

STUDENT'S MOVEMENTS OF 1968 – UNFINISHED REVOLUTION

UDC 329.78 (497.11) "1968"

Milan Petrović

Faculty of Law, University of Niš, Serbia

Abstract. *This study first defines the concepts of the "left" and the "right" as political phenomena. Then, after touching upon the student and black movement in the United States of America, it presents the basic features and development of student movements in the Federal Republic of Germany and France in the late 1960s. Most of the study is dedicated to the revolutionary commotion at Belgrade University in 1968, in which the author of this study personally participated. In a fully new way, the text interprets the activities of the Yugoslav President Tito and a group of professors and teaching assistants from Belgrade Faculty of Philosophy gathered around the journal "Praxis" ("The Praxis Group") during this commotion. The study also provides a contribution to the theory of revolution.*

Key words: *the "left" and "right", student movements, revolution as a social contract, revolutionary leader.*

It has been forty years since student movements – among them that of Belgrade University students – reached their peak. The author of this text personally participated in those events – as a student of Belgrade University's School of Law he was a member of the School's Action Board. However, this text is neither historiographical nor autobiographical; the experience of the author, and other sources, provide just a **grounds** for a comprehension from the viewpoint of the theory of state and political sociology, striving to uncover the whole beneath the particulars. The method employed is, therefore, comparative, where the student movement at Belgrade University is considered parallel with student movements in France and West Germany and, to a point, the United States. This way, we are solving an original problem, because there are practically no papers of the similar kind.

However, in order for the 1968 student movements to be understood, one needs to first shed light on the essence of the political phenomena of "left" and "right". They are incessantly discussed in political life and propaganda. Yet, here, compared to such a "global interest", scientific understanding is falling behind significantly.

From the standpoint of science, the right and the left are typological conceptions (similar to Weber's "ideal types"), scalar in character: accordingly, there is "moderate" right and left, "radical" right and left, and "extreme" right and left. One should bear in mind, though, that some properties can swap their positions in the scale, even move from one scale to the other. Thus, an extreme case of such movement is seen in the totalitarian right and totalitarian left, which exhibit a series of conspicuous similarities, and yet preserve their deepest dissimilarities.

The moderate right is based on the ideas of freedom and equality, the way they were interpreted in the early phase of the French Revolution (1789-1799). The people, nation, society, state are mainly understood as the totality of citizens with equal political rights, whose supreme body is a freely elected parliament, hosting a number of political parties. There is a market economy, based mostly on private property and the freedom of labour. The party pluralism in the political domain is mirrored by the pluralism of independent companies and trade unions in the economic sphere. The state only sets up a legal framework for free competition in the market and interferes only to prevent disloyal competition and abuse of economic power through forming monopolies. "The rule of law, not men" is ensured. Therefore, a strong and independent government is a structural enemy of the system. Accordingly, the constitution of this state defines that the government shall be responsible to the parliament and that courts shall control the legality of executive power (rule of law). In its cleanest form, the moderate right is represented by demo-liberal parties.

The radical right views the nation, state, society – mostly along with conceptions of the German political Romanticism – as an organic whole whose parts are unequal because they carry out unequal functions. There is economic liberalism, but only to the extent to which it favours the advancement of the whole. This is why, in addition to the private company, there is also the state company, in particular state-governed monopolies. In addition to grand national and international investors, the idea is particularly to favour a small and medium farmer, since the patriarchal countryside family is the ideal of the organic organization of the state. Political parties are allowed, but, since their struggle may seriously threaten the stability of the social organism, this struggle is relativized in such a way that above the pluralistic parliament there is a strong government, consisting of officials who are not members of parties (the authoritarian state principle). All parties vouching for the rule of a clear majority principle are structural enemies of this system. Representatives of political systems closest to this regime were Central European constitutional monarchies by the end of World War One and monarchies in the Balkans and Atatürk's regime in Turkey by the end of World War Two. Today, nationalist and religious-fundamentalist parties are the closest successors of radical right's legacy.

The extreme right, first of all, implies national hegemonism, although every national hegemonism does not automatically imply an extreme right regime (fascism). By fully rejecting the achievements of the French Revolution, this regime establishes a "order-based (corporate) state", thus establishing a link with the European Middle Ages. However, the new order state differs from the old one, as it is now possible to move from one order into the other while there is no order hierarchy; in principle, the orders are equal before the dictatorial government. Multi-party parliamentarism is abolished, and in the parliament, representatives from just one party reach decisions by acclamation. The party, as an avant-garde movement of the "national uprising", is the bearer of the dictatorial re-

gime. Dictatorship as the modus of government occurs when the state super power authorizes a state organ to undertake extraordinary, legally unlimited **measures**. As a political regime, and this is the case here, dictatorship exists when the bearer of supreme power authorizes himself to act as a dictator. That regime is **totalitarian** in two senses of the word. First, the whole order based on orders operates after the initiative of the government, representing the unity of the movement and the state. Second, the political police has unlimited coercive power against regime opponents. The principal fascist regimes collapsed after the defeat of Italy, Germany and Japan in World War Two. However, original fascism disappeared after the coup d'état in Portugal in 1974, and after General Franco's death in Spain in 1975. At the moment, neo-fascism appears in the form of politically marginalized, closed groups.

Akin to the moderate right, the moderate left also represents a continuation of the ideas of the French Revolution, however rather in its democratic republican period (1792 – 1795), marked by the reign of the Jacobins. Although private property was most solemnly guaranteed, equality was not taken to be merely legal, but also economic, a "kind of socialism". Progressive taxes and "taxation of the wealthy" were introduced. "The aristocracy of the wealth" was publicly anathemised, said to be more gruesome than "kings' sceptres", and wealth was seen as "liberticide".¹ Like the liberal right, the contemporary moderate left takes the position of multi-party parliamentarianism. However, in the social and economic domain, it differs from the moderate right as it strives to implement the postulation of "social justice". In principle, the moderate left accepts the free market game for private companies and trade union liberties, but it also stresses the need for state interventionism, resulting in a "welfare state". The social policy of the moderate left faces the trilemma of the noted English economist Keynes: full employment, market economy, stability of the currency. The moderate left mostly gathers socialist and socialdemocratic parties from West Europe.

Set against the regime of the moderate left, the radical left is revolutionary. However, it also tries not to break up with the principles of freedom and equality. The financial capital and the main means of traffic and production should be socialized. Instead of being competitors in the battle for the market, companies become the centres of employees' social life. Radical socialism takes over from liberalism mistrust, if not hostility, towards the state. Therefore, the **self-management** of the employees is imminent in socialized companies and institutes. The legislative and executive authorities are unified in the parliament (the convent system of unified authority), with all the politically more important decisions being ratified by the councils (groups) of voters. Administrative and judicial positions are elective. The role of political parties is minimized due to the fact that direct democracy is everywhere. On the other hand, the role of trade unions as everyday organizers is growing. It is interesting that Hannah Arendt, a political theorist of distinct demo-liberal orientation, considered that the political freedom could be achieved only in a "system of councils"². The examples of radical left regimes are the Parisian Commune from 1871, soviets in Russian revolutions from 1905 and 1917, as well as in

¹ See: A. Aulard, *Histoire Politique de la Révolution Française*, 5-e éd, (2e tirage), Paris 1921, 448 sqq.

² Hannah Arendt, *О револуцији. Одбрана јавне слободе (On Revolution. Defence of Public Liberties)*, Belgrade 1991, 206 sqq.

German revolution from 1918. Radical leftists are anarcho-syndicalists, a position occupied by the so-called "Working Opposition" in soviet Russia.

