it resulted in a series of reactionary and repressive regimes which led the country into the disasters after 1939. These are the lessons which are now being recalled and debated in the factories, neighborhoods, universities and offices of France.



RENAULT STRIKE, 1936. French workers staged massive sit-down strike at Paris plant, even then the most important industrial plant in France. Banner reads: "Central Committee of Strikers at Renault."

Whither France?

by Leon Trotsky

the basic Marxist analysis of the "popular front" in France in the 1930s.

\$1

Merit Publishers
873 Broadway
New York, N. Y. 10003

N.J. phone contract vetoed; installers accept CWA pact

The trade union bureaucrats (it would be a misnomer to call them leaders) are having more and more difficulty these days keeping their members in check and maintaining their own status as "labor statesmen." There is increasing evidence of the angry mood of the workers as they see wage gains eaten up by increased costs of living, sometimes even before the increases are won.

In New Jersey the telephone workers organized into the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, on strike since April 6, have just rejected a proposed contract negotiated for them between the IBEW and the Jersey Bell System. Although the terms of the proposed contract were not made public, it was learned that the new contract would provide wage increases from \$4.50 to \$12.50 per week, retroactive to March 31. Additional wage and fringe benefits increases were to have been added at 12- and 24-month intervals.

Another group of IBEW telephone workers in Illinois is still on strike.

Meanwhile Joseph Beirne, president of the Communications Workers of America, whose 200,000 telephone and Western Electric installers membership had gone on strike on April 8, announced that the Western Electric installers units, numbering 23,000, had accepted the national contract in a referendum vote. The WE installers had refused to abide by the previous "acceptance" of a contract on May 6, claiming "irregularities," a charge which Beirne admitted to in allowing a new referendum vote among the installers.

The referendum showed 8,719 for and 6,347 against, not exactly a landslide for Beirne.

Further trouble for Beirne and his board comes from Philadelphia where Joseph Ratti, president of Local 2590, says his union is so incensed by the size of the wage increases and the lack of a wage reopening clause in the new agreement that they are urging that the local pull out of the CWA. Ratti said:

"It's to the point now where the majority of my union are demanding that I make a move. . . We've been stepped on for 20 years with inadequate contracts. The increases do not even cover the cost of living. . ."

Meanwhile, even though the CWA and several of the independent unions have settled with various Bell Systems, most of the workers are not back at work but are honoring the picket lines of those who are still on strike.

The National Picketline

The real wage

Dr. Arthur Burnes, former economic adviser to the White House, has this to say about what is really happening to the purchasing power of American workers: ". . . the average nonfarm worker has enjoyed no increase in real income.

"In 1966," he added, "his weekly wages, after allowing for price increases and higher social security taxes and income taxes, were slightly lower than the year before and last year they were a trifle lower again." (New York Times, May 1)

St. Petersburg boycott called

On May 19 Marvin Davies, state field director of the NAACP, called for a boycott of downtown St. Petersburg, Fla., business, in support of a strike of 211 unorganized garbage collectors who were fired when they struck because a promised 20 cents an hour wage increase was not forthcoming. All but one of the workers is black.

Yet the city manager, Lynn Andrews, says the issue at stake is not racial, purely one of labor relations.

He has refused to allow his community relations director, Alex Hawkins, who is also black, to intervene; nor has he allowed the city's Community Relations Commission to become involved. The Rev. Robert Shirer, a commission member, said the situation was in the area of race relations and ". . . it is certainly potentially explosive."

Even the city's Mayor Don Jones agrees and blames Andrews for "sowing the seeds of the present crisis." He agreed that the men had been promised higher wages they did not get.

The strikers are asking for 20 cents an hour over the present range of from \$1.87 to \$2.27 an hour.

The NAACP representative, in calling for a boycott, said: "Downtown is where the power structure is. When we hurt them economically, they'll do something about this."

