

Formerly **WORLD OUTLOOK**

# Intercontinental Press

Africa

Asia

Europe

Oceania

the Americas

Vol. 6, No. 17

May 6, 1968

50¢



**"END THE WAR MADNESS . . . NOW!"** Youths at the head of giant column of demonstrators marching down Fifth Avenue in New York April 27. A similar feeder column came down a parallel street, Central Park West. The two columns converged

in Central Park, packing the twelve acres of Sheep Meadow with a crowd admitted by the press to be at least 87,000. Police at the rally said unofficially that the total turnout was about 200,000. A rival prowar parade drew less than 3,000.

## ***Which Road for the British Antiwar Movement?***

**The Communist Party View — by Betty Reid**

**A Reply by the Editors of 'The Week'**

**The Trotskyist Position in the Dispute — by Joseph Hansen**

# WE CHANGE OUR NAME

By the Editors

As we expect you will have noticed, we have changed our name from World Outlook to Intercontinental Press.

The change is not intended to indicate any shift in policy. It is made merely to remove a conflict with another publication in the United States. We did not care to fight the thing out in the courts because of the expense involved, although we think we have a good case. When we began publication in Paris in 1963, we registered there in accordance with the postal rules and regulations of France, thereby excluding anyone else from legally using the name in that country at least.

Whatever the courts might have decided, we think our new name is a good one and in some respects even an improvement.

Since our first issue, dated September 27, 1963, we have moved ahead steadily. The technical improvements have been considerable since the first numbers were produced on a mimeograph (or roneo) -- more accurately a sturdy Rex Rotary.

On the editorial side, too, we think we have advanced, particularly in the extent of the field we cover.

As for circulation, this continues to surprise us in view of the cost of a subscription. (We rely wholly on subscriptions to keep going.) The reputation of World Outlook has been spread almost solely by word of mouth.

When we began, our primary intention was to supply various publications in a number of countries with material on a cooperative basis. We still do this, and some articles which we have supplied have reached huge audiences.

Individuals who learned about us began subscribing, however, and this tendency continued until eventually we bowed to the demand and even began servicing a few newsstands.

We have thus come to fill a unique niche in several ways. The late Isaac Deutscher, who was one of our steady readers and very encouraging to us, told us that he did not know of anything quite like it in the history of the revolutionary movement.

Under our new name of Intercontinental Press we will do our best to maintain the high standard in revolutionary journalism which we set for ourselves in launching World Outlook in 1963.

## In this issue

	Page
PHOTO: Antiwar Parade on Fifth Avenue .....	385
We Change Our Name -- by the Editors .....	386
The April 26-27 Demonstrations .....	387
PHOTO: A Placard at Sheep Meadow .....	388
Telling It Like It Is .....	388
PHOTO: Part of Crowd at New York Antiwar Rally .....	389
Count Them Yourself .....	389
"Violence Unparalleled in Postwar Germany" -- by Gerry Foley .....	390
Behind Wall Street's Shift on Vietnam -- by Dick Roberts .....	392
H. Rap Brown Freed on Bail .....	393
Ultraright Terrorist Leader Killed in Guatemala .....	393
Which Road for the Vietnam Antiwar Movement in Britain?:	
The Real Diversionists -- by Intercontinental Press .....	394
Divisions in the Fight for Peace -- by Betty Reid .....	395
The Left and Vietnam -- An Answer to Some Critics	
-- by the Editors of "The Week" .....	399
Trotskyism Vs. Stalinism in the British Antiwar Movement	
-- by Joseph Hansen .....	403
"Open Rebellion" Seen as "Genuine Possibility" Among U.S. Troops .....	407
DRAWING: Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey .....	408
Once Again -- How Many More Troops Was That? .....	408

Make checks payable to

INTERCONTINENTAL PRESS,

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

New York, N.Y.

10010

126

EDITOR: Joseph Hansen. CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Pierre Frank, Livio Maitan, George Novack. TRANSLATIONS: Gerry Foley, George Saunders. BUSINESS MANAGER: Reba Hansen. Published each Monday except last in December and first in January; biweekly in July; not published in August. TO SUBSCRIBE: For 26 issues send \$7.50 to Intercontinental Press, P.O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station, New York, N.Y. 10010. Write for rates on airmail. PARIS OFFICE: Pierre Frank, 95 rue du Faubourg, Saint-Martin,

Paris 10, France. INTERCONTINENTAL PRESS specializes in political analysis and interpretation of events of particular interest to the labor, socialist, colonial independence, and black liberation movements. Signed articles represent the views of the authors, which may not necessarily coincide with those of Intercontinental Press. Insofar as it reflects editorial opinion, unsigned material expresses the standpoint of revolutionary Marxism. Copyright © 1968 by Intercontinental Press.

## THE APRIL 26-27 DEMONSTRATIONS

The vast throng that jammed into Central Park in New York April 27 gave the imperialist rulers of the United States their answer -- if any was needed -- on whether the popular attitude toward the war in Vietnam has changed since Johnson announced that he had decided not to run for office again and was willing to talk any place, any time, anywhere with the government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam in order to achieve peace.

The answer was a warning to stop the double-talk that has been going on since Johnson made these two gestures and get on with bringing the war to an end. The vast majority of Americans want the troops brought home; and they want them brought home now.

The answer was all the more emphatic in light of the student demonstrations throughout the United States the day before. In the New York area, some 200,000 students were officially admitted to have "missed" their classes on April 26. American youth don't want to serve in a dirty war of colonial conquest and they are becoming more and more determined about expressing their opposition in an active way.

Perhaps even more impressive was the miserable fiasco of the prowar "loyalty" parade that was organized by the flag-waving "hawks" in direct rivalry to the antiwar demonstration at Central Park in New York. Obviously intended as a test of strength, it proved to be a stunning boomerang for its sponsors. The New York Times counted 2,669 "loyalty" marchers. This compares with the 87,000 counted by the same paper as participating in the two marches that converged in Sheep Meadow in opposition to the war. (The Times failed to count those who showed up individually and who swelled the attendance to somewhere around the 200,000 mark.)

Most significant of all, the figure of 2,669 bitter-enders stands in contrast to the 30,000 to 40,000 participants and estimated 750,000 viewers at the first parade of this kind in New York in 1948 when it was launched during the "cold war" as an annual affair deliberately intended to kill the labor and socialist tradition of marching on May Day.

The April 26-27 student and antiwar demonstrations were international in scope. Actions occurred in key capitals ranging from Tokyo to Mexico and Paris. As of this writing, only the first reports have reached New York, but it is obviously of tremendous significance that the appeal of the antiwar demonstrators in the United States for sympathetic actions of solidarity abroad should meet

with such widespread and early response.

This, too, constituted a warning to the figures who run the United States to take heed. It is high time to cut short the ill-considered adventure on the mainland of Asia!

Historically minded persons, noting the proximity of April 26-27 to May 1, were reminded by the huge turnout in New York of the old May Day demonstrations in that city.

They noted something else. The observance of May Day followed the initiative of the American workers in calling for a general strike on that day in 1886 in the struggle for the eight-hour day. A similar initiative in the struggle against the war in Vietnam has led to a notable coordination of marches and rallies abroad in 1968. It should now be the turn of the Americans, according to this line of thinking, to resume celebrating the international holiday of the workers and their allies -- but on a new and more militant level.

Despite the extraordinary size of the April 27 demonstration in New York, it was not as large as the one a year ago on April 15. However, it would be an error of some size to conclude from this that the antiwar sentiment is subsiding. The total number of demonstrators involved in actions from coast to coast in the United States on April 26-27 was much higher than a year ago.

In addition there was a significant rise in the militancy of the demonstrations, particularly on the campuses. The association with the black liberation struggle was also stronger judging from the increased number of black participants and the abundance of signs and placards referring to the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King and opposing "police occupation of black communities."

But the demonstrations now involve broad masses of people and are therefore directly affected by fluctuations in the mass mood. No doubt millions of Americans are looking expectantly to the Johnson administration to deliver peace as they had been led to believe he was promising in his March 31 speech. They may have felt that it was less urgent to demonstrate on April 26-27.

The actual number who came out must thus be judged by comparing it with what would have happened if Johnson had not made his speech. It must also be judged by what is certain to happen if Johnson fails to end the war -- and soon.



#### TELLING IT LIKE IT IS

One of the most striking aspects of the April 27 protest against the Vietnam war held in New York was the widespread freedom of speech exercised by the participants. In the photo above, the marcher's cap identifies him as a Veteran for Peace, who has served in the U.S. armed forces. Hundreds at the demonstration carried signs speaking out on many topics involving the war. These ranged from mild dissent to revolutionary socialism. A few portraits of Che Guevara

appeared, as did a few flags of the National Liberation Front.

The freedom of all tendencies opposed to the war to participate in the demonstration with their own signs, slogans and literature was an important factor in swelling its size. Before the upsurge of the antiwar movement began in 1965, groups organizing "peace" demonstrations prohibited unauthorized signs and excluded radicals and revolutionists.