The extreme (communist) left took over the revolutionary ideology, and even the structure (soviets, etc.) from the radical left, but built upon them a totalitarian state apparatus in service of the party which declared itself as the "working class avant-garde", even though the avant-garde was comprised of professional revolutionists from all possible social layers. The communists did indeed battle most ferociously against the radical left, whose spiritual inheritance they adopted. The communists coined a name for the radical left, "ultra-left", in order to present themselves as the only righteous left. In the "Cronstadt uprising" from 1921 (which was completely kept back by the communist historiography) the Red Army ended in blood the uprising of the sailors who wanted to replace Lenin's, as they called it, "commesarocracy" with the working-syndicalist democracy. The destiny's irony is that those same sailors did bring down the Temporary government in October 1917 and brought the Leninists into power. The dualism of revolutionary democracy and revolutionary totalitarianism can be seen even in the first apostle of communism, Karl Marx. It is known that Marx celebrated the Parisian Commune of 1871 as the "finally discovered political form under which an economic liberation of work could be conducted". However, only two years later he returned to the concept of "proletariat dictatorship": "The workers must (...) act towards the most resolute centralization of authority in the hands of state power. They must not be seduced by democratic phrases about the freedom of municipalities, self-management, etc."³ The great Marx's opponent, Russian revolutionist and anarchist Mikhail Bakunin, called him a "pangermanist" and a big admirer of the banking family Rotschild, and further, "It may seem unusual. What can be common to communism and a huge bank? Oh! Marx's communism requires a powerful state centralization, and where such a thing exists, there must, today, exist a central bank..."⁴ Italian fascism and German national-socialism emulated the Russian communist totalitarian state.⁵

The notion "centre" firstly denotes certain party coalitions. The "left centre" is a coalition of moderate right and moderate left parties. It is, so to say, a German idiosyncrasy. The German constitution of 1919 was a joint venture of Socio-democratic party, German democratic party and the Roman Catholic Centrum (Christian People's Party). And as long as that so-called "Weimar Coalition" had the majority in the Central Parliament lasted the parliamentary allied republic, the "Weimar System". The Fundamental law in West Germany from 1949 is also a result of compromise between Demo-Christians and Social Democrats. The "right centre" is a coalition of moderate and radical right parties. In Europe today, it is rare because of the weakness of the radical right. Yet, it sometimes appears in former communist countries as anti-communist and anti-socialist coalitions that tend to liberate economic life with quickened measures. However, in Asia, where strong religiously fundamentalist parties represent the radical left, the "right centre" is not an exception. Let us mention, in relation to that, certain coalitions in Turkey and Israel. The "centre party" is a party which embraces the fractions of moderate right and moderate left,

³ Quoted in: H. Arendt, *ibid.*, 221.

⁴ M. Bakunin, *Staatlichkeit und Anarchie und andere Schriften*, herausg. v. H. Stuke, 1972, 399, 401.

⁵ A.J. Toynbee, *A Study of History*, VIII, 1965, 345, 395.

which gain advantage over each other depending on the historical circumstances. A striking example of this is the Democratic Party in the United States of America.

By shifting the characteristics within the types of right and left we come to a very important term of "populism". Populism can equally be right and left.

The right populism stands on the ground of free market game and private initiative which is characteristic of moderate right. However, its political regime responds to the request of the radical right, which is a strong government, and even dictatorship. In the 19th century, the competent type of this populism was the caesarism of the two Napoleons, the First and the Third, in France. The contemporary example of the right populism is the presidentialism of the United States of America. Among the first, it was H. Finer who pointed out how it is suggested to the American people that their president is "the greatest man in the world (...)with limited powers, but large potentialities".⁶ Yet, such a regime possesses an extraordinary flexibility, which is proven by its ability to transform itself into left populism in critical situations. For example, the "New Deal" of president F. D. Roosevelt, which was created after the economic breakdown in 1929.

The left populism takes over the basic socio-economic program of the moderate left: a liberal state of well-being. But again, the principle of authoritarian state from the radical right. A striking image of left populism is given by the government of general Peron in Argentina from 1936 to 1955. Russia and some of the former Soviet republics also lead such internal politics and have constitutions which fall into this form of populism.

The general cause for the student movements of 1968 was the simultaneous offensive of the left on the global stage and the conservatism of the working classes and established communist parties.

In the year 1968, the war in Vietnam was reaching its peak in which the communist North Vietnam alongside South Vietnamese partisans (Viet Cong) waged a war for national unification and social liberation against the military regime in South Vietnam and the biggest military force in the world, the United States of America. Although the USA fought most savagely and with the use of the most modern military engineering, it was obvious that they must lose that war because the North Vietnamese and the South Vietnamese partisans had controlled 75% of South Vietnamese territory since the end of 1964; the Americans and their allies were practically surrounded in big towns. Two large Portuguese colonies in Africa, Angola and Mozambique, were the sites of the battles for liberation between Portuguese fascists and partisan movements in which local communists played the most important role. In that 1968, the charismatic Indian prime minister, Indira Gandhi, stated in a session of UNCTAD (United Nations Conference for Trade and Development) in New Delhi that, unless the gap between the poor and the rich was not bridged, the poor people would be forced to make changes in a violent way.⁷ Some time earlier, the famous Cuban revolutionist Ernesto Che Guevara abandoned all of the positions in the Cuban socialist regime and left to create a new revolutionary core in the poor Bolivia, where he was captured and murdered in 1967 by the army and the CIA. Che Guevara would become a symbol and martyr of the student movements. The world was shaken by the "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" or shortly the "Cultural Revolu-

⁶ Finer, *The Theory and Practice of Modern Government*, II, London 1932, 1017.

⁷ After: E. Nolte, *Deutschland und der Kalte Krieg*, 2. Aufl., Stuttgart 1985, 534.

tion" which happened in 1966 in communist China. Its carriers were young people between 14 and 24 years of age, organised in "Red Guards". Their leader was, however, the president of the Communist party himself, Mao Zedong. With the help of anarchistic-totalitarian "red guards", Mao wanted to destroy the revisionists in the Communist party and state services at whose helm stood the president of the republic Liu Shao-chi, the "Chinese Khrushchev", but also the whole traditional Chinese culture with its guardians: small owners, intellectuals, Buddhist monks. Although the showdown methods applied by the red guards were horrible, the Maoists had a large number of supporters among the members of student movements and the "new left" in general, which consisted of both student movements and the movements which ensued them or were convergent to them. Those supporters were highly influenced by the revolutionary fervour, spontaneity and fanaticism of the red guards, as well as the fact that it was the case of the first communistic revolution in a communistic country against the red bureaucracy that turned into the ruling class as in other socialist countries. At the same time, in an indirect way, the majority of Arabs entered the upcoming left front. After World War Two, in the process of decolonisation, socialist regimes were established in the most populated Arab countries, that is, the regimes of one anti-colonial left populism: in Egypt, Syria, Iraq, South Yemen, Libya, Tunisia, Algeria. Those countries represented the significant axis of the Nonaligned Countries Movement, the Movement whose founder and biggest authority was Yugoslav president Tito. In the six-day war in 1967 Israel beat its Arab neighbours completely to a general surprise, occupying the rest of Palestine: the old part of Jerusalem, the West Bank of Jordan and the Gaza strip, where Palestinian Arabs banished from Israel and Palestine during the first Israeli-Palestinian war of 1948 dwelled. The Nonaligned Countries Movement condemned the occupation of Arab territories as Israeli aggression and Zionistic colonialism and accepted the Palestinian Liberating Organization as the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. Tito ended the diplomatic relations with Israel immediately after the cease-fire on 13th June 1967. Other communist regimes also took the Arab side. In that way, however, a new zone of tension was opened with the United States of America as the patron of Israel and other world centres of Zionism. At the completely opposite end of the upcoming leftist front was the "Prague Spring" of 1968. In Czechoslovakia, the bureaucratic leadership of the post-Stalinist type had to, mainly because of economic failures, give away the power to the reformist forces, which wanted to introduce socialistic market economy, freedom of thought and democracy within the party. However, the communists lost control over the events (they were incapable of standing up to the requests for the restoration of private property and political pluralism), so that the first hint of Gorbachev's "Perestroika and Glasnost" ended in August 1968 with the invasion of the military forces of the Warsaw pact with the Soviet Army at the forefront.