And when asked about the racial issue, Davies countered:

"Of course it's racial. Can you imagine the manager firing 211 white men from any city job? Some of these men have worked for the city from 18 to 20 years. . . together they have 314 children and debts of more than \$1 million on homes, cars, and things of this sort."

An assistant field director for the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Workers is in St. Petersburg to help the strikers. Two years ago City Manager Andrews refused to allow the union, to which some of the workers belonged, to represent them because "strikes by public employees is illegal under Florida law."

It would seem Andrews didn't learn a thing from Memphis.

— Marvel Scholl



MILLION WORKERS MARCH. Massive throng of workers and students that marched in Paris May 13 against de Gaulle regime.

Million march in Paris: an eyewitness account

By Pierre Frank

(The following eyewitness account from Paris is excerpted from the May 27 issue of Intercontinental Press. Written May 16, it describes the massive march of a million workers and students May 13, and the events immediately preceding the demonstration. The section below begins on the evening of May 11, just after the end of the brutal police attack on student-held barricades [see story, page 1]. Pierre Frank is a leader of the Fourth International, the world party of socialist revolution founded by Leon Trotsky in 1938.)

PARIS—In the evening of May 11 about 9 o'clock, Premier Pompidou made a statement on TV and radio. Pale, his features drawn, with a nervousness quite different from his usual manner, he offered some generalities and then in substance indicated that the government was capitulating on the three conditions laid down by the striking students and teachers. All the demonstrators were to be released, the police were to be withdrawn, the Sorbonne would be reopened Monday.

But things had already gone too far. The declaration had other consequences than avoiding new confrontations in the streets. The CGT (Confederation Generale de Travail—General Confederation of Labor—the communist-controlled union) and CFDT (French Democratic Confederation of Labor) had already decided to stage a general strike and a big demonstration in Paris on Monday. They held to these decisions.

Noting what the government had conceded or promised, the UNEF (French National Student Federation) and SNES (University Teachers Union) stressed that this proved that the government bore all the responsibility for what had happened in the previous days. They decided to continue the struggle until the promises were actually carried out.

Sunday was taken up in preparing for the general strike and demonstration on Monday. In the evening it was announced that the students and teachers were to assemble at the Gare de l'Est, that a parade would go from there to the Place de la Republique where the workers' unions would assemble, that the unions belonging to Force Ouvriere in the Paris region would, for the first time, participate with the others.

The discussions among the organizations had lasted for many long hours. We can reveal some inside information about this.

The Stalinist leaders of the CGT wanted the demonstration to leave from the Place St-Michel and go to the Bourse du Travail on the Place de la Republique. What they wanted was to avoid the Latin Quarter and end up at the address of the bureaucrats.

The spokesmen of the UNEF and the SNES said that they could not accept this proposal and that, if the unions refused to change on this, they would organize an independent demonstration of their own from the Place de la Republique to Denfert-Rochereau.

The heads of the CGT had to assent, just as the evening before, the government had to assent. On top of this they likewise had to accept the leader of the "March 22 Movement," Daniel Cohn-Bendit, who only on May 3 had been called "the German" by l'Humanite (newspaper of the French Communist Party). The marshals had to be made up of one-half workers from the unions and one-half students from the student organizations.

It should be added that on that Sunday the heads of the Stalinist organizations, particularly the marshals—who up until then had never been used against the police (these organizations habitually bow to police orders) but against the "leftists"—were warned by

their chiefs that they must not do anything against the "leftists," even if they were insulted by them.

It was noted that they had to restrain themselves many times during the demonstration. But it would be a mistake to conclude that the Stalinists will be inclined to respect workers' democracy from here on out. They staged this demonstration against their will, and one can be almost certain that they will seek revenge at an opportune moment.

It is impossible to describe the demonstration in a few words. We can only indicate a few features. Most of the workers who marched with the unions were certainly not up to the political level and militancy of the groups assembled around the students and teachers, where the slogans were predominantly anticapitalist, revolutionary, against the bourgeois state, for the socialist revolution, for workers' power, for internationalism ("Rome, Berlin, Warsaw, Paris!").

