The explosions which shook the old walls of the universities in 1968 seem far away. Who, today, still refers to Rudi Dutschke, whose appeals brought tens of thousands of students to the Berlin Kurfurstendamm? The student organisation, SDS, stamped by his charisma, no longer exists; now, innumerable student groups spin themselves into ‘cadre organisations’ who fight each other most vociferously, while some others try to test their ‘entrism’ into the established workers’ organisations.

Who in France today still sings the song of the days of May 1968, that ‘revolution’ must be made, as Cohn-Bendit told us? When larger student movements occur -- as recently in the Medical Faculty -- they aim at selected aspects of university reform; a real mass maturity and clear political character were achieved only by the demonstrations of the secondary pupils. This is true also of Italy despite the fact that there the student movement showed itself to be far stronger and more resilient than in Germany and France.

These facts confirm that the problem of the student movement can only be understood in conjunction with the working class movement; here we deal with one aspect of this problem. There was no lack of experienced functionaries in the working class movement who, in the years of the great student struggles, hid their heads like the blind clairvoyant Tenesius, and predicted the end of the great storm in ‘painful knowledge’, particularly as it contradicted all the concepts they had learnt and taught. Their experience and knowledge had not been sufficient to predict this storm. They could certainly have read in the introduction to Hegel’s Philosophy of History how doubtful is the proposition that nations learn from the experiences of history (and, after all, they claim Hegel as one of their forerunners!). Experience and history show, said Hegel, that nations never learn from history and never follow lessons that might be drawn from it; each epoch is an individual condition that can be determined only from within itself.

Further, in view of the fact that some forms of the student movement contradicted conceptions and traditions of the working class movement, it should surely have been the task of the working class movement to examine the extent to which the failure of the traditional labor movement shared responsibility for many weaknesses of the student movement, and to what extent the short life of the student storm was partially determined by a phenomenon which may well be described as a spiritual crisis of the labor movement.

In Armies of the Night, Norman Mailer contrasted the traditional and the new left: the ritual of the officially sanctioned meetings, taking on the character of processions, on the one side, and the deliberate provocation aimed at exposing repressive tolerance on the other; the routine manifestation of good conscience calculated to the last detail from a central office on the one side, and the explosion with the ‘illumination of the happening’ on the other; the concept of following the program without revolutionary overstepping of borders in the camp of the old, and the radical, dynamic negation of all conventional rules of the game, the vision of the concept-less revolution in the camp of the young.

Where the writer has realised the contrast, we must find the connection. For it is well-known that the rebellion against the hierarchical university structures was transformed into a rebellion against the social structures, illustrating the deep-seated ideological crisis in which late capitalist society finds itself. This admittedly in a period in which the labor movement of Western Europe also finds itself in a spiritual crisis, which inevitably coloured the forms and formulae of the student movement.

THE RENAISSANCE OF MARXISM

Briefly, the essence of this spiritual crisis of the labor movement was that, in the ‘50s., the great alternative to reformism, which was demonstrated to be a variant of the capitalist establishment, exposed its doubtful character in the brute fact that an authentic socialist revolution does not by itself ensure development towards an authentic socialist society; that the ‘overturning of existing conditions’ which Marx had described in Class Struggle in France as the essence of socialism, does not automatically arise from the expropriation of capitalist private property in the means
of production; that the overthrow of bourgeois parliamentary democracy can only be justified if it leads to the institution of a direct producers’ democracy, to the realisation of the idea of councils (Soviets) which gave the revolution of 1917 its immense attractive power. The young Marx once wrote that the so-called Christian states are not the expression in state form of Christianity; the revolutionary working class movement was confronted by the fact that the so-called socialist states are not yet the expression in state form of socialism.

The ideological shock effect of the ’50s. led the institutionalised marxists of Western Europe to the young Marx. They discovered, or re-discovered the author of the Economic-Philosophical Manuscripts, whose concept of alienation especially they used to come to the realisation that the overthrow of capitalistic private ownership of the means of production does not yet remove all forms of alienation, and particularly that it is no guarantee against new forms of repression and alienation. The fact that students of Marx in Christian circles at about the same time discovered the ‘humanism’ of Marx, led to the fact that the concept of alienation soon became the fashionable word of the ‘professorial philosophy of the professors of philosophy’ (Schopenhauer), and furthermore, eased the road to a short-lived dialogue between Christians and marxists.