It was just that the bearer of all those world revolutionary shiftings was not the working class, but peasantry, intelligentsia, army as "armed people", as well as parts of traditional middleclass. The movements at the front of those shiftings differed greatly, even when they defined themselves as the supporters of "dictatorship of the proletariat", from the Bolshevik communist parties who recognized and accepted only themselves as the followers of revolutionary avant-garde and revolutionary orthodoxy. Thus came to life a **new historical subject** and a **new revolutionary avant-garde**. That change was best presented by the American Marxist and political theorist of German-Jewish origin, Her-

bert Marcuse. The first issue of his politically fundamental and for 1968 relevant book "One-Dimensional Man. Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society" was published in Boston in 1964, and it is stated in it that the "comfortable, friction-free, democratic intellectual non-freedom"⁸ rules in the developed industrial civilization. The people of that civilization, "sublimated slaves, but, nonetheless, still slaves"⁹, find their souls in their cars, and the levelling of class differences serves to sustain the existing status. The organized workmanship has long since made a "dishonest agreement" with the capital¹⁰, and that new status quo mocks every overcoming possibility with its strength. The hopes of the thinker cannot therefore, just like with Marx, be connected to the workmanship, but only to a "substrate of the rejected and the outsiders, the exploited and pursued of different colour and race, unemployed and unemployable", "beneath the surface of the conservative basis of people"¹¹, who cannot, though, conduct a revolution in Marx's sense, but represent in their own manner the "great rejection", which appears as the last shown form of negativity in an only positive, "one-dimensional" world. However, when the student revolution of 1968 eventually happened, Marcuse saw a new revolutionary avant-garde that should lead the working class in the international student movement: "The student opposition is one of the determined elements of the world today. It is not, however, a directly revolutionary force, but it is an impulse that could have been transformed into a revolutionary force. That is why one of the main strategic necessities of these years is the international connection of student oppositions. Yet, another more difficult and complex task which constantly binds the mind to revolution should be approached in the same way. The intellectual proletariat must find a common mind with the modern industrial proletariat. It must bring back to the working class the confidence in itself as a revolutionary class. The radical realization of socialism as an integral, spiritual, economic and political emancipation of man cannot and will not occur without that."¹² In the end, as the student movement ebbed, Marcuse would widen the notion of the new revolutionary avant-garde to the "new left" in whole: "When the New Left fights so energetically for the renewal of nature, for public parks and coasts, for the domain of peace; when it demands a new sexual morale and the liberation of women, then it fights against material relations which have been forced upon the people by the capitalist system and its reproduction."¹³

The position of the University of Belgrade students in relation to the contents of Marcuse's perceptions is depicted in a characteristic way by the following episode from the times of the 1968 June strike at the School of Law in Belgrade. One of the colleagues from the Action Board came to me with the following words: "Did you know that there is a philosopher living in America who thinks just like we do? His name is Marcuse. Interesting?!" In fact, the translation of his 1968 relevant book "One-Dimensional Man" was

⁸ H. Marcuse, *Der eindimensionale Mensch. Studien zur Ideologie der fortgeschrittenen Industriegesellschaft*, 3. Aufl., Neuwied/Berlin 1968, 21.

⁹ Marcuse, *ibid.*, 53.

¹⁰ Marcuse, *ibid.*, 14.

¹¹ Marcuse, *ibid.*, 267.

¹² H. Marcuse, *Студентска опозиција и револуција, Разлог 57*, (Student Opposition and Revolution, Razlog 57)1/1968–69, 11. Quoted in: П. Вранички, *Историја марксизма* (P. Vranicki, *A History of Marxism*), II, 5.ed., Zagreb 1987, 273.

¹³ X. Маркузе, *Контрреволуција и револт* (H. Marcuse, *Counterrevolution and Revolt*), Belgrade 1982, 22.

published in that same 1968 in Sarajevo. Earlier translations of his important works – "Mind and Revolution" (Sarajevo 1966) and the "Bible" of sexual revolution "Eros and Civilization" (Zagreb 1965) – did not garner the attention of the Belgrade student youth of that time. Thus, even though we did not read Marcuse, we **intuitively** knew that we were what we were: the new revolutionary avant-garde.

The student movement began in the United States of America as the core of youth movement against war and war crimes of the United States of America in Vietnam. Aside from demonstrations, it was the first that started to apply the "sit-in", that is, taking over of university buildings and other real estate and locking inside, which would later also be done in the European student movements. The first big "sit-in" happened at the University of California, Berkeley on 30th September and 1st October 1964, and the Academic Council at Berkeley took an attitude positive for the students on 8th December of the same year. However, the majority of the student movements in the United States of America did not have a revolutionary character; they did not want to change the regime, but the regime's policy. However, the situation with the Black youth movements, which were mobilized in the poor black ghettos of industrial cities, was completely different.

There was also a black student movement Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), which, having renounced its original orientation, vouched for uncompromising revolution and disrespect of white legislation. In 1966, one of its former presidents, Stokely Carmichael, introduced the concept of "Black Power" and tried to become connected with the organization Black Panthers, advocating even military actions.¹⁴ Black Muslims, an organization which originated in 1960, and which gathered ever more members, was revolutionary since it questioned the ruling Christian culture in America on racial grounds. In their view, the devil is white, and Christian religions were invented by the Jews as instruments of suppression, exploitation, and imperialism.¹⁵ Due to their insufficient political acuity, the charismatic head of a mosque in Harlem, Malcolm X, left Black Muslims, and went on to found an activist youth Organization of Afro-American Unity. While he was attempting to present his program in a rally, on 21 February 1965, he was shot by a person from the crowd. However, in spite of the short duration of his activities, Malcolm X became a cult personality for American black revolutionaries. Their enemy was the white landowner, landlord, white tradesman and white police officer.¹⁶ They were assisted by Cuba (indirectly by the Soviet Union), but mostly by the People's Republic of China – Maoist influence among them was indeed noticeable – for, at the time, China put in tremendous effort to be recognized as the leader and protector of all coloured nations.¹⁷ Their goal was to make an Afro-American nation and state in the United States of America, i.e. the division of this country into black and white parts. However, African Americans gave more support to the older reformist associations, such as the National Associa-

¹⁴ V.: M. Zubak, *Pripremanje terena: odjek globalnog studentskog bunta 1968. godine u jugoslavenskom omladinskom i studentskom tisku* (Preparing Grounds: the Impact of the Global Student Revolt in 1968 in Yugoslav Youth and Student Press), in: *1968 – četrdeset godina posle=1968 – Forty Years Later*. Proceedings, Belgrade 2008, 443.

¹⁵ On "Black Muslims" see: E. Lehnhoff, *Politische Geheimbünde*. Neu bearbeitet v. W. Gebühr, München/Wien 1968, 448 sqq.

¹⁶ R. Dunayevskaya, *Philosophy and Revolution. From Hegel to Sartre, and from Marx to Mao*, New York 1973, 271 sq.

¹⁷ Lehnhoff, op. cit., 449, note 3.

tion of the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), home to the charismatic Baptist preacher and Nobel peace prize laureate Martin L. King. His means in the fight for the equality of blacks included boycott, demonstrations and "freedom marches". Numerous white people joined in. He was assassinated at the peak of popularity, on 4 April 1968.

This was also the time of the rebellion of black youth. To crush these, in addition to police, the state had to use the army and the National Guard. Artillery pulled down entire blocks, which all resembled the Russian Revolution of 1905. When "order" was restored in Detroit in 1967, there were 43 people dead, around 1,500 wounded and 400 arrested.¹⁸ After the assassination of M.L. King, black rage boiled over once again. On 16 April 1968, the German General Consul reported from Chicago: "After three days of the heaviest black unrest, such as this town had not seen in decades, the result is: 12000 members of the National Guard and the Army concentrated in the city metropolitan area, ten people dead, 500 wounded, 3000 arrested, and hundreds of buildings burnt down."¹⁹ This aggressiveness of the authorities made Marcuse say that in the United States "a proto-fascist syndrome" could be found, and that "the entire complex of aggression and its victims points to a *par excellence* fascist potential."²⁰ The student movement in the United States cannot be well understood if not related to the hippie movement, a youth movement well past its zenith in 1968. However, a revolutionary political organization of the white youth which was active in the United States at the time, the Young International Party (YIP – hence the nick "yippies" for its members), attempted to integrate the hippies and the rebellious students into a global revolutionary movement of the young.²¹ The hippies were the representatives of a subculture and a counterculture, which they wished to show through their unconventional external looks. They preached pacifism (symbolically, they called themselves "flower children") and sexual revolution, i.e. the dismantling of the taboos imposed by the Christian sexual morality. Still, ever since World War One, sexual revolution had been supported by the powerful American film industry, and therefore this element of the hippie counterculture was linked to its strong commercial interest. Western student movements set up sexual revolution as one of its goals.

The student revolutionary movement in the Federal Republic of Germany also first appeared in the public in the form of questioning individual policies, not regimes. Its main venue was West Berlin Free University, whose students organized their first sit in on 22 and 23 June 1966, to express their concern over the "catastrophe in the education". Protests against the Vietnam war were still present on the fringes of the political life, and they were controlled by "old forces": senior protestant priests, leftist trade unions, and the German Peace Association. The first major expression of rage occurred during the demonstration against the United States and the Vietnam War, in Munich and Frankfurt, on 8 May 1967, one day before the anniversary of the German World War Two capitulation. In Munich, the demonstrators stopped in front of the United States Consulate General. Around one hundred persons breached the cordon of police officers protecting the Consulate, carrying the flags of Viet Cong and pictures of Marx and Mao Zedong, shelling the

¹⁸ Dunayevskaya, op. cit., 271.