COUNT THEM YOURSELF

The photo above shows only a single sector of the throng that gathered in Sheep Meadow in New York's Central Park April 27 to protest the Vietnam war. Police on the spot estimated the turnout at 200,000.

The New York Times put the total for the two parades that marched into the park from opposite sides at 87,000. But in addition to the parades, tens of thousands came to the park individually.

Shortly after the rally began, the loud-speaker system stopped functioning. The speakers could not be heard at all in the vast open meadow, and many people left the park. Others however continued to stream into the area until late in the afternoon.

Besides listing only what their two reporters claim to have actually counted, the Times argued that the 12-acre meadow could hold only 58,080 people.

This figure, the Times explained, was arrived at by dividing the total area -- 522,725 square feet -- by "the minimal space required for one person to sit down comfortably -- 9 square feet." Sheep Meadow was packed, as can be seen from the photo. Few appear to be sitting as prescribed by the expert at the Times desk, who seems to have also slipped up by failing to inform the two Times reporters what the theoretical maximum of their count could be.

The massive demonstration was in sharp contrast to the prowar "Loyalty Day" parade held in New York the same day, which drew less than 3,000 -- the smallest turnout since 1948. The New York Post predicted 60,000 would march for the war. The Times later admitted the parade was the smallest in the 20-year history of the event. Almost all the marchers wore uniforms: right-wing veterans' groups, parochial school bands, drill squads from military academies, and Boy Scouts.

## "VIOLENCE UNPARALLELED IN POSTWAR GERMANY"

By Gerry Foley

The response of the police to the West German demonstrators protesting the red-baiting campaign of the Springer press monopoly -- which had helped create the atmosphere conducive to the shooting of Berlin student leader Rudi Dutschke on April 11 -- has led to a sharp rise in tension in the Bonn republic.

The moderate German weekly magazine Der Spiegel commented April 22 that "The behavior shown by the police in their attacks on the students and citizens, who built barricades from Holy Thursday [April 11] to Easter Monday [April 14], was indeed cause for weeping. Brutality, sadism, uncertainty in a hysterical atmosphere, and antagonism toward the opponents of this social system drove the forces of order to acts of violence unparalleled in postwar Germany."

The Los Angeles Times-Washington Post news service reported April 16: "Millions of West Germans watched on television the other night a scene in which the police seemed simply to have run amok. A student was felled by a policeman. A girl in a raincoat knelt by his side. The next instant police with clubs flailing at the girl swooped in and hurled her away like a rag."

Massive force was brought to bear against the students by panicky authorities. Troops were used in the capital of the state of Hesse and heavy concentrations of police in most large cities.

Der Spiegel carried a long article April 22 entitled "Violent Acts by the State Power,"\* citing instance after in-

stance of wanton violence.

In Hannover, about fifty SDS [Sozialistischer Deutscher Studentenbund -- German Socialist Student League] members sat down in front of the Hannoversche Presse building where the Springer paper Bild is also printed. The printing plant managers begged the two policemen stationed in the court of the building to clear the way, but in vain. A police car cruised up and down in front of the building obviously paying no attention to the students.

The leader of the SDS group called upon the demonstrators to observe nonviolence, telling them over a bullhorn, "Don't let yourselves be provoked, yield to the police." The students were careful not to obstruct traffic and they helped workers of the Hannoversche Presse to move bundles of that paper out through the plant windows.

Then, Der Spiegel reports, after the sit-in had lasted six and one-half hours, tight ranks of police with water cannon moved in suddenly without warning: "...the police charged blindly into the students, striking deliberately at their folded arms."

A local housewife, Inge-Anke MacArthur gave this description of a police attack in Hamburg on 1,000 young people gathered in front of a police headquarters to demonstrate for the release of their arrested companions: "Quite suddenly" about 150 police charged "on the demonstrators...Although most...tried to run, the police managed to beat a lot of them very severely."

---

\* "Gewaltakte der Staatsgewalt." The German word "Gewalt" means both power in the sense of state power and violence. Thus the title of the Spiegel article is at once an untranslatable pun and an ironic comment.

A law student among these demonstrators gave this account of the police onslaught: "Young policemen with contorted faces charged me and beat me on my back. I lay on the ground next to two

women who were crying loudly. One's head was bleeding. I asked one of the police officers to look after the wounded and, this earned me a kick and two truncheon blows."

Another of these demonstrators, Hartmut Reiser, told how five policemen worked him over with their clubs and fists: "with the most brutal method -- deliberate truncheon blows on the head, deliberate blows on the sexual organs; they kept on beating me until I was in the cell."

A high-school student, Holger Sturm, reported how the police mercilessly attacked those trying to run away: "A running demonstrator ran up against a policeman. He raised both hands as a sign of surrender. The policeman hit him anyway."

Demonstrator Michael Anders said: "They drove us into a doorway. There were six of us and we couldn't move backward or forward. The police rained blows on us, although we begged them to stop. A policeman yelled out to me, 'You Communist swine are going to get it in the kisser!'"

An intern and German army reserve lieutenant, Ulrich Starke, who witnessed the incident, said that the police, obeying "a criminal verbal order, struck indiscriminately." Starke gave first aid to a bleeding student and took him to a nearby hospital where he was outraged to find that most of the wounded students who had been brought there had received "truncheon blows between the eyes."

At the Hallesche Tor in West Berlin, police pursued a fleeing student and beat him over the head until he fell helpless to the ground. Then, according to a young musician who watched the scene from a car with friends, "More police came up and beat the screaming young man lying on the ground with the most extreme brutality."

"There were eight to ten police. The driver of our car, an electrical engineer who had not taken part in the demonstration at the Springer building drove up to the spot, got out, and asked for the policemen's badge numbers. They were not given and he was driven away with blows in the face. At the same time they [the police] struck at us with their clubs through the open windows of the car. An older art historian was struck in the face and suffered a severe wound."

In addition to demonstrators and passers-by, in the heat of the April 11-14 events, police also attacked news cameramen, who were photographing their acts of brutality, as well as the friends and relatives of arrested demonstrators, who came to police stations to pick them

up as they were released.

Spiegel cameraman Gunther Zint, who photographed a policeman ramming his knee into the groin of a young demonstrator, was attacked and beaten to the ground; his camera was seized and a policeman jumped on it with both feet. When Zint tried to complain to the officer in charge, he was told: "Beat it, buster, or haven't you had enough?" Another cop pushed the reporter around several times more, jeering at him: "Excuse me."

At the police station on the Friesenstrasse in the Kreuzberg section of Berlin a couple of dozen cars gathered, waiting to pick up released demonstrators. The police attacked this line of cars in two waves. On the first wave, they beat on the roofs and fenders of the cars with their clubs and smashed headlights and windows. In the second, they pulled everyone out of the cars and beat them up, including some highly respectable bourgeois parents of arrested students.

Reactions to the police pogrom were mixed. West Berlin's Social Democratic mayor Klaus Schütz, a notorious red-baiter, expressed his appreciation of the police efforts: "I want especially to thank the police; when necessary they struck hard and unhesitatingly."

However, in the German state of Hesse, where elections are in the offing, Social Democratic officials sharply criticized the police actions. SPD [Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands -- Social Democratic party of Germany] members were reported collecting eyewitness accounts of police excesses. And even the Christian Democratic state party chairman Alfred Dregger, who had called for harsh measures against the students, indicated embarrassment over the police violence: "I find this also distasteful."

The West German Jurists League [Deutsche Richtersbund] denounced Chancellor Kiesinger's threats of "speedy" trials for the "ringleaders" of the student demonstrations. The organization, as reported in the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung of April 20, declared that such threats degraded German justice to the level of a mere tool of state power, "The hangman of the nation."

Reflecting the international concern, The Economist, the weekly magazine which speaks for the English capitalist class, chided the German authorities for their clumsy use of force. It observed dryly that although "One cannot expect any west German government to dismantle capitalism to keep Herr Dutschke happy ...not all the extremists' demands are unreasonable, nor are all the rioters professional apostles of violence."

BEHIND WALL STREET'S SHIFT ON VIETNAM

By Dick Roberts

"What happens if peace breaks out?" the brokerage firm of Shearson Hammill & Co. asked in a full-page advertisement in the April 19 Wall Street Journal.

Noting that "peace scares" usually send investors "rushing to sell stocks," the Wall Street company asserted that in this case it believed peace would be a good thing.

"Use your heart to pray for peace," the brokers counseled, "and your head for investing."

The advice came in the midst of a spectacular upsurge of stock prices that followed Lyndon Johnson's announcement he would seek peace in Vietnam and not seek the presidency in November.

After falling for many months, average stock prices jumped 10 percent in less than two weeks.

This euphoric mood on Wall Street was somewhat dampened April 22, following Federal Reserve Board chairman William McChesney Martin's assertion: "The nation is in the midst of the worst financial crisis since 1931."

Nevertheless, it is a matter of record that every previous rumor about peace in Vietnam sent stock prices down. This one sent them climbing.

This change of heart reflects a growing conviction in American ruling-class circles that they are paying too heavy a price for the war in Vietnam. They advocate slowing the tempo of escalation and taking economic measures to correct imbalances caused by the war. World peace could not be further from their minds.