The change in the spiritual atmosphere of the institutionalised marxism of Western Europe, which Louis Aragon rather exaggeratedly called the ‘renaissance of marxism’, did not mean that its protagonists were in the position of fighting through a complete jungle. There were already cleared spaces which had been opened by existentialist marxism in its criticism of ‘lazy marxism’ (Sartre) which is able to explain the past accurately, but is unable to change the present in ‘laziness’ (Sartre) which is able to explain the past accurately, but is unable to change the present in ‘laziness’ (Sartre) which is able to explain the past accurately, but is unable to change the present in... (Schopenhauer), and furthermore, eased the road to aa short-lived dialogue between Christians and marxists.

“LUXEMBURGISM”

This was the position at least in the Latin countries, in France and Italy. The German contribution centred on the debate with the paternalistic bureaucratism of the working class movement. This had developed in the revolutionary labor movement on the basis of appeal to Lenin’s thesis that socialist consciousness had to be brought from the outside into the working class movement, which, by itself, could only develop a trade union consciousness. From this thesis there developed the idea of “infallibility” — the right to speak not only in the name of the party, but of the working class, even of the whole people. In the biographical trilogy of Trotsky by Deutscher, we searched for the roots of this bureaucratic distortion. New editions of the works of the re-discovered Trotsky gave impetus to discussions of the relationship between party and working class, between vanguard and mass, a discussion which grew beyond the confines of Trotsky, discovered the ideological world of the so-called Worker’s Opposition, and which finally found firm ground for a principled criticism of paternalistic bureaucracy in the views of Rosa Luxemburg.

Such movements as May 1968 in France, the demonstrations of German students 1967-69, and the struggles in the Italian universities in 1968-69, announced and demonstrated in deed the idea of Luxemburg that Madame History laughingly makes fools of the bureaucratic routinists because they accept struggle only as a product of the organisations; whereas dialectical development, on the contrary, only allows the organisation, and particularly new forms of organisation, to arise as a product of the struggle.

Rosa Luxemburg, when she wrote these words, had in mind the Soviets of the first Russian Revolution, those organs of a direct producers’ democracy which arose spontaneously in the mass struggle, not foreseen in any party program, not predicated by any party leader. These Soviets, in their original meaning, fascinated a rebellious youth who saw in the Soviet democracy not only a rejection of paternalistic bureaucratism, but also a great alternative to bourgeois parliamentary democracy.

Here, the ideas of Luxemburg — at least as far as they were digested — were joined to the slogans and ideas of Bakunin which were given an astonishing revival by the student movement (at least in its first stage), marrying the red flags with the flags of anarchism. This recalls the words of Lenin that anarchism is the account rendered for the sins of the labor movement.

In the libertarian communism of a Cohn-Bendit, as it was systematised in the works of Daniel Guerin, the Soviets of the revolutions of 1905 and 1917 were praised as that ‘spontaneous organisation’ (Bakunin), that ‘a-political power’ (Bakunin) which had realised, as against the state socialism of the ‘barrack regime’, the ‘free organisation of the working masses from below to the top’ (Bakunin). ‘All power to the Soviets’ cried the demonstrating students, not only when confronting the apparatus of the labor movement, but also when confronting a representative democracy, whose emptiness cannot be denied even by its own ideologists. And in the ‘hot autumn’ of 1969 in Italy, the Movimento Studentesco found the idea of a council democracy confirmed in those forms of direct producers’ democracy which burst the limits of the established political and trade union organisations and which paced social-political decisions (beyond the traditional quantitative demands) under
the direct control of the workers in the assembleia operaia.

From the stress placed on spontaneity, different conclusions can, of course, be drawn. The revolt against the manipulation by apparatuses can lead, if taken to extremes, to the negation of any form of organisation; the rejection of authoritarian leadership systems can lead to the negation of every form of leadership and co-ordination. This explains why the French 'Movement of March 22' disappeared like a little cloud after the ebb of the struggle, and why the German SDS announced its voluntary dissolution on March 22, 1969.

On the other hand, worship of spontaneity can also lead to a new version of that mechanical interpretation of marxism which swamped the basing of decisions on knowledge of objective laws. And in a certain sense, we can say the same (and here we are again dealing with it mainly from the point of view of its reception among the students) of many theses of French structuralism which, in the description of ideological systems of different 'archaeological' levels of history, always added an understanding which arises and develops, not as a result of a continuing development, but by mutation.