¹⁹ Quoted in: G. Aly, *Unser Kampf 1968 – ein irritierter Blick zurück*, 2. Aufl., Frankfurt am Main 2008, 62.

²⁰ Marcuse, *Counterrevolution*, 30, 33.

²¹ Zubak, op. cit., 446.

policemen with eggs, stones, and packets of flour and paint. The demonstrators then burnt a straw doll, representing the Union president, Johnson. Four weeks later, on 2 June, there was a demonstration in West Berlin against the visit of the Iranian shah Mohhammad Reza Pahlavi to the divided German capital. In addition to Germans, Iranian students also participated, those whom the shah regime had forced to become political emigrants. Like Ataturk before him, the shah ran his policy in such a way as to modernize the state. Yet, contrary to Ataturk, he had strong and diversified opposition, which he mercilessly crushed. And while members of the shah's secret service (SAVAK), disguised as protesters hailing the shah, together with West Berlin police officers, among them also some former SS members and other Hitler's troops,²² used planks, metal clubs, and batons to chase away the demonstrators, a senior official of the Political Police (Section One), shot a student, protestant pacifist Benno Ohnesorg in the head, while he was lying on the ground, beaten by other police officers. The killer spent only four months in jail and, until his retirement in 1987, he continued working in West Berlin police. After the murder of Ohnesorg, the true confrontation of the students and the regime began. The students burnt the "yellow press", first of all the sensationalist Bild-Zeitung published by the Berlin concern Springer, raging against the demonstrators.

The Socialist German Student Alliance (Sozialistischer Deutscher Studentenbund, SDS) was to become the principal organization of West German revolutionary students. It was founded by the Socialdemocratic Party as its branch in higher education in 1946. In accordance with the Alliance Statute, its members had to advocate socialism. However, after the Federal Republic of Germany acceded to NATO and commenced "rearmament" in 1955, the Party and the Alliance began to distance themselves from one another. Socialdemocracy took the path of opportunism, i.e. support of the platforms which would attract as many voters as possible. This new orientation reached its peak in December 1966, when the first "grand coalition" of Demochristians and Socialdemocrats was made. However, the Socialist Student Alliance retained the markedly Marxist course. There would be an open breakup in November 1961, when the Socialdemocratic party adopted a resolution according to which simultaneous membership in the two organizations was impossible. Even before, the Party had founded another student association under its auspices, the Socialdemocratic Alliance of Higher Education (Sozialdemokratischer Hochschulbund, SHB), but this organization would also escape the custody of its party soon enough. After Ohnesorg was killed, the Socialist Student Alliance admitted a multitude of new members, and its heads became the unquestionable leaders of the student movement in the Federal Republic of Germany.

However, it was the Berlin student Rudi Dutschke, "the Red Dutschke", who would become the charismatic leader of the movement. An excellent student, eloquent and charming, and "ascetic" (he was an anti-alcoholic and a non-smoker), this exquisite pupil of Marcuse's had a rare gift in both revolutionary theory and contemporary revolutionary practice. His noted motto of a "long march through the institutions", that was first found in writing in an interview,²³ does not suggest any reformism, but modalities of a revolutionary struggle. In his view, in West Berlin political unrest should be increased

²² Aly, *op. cit.*, 27 sqq.

²³ *Der Spiegel*, 29/1967.

through student demonstrations and other manifestations. Students would need to link up with the workers from some companies and support wild strikes, where **soviets** would be spontaneously made. West Berlin should become politically independent from FR Germany, a kind of European Hong Kong, a revolutionary centrum of the Third World. A Central City Soviet would be founded, an "antiparliament", whose members would be permanently revocable.²⁴ In an article he published and signed "R.S.", Dutschke said that in the liberated West Berlin, where a civil-servant-free democracy of soviets would be established, "the parliament, parties, and executive" "would have to become permanently dismissed".²⁵ Dutschke therefore advocated a radical, not extreme left, regime; this is best seen in his cry for a "second revolution" in the German Democratic Republic, Eastern Europe, and the Soviet Union.²⁶ However, he saw himself and the movement he was leading as clearly a part of the global front of the advancing left, whose enemy was the "organized International of suppression, embodied by the North American United States."²⁷

There were preparations for Dutschke to be assassinated. On 6 February 1968, "Bild-Zeitung" published the headline: "Stop Red Youth Terror", along with Dutschke's photo. Five weeks later, on 11 April, a manual labourer fired three shots at Dutschke, shouting "You, repulsive communist swine!". Dutschke fell, heavily wounded, and never recovered; he died on the Christmas Eve in 1979. The series of assassinations is suggestive: a few days earlier, on 4 April, Martin L. King was assassinated, and on 5 June 1968, the same year, the most likely future president of the United States, advocate of rights of black people, R. Kennedy was also mortally wounded. As it may be, those who organized political assassinations from the hidden background know better than many historians and sociologists that there are no successful historical movements, especially **revolutions**, without **big charismatic leaders**. To destroy the big leader means to kill a movement, revolution, except if another big leader takes the former leader's place. After Dutschke was removed, in spite of some more spectacular actions, the student movement in West Germany dwindled – it had no true leader. The Socialist Student Association was in serious debts; its creditors overburdened it with lawsuits – also a method of political liquidation in plutocratic regimes – and the association was formally discontinued on 21 March 1970 in Frankfurt. The student movement would break down to a series of reformist movements, to become reunited into the Green Party, another satellite of Socialdemocracy in 1980.

In France, the country of "old" revolutions, there was not only a student revolutionary movement, which largely looked up to the revolutionary movement of West German students. Rather, in May 1968, a true student socialist revolution broke out;²⁸ in addition to students, workers also jointed in and started a general strike, occupying factories, so that a temporary "collapse of the system" occurred.

The remarkable speed and also the "short breath" of Paris student revolution is noticeable. (I say "Paris students", because in France a maximal political, administrative and

²⁴ V.: Aly, op. cit., 43, 96 sqq.

²⁵ Oberbaumblatt. 12.6.1967.

²⁶ R. Dutschke, Jeder hat sein Leben ganz zu leben. Die Tagebücher 1963–1979, Köln 2003, 53.

²⁷ G. Salvatore/R. Dutschke, Einleitung zu Che Guevara, Schaffen wir zwei, drei, viele Vietnam. Brief an das Exekutivsekretariat von OSPAAL, Berlin 1967, 3.

²⁸ On 1968 "student revolution" in France also in: Nolte, op. cit., 509.

cultural centralization had been carried out, so that students of other French universities were mere lookers on, who mainly mimicked their colleagues from the capital). While student commotion in Berkeley and West Berlin took some years, in Paris, the student revolutionary movement persevered for no longer than two months.²⁹

The chain of events leading to the student revolutionary movement began at the Faculty of Humanities (Faculté des lettres) in the Paris suburb of Nanterre. It was an ugly building, more akin to an American automobile factory than a traditional university facility. The Nanterre Faculty was founded by the state only to reduce the pressure imposed on the Faculty of Humanities downtown Paris, Sorbonne, and also to reduce the number of students studying philosophical disciplines; the exams were eliminatory; a student who failed would have no further right to study. The principal reason for the strike of students from Nanterre, which began on 23 November 1967, were pleas for study reforms. To be true, professors themselves considered the eliminatory exam model too strict, so that in the meantime they introduced the practice of taking exams partially. However, students, led by those from the Sociology Department, requested much more, including the right to take part in the Faculty Management, with the right to be listened to, to participate in the discussions, to seek clarifications. Those requests, not supported by students from other departments (French, geography, living foreign languages), were aimed at the Ministry of National Education, after which the strike was over. However, the Ministry did not respond at all. Naturally, this did not please the insurgents. The tension was boosted by the rumour that there were secret police in the Faculty building and that there were "black lists" with the names of students who took part in the political upheaval.