But the level of the workers was considerably higher than in the past. No longer were there unworthy slogans like "des sous, Charlot" ("some pennies, Charley").

The main feature of the demonstration was its anti-Gaullism. Inasmuch as the demonstration took place exactly 10 years to the day since the military coup in Algiers that brought de Gaulle to power, a slogan heard everywhere was "10 years, that's too much."

The leaders of the political parties (the Federation of the Democratic and Socialist Left, and the French Communist Party), who were excluded from the front ranks upon the insistence of the UNEF and SNES, marched in the ranks of the crowd. They were hardly applauded.

For the revolutionary militants it was a day that aroused great hopes. Their groups swelled in size as the demonstration progressed through the city. They did not even have to suffer the tricolor in the demonstration. Even more—a demonstrator climbed up the annex of the Prefecture of the Police to pull down a flag floating from the windows.

Likewise at the Palais de Justice, a demonstrator tore down the tricolor and replaced it with the black flag of the anarchists. The effigy of a member of the CRS (Republican Security Companies—semimilitary security police) suspended from a rope was carried by the Surrealists.

There were only revolutionary slogans and spectacular actions. At the Place Denfert-Rochereau, the CGT leaders called through the loudspeaker for the crowd to disperse. The vanguard groups (March 22 Movement, JCR [Revolutionary Communist Youth], etc.) decided to continue the demonstration. Some groups under the leadership of sectors like the anarchists went toward the Elysee—something that was both utopian and adventurist. But most went to the Champ de Mars where a meeting of some 20,000 to 25,000 persons was held.

This meeting was by far the most important happening of May 13, 1968.

When the groups, some of a dozen persons, others of several hundreds or even some thousands, went from Denfert-Rochereau to the Champ de Mars, packing the sidewalks for several kilometers, bystanders thought that another uprising was under way.

The truth was that most of the participants knew that this was not the time for new battles, but the time to draw the lessons of the events and to decide what to do the next day. For more than two hours there was a democratic tossing about of ideas, of proposals, prefiguring a kind of soviet (council) assembly functioning democratically.

Finally it was decided to continue the student strike and to occupy the Sorbonne the same evening, which was done.

CALENDAR

NEW YORK

FRANCE ON THE BRINK OF REVOLUTION. Speaker: Les Evans, staff writer for The Militant and contributor to Intercontinental Press. Friday, May 31, 8:30 p.m. 873 Broadway, near 18th St. Contrib. \$1. Aisp. Militant Labor Forum.

TWIN CITIES

BENEFIT PERFORMANCE: THE ANYPLACE THEATRE AND TANA (rock group). At The Middle Earth, 1209 S.E. Fourth St., Minneapolis. Friday, May 31, 8:30 p.m. Aisp. Young Socialists for Halstead and Boutelle.

clip and mail

Special to New Readers

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

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

NAME
 STREET
 CITY STATE ZIP

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

Close Dela. college after black protest

By Joel Aber

DOVER, Del., May 18—What began as a demonstration for more control of their school by students at overwhelmingly black Delaware State College here ended with the administration fearfully shutting down the school after a 95 percent effective boycott of classes and occupation of the Student Center.

On Friday, May 10, the administration staged an elaborate ceremony to dedicate the new Student Center. Students had de-

Black student group presents demands to Washington U.

By Jay La Vassar

SEATTLE, Wash.—The Black Student Union (BSU) of the University of Washington has presented a group of demands to the university administration. Included are those for consultation with the BSU in all matters affecting black students and for the recruitment of 300 Afro-Americans, 200 American Indians and 100 Mexican-Americans by September 1968. Currently, the University of Washington has only 150 black students out of an enrollment of 30,000.

On May 17, more than 600 black and white students demonstrated at a campus Military Day ceremony and presented the BSU's demands to Governor Daniel Evans.

