

a labor press service

BL

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

50¢

Un service de presse ouvrier

PARIS OFFICE: Pierre Frank, 21 rue d'Aboukir, Paris 2, France

NEW YORK OFFICE: World Outlook, P. O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station, New York, N.Y. 10010

Vol. 5, No 32

October 6, 1967

Stokely Carmichael:

What Black Power Struggle Is About

Full Text of "Sucesos" Interview



Reba Hansen, Business Manager,

P. O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station,

New York, N.Y. 10010

WORLD OUTLOOK specializes in weekly political analysis and interpretation of events for labor, socialist, colonial independence and Negro freedom publications. Signed articles represent the views of the authors, which may not necessarily coincide with those of WORLD OUTLOOK. Unsigned material expresses, insofar as editorial opinion may appear, the standpoint of revolutionary Marxism. To subscribe for 26 issues send \$7.50 or £2/15s. or 37.50 francs to: Reba Hansen, Business Manager, P. O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station, New York, N. Y. 10010.

WHAT THE BLACK POWER STRUGGLE IS ABOUT

Text of Stokely Carmichael's "Sucesos" Interview

[While he was in Havana at the OLAS conference, Stokely Carmichael granted an interview to Mario Menéndez Rodríguez, the editor of Sucesos (Events). This was published in the August 26 issue of the Mexico City magazine under the title "Por Qué Luchamos los Negros."

[Because of the interest in Stokely Carmichael's views, it is obviously desirable to make this important interview available to the English-speaking world as soon as possible. We have therefore prepared the following translation.

[Stokely Carmichael, of course, must not be held accountable for the inevitable stiffness of language in the translation nor for any of the actual formulations, since what he said in English in response to the questions of Menéndez was first translated into Spanish and then retranslated into English; thus the end result in most instances will not be identical with his original statements. However, the central concepts will, we think, be easily recognized as those of the militant black power leader, who at the moment is traveling in Africa.

[We hope that it will be agreed that one of the most interesting aspects of the interview is the reflection to be found in it of Stokely Carmichael's visit to Cuba and what he learned from his experiences there.]

* * *

What is the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee? When and why was it founded?

The Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, which I work for, is made up of young American blacks who decided to join together to fight racial segregation and economic exploitation in the United States. It was founded in 1960 and the reason why is important -- the other organizations supposedly defending the interests of the black people weren't engaged in an active way. Most of them took their problems to the courts but we felt we couldn't get anywhere if an injustice for which a white man was responsible and which resulted in harm to a black man was taken to courts run and controlled by whites. That meant we were taking up injustice with persons who were unjust themselves. That way nothing could be solved. The only solution was and is in the streets.

Now, we used the word nonviolent because at that time the central figure

in the struggle to defend the black race was no one less than Martin Luther King and anyone who resorted to violence was considered a traitor. Consequently we resolved to use the word nonviolent. However we knew that our struggle would end up in violence, that it was only necessary to wait for the right time. So we accepted this name for the grouping and coordinated activities from city to city, wherever we could engage in nonviolent demonstrations.

However, a year later we came to the conclusion that these pacifist demonstrations were not an adequate answer for our problems; the young people had to be organized. We moved into the state where racial segregation is of unbelievable dimensions -- Mississippi. There we began to organize our people and train them for the struggle. And now we have come to the point where it's our duty to rouse our youth, our people, to fight.

What are your organization's political, economic, and social aims?

Politically, we want the black people of America to free themselves from their oppression. We also want the peoples of the Third World to get their freedom, especially the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America; because we know our liberation depends on their liberation and that, vice versa, their liberation depends on ours. Therefore, we must carry out the same struggle.

Politically, I mean that in the United States we're pressing for the right to control the communities in which we live; because these communities where we're up against incredible poverty, these communities called ghettos, are politically controlled by the whites. Actually, in a tragically real sense, we are colonies inside the United States, colonies like most Latin-American countries; because it is no secret that these countries are controlled by the United States. To sum it all up: both the Latin-American countries and the American black ghettos are part of the colonial empire of the United States.

Economically, we would like our people to be able to enjoy, to get everything they need to enjoy a decent standard of living without having to work as hard as they do now because they are exploited, because they are victims of the political structure of American imperialism. We want power not only to control the wealth within our communities but to divide up this wealth according to the needs of each community. We don't want to establish a black

capitalist system; on the contrary, we want to destroy capitalism economically because this system always goes hand in hand with racism and exploitation. It is no secret that wherever capitalism has been kept up these two characteristics are certain to be seen. Consequently, it is our duty to destroy the capitalist



STOKELY CARMICHAEL, as seen at the OIAS conference in Havana by El Mundo's caricaturist Juan David.

system which enslaves us at home and enslaves the peoples of the Third World abroad.

Socially we want what most people aspire to in life: a happy people, free and independent, who can make all the decisions they think right and in the interests of the majority -- a people who participate in all decisions and never feel ashamed of the color of their skin or their culture.

Psychologically, physically, morally we want a people that feel equality in their entire being, who definitively cast off capitalism.

What is the relationship between the black people of the North and the South in particular and throughout the

United States in general?

Most of our people -- and this is fundamental for a better understanding of the problem of the black people -- emigrated from the South because racial discrimination was most brutal in that region and because they heard that in the North people weren't concerned about the color of your skin, that all that counted was work. We were told, "There are opportunities left and right; good jobs everywhere; all you have to do is work hard." We believed this nonsense; and because we believed it we packed our suitcases and headed north. But when we got there we saw how equal everything was. The lesson we learned was this: we will never be able to enjoy a decent life in the United States under the capitalist system. So today you will not find a single black man who holds any hope for decent conditions under the prevailing system in the United States.

As a result, relations are much closer among American black people; because the black man in the South no longer looks to the North as a way of escape -- no, today all American black people understand that we must join hands as a single people to win our freedom. So what in fact exists in the United States is a feeling of solidarity among all black people no matter where they find themselves. And this means that when the whites touch a black man today they have to deal with all of them -- one big family, and I'm not just saying this, the unity of the American black people is quite easy to see. Every time a racist policeman shoots at one of us, he finds he has to face a whole city and what is more this no longer holds for a single city but for several, for many cities in the United States. This feeling of solidarity is real.

Some people believe that the black people of America think of their struggle only as a racial conflict, that is, a struggle against the white race, instead of understanding it as a class struggle. What is your opinion about that?

On this question, I think it is important to note this: racism is so strong in the United States that it is virtually impossible to get whites to fight shoulder to shoulder with black people. When most poor whites or white workers organize in the United States, they don't fight for redistribution of the land; they fight for more money, all they want is more money. They have no conception of dividing up property, because their main concern is economic and not social. What is happening is that the ruling class in the United States has centered its attention on the countries of the Third World with the aim of increasing profits, profits which it shares to a small degree with the white working class of the United States.

Let's understand one indisputable fact: the American ruling class never reduces its profits; just the opposite, it increases them by dint of the oppression to which it subjects the underdeveloped nations. From this it follows that when it shares its gains with the white working class, the white workers become part of the capitalist system and both of them enjoy the money gotten by bleeding other peoples. The result is that the white working class is unable to fight the capitalist system, because it has become part of it by accepting tainted money.

Consequently, it is hard to develop a revolutionary consciousness in the ranks of white workers. So what we are faced with is a group of white citizens fighting to protect their money. This is also why we aren't able to find white working-class people opposed to the war in Vietnam; the genocide brings them certain advantages. If they opposed the war in Vietnam, they would be attacking the system and injuring their own interests.

Unfortunately, the whites don't realize that if they destroyed this system they could build a better one. Nevertheless, they are so afraid that they cling to the capitalist system to protect the wage levels which are in their favor.

In reality, it is the black people who constitute the vanguard and who are leading the struggle in the United States. And if this struggle has been interpreted as a conflict between black and white, it is due solely and exclusively to the fact that the white working class, out of a contemptible fear of losing the little it has, has joined with the privileged group that oppresses the majority. We believe that a revolutionary consciousness can develop in the white working class only when the United States begins to lose its profits, profits which it gets from the entire Third World. Once this process begins, it will have to seek ways and means at home to maintain its relative prosperity. Then and only then will the white working class develop a revolutionary consciousness, because once their sources of profits in the Third World are curtailed, the rulers of the American capitalist system will stop sharing what it used to share with the white workers.

This means that today only the black people are struggling. Certainly, it would please us if the white working class joined in this struggle. Whether or not this happens, however, does not change the present situation. Because we blacks will fight until we win. And when the white working class decides to join this struggle, we will welcome them. In the meantime, and until then, we will continue in the vanguard.

It cannot be denied that the rul-

ing class of the United States recognizes Marx's concept of the inevitable class conflict that will take place sooner or later. In order to avoid it, to postpone it, they cling desperately to the profits provided by the Third World in order to give a minimal share to the white working class.

What the ruling class of the United States has achieved is postponement of the inevitable class conflict. Today the Third World has become the proletariat and the white society of the West is playing the role of the bourgeoisie. So that when we draw lines based on skin color, these are also class lines because of the way in which white Western society has "won over" the majority of its working class.

This is exactly what Europe did when the imperialist nations there divided up Africa and Latin America among themselves, thus staving off the inevitable class conflict in those countries.

Nevertheless, there can be no more postponement because the confrontation is at hand. Moreover, I think that people outside the United States must remember that, unlike any other people, we were the only people brought in from abroad and enslaved on this continent by those who still exploit us. Other peoples have been slaves in their own countries so that when they fought they could develop a nationalist conception as a point of unity to rally around. We, I repeat, were brought to the United States and cannot develop a nationalist conception. Consequently, our conception must center on the color of our skin, since it was, in fact, due to this black color that the whites resolved to make us slaves. In a certain sense, the color of our skin represents our nationality. Because what the white man did was to scatter Africa around, to bring black people to the United States, to disperse them through all the countries of the continent, without any nationality whatsoever.