The student revolutionary movement in France cannot be separated from a name: Daniel Cohn-Bendit, nicknamed "Red Dani". A German national of Jewish descent, Cohn-Bendit studied sociology in Nanterre and spoke perfect French, which was a prerequisite for his success as an orator; he had the ability to produce a speech filled with vigour and then becalm his tone and analyze facts in cold blood. When addressing opponents, he was full of rage, "holy wrath" and acrid, whether the discussion was about the military and industrial complex of the United States with regard to the Vietnam War, or technocracy ("organized capitalism" or "monopolist capitalism"), whether he discussed the police, whose members French revolutionary students called the SS (the parole was: CRS=SS), or the leadership of the French Communist Party. The following episode made Cohn-Bendit particularly famous. The Minister of Youth and Sports, Missoffe, came to the Nanterre Faculty to officially open a swimming pool for students in 1968. On that occasion, Cohn-Bendit asked him why his "Youth White Book" had nothing on sexuality problems. The Minister responded that the interpellant could satisfy his desires in the swimming pool. Having heard this, Cohn-Bendit called the minister a "fascist". For this reason a procedure was initiated to expel Cohn-Bendit from the university, but, since this was a foreign student, the Minister also vouched that the procedure be halted. Cohn-Bendit had the ability to gather and activate the crowd, but he was not a revolutionary leader. He was rather an "**animator**", similar to his contemporary, Belgrade philosophy student Vladimir Mijanovic ("Vlada the Revolution"). A revolutionary leader must have his own political worldview, which he wishes to carry out through the revolution. Cohn-

²⁹ V.: A. Touraine, *Le mouvement de mai ou le Communisme utopique*, Paris, 1968, 108 sqq.

Bendit had no political program, for him, the revolution was a destructive, but not a creative act. Moreover, he openly opposed individual attempts to constitute the student movement as a separate revolutionary political organization.³⁰ The French Communist Party journal *Humanité* attacked Cohn-Bendit on 3 May 1968, calling him a "German anarchist". However, this spoke too highly of him, since principal anarchist schools have constructive political programs. Cohn-Bendit was more likely a political nihilist. When the revolutionary turmoil stifled in France, he started looking benevolently at the German city guerrilla. He was present at the trial of the anarcho-terrorist organization Red Army Fraction (Rote Armee Fraktion, RAF) in Frankfurt in October 1968. When the verdict was being read, he remarked, aiming at the council of judges: "It is the student court that is competent for all persons indicted!" For this, he was sentenced to three days in prison for disrupting order in the courtroom.³¹ He eventually settled down in the Green Movement, as did many politicians from nineteen sixty eight.

The revolutionary movement of students in Paris, who started calling themselves the "Movement of 22th March" because on that day in 1968, 142 students invaded an administration building at Nanterre University, began gaining momentum during the "Night of the Barricades." After the police had thrown them primarily out of Nanterre and then out of Sorbonne, the revolutionary students started chopping down tree trunks in the city centre and putting up barricades in order to create something that could be labelled a "free territory"; at the same time, they began pulling up paving stones in order to fight the police. Significantly, the regime refused to begin any kind of negotiations with the student movement and wanted to suppress it with mere police force. At 2 am, on 10th May 1968, the police attacked the students using tear gas and batons. The captured students were beaten in police stations. However, the violence expressed towards these students raised the whole left on their feet. On the same day, the labour unions reached a decision concerning the beginning of a general strike, which was set to start on 13th May. This day also saw the demonstrations of solidarity with the students, which gathered around a million people. The regime had to yield. The students occupied Sorbonne and transformed it into a kind of an anti-parliament, workers occupied their factories and journalists working at the national radio and television (ORTF) launched a strike, refusing to let the political factors interfere with information broadcast. Moreover, there was a disagreement between the Government and the police labour unions. The movement of 22th March was joined by some smaller communist groups, Maoists and Trotskyites. Communist intellectuals also decided to join the Movement. On the other hand, the Communist Party of France and the pro-communist labour union *Confédération générale du travail* (CGT) acted differently. These were hardened bureaucratic organizations that had lost their revolutionary character long ago and, just like socialist and social-democratic parties after World War One, become class-reformist. This is why the students and their allies tried to evade arrangements with them and tried to use the direct contact with workers for the purpose of drawing the Communist Party members towards them. The Party was not only hostile towards the Movement, but also betrayed them. Only five days after the launch of the general strike, on 18th May, *Humanité* attacked Cohn-Bendit once again. Afterwards, the

³⁰ Touraine, *ibid*, 193.

³¹ V.: B. Peters, *RAF. Terrorismus in Deutschland*, Stuttgart 1991, 56 sq.

communist leaders started negotiating the holding of an early parliamentary election with the Government and the President of the Republic, de Gaulle; in return, they demanded some privileges for workers. Jean-Paul Sartre, the great French writer and thinker who had taken the students' part, accused the French communist party for the "objective collaboration with de Gaulle; demanding an early election, they were doing each other favours"³². On 29th May, the intellectually prominent members of the Communist Party sent a letter to the Central Committee criticizing their attitude towards the students. The early parliamentary election was held (the first round on 23rd and the runoff on 30th June) and the leftist parties were routed; the voters punished their betrayal. During June and July, the situation was "normalized": many students were arrested, journalists fired, revolutionary movements disbanded. However, the haughty general de Gaulle, could not get over the insults that had been aimed at him – the demonstrating crowd was shouting "de Gaulle – fascist." He resigned in 1969 and died in 1970.

Nevertheless, even if the betrayal of the communist bureaucracy had not happened, the student revolution in France could not have won. The reasons for this can be found in the facts that they did not have a leader or a political program. If we read the revolutionary student graffiti, we cannot see how "the City of the Sun" should look like: "Bourgeois revolution was legal, proletarian revolution was economic. Our revolution is cultural"; "The revolution that is beginning will not only question capitalist society, but the industrial one as well. Consumer society will have to die a violent death. The society of self-alienation must be wiped out of history. We are discovering a new and original world. Imagination will come to power"; "I declare the state of permanent happiness"; "It is forbidden to forbid".³³ The demand for the establishment of self-management was not performed by the French students, but by workers.³⁴

There are two key phenomena that influenced the beginning and the course of the revolutionary process at Belgrade University in this period: the fall of the second most important figure in the Yugoslav regime, the vice-president of the Republic, Aleksandar Rankovic and the influence of a group of professors and teaching assistants of Belgrade Faculty of Philosophy, gathered around "Praxis", a philosophy journal published in Zagreb – a group named "the Praxis group". These were Mihailo Markovic, Zagorka Golubovic, Ljubomir Tadic, Miladin Zivotic, Svetozar Stojanovic, Dragoljub Micunovic, Nebojsa Popov and Trivo Indjic.³⁵ Later on, Mihailo Djuric also became a member of the Praxis editorial board, but due to his non-Marxist views, he could not be considered a member of "the Praxis group".

Aleksandar Rankovic was in charge of personnel policies of the Communist Alliance of Yugoslavia and was the informal chief of the political police named Udba, for Serbia, as Udba was led by people very close to him; after all, before that, he himself had been the chief of Udba. He was forced to resign from all of his positions when, in June-July 1966, the party leadership accused him of using police methods to tap President Tito.

³² Der Kommunismus. Von Marx bis Mao Tse-tung. Herausg. v. I. Fetscher/G. Dill, München/Wien/Basel 1969, 167.

³³ E.-M. Claassen/L.-F. Peters, Rebellion in Frankreich. Die Manifestation der europäischen Kulturrevolution 1968, München 1968, 118, 144 sqq.

³⁴ Touraine, op. cit., 143, 167 sq., 175.

³⁵ See.: M. Marković, Juriš na nebo. Sećanja, I, (Attack on the Skies: Memories), Belgrade, 2008, 114.

However, Rankovic was completely loyal to Tito and it has been proved that the tapping accusations were totally groundless. Rankovic instead was a victim of the conspiracy created by two high officials of the party: Edvard Kardelj, a Slovene and Ivan Krajacic–Stevo, a Croat.³⁶ Rankovic, a Serb and a Serbian in the ruling circle, along with Tito, were the pillars of stable Yugoslavia and this made Rankovic the target of separatists. When Tito realized that he had been deceived, he was terribly sad that he let Rankovic fall.³⁷ However, Rankovic also represented the greatest obstacle for the establishment of socialist democracy in Yugoslavia.