The university's president, Charles Odegard, has agreed "in principle" to the demands, but has refused to allocate funds for the programs. The administration is evidently hoping to extend negotiations until the summer vacation makes any militant student action impossible.

manded that they have the right to name their own school buildings. They wanted to call a new dormitory the Medgar Evers building, and the administration's pettiness was expressed in its refusal to give an unequivocal answer to this request.

Worse still was the administration's hypocrisy in first agreeing to dedicate the Student Center to Dr. Martin Luther King and then inviting Governor Charles Terry, one of Delaware's most vociferous spokesmen for racism, to speak at the dedication ceremony. The students saw Terry's appearance as a direct affront to the memory of Dr. King, and they loudly made their feelings known with a demonstration during the ceremony. Governor Terry left in a display of indignation, escorted off the campus by state troopers, and the college's President Mishoe canceled the remainder of the ceremony.

On Tuesday, May 14, the Delaware State administration suspended Leroy Tate, president of the student government, in reprisal for the demonstration.

As if this action were not provocative enough, the next morning students awoke to find their campus ringed with state troopers, who would not let anyone past their cordon without student identification. The excuse for this intimidation was "to prevent outside agitation" at Delaware State.

By Wednesday evening, the students had organized a sleep-in at the new Student Center. Thursday the main administration and classroom building was also occupied. A boycott of classes was organized and grew in effectiveness as the day wore on. By afternoon, only the few white students were in class, and they were politely told to leave if they did not support the student demands.

As the demonstrations in the buildings grew, 100 National Guardsmen and 125 police were ordered onto the campus. The Wilmington Evening Journal (May 17) reported, "With them the police had bolt-cutters,

sledgehammers, submachine guns and riot guns. Guardsmen were armed with bayonets, ammunition and tear gas canisters."

To avoid bloodshed, the students agreed to leave the administration building, but not the Student Center, on the condition that the police would draw back from the buildings and the trustees would hear their demands in the Student Center. When their demands were presented, 95 percent of the 900 students were in the Student Center. Their demands include:

- 1) Reinstatement of Leroy Tate as a student and as student government president;
- 2) General amnesty for all demonstrators;
- 3) Immediate resignation of President Mishoe;
- 4) Student examination and evaluation of instructors;
- 5) Teaching of black history and culture;
- 6) Improvement of library facilities;
- 7) Increased black representation on the board of trustees from four to eight;
- 8) An apology from Governor Terry for his slanderous remarks;
- 9) Funds and teacher salaries equal to those of the predominantly white University of Delaware;
- 10) Control of the campus by the students and adminis-

tration and not by the governor; 11) Removal of all police from the campus.

On Thursday evening, students at the nearly all white University of Delaware, 30 miles north of Dover, staged a sleep-in in solidarity with the Delaware State students. At one point, the sleep-in had 300 participants.

The Delaware State trustees agreed after their confrontation with 900 students to allow a faculty-administration-student committee to investigate the students' demands. The students are outnumbered on the committee eight to six.

On Friday, the administration closed the school and announced that it would not reopen for the remainder of the semester.

Apparently the administrators are calculating that an extended "cooling-off" period will break the militancy and unity of the student body.

During a Wilmington demonstration a few weeks ago by welfare recipients, Governor Terry smugly said that he was giving the welfare demonstrators "a taste of the State Police." Now Terry has received a taste of black power and student unity.

Letters from Prison

Letters from Prison is a recently published book by James P. Cannon, national chairman of the Socialist Workers Party. It is a collection of his correspondence during 1944, when he was a prisoner in the federal penitentiary at Sandstone, Minn. Along with 17 other leaders of the SWP and of Minneapolis Teamsters Local 544, Cannon was sentenced to prison under the Smith "gag" Act for opposing the imperialist war.

The letters contain a sustained treatment of questions pertaining to the organization, education and leadership of a revolutionary party, as well as a variety of personal and political reflections.