If there is any doubt on this score, one need only glance at the military appropriations bill which was just passed in the U.S. Senate, April 19. It covers the war budget for fiscal year 1969, beginning next July 1.

The bill provided for a total military expenditure of \$82.4 billion -- 15 percent higher than the \$71.5 billion war budget of fiscal year 1968.

Besides the fact that the bill is a good deal larger than the previous one, some of the other differences are instructive. When the war budget was considered in the Senate last year, efforts were made to reduce spending on "strategic" weapons in order to increase funds directly related to the war in Vietnam.

In fact, the senators cut more than \$1 billion from the budget recommended to them by the Pentagon.

The 1969 budget once again increases funds for financing the war in Vietnam, but significantly, it also increases budgets for the "strategic" weapons systems -- nuclear missiles, nuclear-powered submarines and long-range bombers. Moreover, it provides a vast increase in funds for researching future weapons systems.

And it was this point -- the appropriations for military research -- that was explicitly opposed by the three senators who voted against the bill. One of the three, Mike Mansfield, the Montana Democrat who has sharply criticized administration policies in Vietnam, stated April 19:

"In this bill is the seed money for the commencement of far-reaching procurement activities for such immense undertakings as an anti-ballistic-missile weapons system about which some of the most knowledgeable and experienced Americans including members of the Armed Services Committee have expressed grave reservations as to its practicability....

"The bill also retains procurement authorization for the first of 30 floating warehouses of military hardware to facilitate the deployment anywhere around the world of American men and materiel in the event military action is ordered on short notice.

"I am not opposed to efficiency in our military operations, but I do not think that the old-fashioned methods of moving men and supplies to trouble spots around the world may supply that day or two of added deliberation that might preclude the necessity of deep American involvement in brush fire situations around the world."

(The other two senators who voted against the bill were Democrats Ernest Gruening (Alaska) and Gaylord Nelson (Wisconsin); Democratic party "peace candidates" Eugene McCarthy and Robert Kennedy "abstained.")

It is not clear why Mansfield objected to these procurements. They fit in with U.S. imperialism's global policies of oppression and war, its blueprint for world domination as indicated in the "Pax Americana" document disclosed by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in February. (See World Outlook, March 1, p. 172.) Perhaps the senator was seeking some narrow gain for his local backers in Montana.



What is bothering larger sectors of the ruling class is not the policies and program for world domination. It is simply that they believe that escalation of the war in Vietnam at this point would upset these long-range policies.

They fear that it would weaken the military reserve force needed to put down new advances of the colonial revolution in other parts of the world. And they fear that the war is undermining the policy of keeping inflation from exceeding a "gradual" rate.

Discussing these matters in the April issue of Fortune magazine, economists Alan Greenspan and Gilbert Burck declare, "Among the many casualties of the Tet offensive in Vietnam was the hope that the U.S. could soon look forward to the happy day when war costs would go down..."

"That assumption is now obsolete. The war is going to cost more than the budget projects, and perhaps more than most people yet realize."

Burck and Greenspan predict an increase of roughly \$11 billion spending on the costs of the war alone. But they also note: "The Vietnam war has already impaired to some extent the ability of the U.S. to react to aggression elsewhere...."

"The reserve equipment picture is spotty...."

"The manpower situation leaves a lot to be desired....the so-called stra-

tegic reserve is temporarily undermanned."

The problem is how to finance an escalated war, strengthen the present "strategic" weapons system and prepare for more Vietnams without borrowing the amounts of money which would inflate the dollar beyond control -- risking havoc in world trade, an escalation of black ghetto rebellion and an upsurge in labor militancy. And that is no small problem.

Washington threw its armies into Vietnam five years ago expecting to crush the rebellion in short order. But the "brush fire" turned into a full-scale war. The size and extent of the involvement knocked U.S. imperialism's global strategies out of kilter. The "gradual" inflation turned into a sharp one.

"In 1931," McChesney Martin continued in his declaration cited above, "the problem was deflation. Today it is inflation and equally intolerable."

Martin's declarations tend to the dramatic and they are taken with a grain of salt on Wall Street. The market fell 20 points the Monday morning following his Friday declaration but regained its upward climb in the afternoon.

So far no one has come through with a scheme that appeals to both the Pentagon and the Treasury and their partisans in the stock market. But this much is clear -- investors prefer talk about toning down the war in Vietnam to talk about escalating it.

#### H. RAP BROWN FREED ON BAIL

H. Rap Brown, chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, was released from prison April 18 after spending fifty-seven days behind bars.

Brown is free under \$10,000 bail which carries the condition that he not leave the vicinity of New York City. The black power spokesman still faces trial in Maryland for "inciting to riot and arson" in the so-called Cambridge riot that took place last July.

These charges were exposed as a

frame-up by Lyndon Johnson's own Commission on Civil Disorders in a supplementary report which has not yet been made public, although excerpts have appeared in the daily press. The commission blamed the so-called riot on Cambridge police and city officials.

Brown also faces trial in New Orleans on charges that he violated the federal Firearms Acts in allegedly taking a rifle on a plane with him from New York to New Orleans.

#### ULTRARIGHT TERRORIST LEADER KILLED IN GUATEMALA

Raúl Lorenzana, the leader of the rightist Guatemalan terrorist organization Mano Blanco [White Hand], and one of his lieutenants were killed by unknown assailants on April 20. The terrorist group has played a big role in the current re-

pression -- including the murder of a former Miss Guatemala and the kidnapping of Mgr. Mario Casariego, archbishop of Guatemala City. The police had been seeking Lorenzana but with notably little success.

Which Road for the Vietnam Antiwar Movement in Britain?

THE REAL DIVERSIONISTS

On the following four pages we have reproduced an article which appeared in the February 17 issue of Comment, the weekly review of the Communist party of Great Britain. It was circulated on the eve of the preparations for the March 17 demonstration in London in which, it will be recalled, some 30,000 people assembled to voice their anger over the role of U.S. imperialism in Vietnam and their bitterness over the way the Wilson government has backed Johnson's war.

The purpose of Betty Reid's article was self-evident. It sought to discredit the committee sponsoring the March 17 demonstration in hope of cutting down the size of the turnout. The diversionary effort was a conspicuous failure. The demonstration was the most massive yet held by the British antiwar movement in solidarity with the Vietnamese freedom fighters. It included many members of the Communist party and the Young Communist League, who evidently paid no attention to Mrs. Reid's "exposure."

One might have thought this would be sufficient to bury the unfortunate attempt at creating a diversion. Perhaps that is true in Britain, but the article still has its admirers abroad. The "Educational Department of the Communist Party of New York State," for instance, has been distributing it widely in the American antiwar movement with the following recommendation: "This article discusses the activities of Trotskyists and other Ultra-left groupings in the British Peace Movement. We feel that this article is valuable because it provides an ideological basis [sic] for the activities of these tendencies and groups in the U.S. Peace Movement. The parallel situations between the British and U.S. Peace Movement are obvious from the problems indicated in this reprint."

The "Educational Department of the Communist Party of New York State" does not say why it decided to refrain from presenting an original research job dealing specifically with the antiwar movement in the United States. The reason is no doubt "obvious" to the leadership of the Communist party. Those to whom it may not be so obvious may appreciate a few facts to indicate why they decided it was the part of wisdom to lean on Betty Reid.

In Moscow, the Kosygin-Brezhnev leadership has become increasingly concerned about the growing influence of "Trotskyism" on a world scale. This is shown by the fresh material they have been supplying about this "danger" (and anything resembling it such as the views and policies advocated by Ernesto "Che"

Guevara). An example was published in the March 22 World Outlook (page 245).

The various Communist parties that acknowledge the leadership of the Kosygin-Brezhnev team are, as usual, following up in their own territories. The article by Betty Reid is a typical instance.

In the United States, the Communist party is faced with special difficulties in doing its part in this field. Owing to an abysmal drop in prestige and membership, the American CP carries little weight anywhere. On the other hand, the American Trotskyist movement has been growing significantly in recent years and its prestige is high among the knowledgeable sectors of the antiwar movement. To engage in a "Trotsky-baiting" campaign at the present time could be fatal to the CP.

This is where Betty Reid's article fits in. It deals with a situation not well known in the American antiwar movement and therefore not easily challenged on the basis of the personal experience of the American antiwar fighters themselves. In addition, if the reaction is too unfavorable, the American CP leaders are in position to disclaim responsibility -- they didn't write it. At the same time, they meet their obligation to do at least a little something against the foe.

In view of this, our cooperation in making Betty Reid's article available internationally may please them. They may not be so pleased, however, at our effort to round out this bit of educational material with two more articles.

The first one, "The Left and Vietnam -- an Answer to Some Critics" (see page 399), is by the editors of The Week, a British socialist publication to which Betty Reid refers. It appeared in advance of the March 17 demonstration in London (in the March 13 issue). Besides Betty Reid, it also answers others who have added their voices to hers. The second article, "In Reply to Betty Reid" (see page 403), is by Joseph Hansen, a former secretary to Leon Trotsky. It was written after the March 17 demonstration.