Cuba's case is different because here the African has a conception of nationality, since side by side with the white man, he was the victim of oppression and merciless exploitation by the privileged groups. The black people of this Caribbean island, especially after the revolution, feel they are a part of the Cuban system, and even before that they called themselves Afro-Cubans.

Unfortunately for us, this is not the case in the United States and cannot be. For 400 years we have been the victims of a brutal fascism and, with the exception of John Brown, no white man has come out in our defense. Many have spoken and now speak in our defense, but no one is ready to fight to destroy the system of which they are a part.

What do you think of the other

black organizations in the United States, such as the one led by Martin Luther King?

Publicly, it is very important to present a united front and for this reason we support the organizations now fighting for the black people of America. When we feel we have succeeded in gathering together a considerable number of people, we will eliminate the other organizations. At present, in order not to divide those participating in the struggle for the demands of the black race, we support a united front. But the time will come very soon when there will be no reason to discuss and nothing to discuss and then we will simply eliminate all those who put obstacles in the way of the real liberation of the black people. Here and now, many black Americans have set out on the road to real freedom.

What is the relationship between the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and the Movimiento Pro Independencia de Puerto Rico [MPI -- Movement for Puerto Rican Independence]? What is your view of the interrelationship between the Puerto Rican people's struggle for independence and the struggle of the black people in the United States? How do you view the struggle of the black people in the United States as aiding the Puerto Ricans? And what is your view of unity between the two organizations?

Brother Malcolm taught us that we must internationalize our struggle. And carrying out some of his teachings, we started with Puerto Rico. We had a number of reasons. For example, in terms of geographic distance, Puerto Rico is very close to the United States and is a colony of the United States in the full sense of the word. Moreover, a great many people who live together with us in the American ghettos are Puerto Rican.

But it used to happen that we fought against Puerto Ricans -- instead of uniting to fight a system which oppresses us, the American ruling class made us fight each other while the white police watched and laughed at us. Then we decided that one way to begin to awaken the political consciousness of our people and to establish ties with the Puerto Ricans was to come out publicly in favor of Puerto Rican independence. And we achieved this unity. Because if up until recently, when the police attacked Puerto Ricans, the black people did nothing and, in fact, were more likely to join the white police than the Puerto Ricans -- and vice versa -- now, when this happens in New York, in Newark or in Chicago, the black people and the Puerto Ricans rush together to fight the police.

To sum it all up: we have raised our people's political consciousness and

now we are meeting to discuss the most effective methods to fight the capitalist system which oppresses black people and Puerto Ricans alike.

The agreement we have with MPI is based on the following points:

(1) The Movement for Puerto Rican Independence and the Federación de Universitarios Pro Independencia [FUPI -- Student Federation for Independence] recognize the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) as a fraternal organization in the forefront of the struggle for the liberation of the American black people and against the white power structure of the United States.

(2) The Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) recognizes the Movement for Puerto Rican Independence as the vanguard of the struggle of the Puerto Rican people for their national liberation and the Student Federation for Puerto Rican Independence as the organization representing the Puerto Rican students in their struggle against imperialism and as the vanguard of the students in their country.

(3) The MPI and the FUPI offer full assistance to the black people of America in their struggle to win political and economic power in their communities, which is expressed as the struggle for black power.

(4) SNCC declares its support for the Puerto Rican people's struggle for national independence.

(5) SNCC, the MPI and the FUPI recognize that they are in common struggles like the struggle against drafting the youth of their peoples into the United States army, the defense of the cultural integrity of both peoples, recovery of their economic heritage, etc.; and therefore make available to each other their resources and efforts in the common struggle.

(6) SNCC, the MPI and the FUPI recognize that the struggle of the Puerto Rican and black people in the urban ghettos of the United States for political and economic control, for better housing, for adequate education and for better living conditions in general can be waged on common bases and through joint actions.

(7) SNCC, the MPI and the FUPI believe that the struggle against the draft and in opposition to American aggression against the people of Vietnam can be reinforced through joint activities by these organizations.

(8) SNCC offers its assistance to the Puerto Rican organizations MPI and FUPI in their fight to get Puerto Rico's

case as a colony speedy consideration by the United Nations.

(9) The MPI and the FUPI offer their assistance in giving international prominence to the oppression of the black people of America and in getting this problem recognized as one which concerns all mankind rather than solely being an internal problem of the United States.

What kind of struggle will develop in the United States against the policy of imperialism? Do you think that armed struggle is the only kind of struggle left open to the American people to win control of the government? What is your opinion about opposing reactionary violence with revolutionary violence?

Let me make it quite clear that the only solution is a black revolution and that we are not interested in peaceful coexistence. Armed struggle is the only way, not only for us but for all the oppressed people in the world.

The people who talk about peaceful coexistence today are talking about maintaining the status quo because the only way to destroy an imperialist system is through force, since talking doesn't get you anywhere. That is something that is especially clear to us. And I say especially clear because most Afro-Americans in the United States have been talking for 400 years, talking and nothing more. They lost sight of the fact that when you talk you are playing the game of the imperialists, who invented the talking game.

But today we have a new game called guerrilla warfare. It's a game the imperialists can't take part in. And if you want to win a game, you must make the rules. If anybody else makes the rules, he always wins. The imperialists established the rules for talking; and so when you sit down to talk with them you can't possibly win. They always find a reason why they can't do it now or why they can't do it next, and they appear very reasonable. If you sit down with them and try to argue according to their point of view, in their own terms, how can you win?

In the first place, they have no right to oppress peoples, so there is no need to bring up oppression for discussion. They have no right to exploit anybody. So starting a discussion about freeing yourself from exploitation and oppression with those responsible for this exploitation and oppression is ridiculous. It's something like a slave's sitting down with his master to talk about when he must free him. It doesn't make sense because the master doesn't want to free him. What must the slave do? The answer is simple: rise up and kill his master if he refuses to stop exploiting him. That's the only solution.

So, it is completely clear as far as we are concerned that armed struggle is the only road. The time for talking is over. We have talked and talked and talked and talked for too long. We must destroy this system by force.

Besides that, reactionary violence can be legalized by the people in power. For example, if I killed a slant-eyed man, there would be two different reactions depending on whether I did it in the United States or in Vietnam. If I killed thirty slant-eyed men in Vietnam, I would get a medal, since I would be in the army of course. But if I killed thirty or killed one in the United States, say in New York, I would end up in the electric chair for committing murder.

So the question is not violence, but who can legalize violence. That's all there is to it. A policeman can shoot at anyone he pleases or kill anybody he likes for any reason and come before the court and say: "I did it in the line of duty." And they let him go. But anyone responsible for the death of a policeman would automatically land in jail.

So, violence should not be discussed. What should be discussed is whether or not you can legalize it. The oppressed peoples of the world must legalize violence in their own minds in order to solve this problem. Once they have legalized violence, the raising of questions and looking for answers is over with -- all that's left is to take what belongs to them.

So the reactionaries manage to stay in power solely by means of arms but they legalize their violence and then preach with an unheard-of cynicism that it's not right to use violence. Take away their guns and their imperialist forces and we will see how many people listen to them; take away the bases they have in Santo Domingo, Venezuela, Brazil, Chile and throughout Latin America, and the arms they have in these places, and you will see nobody paying any attention to them. But because of their arms the peoples find themselves compelled to listen to them. And so the only thing to do is to become accustomed to the use of arms and have the will and determination to struggle. Then you've got the right answer.

For example, take a good look at the pacifists and all the nonsense connected with pacifism. The United States, Great Britain, France and the USSR developed atomic and hydrogen bombs. After they developed them, they met and declared: "We are going to put an end to nuclear testing; there will be no more tests." And the whole world sat there and believed all that nonsense because they told them: "We don't want bombs to spread; if other

peoples have bombs it will lead to violence."

But what they were doing, since they were the ones who had the bombs, was to keep other peoples from developing the same striking force. So, they were not dealing with the others on an equitable basis. If there was equality for all, everyone should have the bomb.

And so we have an example of how the West utilizes violence to hold other peoples back.

Israel has the atomic bomb, which it got from the United States. On the basis of equality, since Israel has the atomic bomb, Egypt needs to have it too. Otherwise, Israel can threaten to drop the bomb on Egypt and that country will become the victim of atomic blackmail. The whole world must have the atomic bomb; this is all too clear. So, there can be no talk about putting an end to nuclear testing as long as all the countries have not yet developed the bomb.

When all the countries of the world from little Cuba to big China have the hydrogen bomb, then you can say: "We are all going to put an end to nuclear tests." Before then it is absurd to talk about it.

Another example of this is Cuba and the United States. The Americans can threaten Cuba since they have weapons which they can drop on the island. This is a rather recent example, of course; it happened to the Soviet Union when the United States threatened to drop bombs and the USSR said its rockets would be withdrawn.

The United States compelled the USSR to withdraw its rockets. Once they were withdrawn, Cuba was at the mercy of the United States, except for a little something which I think makes the difference in today's world: dignity and the will to fight until victory is won.

The West has plainly developed the best weapons system in existence at present. But there is still another small item, and that is that weapons can never overcome the will of men to struggle. That is just what today's world is all about -- the oppressed peoples have the will to struggle and are struggling against those who oppress them.

So, as Mao said, this is a war of weapons against the will of men. And we believe that weapons can never triumph over the will of men to struggle.

A good example of this is Vietnam, where the United States is using all its weapons and finds itself unable to defeat a small country, because that country has

the will to fight and is prepared to fight to the death before it will let the United States enslave it.

When the United States talked about using bombs and missiles against Cuba, it declared that that Caribbean island had no right to defend itself. It also declared that there was no reason for Cuba to have any kind of missiles. And the rest of the world was more on Cuba's side than on the side of the United States because there was no reason for the United States to foment aggression against Cuba any more than there was later against Vietnam. And what is happening is that the Vietnamese people are not only waging a defensive war but a defensive kind of propaganda campaign; for they have every right to drop a bomb on the United States and to begin bombing that country and to equalize the terms of the struggle in that way. That would be real equality but instead of that they find themselves forced to keep to a defensive war. And this was also Cuba's position regarding the missiles. They were fighting a defensive war.