The following is an excerpt from the letter of Dec. 24, 1944.

I received the quotation Usick sent from Wolfe about pity as the "learned" emotion, the emotion which is fed by an accumulation of experience in memory. I think prison above all is the place where one can learn such things, learn and feel them. We are only partly here, and for a short time. We are still bound in memory to the normal life outside, and we anticipate the future. Besides that, thanks to our education and our philosophy, we have only to open the pages of a book as simply as one turns the key in a lock in order to leave this barren place, to walk beside the heroes who have shown how to storm heaven, and to listen to the philosophers who have tried to understand both earth and heaven.

But, nevertheless, here in prison one must see every day the lost men, the men who never had a chance; men who have been in and out of prison nearly all their lives; men who have never learned to read and thereby to project themselves into another world; men who know nothing and, God help them, will never know anything but prison. There is something to knock the smart-aleckness out of a man and teach him humility and compassion. There is pity.

Yes, pity is the "learned" emotion, but one does not learn it from books. Life is the instructor here, more specifically that part of life which inflicts pain and sorrow. I see proofs of this every day in the tender sympathy and concern which bind the prison-broken old convicts together as in an unspoken brotherhood. Politeness, respect for the wishes and feelings of others—everything that goes



James P. Cannon

by the slick word "courtesy"—is very often only a thin veneer of the most "educated," book-learned people. Here at Sandstone I have seen the real article, pure and simple and sincere. In all my life I have never seen anything more beautiful than the compassion of lost men for each other.

We will soon be leaving here. But I believe that hereafter I will always remain, to a certain extent, a prisoner, a comrade of prisoners. I will never be able to see or hear about a prison without thinking of the men inside its walls. Everytime I read a reference to a prison in my historical studies I feel a stab of pity for the men who suffered there. I shall not forget what I have seen and learned here. Someday, I hope, I will write about it; some words with blood in them in behalf of all men in prison.

We will leave friends behind us here, and many who crossed paths with us here will be our friends, and friends of what we stand for, for the rest of their lives. A man left here not long ago who had been in one prison after another most of his life. He said to me the morning he was leaving: "I just wanted to tell you that I'll never forget how good you treated me here. You certainly meet some good people in prison. If they were all like you Trotskyites it wouldn't be so hard to do time."

I never did anything for him except to joke with him in a friendly way and "trust" him with an occasional package of cigarettes until he could bum enough matches to pay me back at the rate of a penny a box. But a convict is grateful if you simply respect him as a man.

The Great Society

Principled Crusader—The May 19 New York Times reported that while campaigning in Florida Eugene McCarthy "did not mention the word Negro once," but spoke eloquently in tribute to Martin Luther King when he was back in Washington.

Silly Questions—Led by a Philadelphia lawyer, an international symposium on space law posed some legal-ethical questions, including two surprisingly easy ones: "If an American crop surveillance satellite finds that Communist China faces impending famine, is the United States morally or legally obliged to warn the Chinese?" and "Should the government notify the farmer or an oil company if a satellite prospecting for resources discovers oil on the farmer's land?"

Capacity for Intercourse with Public?—We haven't read it yet, but we understand an Esquire article suggests you can get to be President if you have the right psychosexual makeup.

As Long As They Love Freedom—"If our military aid to our allies were determined by the kind of government they maintain at the moment, then NATO would disintegrate."—Defense Secretary Clifford explaining why the U.S. has to arm the current Greek dictatorship.

Rapid Development—When Americans joined in on the sociological expeditions swarming over Kenya to collect unwritten tribal history, some of the "natives" caught wise and have gone onto space rates. "Some of them are demanding a shilling a word!" howled an irate Britisher.

Real Free-World Ally—Not all residents of Saigon were embittered when U.S. jets

bombed their city last month. "How can you hate Americans?" asked a street vendor of black market American cigarettes and candy. "Their pockets are filled with money."