It is to be hoped that the "Educational Department of the Communist Party of New York State" will reciprocate by making these two articles available to members of their party along with Betty Reid's piece. We admit, however, that our hope is rather slim. More likely the department will decide that educational as the project was, it turned out, after all, to be a bad mistake.

-- Intercontinental Press

# DIVERSIONS IN THE FIGHT FOR PEACE

*by Betty Reid*

This is the first of a series of articles dealing with the ultra-left which we will be publishing in *Comment*.

**O**PPORTUNITIES now exist for the peace movement in Britain, if united and active, to raise its whole level of mobilisation, so that 1968 becomes a year of the most powerful and militant actions for peace this country has seen for many years.

At the heart of this movement is the question of the war in Vietnam. That is why we have to ask what can now be done here which would bring about the most immediate assistance to the Vietnamese people? What is it which would have the deepest repercussions on the movement in America? What is it that the people of Vietnam ask from us?

Undoubtedly the central aim to which all our efforts have to be directed is the ending of British Government support and complicity in the crimes of American imperialism in Vietnam, thus further isolating the American Government, and strengthening the demand for an end to American aggression and the right of the Vietnamese people to decide their own affairs.

The question then to be asked is how to mobilise the widest, the most powerful, united and influential campaign with this objective?

How to unite? What do we mean by unity?

At a large demonstration in Trafalgar Square in October, initiated by an organisation called the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign, Pat Jordan of *The Week*, in one of the main speeches of the afternoon, appealed for a united front.

"We are tired of being told that we can't work with certain people because they are Communists, Trotskyists, Maoists, Anarchists. Let's get rid of this MacCarthyism once and for all."

Any appeal for unity in the present situation necessarily evokes an immediate response. Is there not an overwhelming need for the concentration of all possible forces? Must we not welcome all who declare support for the Vietnamese people? Communists can work with Christians, liberals, pacifists. Should they not also be ready to work with all those who claim to be committed socialists? Surely it could only be the most doctrinaire, the sectarian, those who do not see the need for unity, those who want to continue into the sixties old and forgotten controversies and divisions, who could hold back from such an appeal?

Calls for unity, however, must be accompanied by principled discussion and agreement on *policies and forms of action which can be mutually agreed*, whatever the frankly

expressed differences on long-term policies and solutions, because of the urgent need to avert immediate disasters.

We need therefore to progress from general calls for unity to an examination of various policies which are being put forward in the peace movement, in order to see precisely what it is on which we are being asked to unite.

## COMMUNIST POLICY ON VIETNAM

In pamphlets, articles, leaflets, posters, meetings, in the visit of our delegation of three Political Committee members, including our General Secretary, to North Vietnam in 1965, and in our policy resolution at the 30th National Congress in November 1967, the Communist Party has made its policy absolutely clear.

Our Congress resolution states that we believe the only just basis for a solution is summarised in the four point proposal of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, and in the programme of the broad alliance of progressive forces embodied in the National Front of Liberation of South Vietnam.

This has been our position throughout the whole period and remains our position today. It is our objective, by continuous explanation of this policy, to win more and more people to understand and agree with it. Furthermore, Communists have supported and participated in the work of the British Vietnam Committee which was set up as long ago as 1952 and which has consistently campaigned over all these years to bring information to organisations and individuals in Britain about the struggles of the Vietnamese people and to win understanding and support for these. There is no doubt that their work has contributed to no small measure to the decisions of the Labour Party and Trade Union Conferences on Vietnam.

Our Party also declares in its resolution that it will respond to all requests made by the Vietnamese people. What requests have been made? Medical aid and supplies are desperately needed, and we have worked for the fullest support for such a campaign. But above all they ask us for *political* action, for the mobilisation of British people in such numbers that the policy of support by Britain for American aggression can be ended. This would further isolate the US and put greater pressure on it to withdraw its forces from Vietnam, as provided for in the 1954 Geneva agreements.

How to bring this about? Only on the basis of genuine

unity between hundreds of thousands of people, who may differ widely in their views on the causes of war, on religion, on communism and socialism, on the basic role of American imperialism, on the character of the Governments of North and South Vietnam, but who nevertheless can unite in their demands for the cessation of the bombing, for the withdrawal of American troops, and for the right of the Vietnamese people to decide their own future.

Such are the divisions within the imperialist camp, and even within the ruling classes in Britain and America, that not even all of these are united in pursuing present American Government policies in Vietnam. And amongst ordinary people awareness of the pressing danger of nuclear war, of a future clouded with permanent menace, horror at the actions of a world power turning the might of its military machine upon a small undeveloped country, admiration at the heroism, tenacity and skill of a people fighting against aggression, disgust at the corruption of the Saigon puppet Government and its fascist-loving ruling class, are all powerful and varied motives driving many who are not aware of all the fundamental issues involved, or who hold firmly to different views, to become nevertheless the allies of those who already have a totally committed position based on a socialist world view.

It is this kind of unity which is the task before the peace movement, if it is to mobilise forces powerful enough to *change* the situation, and not simply to make a declaration of its horror at what is happening. How to bring into the struggle hundreds of thousands more who can unite on the kind of immediate demands we have outlined, and which if fought for and realised could change the shape of future events both in Britain and on a world-scale?

## THE VIETNAM SOLIDARITY CAMPAIGN

This organisation, a very late arrival on the scene, having been set up only in 1966, claims to be the only organisation in Britain which seeks to build a united front of organisations and individuals pledged to full support for the National Liberation Front and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. "Victory for the NLF" is its slogan, and this it declares must be the basis of united action.

Our party, as we have already shown, has made its own analysis and policy perfectly clear. It is not then on the question of the call for support for the Vietnamese people that we are critical of this organisation, but over *what needs to be done now* to end US aggression. We believe that what is required is a movement of hundreds of thousands that will make a real political impact in Britain.

It is here that the attitude and activities of the VSC are obstacles to the building of such a movement, since they express continuous hostility to all whom they consider have not passed their test of full commitment, and constantly endeavour to narrow down, and indeed attack, genuine efforts for the broadest unity around realisable immediate demands such as we have already outlined.

Thus U Thant, for example, became a figure for major attack and hostility, and his proposals were posed *against* the "full solidarity" this organisation demands.

Are we doing it an injustice? Let us examine a frank declaration of its intentions as outlined in the current *Labour Worker* by the organiser, David Robinson.

Hitherto, he states, the policy of the VSC has been to encourage its supporters to join local Peace in Vietnam Committees and there put forward the "full solidarity" position.

Following the successful Trafalgar Square demonstration, he continues, the VSC must use its new strength in these committees "to call for a slogan of full solidarity with the Vietnamese people" and "the situation is now favourable for transforming Peace in Vietnam groups into Solidarity Committees".

This is, of course, not a call for unity but for disruption. It would exclude the vast majority of organisations from any participation in the committees, including great sections of the Labour movement.

## THE ORIGIN OF THE VIETNAM SOLIDARITY CAMPAIGN

It is necessary to examine the position even further. How did this organisation come into existence? It was set up in Britain with total disregard for all existing organisations, following the call of the "World Congress" of the Fourth International in 1965. By that time the British Council for Peace in Vietnam was already firmly established and embraced a wide range of peace, anti-colonial, labour movement, church and youth organisations, and individuals of all parties and all walks of life.

What was the "World Congress of the Fourth International"? There have been many splits in the Fourth International since Trotsky founded it in 1938 and there are now at least four bodies claiming to be the true heirs of Trotsky. But for our purpose here it is sufficient to know that this Congress was held by the Paris-based section which publishes a journal in English called *World Outlook*. Supporters in Britain do not have a public organisation, but work within other organisations.

The creation of the VSC must be seen in the context of policy put forward by this 1965 "World Congress".

## THE POLICY OF THE 1965 "WORLD CONGRESS" OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

Leading spokesmen of the Fourth International had already, prior to the Congress, proffered advice to the Soviet Union on how it should conduct its foreign policy.

It should immediately arm all the socialist countries, especially China, with a full panoply of nuclear weapons, and should call for international support in a major confrontation with American imperialism, ready to escalate its military measures in response to American escalation.

Thus, with supreme irresponsibility and the effrontery of a group which has never been called upon to take a single decision of any world consequence, it advocates a policy of the widest proliferation of nuclear weapons, a nuclear arms race, and inevitably a further stage towards world nuclear conflict.

Of this "counter-escalation" policy Ernesto Belinguer of the Italian Communist Party writes that "it is absurd because it sees only the military aspect of imperialism and its material strength, forgetting that imperialism is also a political system, a system of alliances and hegemonies, having a foothold amongst the masses. Those who forget or underestimate these elements are virtually renouncing a struggle that, while difficult, is indispensable for defeating the policy of imperialism, and in the final analysis are laying the whole burden of the struggle on the socialist countries."

What further advice is offered? The Soviet Union should address a revolutionary appeal to the American workers to struggle for power, so that they could once and for all end



the threat to peace represented by American imperialism. This theme was continued by the Congress. Denouncing the test-ban treaty, and all attempts towards international nuclear agreement, as treachery to the revolution, they poured scorn on the idea that "diplomatic manoeuvres or pressure of any kind can cause imperialism to draw back". This would be to "hand to Washington a success which it cannot achieve by military means". On the contrary "only the international extension of the revolution can weaken imperialism . . . only the overthrow of American imperialist rule by the workers of the United States can definitely end the danger of a nuclear war".