The point in Debray's book Revolution in the Revolution? that made the most impression on people was that they must go beyond a defensive war and that the next step for the peoples of the Third World is to go beyond a defensive war.

What do you think about guerrilla warfare as a means by which the American continent can gain its freedom? What is your opinion concerning utilization of this type of struggle by the colored people in the countryside and cities of the United States of America?

The imperialists have taken everything by force. For example, they annihilated the native population of Cuba and took possession of the land. So, the only way to win freedom is by force. And the only way to initiate it is to begin guerrilla warfare right now; and it must never be discussed in terms of whether or not it is good or evil. It is the only way to put an end to exploitation and oppression. To discuss whether or not it is right is playing the imperialists' game. When you are at war nothing is good or evil; you are only concerned with the need to gain your objective. And that is what we must understand, those of us who live in the world of the oppressed. There is no doubt at all -- guerrilla warfare is the only way. We will not question whether it is good or evil; we will only raise the tactical question about when to utilize it. That is the only question that ought to concern us.

We are moving toward guerrilla warfare in the United States. We are going to develop urban guerrilla warfare and we are going to beat them in this field because there is one thing the imperialists

do not have: their men don't want to fight, they don't want to fight what they call guerrilla warfare, which is really hand-to-hand combat. You see, their men are cowards. White America is the most cowardly nation in the world. They can send a million men to Vietnam but they cannot wipe out the Vietnamese people and that people will annihilate them in hand-to-hand combat. What the imperialists do is say that there is a guerrilla war in Vietnam, and people think that a guerrilla war is a dirty war, that it is not a clean kind of war. Then they declare that they are sending a lot of planes to drop bombs to win against the guerrilla war. No one asks: What is more revolting than sending a man in an airplane that can drop fifty or sixty bombs on helpless women and children or use napalm on them and burn them to death? Don't you think that hand-to-hand combat is much more honorable? That is the question. The question is simply when to employ it. Urban guerrilla warfare is the only means by which we can win in the United States because they cannot use bombs against us, since we are inside their country. They will have to fight us in hand-to-hand combat and we will defeat them.

The counterpart will be in the South, which is the part of the country where we know the terrain, where we worked the land for years, where the white man has taken the fruits of our sweat, moving us around the whole region. He really did us a big favor because we have gotten to know the area and when we go up into the mountains we will inflict another defeat on him in a guerrilla war waged there. Guerrilla warfare is the only way we can bring them to their knees, it's the only kind of war where they can't use their big guns and bombs. And this is the road we must follow, because they have no guts.

What is your feeling about solidarity among all countries struggling to liberate themselves?

It's the only answer. I think that what we fail to grasp, what we haven't grasped in the past, is that capitalism has become international and that we are fighting against international capitalism. So, against international capitalism, you must wage an international struggle. In the past what occurred, for example, was when a nation was fighting, everyone wished it good luck but no one saw its struggle as part of their own -- even when they could see that it was the same countries oppressing them that were also oppressing the other country, they still didn't get it fixed in their minds that there was a common enemy. What we have done today is to get this situation straight in our minds. We see a common enemy; we are fighting against an international structure that enslaves us, and

the only way to defeat it is to internationalize our struggle. This way, one international power will be pitted against another. That's the only way we can win, because if we do as Che says -- create two, three, many Vietnams -- we will have them fighting on all fronts at once and then they can't win. When a struggle is isolated, imperialism can turn all its power against one country and that country is lost.

But they cannot fight us all at once. So, even if we don't have the same ideas, the same ideology, we have a common enemy -- imperialism. And that will unite us more than anything else.

What do you think about the Organización de Solidaridad de los Países de Asia, Africa y America Latina [OSPAAAL -- Asian, African and Latin-American Solidarity Organization]? What does an organization like yours expect from OSPAAAL?

Well, one thing is that we are now beginning to concretize our relations with these groups. The first thing we must do is just meet all the fighters; sit down with them and discuss with them and exchange ideas. Then, when we have done that, we can begin to act together and jointly plan the strategy and tactics to be followed in our struggle for liberation. But we can only do that when we begin to internationalize our struggle because the enemy has its CIA espionage system and all its intelligence agencies, which are international and work together in a coordinated way. So, they can carry out assassinations and organize coups against governments beginning to fight for liberation.

Once we have taken power -- because we will -- the problem will be to start building an international system with no room for capitalism, in which we can trade with each other on the basis of our needs and what each country has, instead of trying to control the world market where prices are set in accordance with profits and not by the needs of humanity. We will find when we take power that, unless we have the spirit, the will, and the intelligence of Cuba's leaders, many of us will end up in the same way as all the other countries which fell victim to coups d'état, or where taking power ended with acceptance of the whole bureaucratic structure that the imperialists imposed on their countries and where they are not in position to fight. Thus we must begin.

The other thing we must begin is exchanging fighters with the peoples of Africa and Latin America who are struggling for freedom. Thus we can set up an international network of guerrilla warfare, and, for example, if people from other countries want to come to the United States to help us fight when we are able to start fighting the real war there, well and good. We want to do the same thing; we will want to go

away and fight, because that's what the capitalists do. Every time one of the countries they control is in trouble they send aid to that country.

This is clear and that is what happened in the case of Israel, a capitalist country supported by Western imperialism. When it was in trouble, they all came to its aid, including France. What we must do is recognize that once the struggle begins, we must have the determination to aid the forces of liberation with our men, just as the imperialists have the determination to aid each other with their guns, their money and their men.

What do you think about the Organización de Solidaridad para América Latina [OLAS -- Latin-American Solidarity Organization]? What do you expect from an organization like OLAS?

This is the first OLAS conference and we feel more than honored, pleased and happy to be here and to be able to be a part of it, for many, very many reasons. The first is that Latin America is very close to us geographically. Latin America is one of the continents the United States exploits. Many Latin Americans come to the United States. And so it is for all these reasons, plus the proximity of Latin America, we have to begin to act. Cuba is part of Latin America and the United States really wants to crush Cuba; and Cuba is an inspiration, a hope, a hope not only for the black people in the United States but for all the Latin-American countries, an inspiration to begin struggling, to begin fighting. So it is right and proper for OLAS to meet in Cuba and for us to have come here to demonstrate our solidarity, not in words only but determined to offer our lives on the firing line of the Latin-American struggles.

We want to explain to the countries of Latin America that our struggle is just beginning, because the only news they get comes from the AP and UPI which are part of the imperialist-controlled communications media. On the other hand, we cannot get any news from the Latin-American countries except through the UPI and AP and again that means the imperialist-controlled media. So, what they tell us is that there are bandits, or that there are groups of rebel forces, or that the Communists are fighting in Venezuela, or that rebel forces are fighting in the streets of Guatemala or Santo Domingo or Panama. And only because of our political awareness that these groups are fighting for their countries can we read between the lies and propaganda and tell what is happening.

This is the first time we have had an opportunity to meet the people who are

actually struggling to liberate themselves and begin to study their ideologies to see if we have a common ideological base, to get an understanding of their struggle and to explain ours to them without having to have imperialist propaganda interpret our struggles for each other. That is the first thing. The second is that we must carry forward our struggles jointly; and our mere presence here is accomplishing that. Thirdly, to begin to counteract the OAS [Organization of American States] and the mere fact of our holding the conference here is already doing that; it will neutralize the OAS and begin to minimize its importance in the minds of our peoples -- which is quite important because imperialist-controlled propaganda can win the minds of our peoples, and one of the most important battles being waged today is the struggle to win the minds of the people. When we have succeeded in doing that, there will be no doubt that we are ready to fight and to develop systems and channels of aid and mutual support.

What do you have to say to guerrilla leaders like Douglas Bravo of Venezuela, Fabio Vázquez and Marulanda of Colombia, César Montes of Guatemala, and the leaders of the Bolivian guerrillas?

We want to say to our brothers, to our comrades, that although they may not know it, there are many of us here who follow all the news about their struggles very closely and with great attention. We know that they are conducting a victorious, brave and good struggle. And in spite of the fact that we don't control the communications media, we can say to them that they must never lose hope or ever fear that their struggle is in vain or that nobody knows of it. We know about it and we are with them. The day is not far when they will be able to act in freedom; and together, arm in arm, we can build the world we are fighting for. Our only message to them is not to lose hope and to keep up the struggle, because they are our inspiration and hope.

What do you think about the aggression in Vietnam?

I think that it is the most revolting aggression in the world today. I think that it shows the hatred and cowardice of the United States. I think it's the dirtiest war there ever was and because of that I think that, in the face of the determination of the Vietnamese people, the United States will lose the war.

What brought you to Cuba?

I was a boy when the Cuban revolution began and I was very interested in it then. The fact that the prime minister of Cuba, Fidel Castro, stayed in Harlem with the black people when he came to the United States increased my interest. He

stayed at the Hotel Theresa and that was a sign that our relationship with Cuba had become something real; in the sense that Cuba's prime minister, in contrast to all the prime ministers who had come to our country, came to live in the ghetto with us while he was in the United States. We always felt we should repay Cuba for Fidel's visit.

In the second place, we have always known that the Cuban revolution was a good revolution. Although many people in the United States doubted the Cuban revolution, we never did. We knew that it was good. We came to Cuba just to learn and in the few days we have been here we learned things about the Cuban revolution we could never have learned from books, films, or any other medium. Here I have been able to stay among a free people and to understand and see how they are solving their problems. That is what we came for; we came to learn and we have learned a good deal.

What do you think of Cuba's prime minister, Fidel Castro?

He is the greatest man I ever met.

What is your feeling about Che Guevara and the things he has said concerning the revolution in Latin America and throughout the world?

We agree 150 percent with Che; he is becoming one of the most widely read

men in black America today. Everywhere you go black people are reading Che; and not only that, he is being read throughout the world. One of the reasons I think is that Che is a man who has never just talked about revolution but has made a revolution. He is a man who, even after winning a revolutionary struggle for power in this country, left his wife to go to other countries, risking his life to help initiate the struggle there. We don't come across such a man every day.