Ultimate Sacrifice—A WNEW-TV ad announced the station was canceling "three hours of prime programming" to present a documentary on the racial crisis.

In Our Day It Was \$2—According to Drew Pearson, Robert Kennedy's advance men soften his way onto a campus by sprinkling \$20 bills among "student leaders."

Practical Thinkers—In response to complaints that Bobby Kennedy was using the family fortune to buy the presidential nomination, his mother replied that that's what money's for, to spend. Somehow it reminded us of the old Hoff cartoon of the irate parents late at night hollering at their homecoming daughter, with the daughter responding frostily, "That's what streets are for, to walk on."

Lesser Sin Theory—And somehow, both of the above items reminded us that Jack Newfield of the Village Voice says that Kennedy and McCarthy are both whores working in the Democratic whorehouse, but he's for Kennedy. Newfield didn't indicate his view of pimping.

Thought for the Week—"I am happy to report that every chapter is increasing its membership at a greater rate than was anticipated."—Alfred Lawrence, vice commander of the California Military Order of the Purple Heart, whose membership is limited to wounded war veterans.

— Harry Ring

In the May-June

RADICAL AMERICA

Gorz' Strategy for Labor and its Marxian roots • Overview/analysis of New Left development, 1960-65 • STAUGHTON LYND on the radicals' use of history • Reminiscence of '50s student Left • Review of Revolutionary Poetry: An Anthology. 50c or \$3/yr (6 issues).

1237 Spaight St.

Madison, Wis. 53703

354 pp. (cloth)

\$5.95

Merit Publishers • 873 Broadway
New York, N.Y. 10003

American Stalinists view French events

The following appeared in the lead article on the events in France in the May 26 issue of *The Worker*, organ of the Communist Party, USA:

"The de Gaulle regime still hopes to break the unity of the French people by making concessions here and there and by encouraging dissident elements. It is being aided in this by a minority among the students, led by Daniel Cohn-Bendit, which includes the 1,000-member organization of Trotskyite university students.

"Cohn-Bendit, a former anarchist, who now claims he belongs to no political party, is agitating among the striking workers not to forge unity against the de Gaulle regime but to split the workers away from their unions.

"Last week he went to St. Nazaire, a stronghold of the working class, to preach dissension. At a meeting there, he declared:

"I attack the leaders of the union organizations. I do not attack the ordinary union member. Unity of the labor movement will be achieved through youth. Shop by shop, the young unionists must unite. Unity won't come from the top."

"It is doubtful, however, whether the splitting attempts of Cohn-Bendit and the Trotskyites will have much impact on the working class, which is already seeing the effectiveness of unity in pressing for their demands.

"These maneuvers by Cohn-Bendit and his backers may even backfire and isolate them among the students, too. French university students are highly organized politically into groupings of the various national parties. One of the strongest of these is that of the Communist Party.

"The students, too, will not be diverted from the united struggle, led by the working class. They have already seen its effectiveness."

In their own inimitable, slanderous way, the American cousins of French Stalinism have raised in the above article some of the key issues to be answered about the revolutionary events in France.

Who is Daniel Cohn-Bendit (Danny the Red) whom the CP hates with a fervor matching that of the French cops? Why was he—instead of the CP bureaucrats—placed in the leadership of the one-million-strong march of workers and students on May 13?

What is the "1,000-member organization of Trotskyite university students?" Who led the student actions that precipitated the largest general strike in history? What political tendency was really in a "minority" among the students and why?

What was the reaction of the workers to the "splitting students"? What did their leaflets say and what did they stand for?

Who is de Gaulle "encouraging"? The "dissident elements" or the CP bureaucrats?

What kind of "unity" is the CP proposing? What were the results of this "unity" in 1936 and after World War II? What kind of unity are the "Trotskyites" fighting for?

We will deal with each one of these questions in the coming issues of *The Militant*.