These are fine sounding revolutionary phrases. But what do they mean? Do we really believe that a "revolutionary appeal" from the Soviet Union to American workers today would meet with a response? This is cloud-cuckoo land. True enough, the world will not finally be safe from nuclear conflict until the American labour and progressive movement has succeeded in putting into power a Government pledged to socialist policies. But this is not an immediate perspective. How to reach that position? And is no improvement in the world situation possible in advance of the American socialist revolution? This is total defeatism. It turns away from the real task, difficult and complex but essential, of building a real mass movement and advancing it stage by stage, by genuine efforts at agreement and not by the shouting of revolutionary sounding slogans which limit the movement and divide what already exists.

The Congress itself was well aware that its advice would go unheeded. They therefore went on to consider hopefully the "political overthrow" of the Soviet Government (although what this means is carefully never defined) and the "creation of a new Soviet section of the Fourth International which will play an important role in the rebirth of revolutionary consciousness among the Soviet proletariat."

It continued by giving "critical support" to the line of the Communist Party of China as "representing the progressive tendency within the international communist movement" and finally called for concentration upon Vietnam. "Wherever the bureaucracy of the labour movement constitutes an obstacle, it is possible in many countries to make an effective beginning through committees representing smaller forces, and combining them in united front sections on as large a scale as possible".

This tactic, which had earlier been used in the case of campaigns in this country over both Cuba and Algeria, was to create an organisation whose essential task was the furthering of the total policy of the Fourth International, rather than any immediate concern for what could be done to assist the people of Vietnam.

## THE APPLICATION OF THIS POLICY IN BRITAIN

Following the Congress, supporters of the Fourth International in Britain, together with International Socialism supporters, and some who supported the position of the Communist Party of China, called a conference to set up the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign.

International Socialism is an organisation within the Labour Party which, in so far as it has a coherent and predictable line, makes no distinction between capitalist and existing socialist countries, calling the latter "state capitalist". This leads it to support the slander of the Communist Party of China that America and the Soviet Union are collaborating to defeat world revolution, including the Vietnamese people. In industry, to which it pays special attention, it puts forward a perspective of a national rank and

file movement moving into conflict with rather than changing the trade unions.

Like the Fourth International, from time to time it produces useful anti-capitalist material. Both organisations encourage their supporters to seek out Communist Party members for united action at local level. Both make no secret of their enmity towards the Communist Party as a national organisation, and to its policy.

Later the supporters of the Communist Party of China withdrew from the conference because of various differences with which this article is not concerned, and what finally emerged was a committee largely composed of members of these other two groupings.

## GENUINE SUPPORT WELCOME FROM WHATEVER QUARTER

Whatever our views about the nature of the two organisations we have described this would not cause us to create divisions in any genuine united effort for Vietnam. The issue is too immediate, too important, too central for that. However, not all who shout the loudest match words with deeds. The VSC, as we have seen, explicitly campaigns against the concept of a broad united movement, and not only that, but it also seeks to bring into the movement adventurist policies stemming from the whole Trotskyist analysis.

When the journal *The Week*, which played a big part in the setting up of the VSC, states, for example, in an editorial that the demonstrations in Britain and America on Vietnam represented "the agonised socialist conscience of the Western world" (our emphasis) we must say that this is nonsense, and dangerous nonsense, since on the one hand it totally overestimates the stage reached in terms of a coherent socialist position, and on the other it underestimates what mobilisation on a broader scale could achieve.

And if we listen again to Mr. Jordan of *The Week* speaking at Trafalgar Square we may come to a further conclusion—that he is implying that nothing in fact can be done for Vietnam of any real consequence until we get a genuine socialist government, with an anti-capitalist, anti-imperialist mandate.

"We can only force a change in the sense that this Government manoeuvres. This Government is totally committed to the defence of capitalism and imperialist domination of the third world . . . therefore the only lasting thing we can do to help the people of Vietnam and other countries in their fight against imperialism is to replace the present Government with one which is anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist."

As always, the ultimate objective is posed *against* immediate demands. Thus on the one hand we are offered as a solution to the Vietnamese war the revolutionary overthrow of the American Government, and in Britain where the majority of the population has not been won to an understanding of the nature of capitalism and to a committed socialist position it is proposed that we should narrow down the movement for Vietnam to those who understand the need to participate in the struggle for socialism.

The fight to explain the necessity for a socialist solution and to expose the role of right-wing democracy must go on, and the Communist Party devotes a major part of its energies and resources to precisely this task. This, however, is not the task of the peace movement which brings together people on a clear platform of immediate demands.

*Continued on next page*

## A FAMILIAR THEME

To those whose memories go back to prewar days this theme is not new. In the thirties Trotskyists posed the slogan of a "Workers' Government" against the efforts to build an anti-fascist front against Hitler. Participation in a Popular Front with non-socialists was described as treachery. What then should have been done?

In France in 1936 we were told "Breaking at once with the Popular Front the Communist Party could even then have called for the formation of Soviets. The response would have been instantaneous".

In Spain the demand should not have been the call to rally the widest forces behind the democratically elected Spanish Government, but a "revolutionary call to the Spanish workers to establish a revolutionary Government" should have been made, and the workers would have responded immediately. So one could continue with similar statements made about the situation in Europe after the Second World War.

No evidence of any kind is ever advanced for these claims. A detailed examination of voting figures, the position of workers' organisations, the existing class forces, would give the lie to them. But these claims are not in fact made on the basis of examining conditions in the real world. They are made because Trotsky stated that in this period all that was now required to bring about a revolutionary situation was the correct revolutionary leadership. Thus all defeats experienced, as indeed the 1965 Congress stated, were due to "the absence of dependable revolutionary leadership". It follows from this that the one remaining requirement, as Trotskyists modestly state, is the creation of a Trotskyist revolutionary leadership. It is this which is their major task and preoccupation, to which all else is subordinate. This is the explanation for their lack of concern at the immediate effect of their actions, since in fact they do not regard any worth-while objectives as realisable in advance of the socialist revolution which they will lead.

It is true that their efforts are somewhat impeded by the continuous internecine warfare and polemic between the various Trotskyist groups and organisations, and the tiny forces which they represent. We should certainly have no excuse, however, for failing to notice what is spelt out in all Trotskyist policy documents.

Communists believe that nothing could more effectively deepen understanding of the real issues involved, nothing could more powerfully release democratic and progressive forces, nothing could be more important for the whole advance to socialism, than the creation of a united, active, fighting peace movement pledged to fight against American aggression in Vietnam, and to a progressive policy. That is why we oppose all efforts to disrupt, whether consciously or in error, and to introduce divisions into such a movement.

## SUPPORTERS OF THE POLITICAL LINE OF MAO TSE-TUNG

We now come to those groupings supporting the position stated by the Communist Party of China. Whatever our differences, do they not show concern for Vietnam? Should we not work with them to assist the mobilisation of support against American imperialism?

Let us quote Mr. Denys Noel, a well-known exponent of their view.

"The line taken by the Soviet leadership must be exposed, and opposed. Working with organisations that turn out to be unwilling to oppose the line of the Soviet

Union makes it impossible to clarify the confusion that reigns in peoples' minds about the solution to the war in Vietnam."

Thus the condition of unity imposed here is that there must be acceptance of the line that America and the Soviet Union are collaborating to betray Vietnam.

Again, as in the case of the VSC, in practice it has been found that supporters of this political line are concerned not with unity around the immediate demands acceptable to the broadest number of people, but with freedom to expound their whole policy, which has as its main objective the attack upon the Soviet Union and which dismisses the possibility of moving the British people into action.

## OTHER ORGANISATIONS AND JOURNALS

There have been other demonstrations called under the slogan of assistance to Vietnam, by supporters of another group of organisations.

These are represented by the journal *Solidarity* (not to be confused with the previous organisation mentioned, the VSC), by Socialist Action, and by some of those who in the past have been associated with the activities of the Committee of 100.

Let us quote from the *Solidarity* pamphlet *Rape of Vietnam*. Here the defeat of American imperialism in Vietnam is seen as a necessary prelude to the final struggle against Ho Chi Minh. As for the position in Britain "We are not interested in bringing pressure on Wilson. We are not interested in replacing him with someone 'more left' or 'more honest'. We want to destroy the whole apparatus . . . we are for a classless society".

Advising Labour Party members to burn their cards, they lay about them without the slightest concern for the results of their actions, since this is to promote "the new revolutionary society" and "educate people in the ideas of revolutionary socialism".

Infantile and irresponsible in its political line it can only weaken and confuse since it totally rejects any attempt to build a united mass movement. This again is a reason for going behind the surface to the reality of the policies being put forward.

Such is the deep concern about Vietnam that increasing numbers of splendidly militant and committed people, especially amongst the youth, are willing to demonstrate in Trafalgar Square and show their support for the Vietnamese people and for the cause of revolutionary struggle everywhere against oppression and imperialism.