The struggle you are waging in the United States is giving some people the impression that you have signed your death sentence. What do you think about that?

Brother Malcolm used to tell us that there are several different kinds of death. I think that dehumanized people who don't respond to blows are dead people. The West has been able to do that to most of us. It has dehumanized us to the point where we don't even hit back. Once you begin to strike back you are alive, you are alive and bullets won't kill you. If you don't hit back against the blows you are dead and all the money in the world can't bring you back to life. Today we are alive, we are alive throughout the whole world; all the oppressed peoples are coming back to life, they are striking back, they are fighting for humanity. When you are dead, when you do not rebel, when you are not fighting to live, then you are already dead. But we are alive and we love life so much that we are ready to lose it. We are alive. Death cannot stop us.

CANADIAN CAPITALIST NEWSPAPER DISSENTS ON OAS

[The meeting of the Organization of American States, which ended September 24 after a three-day discussion on how to meet the challenge of the OLAS conference held recently in Havana, was hailed with satisfaction among imperialist circles in the U.S. For instance, The New York Times, in an editorial September 26 noted with approval the progress being made toward a "consensus on the threat of Castro's subversion" among the dictatorial regimes brought together for the confab by the Johnson administration. The Times was even satisfied that Secretary of State Dean Rusk's most outrageous proposals were not adopted, since they would have proved unworkable anyway.

[A refreshing difference in the international capitalist camp over the role of the OAS was expressed by the Toronto Globe and Mail September 27. Inasmuch as the big Canadian daily hews to a Tory and therefore very conservative capitalist outlook, its dissent is all the more interesting. The full text of the editorial, "Not a club of equals,"

is as follows.]

* * *

Voting 20-0 with Mexico's eloquent abstention, the foreign ministers of the Organization of American States have asked all friendly countries to halt exports to (and imports from) Cuba until Havana stops exporting revolution. A highlight of the performance which helped to explain this impressive dénouement was Bolivia's striking use of stage props. These included photographs, fingerprints and documents which, seen from a distance, realistically conveyed the illusion that Castro's comrade Ché Guevara was leading rebels against the democratic regime of General René Barrientos: a U.S.-trained air force officer who first seized power in 1964 after a coup d'état.

Once again the wisdom of Canada's remaining outside the OAS has been demonstrated. The vote offends on four counts. First, it pushes weaker states that depend on U.S. aid, trade and investment into

upholding Washington's self-proclaimed right to play the policeman in the Western Hemisphere.

Second, the vote again stresses how dangerous it would be for Canada, if an OAS member, to be faced with the choice of publicly thwarting a policy that the United States holds to be vital, or of giving up our own policy of divorcing trade from politics. We have enough problems with the United States without throwing ourselves in its path on issues where it has proved less rational than in its bilateral dealings with us.

Third, the OAS vote proceeds, as usual, from a notion of "hemispheric solidarity" which substitutes a spurious geographic closeness for more meaningful economic and political affinities. Canada's natural economic and political solidarities do not lie with Latin America, but with the United States, Europe, the Commonwealth and, more and more recently, with Japan. Our future solidarity with Latin America, which we eagerly hope for, must grow not from arbitrary verbalizing but, like our other ties, from a spontaneous coincidence of interests.

DOMINICAN PRD SWITCHES ITS LINE

Santo Domingo

To proclaim the possibility of a peaceful revolution in Latin America is a lie, Dr. José Francisco Peña Gómez, general secretary of the Partido Revolucionario Dominicano, has finally admitted.

Dr. Peña Gómez himself has thus affirmed that only a government representing the workers can solve the problems afflicting the people. He used this language at a meeting at the party headquarters here September 23.

His statements represent a turn of 180 degrees in the political line of the PRD, a party that participated in the national elections June 1, 1966, during the occupation by American troops.

Dr. Peña Gómez was profuse in his

Finally, and most distastefully, the OAS vote underlines the enduring sterility of the U.S. Latin-American policies into which membership in the Organization might fatally draw us. Containment, embargo, boycott, blacklisting -- these are the familiar vehicles of a bankrupt diplomacy, which tries to hide behind pious posturing its utter lack of either courage or imagination.

The time for Canada to join the OAS depends on many factors, but on none more than this: our country can play no useful part until its hegemonic power, the United States, decides to lead the OAS in actively promoting democracy and economic and social reform. As long as Washington drags its regimented clientele behind a chariot of debilitating anti-Communism, we could expect, as members, only to be dragooned from what we think are truly relevant causes.

These do not include pandering to dictators; they do include helping the people of Latin America, as we do now and should much more, through the non-political Inter-American Bank.

explanations as to why the PRD was giving up the position of "creative opposition" and taking up revolutionary nationalism, "a dictatorship with popular support."

He said that recent events had demonstrated that a "peaceful revolution in Latin America is a lie" due to the fact that the United States will not permit the structural changes which the nations of this continent are demanding today.

"We are located in the Caribbean where the United States does not permit peaceful revolutions," he said.

A group of PRD workers at the meeting decided to back the thesis of a dictatorship with popular support. This thesis was advanced by Juan Bosch from Madrid where he is living at present.

JAPANESE CP REJECTS MAO "CULT"

The Japan Communist party, which began moving away from its former pro-Peking stand last year, has opened a series of sharply critical attacks on Mao Tse-tung and the Chinese Communist party.

Previously the JCP party leaders had been very reluctant to explain their

differences with the CCP and little had appeared on the subject in their press.

Recent issues of Akahata, the official paper of the JCP, show how open the struggle between the two parties has become. An editorial in the August 21 Akahata, entitled "The Decisive Answer to

the Disrupters," attacked Mao's followers and the CCP. This editorial denounced the beating of two members of the JCP at the Peking airport by Red Guards. It also denounced the charge of the Chinese People's Daily that the Japan Communist party is a follower of the Soviet revisionists.

The editorial said, "The Chinese Communist party is permeated with a personal cult for Mao Tse-tung....the CCP has forced friendly parties internationally to regard dictatorial Maoism and the 'Proletarian Cultural Revolution' as the basic line of the international Communist movement."

"We will struggle resolutely," Akahata continues, "against the CCP's ultraleft utopianism and chauvinism. We will also throw light on the character of the 'Cultural Revolution' and Maoism itself. We will exercise our right to criticize them by scientific means."

It is ambiguous whether their "scientific criticism" suggests supporting the Liu Shao-chi and Teng Hsiao-ping group or not. Recently Koh Nakanishi, a member of the JCP, published an article supporting the Liu-Teng group. He was denounced within the JCP.

Judging from this, the JCP seems to be hesitating about collaborating with the Liu-Teng group, averring that it is reluctant "to intervene in the domestic affairs of China."

Meanwhile in Korea, the August 16 issue of Central News, the paper of the Korean Democratic People's Republic, carried an article by Kim Il Sung which criticized the Chinese CP as well as the Communist party of the Soviet Union.

The president of Korea said, "We are firmly opposed to the line of making compromises with imperialism....At the same time, we cannot agree with paying only lip-service to overthrowing imperialism without any action. This attitude is a kind of compromising line too."

There is no doubt that the latter criticism is leveled at the CCP which is launching verbal attacks on American imperialism while not showing any positive attitude toward international united action against American world policy, especially in Vietnam.

Another indication of the impact of the developing independent tendency in the world Communist movement was shown in the lineups of foreign delegations at the World Conference Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs that met in Tokyo at the beginning of August.

Actually two rival conferences

were held at the same time and under the same name. One was sponsored by Gensuikyo [Japan Council Against Atom and Hydrogen Bombs], which is supported by the Japan Communist party.

The other was called by Gensuikin [Japan Congress Against Atom and Hydrogen Bombs] which is backed by the Socialist party and Sohyo [General Council of Trade Unions of Japan].

The Soviet Union was not invited to attend the Gensuikyo conference. Also missing this year were delegates from the People's Republic of China, New Zealand and other countries which quit the pro-JCP organization last year.

Delegates at the Gensuikyo conference included participants from Cuba and North Korea and messages of support were received from President Kim Il Sung of North Korea and Ho Chi Minh of North Vietnam.

The Soviet Union, which attended the rival Gensuikin conference last year, sent no delegation at all. This marked the first time that Moscow was not represented at either world conference since the first one was held in 1955. The Asahi Evening News commented August 1 that "Observers believe the Soviet Union decided to miss the Gensuikin conference because it is presently attempting to remedy strained relations between its Communist Party and the Japan Communist Party...."

"The Soviet Union's decision to abstain from attending the Gensuikin conference is also believed to have been motivated by considerations for other Communist countries. Gensuikyo sent invitations to North Vietnam, the South Vietnam People's Liberation Front (Viet Cong), Rumania, Cuba, North Korea and other Communist countries which are taking 'independent' courses."

"Consequently, if the Soviet Union should attend the meeting sponsored by Gensuikin, now at odds with the Japan Communist Party, it would place itself in the position of 'confronting' these 'independent' Communist nations."

If indeed these were conciliatory overtures on the part of the Soviet bureaucracy, there was no indication that Gensuikyo responded to them favorably. First there is their refusal to invite a Soviet representative. In addition, the Japan Times reported August 1 that Masaharu Hatanaka, director of Gensuikyo, at the opening session of the Gensuikyo conference the previous day had "said in his speech that unified action should be taken against the Vietnam war. He criticized the policies of both the Soviet Union and Communist China by saying that one followed a policy of 'spurious peace-

ful coexistence' and the other a policy of noncooperation with those which did not adhere to its own line. He said unified action should be taken on matters

where everyone was in agreement, such as opposition to the Vietnam war and other pressing issues."

PENTAGON JUBILANT OVER APPARENT PARALYSIS OF CHINA'S DEFENSE

An authoritative Washington correspondent reports that the Pentagon brass are "gloating" over their success in carrying the bombing of North Vietnam to the very borders of China, without touching off a defensive response such as occurred in the Korean war.