In this presentation the decisions of the will disappear, there are thought structures, but no anticipation, no development. There is reproduced, certainly under different conditions and with other mental assumptions, "the iron 'must' of history" which was once the aroma produced by vulgar marxism in the labor movement. The concrete role of the structuralist model at the universities became clear in May 1968 when the students wrote on the blackboard 'Les structures no sont pas dans la rue!! (The structures are not in the street). Obviously, structuralism did not suit these young people who were building barricades.

"THIRD WORLD-ISM"

In the meantime, that spiritual break-through had occurred which actually gave the student movement at its peak its real profile and which has been called, not without justice, Tiersmondisme (Third World-ism). It was particularly the struggle of the Vietnamese people which achieved this break-through, tore down the bounds of powerless pessimism, and led to that activism which, between 1967 and 1969 dominated the university atmosphere in Germany, France, Italy, Belgium and, to a lesser extent, the Scandinavian countries.

This Third World-ism was not only a reaction against the Eurocentrism which dominated the traditional labor movement and assessed the problems and phenomena of the 'forgotten continents' with the measuring sticks and criteria of Western Europe; it was not only the expression of solidarity with the explosions by which the centuries-long accumulated energies of these countries broke through to light and air; it was not only inspired by theses such as those of the American economists Baran and Sweezy and of the American philosopher Marcuse, who found their strongest expression in the general line of the Chinese communists: that is, that the revolutionary upheavals of our time must find their starting point in the Third World, that the revolution in the developed countries could only arise after these upheavals, be their consequence. This Third World-ism was also supported by the conviction that the forms of struggle developed there could very well be transferred to Western Europe -- even Guevara's slogan 'Another two, three Vietnams'.

But the activism was especially a revolt against the immobilisation which had largely characterised the strategy and tactics of the established labor movement, whose only initiatives were those certified as allowable by the authorities, whose tactics were those of the precisely calculated 'next step' which far too often meant marching up and down on the one spot.

The most fertile expression of Third World-ism was Guevarism, the unlimited admiration which the masses of struggling students felt for this fascinating personality, in whom they saw realised that unity of word and deed, theory and practice, principle and behaviour which they failed to find in, or saw as forgotten by, the traditional working class movement. The Focolaio (focal point) theory which they obtained through the mediation of Regis Debray underlined the enormous significance of the initiative of students in the unleashing of the armed beginning, independent of the Communist Party or a political front, looking with derision on the traditional forms of mass work, of mass organisation, of mass agitation, with its conventional newspapers, conferences and delegations. It decreed that delegations. It decreed the natural bent of youth to revolution by stressing the connection between 'biology and ideology', illustrating the unity of bodily and moral firmness by the example of Che's practice, and replying to the great problem of the relationship between objective and subjective factors, between objective and subjective maturing of revolution, between revolutionary consciousness, revolutionary organisation and revolutionary consciousness which are pre-conditions for armed action, but, on the contrary, that these are the result of armed action. Looking back, one is justified in asking whether, in the student movement, we do not already see in Buevarism a certain loose connection with traditional ideology, for while the authority of paternalistic bureaucracy in the labor movement is increasingly rejected, there broke through a certain romantic flirting with military discipline, and in direct contradiction with their own practice of night-long discussions and deliberations, the temptations of a democratism were accepted which would have 'no political hither and thither, no interminable deliberations'. (Debray).
This peculiar amalgam of anti-authoritarianism and readiness to submit to a charismatic authority we find in an even more developed form in the reaction of the student movement to the Chinese cultural revolution, whose options have probably influenced Third World-ism most lastingly. The slogan 'It is right to rebel', the mass stream of millions of young people against firmly entrenched and hierarchical structures of the Party and State mandarinate, the thousands and tens of thousands of wall posters in which young people, many students among them, could express free and unsparing criticism, last but not least the fact that this storm had its starting point at a university, necessarily aroused enthusiasm in a movement whose birth certificate was endorsed with the struggle against established authority. And at the same time came the expression of a need for identification with undenied greatness, the charismatic infallibility, which was satisfied by the fact that the Chinese cultural revolution -- in complete contradistinction to Guevarism -- smashed intellectual elitism and posed the problem of the relationship of intelligentsia and workers in a new way which was to cause even protagonists of the anti-authoritarian period to take a 180° turn in the crisis which later beset the student movement.