It is vital that such people should not be misled by revolutionary phrasemongering and adventurist calls, and their deep feelings exploited in pursuing policies which divert rather than advance the struggle.

They must be won to see that the urgent need is to strengthen and broaden the peace movement, to win new sections of the people for action, and to bring new active and militant support to the activities of the established peace organisations which together are seeking to build a movement based on the organisations of the labour movement but embracing all organisations and individuals working for genuine unity around the demand we have outlined earlier.

A firm and principled fight for this political perspective will prove to be the really revolutionary position, when the reality behind these adventurist policies is revealed, and when the process of feuding and splitting, already begun, and an invariable accompaniment to such organisations, leads to the inevitable disillusionment and confusion of those who have been misled.

THE LEFT AND VIETNAM -- AN ANSWER TO SOME CRITICS

By the Editors of The Week

This article is being written during the last few hectic days of preparation for the March 17 demonstration. Whilst we cannot be sure how many people will turn up on that day we can be entirely certain that the demonstration will be very big and very militant. Already the press is showing an acute interest and the demonstration has been covered in nearly all newspapers. Most comment is hostile in the sense that it links March 17 with so-called student hooliganism; readers minds are being prepared for a call for discipline on March 18.

But it is not only the capitalist press which is training its guns on March 17 and the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign [the sponsoring committee]. A very strange alliance, indeed, has arisen; it is not often that one sees the Anarchists, Peace News, the Youth Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, the Socialist Labour League and the Communist Party of Great Britain together in a "united front." However, such a "front" has arisen in the last few weeks: it is a front of hostility towards the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign in general and The Week in particular. We intend in this issue to deal with the more serious arguments used against us.

The most detailed and sustained criticism of the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign and The Week comes from Comment, a Communist Party publication which caters for party activists. The February 17 issue carried a four-page section entitled "Diversions in the Fight for Peace," by Betty Reid, almost entirely devoted to attacking the V.S.C. and The Week. We have reprinted the major extracts from it elsewhere in this issue. There were also attacks upon the Fourth International, International Socialism, supporters of the Chinese Communist Party and Solidarity. We will not concern ourselves with these attacks -- these organizations are quite capable of speaking for themselves.

One is struck by Betty Reid's dishonesty in dealing with her subject. She manages to write this full and detailed article without mentioning the British Council for Peace in Vietnam or the British Peace Committee, two organisations in which Communist Party members play a leading role. She says nothing of these organisations' political line or their activities despite the fact that the article is supposed to be on the tactics of building a mass movement against the war in Vietnam.

Mrs. Reid gives a potted account of the formation of the Vietnam Solidar-

ity Campaign without mentioning the role which the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation played in starting that organisation. (It is well known that the B.R.P.F. supplied an office, an organiser and other considerable help to V.S.C. to help get the V.S.C. off the ground.)

She writes about the activities of the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign without even one word about the organisation's two major activities in its first year: the Free Speech Campaign (designed to get support for allowing National Liberation Front representatives to visit this country) and the campaign for support for the International War Crimes Tribunal. Both these campaigns were very broad in scope and both were waged in full consultation with the Vietnamese. (In the case of the War Crimes Tribunal the project would have been impossible without collaboration from the North Vietnam authorities in allowing visits by teams of investigators, etc.)

These omissions can scarcely be mistakes or arising from lack of knowledge; Mrs. Reid has obviously done considerable research into her subject. On the contrary we can be confident in saying that Betty Reid, in her carefully written article, conveniently forgets these facts because they would undermine her main argument.

When dealing with the position of the Communist Party on Vietnam, Mrs. Reid draws attention to the resolutions passed on Vietnam by that party; especially those in "support of the Vietnamese people's right to self-determination." But unfortunately, these fine words have not always coincided with the deeds of Communist Party leaders and members, who have concentrated their activities in the British Council for Peace in Vietnam which, as we have noted before, Mrs. Reid forgets about in her article. This organisation, which we must say does very good work in general propaganda, has consistently refused to adopt a principled line on Vietnam.

Its founding statement of aims stated that the B.C.P.V. did not seek to take sides. How can this be reconciled with giving support to the right of the Vietnamese people to self-determination? It has consistently called for "negotiations" as an aim regardless of the position the Vietnamese themselves have taken. Of late, it has pushed the slogan: "Support U Thant." The North Vietnamese had occasion last year to criticise Fenner Brockway, the chairman of the B.C.P.V., in very strong terms. (We have reproduced

the text of the main criticism in this issue.) The Vietnamese totally rejected U Thant's most recent proposals, yet Betty Reid takes the V.S.C. and The Week to task for attacking U Thant. In fact, the criticisms that V.S.C. had made of U Thant and his proposals were extremely mild in comparison with those made by both North Vietnam and the N.L.F., as any regular reader of Vietnam Courier will confirm.

Where does Betty Reid stand on this question? If the V.S.C. and The Week are guilty of "disruption" because of their mild criticisms, then surely, by the same logic, the Vietnamese are totally disrupting the peace movement in this country by their much more severe attacks. But this is obvious nonsense. Betty Reid is counting upon the readers of Comment being unfamiliar with the Vietnamese point of view, which is seldom to be seen in Communist Party publications.

Neither is Mrs. Reid particularly reliable in her use of quotations: consider how she uses part of Pat Jordan's speech in Trafalgar Square on October 22. She wishes to demonstrate that The Week believes that nothing of importance can be done in Britain to defend the Vietnamese people until we have a socialist government. But readers of The Week will know that we have consistently polemicised against this sectarian view attributed to us. In fact, the very passage Betty Reid quotes was directed primarily against those who claim nothing can be done because the Labour Government cannot be forced to change its policy, or that we should suspend activity on Vietnam until after the social revolution.

By missing out two sentences prior to her quotation and by missing the word "But" from the beginning of her extract she maliciously distorts our real position. Readers of this issue [the March 13 issue of The Week] can compare her quotation with the original.

So much for Mrs. Reid's methods of arguing. What of her politics? Here we are on familiar ground and the issues are straightforward: firstly, whether we should seek to build a movement on a principled programme or by diluting the programme to give it the widest appeal; and, secondly, on the nature of the "united front."

At this point we feel it helpful to quote Harold Wilson when speaking in the House of Commons on Tuesday, March 12; he said:

"Provided that those who demonstrate genuinely want peace and not military victory for one side or the other, if it makes them feel good, I have no objection."

In the past, Mr. Wilson has made similar statements, adding that the people who demonstrate should go to the Chinese Embassy. Why does Harold Wilson not object to those who call for "peace"? Because he knows that if the call is confined in such a way the issues become blurred. He can claim, quite correctly, that he wants "peace in Vietnam." It can be argued that Johnson wants "peace in Vietnam," too.

The point is, of course, what kind of peace? Supporters of the V.S.C. and The Week want a certain kind of peace, one which is more likely to be lasting peace, moreover -- a peace consistent with self-determination for the Vietnamese people. Johnson's "peace" would be that of his victory over the N.L.F.

Therefore, a mere call for "peace" in Vietnam is totally inadequate and confusing. A movement based upon this slogan -- as is the British Council for Peace in Vietnam -- will be thrown into disarray by Wilson's and Johnson's phoney "peace" moves. The B.C.P.V. will, furthermore, appear in the position of putting equal pressure on the victims of aggression and the aggressors to "open negotiations." Little wonder that the representatives of the Vietnamese people have had to publicly criticise the Fenner Brockways.

Even from a historical point of view all the available evidence points to a solidarity position being more effective, as well as being more correct. In Britain, there have been two occasions when really mass movements arose on foreign policy issues: in support of the young Soviet republic in the twenties; and against the fascists in Spain. In both cases, there was mass mobilisation of very wide support and, more important, big sections of the working class were involved.

In both cases it was precisely because the movement was committed to one side that it was so large, enthusiastic and effective. We ask Betty Reid: what kind of movement would have been built on the programme that called for "negotiations" between the young Soviet Republic and the intervening powers? Would there have been a mass movement built on the basis of "peace" between the fascists in Spain and the Republicans? To pose these questions is to answer them.

Can anyone say that the Vietnamese are less justified in their cause than were the Soviets or the Spanish Republicans?

Mrs. Reid, for all her talk about broad support, from her criticism of other left-wing groups wants to make her "united front" in support of the Vietnam-



ese people conditional on agreement on a whole series of other issues not necessarily relevant to Vietnam.

That is why she finds it necessary to bring in the question of Trotskyism and the Fourth International's estimate of the Soviet Union.

But her criterion for working with other leftist groups changes when it comes to forming a front with Christians, Liberals, etc., who are often anti-Socialist and anti-Communist. Betty Reid would, no doubt, be very enthusiastic about the fact that the British Peace Committee is so broad-based that at a conference organised by it in London last weekend there were a large number of delegates who support N.A.T.O. But to work with people who talk of the "agonised socialist conscience of the Western World" is dangerous. We will examine why Mrs. Reid thinks this is dangerous later, but let us look a bit more at this question of "broadness."