In the programme of the Alliance of Communists of Yugoslavia in 1958 and in the Constitution of SFR of Yugoslavia in 1963, Tito created a dual regime. On the one hand, he established an integral self-management system consisting of a number of enterprises and institutions and of assembly councils, being a sort of a soviet system. At the same time, the Constitution guaranteed freedom of individuals and citizens and freedom of personal work "to a limit and on conditions prescribed by the law", as well as the right to private property, thus confirming the existence of civil society. On the other hand, the Communist Alliance remained untouched, being an organization whose ruling circles consisted of bureaucracy that did not differ much from party bureaucracies in other totalitarian regimes ruled by the extreme left. These two systems, the former belonging to the ideology of the radical left and the latter belonging to the ideology of the extreme left, could not function independently from one another. This in turn opened two options that excluded each other. The first one was the idea that self-management should become the ruling political process and that the Communist Alliance should be transformed into a **movement** within this process, which all included the destruction of the party's bureaucracy or "anti-bureaucratic revolution". The second option was that the Communist Alliance stayed the same, which would in turn make self-management lose its political character and place it within narrow class-labour union frames. Obviously, Tito was cautiously testing the possibility of introducing the radical left regime; I say "cautiously" as he wanted to avoid the revival of liberal political pluralism, especially proved by his clash with Djilas starting from 1954. In spite of this, Rankovic was the defender of the existing regime of the extreme left. Petranovic, a historian, claims that "there is a possibility that Rankovic believed that the conflict with the "Russians" ended with Belgrade and Moscow declarations and this made the retaining of the old regime possible"³⁸ This possibility is confirmed by the reading of Rankovic's "Diary Notes". In them, one can see that they are written by a bureaucrat and police officers involved in various "courtly" affairs, who did not have enough "time" for democracy.

An average Serb received the news about the fall of Rankovic and Udba with pleasure. People living in villages were especially happy about this, as they simply could not forgive them the terror they went through during the forced purchase and collectivization in the initial period of the existence of "the people's rule". Everyone seemed to feel better for being allowed to talk about political issues without fear. The beginning of 1966/67 aca-

³⁶ See: A. Ranković, *Dnevničke zabeleške* (Minutes from a Diary), Belgrade 2001, 35 sqq., 152 sqq., 162 sqq., 268 sqq.

³⁷ V.: V. Cenčić, *Titova poslednja ispovijest* (Tito's Last Confession), Cetinje/Belgrade 2001, 41, 52, 58, 158.

³⁸ B. Petranović, *Istorija Jugoslavije 1918-1988, III: Socijalistička Jugoslavija 1945-1988* (The History of Yugoslavia 1918-1988, III: The Socialist Yugoslavia 1945-1988), Belgrade 1988, 387.

demic year at Belgrade's School of Law set a new standard for the operation of main organizations involved in the Communist Alliance; their meetings now included debates on social issues without any hesitations. Moreover, these debates were better than the ones at the Federal parliamentary sessions. This is how they created a specific spiritual climate for 1968.

"Praxis" journal started coming out in 1964 and had a national and an international volume. At the same time, starting from 1963, the "Korcula Summer School" starting being held – this was a semi-formal meeting of Marxist philosophy authors from Yugoslavia and abroad that was public and thus included students and journalists. "Praxis" editors were also publishing papers presented at "the School". The leading thought that kept "the Praxis group" together was the idea that Marxist philosophy is actually a **revolutionary praxeology**; this is what gave the journal its name – "Praxis". In the introduction to the first issue, which explained the purpose of the journal (*A quoi bon Praxis?*), the members of the editorial board say: "We want a philosophy magazine in the sense that philosophy is the merciless critique of everything existing, a humanist vision of a truly humane world and an inspirational force of the revolutionary action." (*Ce que nous désirons, c'est une revue philosophique dans le sens où la philosophie est la pensée de la révolution: la critique impitoyable de tout ce qui existe, la vision humaniste d'un monde vraiment humain, et la force inspiratrice de l'action révolutionnaire.*)³⁹ The idea that philosophy is "the merciless critique of everything existing" and "an inspirational force of the revolutionary action" had to bring "the Praxis group" in collision with the Communist Alliance, who, in the first principles of 1963 Constitution, defined themselves as follows: "The Communist Alliance, with its directional ideological and political efforts, in the conditions of democracy and social self-management, represents the main starting device of the political activity which protects and further develops the inherited foundations of the social revolution and social relations, and especially of the strengthening of the socialist public and democratic conscience of the people." Thus, they were in collision not only with the party bureaucracy, but also with the Communist Alliance as a whole. Therefore, "the Praxis group" wanted to establish themselves as a political force. However, there were very few of them to face Communist Alliance. All they could do was see themselves as a "central committee" needing a massive basis. They sought this basis in the student movement. This is why "the Praxis group" largely contributed to the affirmation of the student movement and their promotion in public; they, at the same time, ruined this movement.

Belgrade student movement started at Belgrade Faculty of Philosophy. To a certain degree, a "midwife" of this movement was the regime itself, because they organized protests against Vietnam War, as Tito supported the non-aligned North Vietnam in their fight against the United States of America. An official anti-war meeting was held on 23 December 1966, at Belgrade University. After the meeting ended, a group of students, one of whose leaders was Vladimir Mijanovic (nicknamed "Vlada the Revolution"), the future president of the Student League Faculty Committee of Belgrade Faculty of Philosophy, attempted to organize a protest walk to the American Cultural Centre and the Embassy of the United States of America. The police prevented them from doing so, using batons. This was followed by a riot around the University Headquarters. After, on that occasion,

³⁹ Praxis. Revue philosophique. Ed. internationale, 1965, 1^{ère} année, n° 1, 4.

the police broke into the Faculty of Philosophy, a number of Student League and Communist Alliance members officially protested because of the violation of University autonomy. The regime, however, decided to run an internal investigation, which included a number of severe disagreements between the party's University leaders and some members of the Communist Alliance fractions belonging to Philosophy and Sociology Departments – exactly those departments that included Belgrade's section of "the Praxis group". Aleksandar Kron, an outsider, was marked as the protest organizer and leader of critics, and was punished by being expelled from the Communist Alliance. Nevertheless, the group of students gathered around Mijanovic continued organizing protest manifestations: against political persecution performed by the Greek military junta, against crushing the student protests in Poland, against West German anti-student State of Emergency Law and Dutschke's assassination attempt (in front of the Embassy of FR Germany). The meeting of student members of the Communist Alliance held on 20 March 1968 in Belgrade's new city Studentski Grad (Student Campus) indicates that something much more serious was being prepared. In a very tense atmosphere, one of the participants proposed an action which would involve breaking "some windows of some nice buildings" in order to call the attention to students' problems.⁴⁰

This action took place on 2 June 1968. It opened a straight way towards the establishment of Belgrade students' revolutionary movement. A large group of students wanted to attend the "Friendship Caravan" that was organized at Workers' University that was located just across the land where the Campus facilities were located. Workers' University auditorium had 400 seats only and they were reserved for the brigadiers – voluntary physical labourers, who were staying in a settlement near the Campus. When the watchmen tried to stop the students and other "citizens" (most probably the so-called "illegals" – the illegal inhabitants of students' dormitory) from entering the building, they tried to break in by force. The fight broke out around 8 pm. Very soon, a patrol vehicle with three police officers arrived, but they could not establish order. An hour later, a fight involving the use of laths and stones culminated. The performance was interrupted. Around 10 pm another forty police officers arrived, now wearing helmets and driving firetrucks, and used batons and hoses to disperse students and other "citizens". Nonetheless, the number of students started increasing. A "militant group", led by Vladimir Mijanovic⁴¹ captured a firetruck and drove them towards the centre of the Campus, while the police remained near Workers' University. Whether the riot was spontaneous or programmed by "Vlada the Revolution" is still an unanswered question. Around midnight, in the summer heat, in Studentski grad, there were around three thousand students in the open. They reached an agreement about going to Belgrade and handing their demands to the MPs. One can easily notice the high moral conscience of these student demonstrators. Although they were in a conflict with the police, they denounced the ones who had robbed a store placed near the Campus.⁴² In Paris, the revolutionary students let young criminals join them, as they

⁴⁰ B. Kanclajter/K. Stojaković, „1968" u Jugoslaviji – Studentski protesti između Istoka i Zapada, (1968 in Yugoslavia: Student Protest Between the East and the West), in: 1968, op. cit., 470, note 73.

⁴¹ Marković, op. cit., 55.