Anthony Howard of the London Observer Service comments wryly on the Pentagon's gamble in his column carried in the August 25 issue of the Asahi Evening News of Tokyo:

"The raids, one is given to understand, were 'an edgy thing to decide upon' but, having taken place and produced no obvious Chinese response, they have significantly strengthened the hands of those who all along have called for a more resolute prosecution of the war."

Howard describes the air of jubilation that pervades ruling circles in Washington:

"A certain degree of gloating is now apparent even at the top of the Administration. 'Suppose,' one is told, 'that someone two years ago had forecast that we could have half a million men in Vietnam, and bombing at its present level, without Chinese intervention, would you or anyone else have believed it?'"

On the basis of China's failure to respond in any meaningful way to the continued escalation of the war, Johnson and company feel emboldened to plan a whole new series of escalations.

"Certainly on the subject of China an entirely new confidence is now evident. The risk of Chinese troops swarming across the frontier into Vietnam is now dismissed almost out of hand.

"Only one contingency appears to be envisaged in which that could happen -- what is called 'the end-game situation,' in which Hanoi at the point of collapse, Peking (perhaps even in accordance with an already given understanding) rushes to North Vietnam's aid in efforts to prevent her obliteration as a Communist state."

Johnson is operating on the assumption, then, that the Chinese have already written off the freedom fighters in South Vietnam and that he is free to try to destroy them without fear of Chinese intervention. Mao has certainly failed to demonstrate unequivocally that Johnson's estimate is wrong.

The Soviet Union, of course, with its superior technology and nuclear capacity, is in an even better position than the Chinese to serve notice on Johnson that further American escalation in Vietnam will be met with an effective counter-thrust. Brezhnev and Kosygin, however, are not about to depart from their policy of conciliating imperialism.

The world is thus still confronted with the ever-growing danger that Johnson, betting on the continued paralysis of the Chinese and the "peaceful coexistence" of the Soviet Union, will push his luck too far and precipitate a nuclear holocaust.

THE CARGO CULT SYNDROME

During World War II, a strange "cargo cult" arose among the indigenous inhabitants of New Guinea which is now giving the authorities some concern.

The natives saw thousands of tons of cargo being landed by both Japanese and Allied forces. They noted that it was the key to an attractive way of life. The soldiers never made anything; they simply signed for what they needed. Thus arose the belief that the white man need not work; he signs a slip of paper and the goods are delivered. This belief spread until now whole villages have accepted the "cargo cult" as a superior religion.

Missionaries and budding capitalists are worried that the belief will hamper development of a dependable work force. They are therefore taking action. The plans include sending for photographs of white workers making goods in order to show the cultists how fantastic their belief in the magic powers of delivery slips really is.

It is not known whether the photographs will include scenes of another class in advanced industrial countries who obtain goods like magic by simply clipping pieces of paper called coupons.

LONDON ANTIWAR RALLY PLANNED FOR OCTOBER 22

An October 22 Vietnam ad hoc committee has been established in London to coordinate antiwar activities in Britain parallel to the October 21 mobilization in Washington, D.C.

The October 22 committee's plans include demonstrations in local shopping centers October 21 parallel with larger rallies in Hull, Edinburgh, Leeds, South Wales and other regions. These rallies will send coaches to London for a mass rally in Trafalgar Square, October 22, at 2:30 p.m.

Speakers at the Trafalgar Square rally will include delegates from American and European antiwar movements, trade unionists, a member from the International War Crimes Tribunal and eyewitness accounts from North Vietnam.

It will be followed by a march to the American embassy via the embassies of

other countries whose troops are in Vietnam and the British Foreign Office.

The Saturday evening before the London rally, a Vietnam concert has been scheduled including the Cartoon Archetypical Slogan Theatre, Adrian Mitchell and members of the Folksingers for Freedom in Vietnam.

The October 22 Vietnam ad hoc committee lists more than fifty supporting organizations. One of these, the National Association of Labour Student Organizations (NALSO) is planning a teach-in on socialism and student power to take place on Saturday before the folk concert.

The Vietnam committee asks for messages of support from as many countries and organizations as possible. Its address is 49 Rivington St., London, E.C. 2, Telephone 739-6941.

OCTOBER 21 DEMONSTRATIONS SET IN NORWAY

[The following letter was printed in the September 25 Progress Report of the Student Mobilization Committee in New York.

[The Student Mobilization Committee is coordinating activities for the October 21 antiwar mobilization in Washington, D.C.]

* * *

DEN NORSKE SOLIDARITETSKOMITE FOR VIETNAM, OSLO, NORWAY -- Hereby we inform you that we are preparing for great actions October 21 to show our solidarity with the Vietnamese people as well as the progressive groups in the U.S.

The Norwegian Committee of Solidarity with Vietnam is now gathering the following organizations to create common action to press our government to protest the American war on Vietnam:

Parties: Socialist Peoples party, Communist party, Youth Organizations of the Liberal party, and the Labour party. (The Labour party, which is the largest party in Norway, stated at its last congress its solidarity with the NLF [National Liberation Front], and demanded U.S. troops to get out. However, their principal line is not to cooperate with left groups in Norwegian political life, and therefore they are outside most of our actions.)

Student groups: Liberals, Social-

ists and Social Democrats, and independent progressive student groups.

Peace organizations: most of them, WRL's in Norway, WISP's in Norway, and other pacifist organizations.

A lot of trade unions are also stating their support of the action.

The students will arrange a meeting on the morning of October 21 at the University square; the plan is that a two-hour strike is to follow in most of the faculties. There will be, all day, all over town, stands spreading leaflets, propaganda materials and gathering funds for medical aid to the NLF.

This time in Norway there will be no mass rally in Oslo; we have decided to arrange this semester's great mobilization on December 10, the Day of Human Rights. But October 21 there will be protests all over Norway, in all cities and larger places by our forty-five local committees.

In Oslo the arrangements will conclude with a big concert and meeting in one of our largest halls, where our most famous writers, artists and musicians will demonstrate their solidarity. The action slogans are as follows:

WE DEMAND A CLEAR STATEMENT FROM THE NORWEGIAN GOVERNMENT: SOLIDARITY WITH VIETNAM -- STOP THE TERROR BOMBING -- U.S. TROOPS OUT OF VIETNAM!

THE TRADES UNION CONGRESS GOES AGAINST WILSON

By Ernest Tate

London

The ninety-ninth annual conference of the Trades Union Congress held at Brighton September 4-8 made glaring the deepening contradictions between the trade unions and the Labour government in several key policy areas. The results of the conference have profound implications for the coming Labour party annual conference in Scarborough where the union bloc votes will carry the day.

At Brighton, government supporters -- who include the majority of the General Council -- were defeated on motions which called into question the government line on economic affairs, on the prices and incomes policy and on Vietnam. A kite-flier by the government on a "means-test" for social services was also shot down.

The spectre of unemployment hovered over the gathering and this fear determined the mood of the delegates, many of whom have bitter memories of the depression. Summer jobless figures in Britain are at their worst since World War II -- 500,000 in July -- and it is estimated they will rise to over 750,000 by the middle of winter. This was a recurring theme during the conference.

Even Sir Harry Douglass, a right-wing stalwart, was forced to acknowledge it in his presidential address and to warn the government that "the trade union movement was not prepared to accept the discipline of unemployment."

Discontent with the Wilson leadership ran rampant through the conference. Prior to the opening, it reached right into the TUC ruling body, the General Council, which split eighteen to fourteen on whether or not it should recommend acceptance or rejection of a composite resolution strongly criticizing the government.

The motion, entitled Plan for Economic Progress, was submitted by the Shopworkers, ASSET [Association of Supervisory Staff, Executives and Technicians] and SOGAT [Society of Graphical and Allied Trades]. It called upon the conference to deplore "the use by the Government of traditional deflationary measures to manage the economy which involve the creation of a pool of unemployed workers..." and to reject "the Government's intervention in collective bargaining as a solution to the country's economic problems."

It asked the government to maintain full employment, control the export

and import of capital, reduce military expenditures, limit and stabilize prices, rents, dividends and profits and to increase productivity and encourage the recognition of trade unions by all of industry.

The motion concluded by stating, "any plan for economic progress resulting in a real growth of wages and salaries can only be achieved by an extension of public ownership which it considers vital to any national economic plan."

In debate on this motion, the government could find few defenders -- only Les Cannon of the Electrical Trades Union, one of the most reactionary leaders of the TUC, and J.R. Peel of the Dyers and Bleachers. Of the first six speakers to take the rostrum, only one supported the government.

As Richard Seabrook of the Shopworkers put it, if there was deep distrust in the General Council of government policy, then it was even truer of the delegates.

Clive Jenkins of ASSET dismissed as a "panacea" George Woodcock's appeal for a £100 million injection into the economy. What was needed, he said, was an entirely new strategy.

"It's not enough for the Government to say they've been blown off course," he said. "If that happens once it is an accident; if it happens twice it's a coincidence; but if it happens three times it means the flight plan is wrong."

To thunderous applause, Jenkins urged the government to "adopt new terms of reference, adopt a new strategy and we will work as hard as we can to bring it to fruition."

The motion carried over the objections of the platform by 4,883,000 to 3,502,000.

This victory was substantial in itself, but had the Amalgamated Engineering Union [AEU] vote also been thrown against the government, it would have been a virtual landslide. And the response to the way in which the AEU vote was given to the government testified to the leadership's difficulties.

When John Boyd, AEU president Caron's loyal lieutenant, stood up to cast the union's vote against the motion, there was an immediate outburst from the AEU delegates as they took the floor to

shout, "That's Carron's vote, not the vote of the AEU!"

Earlier, the majority of the 26-man AEU delegation had circulated a petition attacking "the dictatorial attitude of Brother Carron" for refusing to allow a democratic vote in the delegation on its attitude to the motion. Carron had cynically referred to his ruling as "Carron's law."

On the prices and incomes policy, a resolution supporting the government was defeated by 4,270,000 to 4,109,000. Many of the delegates were bitter over the recent 10.5 percent increase by the Electricity Board in electricity rates.