However contradictory the forms which Third World-ism took in different countries and in different phases of the student movement, it is undeniable that it belongs to the essence of the ideology of this movement and that it explains the astonishing phenomenon that in 1968 the developments in the USSR, the rise and fall of the 'Prague Spring' which one might have expected to have great powers of attraction, for it raised problems of an industrially developed society and a possible model for West European revolutions, found no great echo among the rebellious students. On the contrary, their allergy towards bourgeois parliamentary democracy was carried over into their attitudes to a development which had gone far beyond it.

Third World-ism was fed by a conception which had come to Europe from the USA according to which the traditional protagonist of the revolution, the proletariat, had lost this function in modern capitalism because it had been integrated completely in the modern industrial society as a result of technical development and the manipulative mechanisms of the welfare state. For two or three years, Marcuse was undoubtedly the most widely read contemporary in the student movement of Western Europe. His formula of 'repressive tolerance' and the 'great refusal' towards all institutions and reform plans justified a standpoint of boycott, which gave the student movement impetus and homogeneity when it was on a rising plane, but led after its peak to a certain immobilisation which -- it seems to me -- rather sharpened the crisis of the movement. For in fact the 'integration' complex which describes any reform, any constructive action, no matter how aggressive, as being 'integrated into the system', must lead to abstention and waiting. Hectic actionism could not retain the stormy rhythm for long, and had to retreat into itself when ideas about the relationship of reform and revolution were themselves integrated into the integration complex.

SWING OF THE PENDULUM

'America, you are better off than our continent, the old one, you have no castles in ruins' Goethe said. But many conclusions which arise from the particular situation in the USA could not be simply transplanted into countries which, as distinct from the USA, had a labor movement with rich traditions of struggle, of ideology, of terminology; traditions still continuing to act today, even in the period of the spiritual crisis of the working class movement. The students looked for outsiders and outcasts on whom they were to orientate themselves, in certain branches of industry threatened in their existence by technological development (among coal miners, for example); they found their ' negroes' among the 'migrant workers' from Africa, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Turkey -- a section which in Western Europe has long since ceased to be a marginal aspect of the proletariat, and has moved into more or less permanent positions in 'skilled trades'.

But the French May of 1968, and even more the 'hot autumn' of 1969 signalised the powerful potentials which the labor movement continues to possess, but which remain unused because of the crisis of the working class movement.

This crisis was one of the conditions which to a large extent created the forms and ideological framework of the student movement. It helps to explain why activism lost its wind, why anti-authoritarian ideology was wrecked on its own contradictions, and why, after a real collapse, the swing of the pendulum occurred which often -- even if in essentially smaller proportions -- reproduced the very deformations which the student movement had originally aimed to overcome and to prevent, and to whose overcoming it had made a respectable contribution by new forms of struggles and new ways of thinking.

Anti-authoritarians of yesterday became passionate defenders of strict cadre organisation; spontanists, quoting Luxemburg, became protagonists of military discipline who rejected every objection in the spirit of their views of yesterday as petty-bourgeois pseudo-revolutionism. Persons and groups which had won great popularity in the universities, in a new kind of narodism, demand compulsory periods in factories in order to examine the possibility of mobilising the proletariat and to find starting points for the formation of a new revolutionary working class party. The great movement has collapsed into many small groups which fight and expose, expel each other, and increase their number constantly by splits; and every group sees itself as the kernel of the coming revolution. Some enter the established working class parties convinced that they will achieve in this way, 'entristically', that connection with the working people which
the movement in the universities failed to achieve. Tired of the long discussions termed ‘raising consciousness’ in ever smaller groups, some, sarcastically referred to as ‘writing desk revolutionaries’ recommend concentration on serious analyses and studies, often with a certain resignation in view of the lack of clear perspective.

LASTING INFLUENCE

In view of this development which requires some qualifications as far as Italy is concerned, the question may be posed whether the two to three years of explosions and confrontations have achieved anything at all, whether they have in any way or anywhere exerted a lasting influence. We are indeed convinced that this is the case, and not only in the universities or the education system generally, where the question of reform was firmly placed on the agenda by this movement, forcing governments, parliaments, parties, to appear concerned, even if undoubtedly timidly and incompletely, with school reforms, but nevertheless with the formulae and formulations of the student movement.