⁴² N. Popov, Društveni sukobi – Izazov sociologiji (Social Conflicts – a Challenge to Sociology), 2nd ed., Belgrade 1990, 16, note 13.

considered these criminals victims of the "social disorganization".⁴³ Near "the Underpass" (a landmark that no longer exists), a passage under the Belgrade-Zemun railway, the student column was stopped by much stronger police forces, got dispersed and driven back into the Campus. At 4 am, the Campus public-address announced that the Action Committee of the demonstration had been formed and at 8.15 am another meeting started, reaching a decision to start going towards Belgrade city centre once again. However, near the Underpass, the column of students was once again intercepted by strong police forces; moreover, the road was now blocked with trucks and a freight train manoeuvred above the Underpass in order to prevent crossing the railway. Now, they were joined by politicians, professors sociopolitical workers – a group of them was with the students and another group was placed behind the police cordon. The students, carrying Tito's photo, the state and party flag and singing the anthem and the Internationale, started carrying signs and shouting slogans, some of which had a loyalist character ("Tito – the Party!"), while others were packed with critical and revolutionary tones: "Do we have the Constitution?", "Students – Workers!", "Down with the socialist bourgeoisie!". Primarily, negotiations about letting the students pass into Belgrade began. However, when the students' pressure onto the police cordon increased, the Republic Secretary of Internal Affairs, Slavko Zecevic, and the City Chief of Internal Affairs, Nikola Bugarcic, ordered the police to use batons to disperse the demonstrators.⁴⁴ According to the health-care facilities records⁴⁵, the number of the injured on 2 June and 3 June was 169 – 134 of these were students, 21 were police officers, 9 were brigadiers and 5 were citizens. After receiving the appropriate medical assistance, 12 people were kept in hospital, and three days later only eight of them remained – 6 students, 1 police officer and 1 citizen. Serbian police was not exceedingly harsh; in any case, it was much less harsh than West German or French Police. The students kept in custody were soon released and were not maltreated in police stations. For the purpose of comparison, I would like to mention that in Mexico, a country ruled by a regime similar to the one in the United States of America, students demonstrating on 2 October 1968, in the wake of the Olympic Games, had to face military forces in tanks, five hundred of them being killed. Afterwards, the Olympics were held as if nothing had happened.

The morning of 3 June was a peaceful one at Faculties in Belgrade. I had an exam in Socio-political systems. Before that, I had been listening to the radio; Radio Belgrade had a report on Novi Beograd riot, one could not grasp the exact state of things from this report. When the colleagues living in Student Campus arrived to School of Law, we got to know that what we had long been waiting for had finally begun. With another student leader, I immediately entered a taxi and took a roundabout way, over Zemun, to the Student Campus. There was a multitude of injured and exhausted colleagues, and they were resting in nearby lawns. The orderlies recognized us and immediately took us to the room in which student representatives talked to Milos Minic, Serbian Parliament Speaker, Branko Pesic, Belgrade Mayor, and Petar Stambolic, Serbian Communist Alliance Central Committee President. Minic had bruises and was in bandages; he did not manage to

⁴³ Touraine, *op. cit.*, 152.

⁴⁴ I. Miladinović, 1968. *Poslednji veliki san*, (The Ultimate Big Dream), Belgrade 2008, 47 sqq.

⁴⁵ Popov, *op. cit.*, 18, note 17.

escape the batons, either. Later on, a police chief, who took part in the event, made the case clear to me. His words go: "Milos Minic was the most repulsive for us. As the highest representative of government in Serbia, he ordered the police to stop in front of the Underpass and not to allow students into Belgrade. When we started beating students, he stood before us and asked who ordered this. We pretended not to know him and beat him the way only we, police officers, can!" Three high officials opted for the following cast: Minic minced and chose to side with the students. Branko Pesic, a leader of World War Two guerrilla in Zemun ("the written-off group") was "angry" and threatened he would not allow the demolition of Belgrade. When a student made a remark, he stood up and picked a fight with him. Pera Stambolic, with his fat and expressionless face, attempted a manoeuvre to lead students to a different track: "Those to blame for your difficulties are craftsmen who have become overly rich. Recently you have been able to read in the papers about this craftsman from Mostar. But, we, communists, we will eradicate this evil." I spoke to myself: "It's not the private craftsmen that are to blame, it's the ones like you."

In the afternoon the same day, the University Council convened. They supported student requests and, as of 4 June, declared a seven-day strike at Belgrade University. On the night of 3 and 4 June, students gathered in their faculties, held meetings, elected action boards, convened sessions. Near the faculties, police units were located so as to prevent masses from rallying in the open air. The only piece of the "open air" was found at the Faculty of Philosophy, along with its beautiful and spacious venue, Captain Misa's House, where student's gatherings took place, along with cultural events, since Belgrade artists sided with the students. Students also visited enterprises, to establish contacts with workers, and workers visited faculties, too. However, those contacts were encumbered because the regime set up "workers' guards" to hamper them. Yet, those students in the building were supplied with food and refreshment (alcohol was not allowed!) by nearby shops, free of charge. "Take it, children, you are fighting for all of us now!" The so-called social, purely professional-interest-based student requests were not very important, they were just there to "make the front broader", to deepen the cleft between the movement and the regime.

However, the movement and its organization were not made only of students. At Belgrade School of Law, the Assemblage, the supreme political body of the Faculty, did not only include students, but also professors, associate professors, and teaching assistants. Assemblage meetings were presided by the Action Board made up of eight members, where four came from among students, and four were made up of professors and assistants, as follows: students – 1 third year student, 1 fourth year student, 1 student who had taken all undergraduate courses and had only one or two exams till graduation, 1 post-graduate student; the faculty: 1 teaching assistant, 1 assistant professor, 1 associate professor, 1 full professor. In the Action Board, there were two professors, most fervent critics of the regime: Stevan Vracar and Mihailo Djuric. They rarely spoke in public, but they chaired the sessions of the Action Board and their word was to be the last. What they agreed on would soon become the position of the Action Board. Others did not mind this. These two professors were role models and a serious authority for us, and we were honoured to cooperate with them. The situation must have been similar in other faculties. In any case, "the Praxis group" fully controlled the movement at the Faculty of Philosophy.

Our enemy was the party bureaucracy, the "apparatus" of the Communist Alliance, the "red bourgeoisie", as we called them. Since its members, mimicking one another, usually

had expensive French cars, "Peugeot", we scorned them and called them "Peugeoisie". We did not deny the state and self-governing ruling structures, nor the Communist Alliance as such. We were against the so-called "democratic" centralism, i.e. the rights of committees as central bodies of "the red bourgeoisie" to order about to its members in bottom-level organizations. At a meeting of the Party at the School of Law, I retorted to an assistant professor, V.P. She was the most fervent guardian of the interests of party bureaucracy in our area. I said to her that if certain Party members could not reach an agreement over an issue, they should address the Assemblage and start a discussion there. Assemblages, as venues of free political discussion, were the student movement's contribution to the theory and practice of political systems. At one point, during the strike, in the packed auditorium number five, the assistant professor Aleksandar-Sasa Stojanovic took the floor and said, supported by ovations: "The Assemblage, this is a new form of dictatorship of the proletariat!"

Since the Faculty of Philosophy was within the focus of the controlled media, the regime felt the most danger came from over there. One night, I went to their "convent" to get some personal impressions. In the auditorium, the floor was taken by some pretty slobby and uneducated fellows who vouched for "**complete**" equality in socialism. The moderator was professor Svetozar Stojanovic, who proposed on June 4 that Belgrade University should be renamed "Karl Marx Red University". I expected that Stojanovic would somehow oppose them. Instead, he even supported their Maoism. That Maoism was one of the central ideal and political currents at the Faculty of Philosophy I realized a bit later, at a convention of student representatives in the grand hall of the Faculty of Engineering. To the surprise of all, the representative of the Faculty of Philosophy said there that in socialism private property should be fully cancelled! Let us hear Svetozar Stojanovic himself. In his words, the 1968 June movement favoured the continuity of the social revolution, it was "spontaneous, democratic and communistic in nature" and, as such, it opposed the etatist forces, under whose influence "all proclaimed reforms result in mere reorganisation" and it also opposed petty bourgeoisie, making a fetish out of the storm in the market.⁴⁶ Without some kind of private property and market "storm" there is no liberty. A society in which planned order reigns soon becomes a military barracks. Egalitarian Maoism was one of the major deviations of a part of our student revolutionary movement. At a meeting discussing social inequality in socialism, organized by the University Committee of Belgrade Communist Alliance, on 25 April and 14 May 1968, a person named Bube Rakic said: " Let this be a total levelling of everything. If we cannot make a system which would distribute social wealth more evenly, we had better stick to egalitarianism. I would opt for a handful of rice for all, not for the situation in which someone can eat caviar, and someone else must stick to rice."⁴⁷

The second drawback of our revolutionary movement was its **lack of leader**. This is why the movement was not unified enough, and with no serious chance to succeed. However, the leader emerged, but failed to be recognized.