A sharp attack was made against Wilson by a former member of the government's Prices and Incomes Board, Ray Willis, SOGAT joint secretary. Commenting on Wilson's take-over of the responsibility for economic affairs, he said, "Having known the fiery turbulence of George Brown and having suffered the icy freeze of Michael Stewart, we have now been led into the mist of indecision by an overlord who is past master of the art of invective."

What trust, he asked, could be placed any longer in government policy that had "rigorously and almost brutally held down wages" and at the same time increased prices while creating the biggest unemployment problem in postwar years? In putting forward the policy originally, he said, the government had had almost the full backing of unions. "It had our confidence and our trust and it failed."

W.L.Kendal of the Civil Service Clerical Association spoke of "callous complacency and government policies which seem finally and absolutely out of control and which are beginning to take on a mad momentum of their own." He predicted an unemployment level of 750,000 by February.

Moving another composite resolution on the Incomes and Prices Policy, Dan McGarvey of the Boilermakers stated, "I hope this congress will say to Harold Wilson he has not yet the monopoly of the custodianship of democratic socialism. We say to Harold Wilson you are there by the grace of God and the Labour Party."

"The message for Harold Wilson in our resolution is that you have been tried and it has failed. Try to do something better and collect the support of those you have lost in time enough for the next election."

On Vietnam, defenders of the Labour government again found themselves

in a minority. By 4,686,000 to 3,319,000, delegates overrode General Council's demand that a motion be defeated, calling upon the government to dissociate itself from the American bombing of North Vietnam. They said that the resolution was already TUC policy.

Yes, said J.E.Mortimer of DATA [Draughtsmen and Allied Technicians' Association], Congress last year had called for a stopping of the bombing -- this was the movement's official policy. But what had happened since then? Had the bombing stopped? On the contrary, it had intensified, and Wilson had promised that in the event that Hanoi and Haiphong were bombed, the government would not support the United States. What had changed Mr. Wilson in carrying out his promise because now the cities of North Vietnam were being bombed?

Those who supported the U.S. were becoming more isolated. He appealed to the delegates not to place themselves on the side of those reactionary forces inside the U.S. who are for intensifying the bombing in Vietnam and at the same time are promoting antilabour legislation for their own working class.

"Are we to continue to support," asked C. Bush of the Civil Service Clerical Association, "a policy which spews freedom from the belly of a bomber and prosperity from the muzzle of a rifle. Strange fruits from the hands of a delivering angel."

This motion, exceptionally mild in its demands, and by no means meeting the needs of the Vietnamese people -- the recognition of their right to self-determination -- nevertheless called forth a red-baiting attack from some of the right-wing spokesmen.

The sum total of the opposition victories do not make an alternative strategy for changing government policy. There was no mention of a strategy for on-the-job action to turn back the government offensive.

If the unions wished, they could begin a campaign for the shorter work week which would mobilize the workers and begin to make headway in that area where it has the most influence. By and large, the positions adopted went no further than the pre-1964 position of the Labour party, but mild as they are, they provide the umbrella for an effective socialist opposition.

The next stage in the battle is Scarborough, the Labour party conference in early October.

September 8.

THE BY-ELECTIONS IN CAMBRIDGE AND WALTHAMSTOW

The by-elections in Walthamstow and Cambridge September 21 gave further evidence of working class disaffection from Wilson's Labour government. The critical temper of British workers was reflected by the rejection of Wilson's policies at the Brighton Trades Union Congress earlier in the month.

Walthamstow is an industrial area within Greater London. It has always been considered one of the safest Labour parliamentary seats in Britain. Indeed, for many years it was represented by Clement Attlee, the longtime Labour leader and former prime minister.

Even in the darkest days of Labour's fortunes, when Ramsey MacDonald was saving British capitalism at the depths of the depression in 1931 through stringent antilabour measures, Walthamstow remained faithful to Labour.

This is the seat which the Labour party has just lost to the Tories in a by-election. A comparison of the voting figures with the general election results is revealing:

	<u>General Election</u>	<u>By-election</u>
F.Silvester (Conservative)	5,940	6,652
E.Deakins (Labour)	14,665	6,590
M.Wingfield (Liberal)	3,370	4,105

The Conservatives won the seat by 62 votes. In 1965, Labour romped home with a majority of 8,725. This is almost

exactly the number of voters who failed to vote this time.

The working-class voters of Walthamstow, true to themselves and to their class, have refused to vote the Tory ticket. But they have also expressed in no uncertain measures their complete lack of confidence in Wilson's Labour government by staying away from the polls.

Something similar happened at the Cambridge by-election the same day. Here, the voting was as follows:

	<u>General Election</u>	<u>By-election</u>
D.Lane (Conservative)	20,972	20,488
G.Scurfield (Labour)	21,963	14,510
D.Spreckley (Liberal)	4,928	4,701

The Tory vote, according to these figures, remained almost stable while the Labour vote fell by a disastrous 7,000. Again it was abstentions which brought about the Labour debacle.

In the past, a Labour victory at the polls has generally resulted in a fall in share prices on the London Stock Exchange. The reverse has been the case when the Tories won. This time share prices started falling after the by-election results were declared. A stock exchange dealer was asked by the London Daily Telegraph September 23 why the prices had fallen. He replied, "fears of a Conservative government."

FROM BRIGHTON TO SCARBOROUGH

By George Cunvin

Left-wing delegates to the sixty-sixth annual conference of the Labour party, which convenes at Scarborough on October 2, will arrive heartened by the militant lead given to the Labour movement at the Trades Union Congress just concluded at Brighton.

The fight against the right-wing policies of the Wilson government now takes on new depth and meaning. No longer is it confined to the hard core of left-wingers who have consistently fought for a socialist approach to the problems besetting Britain and the world. The most powerful trade-union movement in Western Europe has now come out for a break with Wilson's complicity in the Vietnam war,

for an end to the antitrade-union economic policies of the Labour government.

This has transformed the whole situation. In the past the trade-union bureaucrats have been able to manipulate their millions of votes to sustain the right-wing conservative leadership of the Labour party. They were able to do this by appealing to the traditional class loyalties of the workers who responded because the Labour party was their party, created by the unions as the political voice of organized labour.

The return of a Labour government under Harold Wilson in 1964 and then with a massive majority in 1966 was the culmi-

nation of years of struggle and dogged work in the constituencies.

Disillusionment followed swiftly as the Labour government pursued largely the same line as its Tory predecessors. In the economic field, Wilson's administration was carrying out the injunctions of the bankers of the City, Wall Street and Zurich. In foreign affairs, Wilson was the tame lapdog of L.B. Johnson, lending his prestige to U.S. aggression in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. Now disillusionment is turning into the beginnings of revolt.

This new spirit is reflected in the resolutions which the Labour Party Conference will be debating in October. True, resolutions similar in content could be found in the agendas of previous conferences, but, in the past, they represented the views of a minority, swimming against the stream, determined to keep the flame of socialism flickering -- a militant minority who knew beforehand that their resolutions would be defeated by the platform but who also knew it was their duty to keep the socialist principles before the movement.

This year the leadership in the fight for a socialist policy may well pass into the hands of the massive trade unions. This time there is every chance the platform will be defeated on decisive issues.

The mood which is sweeping the rank and file is well expressed in the resolution from Sheffield, Hallam CLP [Labour party constituency]:

"This Conference reaffirms its support for the programme on which the Labour Government was returned to power. In doing so it notes with deep regret the failure of the Government to withstand reactionary pressure both at home and abroad. In particular it calls upon the Government to end its present subservience to the economic policies of the Treasury and the City of London and the foreign policies of the American Government and it reiterates its conviction that only a Government committed to economic and social equality, ready greatly to extend public ownership and planning and prepared to conduct an independent foreign policy, can overcome the deep-seated social and economic problems of Britain."

It is typical of many resolutions. Always there is the firm affirmation of support for a Labour government -- but a Labour government which carries out the wishes of its working-class supporters, not a Labour government subservient to the dictates of finance capital at home and abroad.

Even those who support the idea of a Prices and Incomes Policy are critical of the way it has operated: freezing wages while prices go up, creating a big pool of unemployment and generally lowering the hard-won living standards of the workers. What these would-be supporters of the government do not understand is that under capitalism the control of prices is virtually impossible and all the pious resolutions cannot change this fundamental economic fact.

Resolutions on foreign policy show an awareness of the interaction of domestic and foreign affairs. As the resolution from Liverpool, Wavertree CLP, states:

"Conference believes that a prerequisite to a socialist foreign policy is a thoroughgoing socialist domestic policy.

"...on the basis of capitalism at home, a Labour Government cannot show the way to economic and political freedom to the exploited, backward countries of the world."

On Vietnam, there is some confusion from those who believe that the United Nations or negotiations between the American imperialists and Hanoi can resolve the conflict. But the socialist position is firmly put, for example, by the Bute and North Ayrshire CLP:

"This Conference recognises that the war in Vietnam is basically a class struggle between the people of Vietnam through the National Liberation Front, and the U.S. imperialists and the fascist puppet government in Saigon.

"Conference therefore urges the Labour Government to disassociate itself from the United States' imperialist policy, as only the Vietnamese have the right to decide the future of their country.

"Conference furthermore declares its belief in internationalism and pledges full support to the victory of the Vietnamese and the National Liberation Front."

One thing is certain! Wilson's backing of LBJ in Southeast Asia is going to get a severe thumping from the delegates at Scarborough. All these issues and many more which cannot be discussed in detail within the scope of a single article are of great importance for the future of British labour. But, perhaps the most important is the fight for democracy within the Labour party.

Since coming into power, the Wilson government has completely disregarded the movement when it voiced demands contrary to the interests of capital. Conference

must now face up to this issue and insist that the policies it adopts must become the basis for legislation introduced by the Labour government. If it fails to do this, the government will be labour in name only; in fact it would be the executive committee of the ruling class.