But going beyond the problem of education, which doesn’t really belong to the subject under discussion, the student movement has -- not least by the smashing of taboos -- raised problems before the whole people, examined aims and popularised slogans and solutions which have influenced the mental and political atmosphere. Somehow, some things which previously had been self-evident, became impossible. In considering the relationship of the student movement to the labour movement, it must be noted that the great university movement has posed new complexes of questions for discussion, has revived forgotten thoughts, and has in some respects even introduced a renaissance of revolutionary orientation. It is not absolutely excluded that a future historian will be able to say that the movement at the universities of Western Europe from 1967 to 1969 was one of the most decisive contributions in resolving the coincidence of the spiritual crisis of the labor movement with that of the bourgeoisie.

It has already been mentioned how much Third World-ism aroused by the struggle of the Vietnamese people put its imprint on the student movement, and found its strongest expression in Guevarism and in the echoes of the Chinese cultural revolution. Whatever one may think of this orientation, which was certainly not without contradictions, it seems undeniable that it is its achievement to have aroused a certain new way of thinking in parts of the institutionalised labor movement. Indeed, this was dominated by that euro-centrism which judged all questions of the Third World with criteria and value judgments which had crystallised in the industrially developed countries, reminding one of Christopher Columbus who saw in the flora and fauna of the new world confirmation of the myths of antiquity. In a kind of new edition of the theory of stages which had played such an important role in the labor movement and which separated historical development into strictly divided stages, so that revolutionary break-throughs were all too easily dismissed as ‘premature’, a method of thinking had prevailed even among the so-called advanced labor movement which believed seriously that a basic question of mankind could be solved in the following way: that the most developed of the underdeveloped countries of today would in 200 or 300 years reach the level of the least developed of the developed countries of today, if possible with constant affirmations of thanks for developmental aid from industrialised countries which was essentially aid for the development of the profits of these countries.

The same may be said of the conception of direct democracy, of council democracy, which was rediscovered in debate with paternalistic bureaucracy and the recognition that state bureaucracy is not an attractive alternative to parliamentary democracy. This was thrown into the discussion in the labor movement. The new printing of long forgotten and unavailable books by Trotsky, Luxemburg, Pannekoek, Korsch and the translation of Gramsci, unknown outside Italy, opened a window through which one could glance at the original idea of councils.

Certainly the movement of factory occupations in May 1968 in France, the formation of committees at the base by the factory employees in the ‘hot autumn’ in Italy in 1969, the ‘wild strike’ in 1969 in Belgium and Germany, etc. have, in the final analysis, a greater importance for the discussions in the labor movement than the university movement in the search for a way out from the spiritual crisis of the labor movement, in the working out of the concept of direct democracy. But they were undoubtedly fertilised by the student movement just as, in general, the concept of self-acting organisation, initiative from below, owes its growing reverberations to a large extent from the visible example given by the student movement. This concept took on concrete forms not only in the basic and project groups of the universities, which are still effective today, small monuments to a great past, but also in the innumerable citizens’ committees, emancipation groups, in which students frequently play a very active role and which are barely thinkable without the student movement of 1967-69. The same may be said for the new women’s liberation movement. In the West European countries independent initiative groups have arisen in the struggle against pollution of the environment, for the right to housing, for a democratic health system, etc. not to mention questions of education. These groups are free from the control of established organisations and institutions, living organs of a direct democracy which have contributed more to creative activity than all the discussions about alienation, more to the propagation of living democracy, more to the prevention of the danger of integration from reformist goals than all the discussions about integration as a result of ‘repressive tolerance’.
WORKING CLASS AND INTELLIGENTSIA