⁴⁶ After: Popov, *ibid.*, 15, note 8.

⁴⁷ Quoted in: M. Arsić/D.R. Marković, '68. Studentski bunt i društvo (68: Student Revolt and Society), 2. ed., Novi Beograd 1985, 66.

During the university strike, the regime worked vehemently. In the City Committee building, at the Student Square, a "crisis headquarters" was in constant session. Its most relevant members included Edvard Kardelj, Petar Stambolic, Milos Minic, and Simeon Zatezalo. They even considered the idea of gathering retired police officers and secret service officials into squads to take over faculties.⁴⁸

During this time, the first in the line of command, Tito, followed up on the situation, took some "quiet" steps on the political chessboard, and did not speak in public. As one of the biggest revolutionaries in the world, he was fully aware that what had started here was a revolution. He was not a de Gaulle type reactionary, and therefore he considered the odds that he could stand at the front of the revolution, get rid of party bureaucracy, in particular of Kardelj,⁴⁹ and make a new Communist Alliance with the students. **The School of Law in Belgrade was to have a central role in this "second revolution"**. Tito's most trusted men were red soldiers, fighters from the Spanish civil war and World War Two top generals, widely labelled "heroes of the people". Without the Spanish soldiers, he could not have started the 1941 uprising nor won in the war in Yugoslavia. It is suggestive that before the end of the war, in 1945, all four commanders of Tito's armies were former fighters from Spain: K. Popovic, P. Dapcevic, K. Nadj, and P. Drapsin. Tito often sent Spanish fighters and heroes of the people to our Faculty to talk to professors and students. Among others, these emissaries included: Veljko Vlahovic, man number three in the Communist Alliance, Vlajko Begovic, Branko Jevremovic, and Milinko Djurovic. There were others, too, but I did not know them, and I cannot remember their names. I add that, practically all along, professor Miroslav Peculjic was with us, and he was a major Serbian political essayists and member of the Executive Committee of the Central Committee of Yugoslav Communist Alliance. At an Assemblage, the hero of the people Milinko Djurovic ended his speech with the words: "As we fought against the old bourgeoisie once, when we were young, now you are fighting against the new, red bourgeoisie!" If this revolution had succeeded, history would have made another turn: more to the left.

On 9 June 1968, Tito chaired the joint session of the Presidency and the Executive Committee of the Central Committee of Yugoslav Communist Alliance. Having remarked that the "volcanic explosion of unrest" showed that party leaders might be "blown away from their comfortable chairs",⁵⁰ without an explanation, Tito left to give his famous speech on TV. The broadcast started at 8 pm the same day, and we watched it on a TV installed in the auditorium number five. Tito supported students and their requests, saying, among other things: "This time I promise to students that I will whole-heartedly strive to find a solution, and students should help me with this (!). Moreover, if I am not capable of solving such issues, I should no longer stay in this position. I think that not a single older communist, any of them, anyone having the mindset of a communist, should insist on staying on their position, but should rather give those positions to people capable of solving problems." He also added: "And I also wish to say that I am happy to have such a youth, a youth which has shown itself to be mature. Here, the latest development in the

⁴⁸ Marković, op. cit., 45 sq.

⁴⁹ V.: Cenčić, op. cit., 59 sqq., 159 sqq., 296 sqq. Ranković, op cit., 125 sqq.

⁵⁰ Kanclajter/Stojaković, op. cit., 454 sq.

universities has shown that 90 percent students are our real socialist youth, who won't let themselves be poisoned, not allowing various supporters of Djilas, of Rankovic, of Mao Zedong or the like to use a pretext of worrying for the students, and to actually attempt to fulfil their own goals."⁵¹ There was euphoria after this speech, especially since we had by then feared that the police would enter the building and beat up whoever was in their way; actually, just before and during the speech, the police discreetly retreated. The teaching assistants, sitting in the front rows, started singing and dancing the partisan dance of Mt. Kozara. The strike was with it over. I expected that now the goals it had begun for would start coming true. This is why tomorrow I was appalled by the news that the Faculty of Philosophy did not accept Tito's speech and that they would continue their strike. This broke down the student movement, and pushed Tito back into the alliance with the bureaucracy, indeed the worst bureaucracy for the Serbian people – the separatists. The former Praxis group member, academician Mihailo Markovic, would say forty years later: "It became gradually clear that Tito's speech of 9 June had been a big deception. It was a masterpiece of Machiavellian politics."⁵² This claim is sheer mystification. How could the Praxis group members know that Tito's speech was a fraud the following morning already? The truth is simple: they recognized themselves as the ones "poisoning" the students, as those Tito would not talk to, and started acting like enraged losers – irrationally and self destructively.

Every major revolution is a social contract. Up until 19th century there was a general position that the state was made up through social contract. The position was abandoned after the irrefutable claims of Hegel, the historical school of law and positivism that the state was a result of historical processes. However, the social contract concept has a "healthy core", a key to the explanation of the idea of grand revolutions. The middleclass revolution is a social contract in which a nation adopts the declaration of rights and freedoms of man and citizen. This declaration is the text of the contract. The socialist revolution is a solidarity pact between the working class and the radical intelligentsia as their avant-garde. However, since this avant-garde had identified itself with the regime apparatus and thus become bureaucratized, there was a need for a new intellectual avant-garde to replace the old, and become a party in a social contract with the working classes. This was the meaning behind Belgrade University students' motto "Students – Workers!". However, the only possible intermediary in the conclusion of this new social contract could have been the grand revolutionary leader, he who had unlimited dictatorial power and a huge charisma in Yugoslavia and the world, Tito. With no doubt, this new social contract could have been a formula for other socialist countries. Tito's dream, started after his conflict with Stalin, that he should become a leader of the world revolution, would have commenced then. Therefore, the continuation of the strike at the Faculty of Philosophy was a counterrevolutionary act.

We silently witnessed his repression at the Faculty of Philosophy. As of 19 June 1968, branches of the Communist Alliance at the Departments of Philosophy and Sociology were disbanded, with the explanation that "for a while now... a number of communists... have openly opposed the ideo-political currents and principles of the Communist Alliance

⁵¹ The entire Tito's speech may be found in: Arsić/Marković, op. cit., 117–122.

⁵² Marković, op. cit., 56.

of Yugoslavia". In his subsequent speech, on 26 June the same year, at the Sixth Congress of the Yugoslav Trade Union Association, Tito made this measure more concrete by saying: "You know, dear comrades, that now there have been numerous attempts by various elements. Some persons have appeared that we had dealt with before the student revolt. These individual professors, some philosophers, some Praxis group members, and other various dogmatists, including those who made various deformations in the State Security Department, etc."⁵³

However, this was the end of Tito and Tito's Yugoslavia. In his "political testament", conversations he had with the Yugoslav military and political leaders from 21 to 28 December 1978, Tito attacked the 1974 Constitution which tore Yugoslavia apart, saying it was imposed on him. He also talked of the "Yugoslav nation", the "rich peasant" as the pillar of the state, only to conclude: "Yugoslavia must be in our hearts, and in our souls. Do take care of it!"⁵⁴ Interestingly, with such a view, Tito came quite close to the ideology of his archenemy, King Alexander Karadjordjevic. However, his "political testament" ultimately shattered on the rocky ground, since Yugoslavia no longer had a movement to defend it.

STUDENSKI POKRETI 1968. – NEDOVRŠENA REVOLUCIJA

Milan Petrović

Ova studija najpre utvrđuje pojmove "levice" i "desnice" kao političkih fenomena. Potom, pošto se dotakla studentskih i crnačkih pokreta u Sjedinjenim Američkim Državama, ona izlaže osnovne osobine i razvoj studentskih pokreta u SR Nemačkoj i Francuskoj kasnih 1960-ih godina. Najveći deo studije posvećen je studentskim revolucionarnim gibanjima na Beogradskom univerzitetu 1968. godine, čiji je neposredni učesnik bio i pisac ove studije. Na sasvim nov način u njoj se tumači delovanje jugoslovenskoga predsednika Tita i grupe profesora i asistenata beogradskoga Filozofskog fakulteta okupljenih oko časopisa "Praxis" ("praksisovaca") u tim gibanjima. Studija je takođe prilog teoriji revolucija.

Ključne reči: "levica" i "desnica", studentski pokreti, revolucija kao društveni ugovor, revolucionarni vođa.

⁵³ Quoted in: Arsić/Marković, op. cit. 124.

⁵⁴ Quoted in: Cenčić, op. cit., 19–66.