There are several resolutions on this vital issue which will probably be composited into a single resolution embodying this demand for inner party democracy and insisting that the conference and not a cabinet cabal determine the policy to be pursued by the party's parliamentary representatives.

Brighton marked a turning point which will almost certainly be endorsed at Scarborough.

The enthusiasm which brought Labour to power in 1964 and which was turned into apathy and despair by the antiworking-class policies of the government will now be revived under the impulse of the new militancy which is developing within the movement.

Socialism is once more on the agenda for British Labour!

September 9.

McNAMARA'S PERSPECTIVE OF UNLIMITED MEGA-DEATHS

In an address to United Press International publishers and editors at San Francisco September 18, Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara made one of the most important statements in the past decade on U.S. military strategy.

He announced Johnson's decision to build a "limited" Nike-X missile system which will cost \$5 billion. It will rely on long-range radar to pick up approaching missiles thousands of miles away, launch Spartan interceptor missiles within 400 miles of the target and fast-accelerating Spring missiles within fifty miles of the target.

McNamara claimed that this network was being installed as a countermeasure to the emerging nuclear capability of China.

"China has been cautious," he said, "to avoid any action that might end in a nuclear clash with the United States -- however wild her words -- and understandably so. We have the power not only to destroy completely her entire nuclear offensive forces, but to devastate her society as well.

"Is there any possibility, then, that by the mid-1970's China might become so incautious as to attempt a nuclear attack on the United States or our allies?

"It would be insane and suicidal for her to do so, but one can conceive conditions under which China might miscalculate. We wish to reduce such possibilities to a minimum."

He stated that the anti-China system would bring the added benefits of restraining China from employing nuclear blackmail against her neighbors and limiting nuclear weapon proliferation in that area, strengthening the Minutemen sites against Soviet attack, and protect-

ing the U.S. against the accidental launching of an intercontinental missile.

The bulk of his speech, however, was directed to the Soviet leadership. He warned Moscow against following the U.S. example and expanding its limited anti-missile network. The penalty, he indicated, would be an increase by the U.S. of its offensive arsenal.

"The cornerstone of our strategic policy," he stated, "continues to be to deter deliberate nuclear attack upon the United States, or its allies, by maintaining a highly reliable ability to inflict an unacceptable degree of damage upon any single aggressor, or combination of aggressors, at any time during the course of a strategic nuclear exchange -- even after our absorbing a surprise first strike.

"This can be defined as our 'assured destruction capability.'"

McNamara went on to say: "The United States cannot -- and will not -- ever permit itself to get into the position in which another nation, or combination of nations, would possess such a first-strike capability, which could be effectively used against it...

"Now, we are not in that position today -- and there is no foreseeable danger of our ever getting into that position."

He pointed out that, as matters stand, neither the Soviet Union nor the United States possesses a first-strike capability and both have "an actual and credible second-strike capability" against one another. However, the United States "does have a substantial superiority over the Soviet Union in the weapons targeted against each other."

Washington is determined at all costs to maintain this advantage. "We are

not going to permit the Soviets to out-distance us, because to do so would be to jeopardize our very viability as a nation."

The defense secretary called on the Soviet leaders to begin negotiations to slow down the catastrophic nuclear arms race and reduce the size of the overkill arsenals both sides possess. Both powers now have more than enough ICBM's to deter a first strike by the other.

"Our alert forces alone carry more than 2,200 weapons, averaging more than one megaton each," he said. "A mere 400 one-megaton weapons, if delivered on the Soviet Union, would be sufficient to destroy over one-third of her population, and one-half of her industry. And all of these flexible and highly reliable forces are equipped with devices that insure their penetration of Soviet defenses."

Significantly, McNamara made no mention of tactical atomic weapons which the Pentagon has plans to use in what the defense secretary designated as "a wide spectrum of lesser forms of political and military aggression -- a level of aggression against which the use of strategic nuclear forces would not be to our advantage..."

The decision to go ahead with a limited missile defense system at this time is characteristic of Johnson's style of procedure. His administration keeps taking partial steps in escalating the arms race while protesting that it would

prefer to take the opposite course if only the enemy would be more reasonable.

For months influential members of Congress and the head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, egged on by big corporate contractors, have been pressing for a massive antimissile system costing \$50 billion or more to be erected against a supposed Soviet surprise attack. The administration has been reluctant to plunge into so costly a venture when the federal budget is already far out of balance.

However, Johnson does not want to foreclose such a move lest, among other reasons, the less restrainable Dr. Strangeloves in official circles charge in the coming election year that he is jeopardizing the security of the American people. The plan to proceed with a limited Nike-X network is a step in that direction.

McNamara argued that the sole purpose of stockpiling such colossal megatonnage is to deter the Soviet Union and China and that the United States does not harbor any aggressive intentions.

His assurances are rendered somewhat dubious by what James Reston, associate editor of the New York Times, had to say in a book published the same week. Reston, who has direct access to the thinking of the Pentagon's military strategists, writes that Khrushchev's assumption that the United States would never use nuclear power was "highly reckless," adding: "For nuclear war...is not 'unthinkable.' It is, in cold fact, being thought about and planned."

TRADE UNIONS IN JAPAN SET VIETNAM WAR PROTEST FOR OCTOBER 21

A massive demonstration against U.S. aggression in Vietnam is scheduled to take place in Japan on October 21. Called under broad sponsorship, the action promises to be one of the most significant of the international protests being held in solidarity with the American antiwar movement's mobilization in Washington the same day.

The chief organizers of the Japan action are SOHYO [the Japan General Council of Trade Unions], the Japan Socialist party and the Japan Youth Committee Against War.

Hiroyuki Sasako, general secretary of the Japan Youth Committee Against War, estimated in a letter to the Student Mobilization Committee in the U.S. that a central meeting in Tokyo would bring out 300,000, and as many as three million people would demonstrate throughout Japan.

October 21, Sasako said, is a

"very significant date for the peace and democratic movement in Japan." It marks the first anniversary of a nationwide general strike against the war in Vietnam called by SOHYO on October 21 last year.

It is also the date when Japan's Prime Minister Sato is expected to arrive in Saigon for a goodwill visit to the military clique of Thieu and Ky.

The Japan Youth Committee Against War, at a special national convention, voted to call for demonstrations of Japanese youth on October 13 to help build the International Day of Protest the following week. The demonstration will have two aims: to demand that the U.S. get out of Vietnam and to oppose the planned visit of Prime Minister Sato to South Vietnam. The government's decision to allow the U.S. atomic carrier Enterprise to dock at Japanese ports in the near future will also be protested.

THE FRANKFURT CONGRESS OF THE SOCIALIST GERMAN STUDENT FEDERATION

By Manfred Ernst

Frankfurt

The twenty-second annual congress of the Sozialistischer Deutsche Student-
enbund [SDS -- Socialist German Student
Federation] met in Frankfurt, Septem-
ber 6-8. The meeting displayed the action
and high theoretical and political debate
which have made this student organization,
the only legal left opposition in West
Germany today, a dynamic arena in which a
new generation of youth have boldly chal-
lenged their country's ruling class.

They are the horror and scandal of
their fathers, as the sensational newspa-
per coverage here reveals, but a new and
promising revolutionary cadre is being
assembled within their ranks.

The delegated conference repre-
sented all SDS groups in West Germany and
there were more than 200 invited guests,
ranging from a delegation from the Soviet
Union to a delegation from the Fourth
International.

The spirit and temper of the con-
ference was symbolized by a large flag of
the Vietnamese National Liberation Front
dominating the wall behind the presidium.
The SDS has sparked and organized a se-
ries of impressive actions and demonstra-
tions in solidarity with the NLF in the
recent period. [See World Outlook, Sep-
tember 8, p. 767.]

In fact, during the conference
itself, SDSers seized the opportunity to
demonstrate their modus operandi: A pro-
American, CIA-subsidized institution in
Frankfurt, American House, had imprudent-
ly sponsored a symposium at this time on
"Vietnam -- Is the American Effort Suffi-
cient?" to which they invited West German
journalists and representatives of News-
week magazine to participate.

To the consternation of the orga-
nizers, a delegation of the SDS led by
Rudi Dutschke of the Berlin SDS took over
the platform, raised an NLF flag, and
opened the meeting by singing the "Inter-
nationale." Dutschke then introduced an
American professor who spoke on Vietnam.

With some 100 SDSers in the audi-
ence and SDS control of the podium it was
clear that the pro-American organizers
had lost control of their meeting and
they called the cops. One hundred offi-
cers took on the SDSers and finally suc-
ceeded in driving them out of the hall.

But once out, the students rein-
forced and reformed their ranks and
staged what they call an "anti-

discussion." The entire action was admi-
rably and smoothly organized with a thor-
oughness that has characterized most of
the Berlin SDS actions. In this case it
served as a laboratory demonstration for
the youth leaders from all over Europe
who had been invited to the congress -- a
demonstration initiated and led by the
Berlin section of the SDS to illustrate
their thesis that in the present context
of West German politics, spirited action
is needed in order to break up the image
of smug conformity that seems to dominate
all of West Germany.

The Berlin section of the SDS is
the dominant tendency inside the SDS and
succeeded in establishing its leadership
of the SDS at this congress.

A major debate on the congress
floor on the role of the working class
brought the Berlin tendency in confronta-
tion with a loose coalition of tendencies
which can roughly be described as spokes-
men and sympathizers of the illegal West
German Kommunistischen Partei [CP -- Com-
munist party].

The CP is actually a small appa-
ratus kept alive for its possible usefulness
ultimately in bargaining between East and
West Germany.

The Berlin students, beginning
their political lives with wholesale re-
jection of the West German bourgeois es-
tablishment, also tend, like many American
students, to overlook the revolutionary
potential of a largely conservatized work-
ing class.

This has led to the popularity of
Herbert Marcuse, whose writings find a
ready echo in the students' own present
experience. In a sense they are being
victimized by Marcuse, who represents an
old generation that saw all its hopes
destroyed by Stalinism and fascism. Pre-
ferring to forget its own responsibilities
for that dark period, it takes a lugubri-
ous revenge by denying the class struggle
and the historical role of the working
class.