Is it true that the solidarity position "narrows down the movement for Vietnam"? Look at the messages of support that the October 22 demonstration received. The March 17 demonstration is receiving even wider support from all sections of the movement and all walks of life. Mrs. Reid's last argument is thus disposed of.

The attacks made upon us by the Anarchists and the Socialist Labour League are predictable and easy to dispose of. The Anarchists are consistent in their hostility towards any state, regardless of its class content, and equally consistent in their attempt to approach everything from an abstract "moral" position. This leads them to chant, "Ho, Ho Chi Minh; How Many Kids Have You Done In?" Thus, despite their ultra-revolutionary phraseology they in essence reflect the pressure of bourgeois propaganda. The concept of taking a class position, of giving critical but fulsome support to all those struggling against oppression, is totally alien to them. What living struggle could be supported if one applies the Anarchist criterion? None, unfortunately, not even those few struggles which have been led by Anarchists. So what is the logic of the Anarchist position? That of not taking sides and, in effect, opposing those who do want to do something.

The critique which the Socialist Labour League makes, through the redoubtable Cliff Slaughter in the columns of The Newsletter, has to be read to be believed! According to Slaughter the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign and The Week are about to be absorbed by the Communist Party. As proof he offers Comment's four-page attack on these two groups! Pat Jor-

dan's speech in Trafalgar Square in which he said, "...the only lasting thing that we can do to help the people of Vietnam, and other countries, in their fight against imperialism, is to replace the present Government with one which is anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist" is brought forth as evidence to prove that actually The Week stands for the exact opposite: the abandonment of the struggle for socialism in Britain.

It is said that Cliff Slaughter is an expert on dialectics: it seems to us that in attempting to "negate the negation" he has "negated" once too many times. However, many will think that this is an improvement on the previous Newsletter position that the October 22 demonstration was "pacifist."

Basically, the efforts of The Newsletter are geared to the great task of demonstrating that only the Socialist Labour League stands against the corruption of the true principles of Marxism by the seductiveness of "Pabloism" and "state capitalism," a task they equate to pursuing the class struggle against all forms of "revisionism." This is classic red herring stuff: to our knowledge there is not a single supporter of Michel Pablo in Britain, yet The Newsletter in issue after issue spends up to one quarter of its space warning its readers against "Pabloism."

We are tempted to think that the real aim of the operation is to create a "Chinese Wall" to prevent a discussion with other Marxist tendencies and members of the Socialist Labour League and the Keep Left Young Socialists. The latter, not generally on a high political level, might be corrupted if they were to take part in the united front activities where they would be able to freely discuss with non-SLLers.

Taking leave of this almost classic textbook sectarianism we come to the rather pathetic case of the Youth Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament. We do not know if Alistair Bucknell was speaking officially for Y.C.N.D. (of which he is chairman) when he wrote to Peace News, March 9. If he was he has done that organisation a great deal of harm. His letter (see elsewhere in this issue [of The Week]) was hysterical: "Forget March 17. It is irrelevant and dangerous."

It is difficult to see how it can be both "irrelevant" and "dangerous" but we are more concerned with Comrade Bucknell's political ideas than his ability to argue logically. It remains to be seen whether or not Comrade Bucknell's letter to Peace News stops people coming on March 17 and instead mobilises them for March 24; we doubt whether it will.

Comrade Bucknell's main complaint is that the slogan, "Solidarity with the Vietnamese people against American aggression" lets Wilson off the hook, is therefore just what "the C.I.A. would like us to say" and undoes "years of hard work by the C.N.D. [Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament], the Committee of 100 and others in breaking down barriers of fear, hatred and prejudice."

As we stated against Betty Reid, we think the exact opposite: the slogans of the Y.C.N.D. which call for support for "negotiations" and U Thant have been the same ones which got Wilson (and, for that matter, Johnson) off the hook. As long as people are unclear about the essential nature of the war in Vietnam, i.e., that it is an American war of aggression, it is impossible to meet the argument that the war is going on because Hanoi refuses to negotiate.

The Week is in full agreement with the slogan, "Britain must dissociate"; so is the V.S.C. Bucknell omits to tell the readers of Peace News that this slogan is one of the demands under which the March 17 mobilization is being organised. He also omits to tell people that the V.S.C. was the first organisation in Britain to organise a demonstration on that very theme -- in the autumn of 1966.

"...March 24 is the time to make a major step in forcing a real British initiative for peace and freedom in Vietnam." The truth is thus out: stopping short of calling for solidarity and confining oneself to a call for dissociation is a shame-faced way of calling for a "British initiative." A "British peace initiative" could only have meaning if we were confronted with two equally guilty parties who refused to negotiate because of stupidity. Surely, if we understand that the U.S. is the aggressor the better thing to do is to call upon the British Government to demand that the Americans cease their war of aggression and unilaterally withdraw?

All previous British "peace initiatives" have been rejected by the Vietnamese people as shams and attempts to get them to capitulate to the U.S. Thus Wilson, and Johnson, have been able to say that it was the North Vietnamese who were the obstacle to peace. Each one of these farces has been followed by a further escalation in the war.

In fact it is quite logical to argue that the so-called "peace initiatives" have been part of the psychological preparations for escalation. These people in the peace movement who have placed their hopes in the "peace initiatives" have, therefore, been the unwitting tools of Wilson in his political support of the White House. We say this without in any

way challenging the sincerity or good intentions of the people concerned. It is precisely for these reasons that the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign was formed, and it is precisely for these reasons that it has been a success.

Comrade Bucknell may want to be like the proverbial ostrich, and put his head in the sand, but the majority of the members of his organisation will be out on March 17 and a comparison of the size of the two demonstrations will be a good indication of what line can exert the most attraction and influence.

In the same issue of Peace News which contained Alistair Bucknell's letter there was an editorial entitled "Sham Solidarity." This is a cleverer and more honest statement of the pacifist position. (See elsewhere in this issue [of The Week].) Thus it states: "...Our position ideally is that the NLF should cease fire unilaterally and that the United States should withdraw unilaterally...." However, Peace News recognises that "we have no right to call upon the NLF to cease fire." (Emphasis in the original.) "We are too much responsible for what the Americans are doing in Vietnam to be entitled to condemn the NLF when they resist with violence."

This handsome concession (it is a fine thing that leader writers from Caledonian Road are prepared to concede the right of Vietnamese peasants to defend themselves with violence) is in marked contrast to the treatment that Bob Overy dishes out to anti-Vietnam war demonstrators who take the solidarity position. They are described as "a shouting 'militant' mob," "a huge slogan-shouting, unruly march," and people who "show contempt, by...lack of dignity and commitment"; in fact, the whole demonstration will be one of "frustration, ill-directed violence" (does the pacifist recognise well-directed violence?) "and anger" which is really "self-contempt." Comrade Overy's advice is that "we should get on with doing" things "...to dissociate Britain from America and to help forward the pressures for American withdrawal." Bob Overy's anger is understandable from his point of view; not only has he had to concede the right of the Vietnamese people to defend themselves, he has also to recognise that there is going to be a huge demonstration in favour of the Vietnamese being successful in this struggle.

But to conclude this examination one has to ask the question: why have all these organisations chosen to attack the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign at this very time? We would venture the following answer: precisely because of its success in mobilising and because that success is attracting support from the rank and file of those organisations. The united front

concepts of the V.S.C. and the Ad-hoc committees which V.S.C. has initiated frighten them. These small-minded people put the sectarian interests of their organisations above that of forming an all-embracing non-exclusive mass movement in support of the people of Vietnam.

That is why they ignored invitations to attend the founding meetings of the October 22 and March 17 Ad-hoc committees. Had they attended these meetings they could have easily taken part in the formulation of slogans and the general policy of the demonstrations. The fact that this non-exclusive, democratic method was used by the Ad-hoc committees has been completely hidden from the readers of these organisations' journals.

They will not be successful; this

struggle also took place in the United States and the sectarians were defeated. As a result the most significant anti-war movement ever seen in the United States has been built against the most fantastic odds.

The same process is happening in this country. Those organisations which refuse to participate in the united front of support for the Vietnamese people will themselves suffer. Those leaders or organisations who stand against the united front will only have themselves to blame if they lose members and if their organisations are beset by bitter wrangles. The united front will grow and important lessons will be learnt by thousands of militants which have relevance for all struggles. The Week is very proud of the modest part it has played in this process.

### TROTSKYISM VS. STALINISM IN THE BRITISH ANTIWAR MOVEMENT

By Joseph Hansen

The Vietnam Solidarity Campaign has succeeded in organising two demonstrations in London in solidarity with the Vietnamese people that made headlines around the world, gave fresh impetus to the antiwar movement in a number of countries, and brought fresh encouragement to the heroic freedom fighters in the small Asian country that dared to stand up to the mightiest military power on earth.

The Vietnam Solidarity Campaign succeeded in doing this despite the most limited resources and in face of bitter and slanderous opposition ranging from the Kremlin-oriented Communist party to the ultraleft sectarians of the Socialist Labour League, with the Tories, the police, and the capitalist press doing their bit, too.