The ideas which the fighting students developed, particularly the struggles themselves, must also be honoured as an important contribution to that problem which has occupied the labor movement for more than a century and which is closely connected with the question of direct democracy; the relationship of the vanguard and the masses, of party and working class, of organisation and movement. In 1967, 1968 and 1969, there were large mass struggles which were not foreseen or predicted by the established workers' parties as occurring in this form, with those aims and with such force, and this not least because they were basically convinced that movements which are not centrally planned must disappear into smoke, cannot achieve lasting effects. It is true that the experiences of 1968-69 show that larger movements cannot do without synthesis, co-ordination and theoretical generalisation, but a serious analysis of these events and years will not support the well-known formula of Lenin that the working class independently can develop only trade union consciousness. Symbolic actions, even violent rebellions are not yet revolutionary, i.e. the real transformation of the social structure, but this is equally and even more true of demonstrations of all kinds organised by the central apparatus. The recognition of a profound and complicated dialectic between organisation and the masses is needed, because it is in any case more complicated than the well-known picture of transmission belts which link the single motor with different wheels - a picture which even from the purely technological point of view has become anachronistic. Just because of the experiences of the revolutionary labor movement, which has far too often lost control of its functionaries and ended up under their control, the well-known words of Rosa Luxemburg that mistakes made by a really revolutionary movement are from a historical point of view more fertile than the infallibility of the best of all central committees, have regained their old freshness.

Already in the complex of questions mentioned -- and this is natural in a movement of intellectuals -- the discussion about the position of intellectuals in the labor movement, about the relationship of intellectuals and workers which has always been posed anew in the history of the working class movement has been enriched with new aspects by the student movement of the last few years. In the revolutionary labor movement the following conception has increasingly gained currency in the last few decades. Intellectuals, mostly sons of the bourgeoisie, brought socialist consciousness into the labor movement during its early years. When Lenin speaks of professional revolutionaries in What is to be Done? he means mostly intellectuals and, not least, students. This unification of science and labor movement has created the modern labor movement. From the moment of this unification, the intelligentsia is to be considered as a middle stratum closely tied to the existing social structures, but which can be won as allies of the labor movement for material or moral reasons -- useful potential fellow travellers of the revolutionary class whose ideological position they must of course adopt. The 'frontism' of the period between the two world wars applied this formula in a particular historical context, when it was necessary to create the broadest possible alliance against war and fascism under the leadership of the working class. The cliche (which among other things puts the real problem out of sight) that the scientific methodology of social critical analysis and of socially changing initiative, must always be developed, that the representatives and scientists of this methodology therefore should hold an important function -- this problem was resolved particularly by Antonio Gramsci. Gramsci, who described the working class movement as an 'intellectual collective' differentiated between the 'organic intellectuals' and the 'traditional intellectuals' which reproduce themselves as a reservoir of the traditional professions. The 'intellectual collective' cannot abandon the attempt to win a part of the traditional intellectuals for its aims, as the intellectuals are the connective tissue of the nation, as intellectual and moral reform as a pre-condition of every real revolution is impossible without important parts of the intelligentsia particularly as the debates in the cultural sphere represent an important part of the emancipatory struggle.

In the present period of modern industrial society -- this was also confirmed in 1968-69 -- these thoughts of Gramsci have greater significance than the tiresome cliche. Technological-sociological development and the scientific-technological revolution lead to the conclusion that the greater part of the intellectuals have become a salaried middle class which certainly cannot, as is often done, be simply equated with the manual workers.

A part of this intelligentsia fulfils in relation to the workers the function of overseer and controller, but is frustrated in relations with the employer in the same alienated way as other workers and employees. The former notables have become one more category in the number of wage and salary earners, which in Western Europe represent the overwhelming majority of the population. Certainly, the technical intelligentsia -- and this became clear also in 1968-69 -- may often, on the basis of their position, although satisfied as far as material needs are concerned, recognise more clearly that the gradual demands of the politicians of the day, the so-called quantitative demands typified in trade union work, are not enough any more, that qualitative demands concerning working conditions, the education system, public transport, the health system, the question of housing, etc. are coming to the fore, that trade unions, too, need to do more on socio-political questions. In 1968-69 it was frequently modern enterprises in which the number of technical intellectuals is relatively high -- and not the traditional economic branches like mining, railways, building, etc. -- which were the starting points for movements for qualitative, system-destroying reforms. In contradistinction to the traditional concepts, including the 'frontist' one between the wars, a new model of the 'historical bloc' appeared, not least precognised by the student movement, equally removed from the elitism which was typical of the anti-authoritarian period and from the 'solidarity with workers' which, by the swing of the pendulum
against elitism proclaimed the need ‘to go among the people’ and to prove one’s proletarianisation by the use of strong language often with the curious side effect that intellectuals abuse intellectuals, as intellectuals.