But these students have nothing in
common with the old, defeated and sour
survivors of the past. That Marcuse now
sees progress through classless conscious-
ness of a presumed elite brings his views
into a temporary accord with a new genera-
tion of students who have entered the
political stage -- and see that they oc-
cupy it almost exclusively.

Formally and to a large extent ab-
stractly, the other tendency in the con-

gress, which the Berlin group calls pro-Stalinist, defended the Marxist view on the role of the working class. This, of course, is the weak side of the Berlin group and it leaves them wide open to attack.

But when it comes down to basic decisions of what to do now and how to do it, the Berlin group shows its superiority. The others gave the very strong impression of being rather passive elements who would like to put the SDS at the disposal of the trade-union bureaucracies.

When this tendency introduced a debate on a motion to fight for the legalization of the West German CP, which to them was the major question for the congress, they met defeat because they refused to agree that all revolutionary groups be legalized. This would include the Fourth Internationalists in Germany. The tendency's sectarianism tripped it up.

A further debate took place on a resolution hailing the fiftieth anniversary of the October revolution. Here the division between Stalinist-influenced and left-wing students became quite clear. The left wing wanted to differentiate between the program and ideas of October in Lenin's time and the myths and parody of the Kremlin usurpers at present. One of the Berlin delegates spoke of the disastrous heritage of Stalinism and its consequences. Pointing to the East German regime, he denied that it should be called a truly socialist state and said it must be characterized as a transitional state that could lead to socialism.

A delegate from Heidelberg called attention to the festivities being organized in West Germany by the Soviet embassy to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary. He said that Kiesinger, Strauss, Beitz and 1,696 leaders of big business, finance and the church were invited to a special party to be given by the Russian ambassador.

A high point was the announcement that a representative of the Fourth International would address the convention. The audience, which had generally kept up a buzz of conversation and moving around during all addresses, came immediately to attention and an uncommon quiet descended as Thomas Clement, the young representative of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International, began to speak. He took up some of the issues in dispute, relating them to the worldwide revolutionary struggle of today, from Vietnam to Latin America. [See text of speech elsewhere in this issue.]

Following his remarks, the Soviet delegation -- all middle aged -- left the congress, to the amusement of the majority of delegates present. They sent a letter

to the congress which was read the next day.

It protested the appearance of the Fourth International spokesman and what they called the "anti-Soviet spirit" of the congress. The contrast between the reception given their spokesman and that given to the spokesman of the Fourth International was too humiliating to be ignored. In this small but significant episode, one can read the harsh judgment being drawn up by a new generation of German revolutionists on Stalinism -- straight or sugar-coated.

It is too early to predict the final evolution of this student movement. But obviously at the present time it is of considerable importance in a regrouping and reorienting process that is taking place in West Germany.

It would be superficial and mistaken to take the formal ideology of the present dominant leadership which is heavily burdened with Marcusean conceptions and read into it an inevitable evolution to the right and other dire consequences. To be sure, this ideology carries with it an inevitable collision with the fundamental historical tide of the European working class.

If one accepts the basic premise of this thinking, which posits the complete passivity of the working class as a class, then all prospects of a revolutionary socialist transformation including that attempted by an elite of so-called conscious people fall to the ground.

Then the work and sacrifices of the SDS cadres themselves will turn out to have had only a nuisance value. Much more must be said about the basic propositions of Marcuse insofar as they influence the program and thinking of these students, but this requires another article. Nevertheless, we will see how Marcuse's basically antihistorical construction stands up at the first serious test of strength between the German bourgeoisie and the many-millions German proletariat.

And we are safe, I think, in concluding that there is a world of difference between the Marcusean speculations of a defeated professor in his study, and the exhilarating self-consciousness of students who take on the cops in Berlin and Frankfurt.

An entire generation of German revolutionists was destroyed by Hitler after being betrayed by German Social Democracy and Stalinism. The revolutionary socialist continuity was snapped and its human agents were pulverized. Now the threads of that continuity are slowly being spliced together in the hands of a

new generation. As many times before, students are the first to take up that task and so it is in West Germany today.

Two strongly positive orientations were manifested by the leadership and cadre of the SDS which gives it big promise for the future. The first was its wholehearted identification with the worldwide struggle against imperialism and the second was its realization that

it must orient to the organization of young high-school students who are, after all, the proletarians of tomorrow.

And one should mention also the avid interest these students have in ideas and program. At the very least, they will help swell a demand for revolutionary literature in Germany which will bear its own fruit. This was clearly manifested at the Frankfurt congress.

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL GREETES SDS CONGRESS

[The following is the text of the remarks made by Thomas Clement in behalf of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International at the congress of the Socialist German Student Federation held in Frankfurt, September 6-8.]

[For an evaluation of the congress see the report elsewhere in this issue of World Outlook.]

* * *

Comrades,

In bringing your congress the greetings of the Fourth International, I would first of all like to express the solidarity of my organization with the struggles you are enthusiastically leading against the imperialist aggression in Vietnam.

It is not by chance that support for the Vietnamese revolution has been taken up as a main task precisely by those youth organizations that have appeared in most European countries in recent years independently of the traditional workers parties.

Following the successes of the colonial revolution in China, Cuba and Vietnam, it is a fact that the revolutionary drive in the Third World was dealt a series of grave setbacks -- in Brazil, the Dominican Republic, the Congo, Ghana, Indonesia and recently in Greece.

In this context of successes and setbacks, Vietnam constitutes the essential point of resistance against the imperialist offensive. The immediate future of socialism and humanity hinges on this confrontation.

Either the Vietnamese revolution will win by defeating the U.S., thereby unleashing immense forces throughout the world; or imperialism will win, thereby bringing the working and peasant masses under repression and directly threaten-

ing the workers states of Cuba and China.

The decisive nature of this confrontation has been pointed out by Fidel Castro and Che Guevara. In place of the paralyzing policies of peaceful coexistence, it is necessary to substitute revolutionary political action on a world-wide scale. This is the meaning of the slogan "to create two, three...many Vietnams."

Of course this is not applicable in the advanced capitalist countries where an exceptional period of economic growth and stability has existed for twenty years.

The main responsibility for this situation lies with the reformist workers parties -- in the first place, the Social Democratic parties tied in with their own bourgeoisies, and, secondly, the Communist parties linked to the Soviet bureaucracy and its policy of building socialism in one country.

It was mainly under the impact of the colonial revolution that revolutionary youth organizations began to appear in our countries. The problem for these organizations is to break out of their social and political isolation and find support among other social layers, particularly the working class. In this connection, two dangers are to be avoided:

The first is to conclude from the fact that the working class tends as of the moment to be sucked in by capitalism that this is an organic structural feature of the working class itself.

The second danger is of an opposite kind -- to discount the possibility of organizing a real mass movement among the youth while awaiting the appearance of a revolutionary current among the workers.

If the working class is the only class that is revolutionary historically,

it is not necessarily revolutionary at each and every moment. In France, Belgium and Italy the development of class consciousness among the workers has been held to the trade-union level. In Germany even the elementary beginnings of class consciousness were destroyed for a whole period by Nazism. The problem is to revolutionize the class as such and to bring it to exist for itself.

The lines of action proposed by your congress -- first, to mobilize on the parliamentary level against the emergency laws; second, to campaign for the expropriation of the Springer newspaper chain; third, to organize demonstrations in support of the Vietnamese revolution and against NATO -- go beyond the campus and can be understood and accepted on a broad scale among the exploited layers of society.

The activities of your movement

along such lines can contribute to breaking the impasse in the German political situation, for it is only by and through political action that class consciousness can be developed.

We think that the student revolt in the German Federal Republic is an extremely important phenomenon. Our movement appears in the social scene not in an abstract way, verbally, but concretely through mass action. It can open up a dynamic process, the result of which would be to set the working class into motion.

Long live the SDS congress!

Long live the Vietnamese revolution!

Long live revolutionary Cuba!

Long live socialism!

"I'M NOT A WARMONGER BUT..."

Most people in the world look on the United States' bombing of North Vietnam as a brutal aggression against a people fighting for their freedom. Not so Lieutenant John Newman, a U.S. navy pilot who flies bombing raids "over the beach" (into North Vietnam) every day.

"I'm not a warmonger," Newman told Mark Frankland of the London Observer, "but flying over the beach is a great thrill, like playing Russian roulette, taking LSD or having sex."

Traditionally, in Russian roulette, the player points the gun at his own head.

Newman feels hurt by the lack of respect for professional military men in

the U.S. After all, he says, "we do live a gentleman's war out here....We sit down to dinner attended by stewards and we go to bed between sheets."

This career officer has his own solution to the war:

"You could just start at the DMZ and move north, bombing everything. I think Haiphong should be annihilated."

Does he advocate the wholesale bombing of civilians? Not at all: "There aren't such things as civilians over there. I've seen kids with rifles shooting at us. If that kid learns about trajectories and hits my engine or fuel line I'm finished."

In this issue

Page

What the Black Power Struggle Is About [Text of Stokely Carmichael's "Sucesos" Interview]	802
Canadian Capitalist Newspaper Dissents on OAS	810
Dominican PRD Switches Its Line	811
Japanese CP Rejects Mao "Cult"	811
Pentagon Jubilant over Apparent Paralysis of China's Defense	813
The Cargo Cult Syndrome	813
London Antiwar Rally Planned for October 22	814
October 21 Demonstrations Set in Norway	814
The Trades Union Congress Goes Against Wilson -- by Ernest Tate	815
The By-elections in Cambridge and Walthamstow	817
From Brighton to Scarborough -- by George Cunvin	817
McNamara's Perspective of Unlimited Mega-Deaths	819
Trade Unions in Japan Set Vietnam War Protest for October 21	820
The Frankfurt Congress of the Socialist German Student Federation -- by Manfred Ernst	821
Fourth International Greet SDS Congress	823
"I'm Not a Warmonger But..."	824