War opponents given sanctuary

By Barbara Mutnick

BOSTON, May 21—The Arlington Street Church granted sanctuary May 20 to an antiwar GI and a draft resister. SP-4 William Chase, who served in Vietnam, is absent without leave from Fort Lewis, Wash. Robert Talmanson has been sentenced to three years for not reporting for draft induction.

With them are 10 members of The Resistance who pledged "to place themselves between the law and these two."

Chase told this reporter that he had distributed antiwar literature to his fellow GIs while in Vietnam.

He said most had considered his views with an open mind and were "very distrustful" of the war. He said this distrust had deepened tremendously after the events surrounding the capture of the U.S. spy ship, *Pueblo*, in North Korean waters.

3,000 at New York benefit for Calif. Black Panthers

By Elizabeth Barnes

NEW YORK—The defense effort for Eldridge Cleaver and other victimized members of the Oakland Black Panther Party got off to a successful start here May 20 with a benefit which attracted some 3,000 people.

The meeting featured a combination of black theater productions and speeches by Panther Party leaders who came from the coast to take part. James Forman, international affairs officer of SNCC, was chairman. Herman Ferguson of the "Queens 15" and playwright LeRoi Jones also spoke in defense of the Panthers.

Kathleen Cleaver, Black Panther leader and wife of Eldridge Cleaver, presented a brief history of the many attacks on the Black Panther Party carried out by the Oakland cops. She described the April 6 attack on her husband and eight other Panthers, in which 17-year-old Panther Bobby Hutton was killed, as the most "well-coordinated, calculated" attack on the Panthers yet.

Panther Party Chairman Bobby Seale gave a talk in which he made clear his belief that a revolution is needed in this country, and that "black people are in the vanguard."

Seale pointed out that some people have the false idea that the Panther Party is a "purely militaristic group." He then went on to describe the 10-point program of the party, one point of which calls for an immediate end to police brutality and murder of black people.

The benefit, sponsored by the Radical Repertory Theater, began with an inspiring film produced by playwrights LeRoi Jones and Ed Bullins. The theme of the film was the awakening black consciousness in the black community, and it ended with a repetition of the words, "Know who you are, and you will know what to do."

The film was followed with a series of powerful and entertaining theatrical productions by such groups as the Spirit House Movers and Players of Newark, which is

directed and organized by LeRoi Jones.

Most of the skits and plays were oriented around black nationalist themes: self-determination, black consciousness, black unity. The audience, which was about 50-60 percent white, responded throughout with applause and cheers, although there were a few whites who were obviously hostile.

It is interesting that the meeting even affected the thinking of the reporter sent by the New York Times. He wrote in his article

reporting the benefit: "I must stop saying 'Negro': if the evening taught me anything, it is that the word is 'black.'"

The skit most favored by the audience seemed to be an anti-cop comedy by a Puerto Rican theater group, the "Gut Theater" of East Harlem. It featured a policeman named Uncle Sam (who looked like he was right out of a Muhammad Speaks cartoon) who gets into trouble when he tries to solicit help from Puerto Ricans while chasing after a black man.



Socialists win recruits from McCarthy

By Caroline Lund

Young Socialists for Halstead and Boutelle in Seattle were recently planning to debate the chairman of Students for McCarthy on the University of Washington campus. However, after the chairman heard Paul Boutelle, the Socialist Workers vice-presidential candidate, speak at the University of Washington, he became a Halstead-Boutelle endorser and dropped out of the McCarthy effort.

Incidents like this have been occurring across the country. They indicate that many young supporters of McCarthy are primarily opponents of the Vietnam war, tricked into believing McCarthy's campaign is a vehicle for struggle against the war.

Dan Styron, SWP candidate for Senator from Illinois, made this comment after making a speaking tour of Illinois and Indiana campuses: "McCarthy has many supporters on the campuses. Usually they are surprised to find that McCarthy doesn't support withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam. We found many McCarthy supporters considered the SWP campaign as complementary to their own, and said they would throw their support to Halstead if McCarthy didn't get the Democratic nomination. At several of the campuses we visited I noticed that people who were building McCarthy's campaign had Socialist Workers Party election campaign posters on their walls."