The discussions about the relationship of workers and students, of intellectuals and the labor movement, received a particular tone through ideas which sprang from certain aspects of the Chinese cultural revolution related to the relationship between factory and school, production and culture. The gradualism in the labor movement had, as its aim, a reform of education, placing in the forefront the demand that more working class children should have the opportunity to go to higher schools, that evening classes and education leave should enable workers to rise to the higher categories of employees and technicians, so as to realise ‘equality of opportunity’. Experience teaches that the majority of graduates leave the higher schools and extended education courses as integrated citizens. On the other hand, a number of interesting conclusions arose from factory struggles aimed against classification and wage categories, based on the splitting and division of the work process and in the system of work relativised to a huge scale of wage differentials. Large factory struggles, particularly in France and Italy, have been conducted against this unlimited division into different categories, and have aroused principled discussions about the problem of the education system which went well beyond the usual complex of questions relating to school reforms.

The traditional demands of the established working class parties often give the impression that capital continues to deny working class children the right to education and is interested in selection at school. In the main capitalist countries this is less and less often the case. Technological development and the scientific-technological require an increasing stream of diploma-ed and qualified intellectuals. On the other hand, there are as a rule more graduates than positions according to their qualifications so that the administration is glad to know that hundreds, often even thousands, of young people are ‘busy’ at school rather than being unemployed contestants for jobs. What interests modern capitalism is not the selection at school than the selection system of the schools themselves which fortifies the differences between qualified and non-qualified, between technicians and manual workers. The ‘rise’, or better, the ‘flight’ of this or that worker into higher categories changes nothing in the division into categories of the producers. The traditional slogan ‘More workers’ children in the higher schools’ increasingly misses the real problem. The real problem is to achieve the right of workers - as workers - to education, that is to develop a school system which overcomes the separation of factory and school, of production and culture, of working people and intelligentsia.

TO LIVE DIFFERENTLY

Thus we can understand why, for instance, during the ‘hot autumn’ in Italy concepts arose which demanded the right of workers to schooling, the right of students to work. Certainly, this may also be ascribed to the influence of certain aspects of the Chinese cultural revolution, although it is doubtful whether it can be transferred holus bolus to developed capitalist countries. But the fact remains significant that to the gradualism of the traditional labor movement whose demands were that people should live better, there was opposed, in the sense of Marx’s views, the orientation that it was not just a question of people living better, but that they should live differently.

Perhaps this is the most significant contribution which the student movement made to the overcoming of the spiritual crisis of the labor movement.

Indeed, the traditional labor movement in its different variants has increasingly become fixed in a certain gradualism the aim of which is essentially to gain the working man a better life, cheaper articles of consumption, higher incomes, more beautiful housing, more possibilities for their children to get on, etc. Even the passionate discussions which dominated the labor movement for almost a century as to the road of gaining power, by peaceful means or by civil war, by gaining a parliamentary majority or by violent revolution

ity or by violent revolution had less and less to do with the aim and lost the great vision which had stood at the cradle of the labor movement: that it was not enough to change the relations of production whose judicial expression were the relations of property, but that it was necessary as Marx had written in Class Struggle in France to ‘overthrow’ all social relations, that the question is to have ‘a state which is no longer a state in the proper sense of the word’ (Engels), to have new relations in the family, in the factory, in the school. This ‘overthrow’ of social relations certainly presupposes a change in production relations, but does not arise automatically from them. Even this achievement of a change in production relations by the revolution, may be put into question if the overthrow of social relations does not result.

The student movement has reminded the labor movement of its birth certificate; the great vision of an ‘association of free producers’ in which the free development of each is a pre-condition for the free development of all, where the personality of man is developed to the maximum and all-sidedly, a society with a maximum of freedom, of information, of alternatives and happiness.

The many-sided reciprocal action between the labor movement and the student movement was also linked with a phenomenon whose significance has not been sufficiently appreciated. Marxism has become a subject of study and research at most West European universities. Hundreds of monographs in the areas of philosophy, history and economics already, today, signalise a significant deepening and enrichment of scientific socialism - and we are only at the beginning of a development which will be important not only for the future of the ‘philosophy of praxis’, but for revolutionary ‘praxis’ generally.