Everyplace where Halstead-Boutelle supporters have engaged McCarthy supporters in friendly discussions, pointing out what McCarthy's real record is, they have received a sympathetic response. When Dan Styron recently debated Sanford Gottlieb, national director of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy and a leading McCarthy supporter, the majority of students present at the debate were sympathetic to the Halstead-Boutelle ticket and Styron's candidacy.

In Detroit Evelyn Kirsch, Socialist Workers Party candidate for the Wayne State Uni-

A new, improved version of the "McCarthy Truth Kit" has been prepared by the Socialist Workers Campaign Committee. The kit, a 16-page pamphlet, documents McCarthy's record and shows just where he really stands. Order from the SWP Campaign Committee, 873 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10003. Cost: 25 cents for a single copy and 15 cents for 5 or more.

versity Board of Governors, debated the Wayne coordinator of Students for McCarthy in a meeting under the auspices of CHOICE 68, the national college presidential preference poll taken April 24.

The debate turned into an analysis of the dynamics of revolution, and, after being harangued by students, the McCarthy debater finally admitted at the end that it is the system that has to be changed and McCarthy represents the system. After the meeting, when Evelyn Kirsch commented to the McCarthy debater that he had done a good job defending his position, he replied, "How can you say such a bold-faced lie?"

At Antioch College in Ohio, SWP supporters have been less successful in engaging McCarthy supporters in public political debate. However, the Antioch Volunteers for McCarthy accepted a challenge from Young Socialists for Halstead and Boutelle to play a softball game. The YSHB had just recruited some husky high-schoolers, and won 14 to 10.

In Madison, Wis., Eugene McCarthy was forced to show his true colors when he was asked to support a Madison referendum on the withdrawal of troops from Vietnam. Bob Wilkinson, chairman of the Madison Committee to End the War in Vietnam and SWP candidate for governor, wrote McCarthy a letter asking his endorsement of the referendum. Despite the repeated pleas for support from his own organization, McCarthy replied that he had his own proposals to make, and "cannot support your referendum."

In March, Halstead supporters in Madison defeated McCarthy supporters so completely in a debate that the Young Democrat speaking

for McCarthy agreed that he would be voting for Halstead in November.

A member of YSHB in Madison wrote to the campaign committee: "Our success was so great that on CHOICE 68 voting day this incident occurred: A student who had just voted for Halstead for President was told by his girl friend, 'But you have to make McCarthy your second choice. After all, you worked for him.'"

The campaign office recently received a letter from Stephen Weiner who goes to Simsbury High School in Simsbury, Conn., which sums up the response that SWP campaigners have found from young McCarthy supporters. He wrote: "A few months ago I wrote to you for some information on Halstead and Boutelle. Subsequently I was tricked by Eugene McCarthy liberalism. Now I am enclosing an endorsement card for the SWP campaign."

NEW YORK—A large crowd came to hear presidential hopeful Eugene McCarthy speak at a Madison Square Garden rally on May 19. They were met by supporters of the Socialist Workers ticket of Halstead and Boutelle, selling "McCarthy Truth Kits." The "Kits" document McCarthy's actual record, and have been prepared by the Socialist Workers Campaign Committee.

Frameup of Rap Brown

The frame-up of H. Rap Brown on a phony firearms charge is intended as one more step in trying to crush the most revolutionary elements in the black liberation movement. The five-year sentence, plus \$2,000 fine, demonstrates again there is no justice for black people in American courts.

The victimization of the SNCC leader underlines the need for a national, independent black political movement with the power to act for the oppressed. Every supporter of black liberation must join in fighting to free H. Rap Brown.

Notice to subscribers

Changing your address for the summer? Send us your new address, including zip code, right away.