The line followed by the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign was straightforward: (1) Organize mass demonstrations in the streets to protest the U.S. role in Vietnam and to express solidarity with the Vietnamese. (2) Organize these demonstrations on a nonexclusive basis -- everybody together in the action no matter what the differences among the tendencies, groups or factions. (3) Try to link up the demonstrations with those being organized similarly in other countries, particularly the demonstrations in the United States. (4) Pay sensitive attention to the wishes of the Vietnamese freedom fighters in the use of slogans, particularly those concerning "peace" and "negotiations" which easily play into the hands of the imperialists to the injury of the Vietnamese cause.

The correctness of this line of ap-

proach has been proved by the way it helped to mobilize tens of thousands of participants, first on October 22, 1967, then again last March 17. These were the largest demonstrations yet seen in Britain in opposition to the war in Vietnam and in solidarity with the Vietnamese.

The correctness of this way of proceeding has been proved in another, perhaps even more significant way. That is in the increasing clarity of the slogans and the rising militancy of the participants. The shift is from a petty-bourgeois pacifism calling for "both sides" to make concessions so as to pave the way for "negotiations" and "peace," to an emphatic demand, addressed squarely to the Johnson administration (and Johnson's ally, Harold Wilson) to get out of Vietnam and get out NOW!

A good many groupings have taken alarm at this development. Not the least of them is the Communist party of Great Britain. The reason is clear. Demonstrations of the kind sponsored by the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign go squarely against the Brezhnev-Kosygin policy of "peaceful coexistence" with imperialism. Demonstrations like the one on October 22 and the one on March 17 convert "solidarity with the Vietnamese" from mere talk into a concrete action in the streets that has palpable political effect, not only nationally but internationally.

Betty Reid was evidently assigned to write her article, "Diversions in the Fight for Peace" (in the February 17 issue of Comment), when the British Communist party chiefs took alarm at the response in their own ranks to the prepara-

tions for March 17. The aim of the article was to sabotage the March 17 demonstration by arousing prejudice against the sponsoring committee. It was hoped that this prejudice could be induced by dragging in "Trotskyism." This is the technique known as red-baiting. That Betty Reid failed in her aim does not make her effort less of a betrayal of the Vietnamese cause.

But even if the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign has proceeded correctly and has scored resounding successes, isn't there something sinister about Trotskyism? What is its "association" with what the VSC has been doing? What is its role in the antiwar movement? And what about Betty Reid's specific charges? Does she have the goods on the Trotskyists?

According to Betty Reid, the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign is "a very late arrival on the scene, having been set up only in 1966..." Its creation, she insinuates, "must be seen in the context of policy" adopted a year earlier by the 1965 World Congress of the Fourth International. We are thus invited to assume that the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign was set up by the Fourth International or was set up under its direct inspiration in view of the suspicious timing.

Our sleuth conveniently overlooks several other clues that really ought to be examined in considering the date of origin of the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign and the context in which it occurred: (1) Johnson's escalation of the war in Vietnam in February, 1965. (2) The failure of the Brezhnev-Kosygin regime and all the Communist parties under its influence to rally massive support to the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the freedom fighters in South Vietnam, a failure that left a vacuum bound to be filled by others. (3) The direct role of the Bertrand Russell Foundation in organizing the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign and getting it off the ground. (4) The favorable attitude taken by the Vietnamese toward the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign and its work.

It is within that context that the participation of Trotskyists in the activities of the committee must be considered. If they chose to participate, while others, like the leaders of the revisionist Communist party and the sectarian Socialist Labour League, chose to abstain, then it is only natural that some of the political benefits should go to the Trotskyists. Betty Reid, however, is much too generous in insisting that all the credit should go to the Trotskyists. They constitute only one tendency among those who, despite their differences on many issues, have found it possible to join in action in this way to express opposition to the Pentagon and the White House, to help the

Vietnamese, to offer a hand to the American antiwar movement, and to give dramatic invigoration to the cause of genuine peace.

Priority and the right associations count the most with Betty Reid in deciding who should take charge of organizing help for the Vietnamese. She cites the establishment in 1952 of the "British Vietnam Committee." In contrast to the "bad" Vietnam Solidarity Campaign, which is associated with "Trotskyism," the "British Vietnam Committee" is a "good" body, as proved by the fact that the British Communists "have supported and participated in" it. Things were going along quietly and peacefully with the "British Vietnam Committee" until 1965 when the World Congress of the Fourth International suddenly decided, for mysterious reasons, to disrupt it by setting up a "late arrival on the scene."

We must thank Betty Reid for this precious example of the Stalinist way of thinking. The point of qualitative change in the idyllic routine of the "British Vietnam Committee" was a decision reached by the Trotskyist troublemakers!

Note well what she says. If it had not been for the Trotskyists, the bureaucrats of the Communist party of Great Britain could have continued "to win understanding and support" for the "struggles of the Vietnamese people" in exactly the same routine way they had followed for fourteen years! If it had not been for the Trotskyists and their World Congress and their inexplicable thirst for "diversions"...

What striking symptoms of calcification of the brain! Johnson's escalation of the war in Vietnam does not exist for Betty Reid, nor the qualitative change in the situation for the Vietnamese people, nor the military assault on a workers state protected by an alliance with the USSR, nor the enormously heightened threat from imperialism to the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union, nor the swiftened acceleration given to the threat of atomic war -- none of this exists for Betty Reid. The British Communist bureaucrats found their stodgy pattern of muddling along disrupted by something. What? Cherchez les Trotskyistes! When you find the Trotskyists and dispose of them, you can return to your bureaucratic slumber...

Where did Betty Reid learn to think like this? In the school of Stalinism, of course. This is no slander but a fact.

In the days when Trotsky was warning with all the strength at his command of the danger the Soviet Union faced as Hitler rearmed Germany and Stalin undermined the Soviet defenses, Stalin's reply



was to condemn -- Trotsky. In Stalin's eyes, Trotsky was the real danger, not Hitler. Stalin found it possible to even sign a pact with Hitler. He murdered Trotsky. Those in the Soviet Union who gave indications of being disturbed by Stalin's policy of conducting bureaucratism as usual were framed up as "diversionists," "mad dogs," "agents of Hitler and the Mikado," and, labeled as "Trotskyists," were disposed of in the concentration camps or before firing squads.

Betty Reid does show some traces of reform, we must admit, and we are duly thankful to her for it. She does not mention by a single word the famous charges that were leveled against the victims in the Moscow Trials. In place of charging the Trotskyists with being "agents" of imperialism, she credits them with at least having a political program. Khrushchev's admissions at the Twentieth Congress compelled the Kremlin to modify its line on Trotskyism, to "bring it up to date," so to speak; and Betty Reid, too, has undergone "de-Stalinization." But the basic pattern of thought displayed in her article remains the same.

Betty Reid has fixed up a political program for the Trotskyists that accords very well with what has been laid down in recent articles on the subject by the specialists in Moscow. The lack of any resemblance to the real views and program of the Trotskyists, living or dead, is, of course, no concern of hers.

To supply a bit of background, she appeals to "those whose memories go back to the prewar days" and points to Germany, France and Spain.

Many elderly people are noted for unusually vivid memories of distant events. Unfortunately Betty Reid is not one of them. She quite forgets that Stalin accused the Trotskyists of having sold out to Hitler. As she remembers it, "the Trotskyists posed the slogan of a 'Workers Government' against the efforts to build an anti-fascist front against Hitler."

The truth, of course, was just the opposite. It was Stalin who opposed the efforts to build an antifascist front against Hitler. Trotsky fought for a united front between the Communist party and the Social Democracy. The two parties were followed by millions of workers and commanded forces far stronger than those being assembled by Hitler. A united front against the Nazis was an elementary defensive measure. Stalin rejected this, calling the Social Democrats the "main enemy," labeling them "social fascists" and the "twin of fascism."

"What then should have been done?"

asks Betty Reid with touching naiveté. The answer is that the two big parties of the German working class should have heeded Trotsky's warnings and formed a united front against Hitler. They should have fought to put a workers government in power instead of letting the Nazis take over unopposed. The failure of the Communist and Social Democratic leaders to join forces on the basis of a program of class struggle assured Hitler's victory with all its tragic consequences for humanity.

On France, Betty Reid refers to the "Popular Front" but so briefly that one is left with the impression that no subject could be of less interest to her than the revolutionary potentialities in France in 1936, otherwise she might at least have displayed curiosity as to Stalin's reason for switching to a "Popular Front" after the disaster in Germany.

The "Popular Front" was a variant of the policy followed by the Stalinists in Germany. It was a practical agreement between the Stalinist and Social Democratic bureaucrats to work in common against the program of socialist revolution. In face of the threat of fascism, which had become acute in France following Hitler's victory in Germany, the bureaucratic partners in the "Popular Front" laid their bets on the "progressive sector" of the French bourgeoisie. Instead of seeking to establish a socialist government in France that could have blocked the preparations for World War II, the "Popular Front" helped pave the way for the capitulation to the Nazi armies and the establishment of the Petain dictatorship.

On Spain, Betty Reid again offers a striking case of clouded memory in a senior citizen. She has forgotten the slanders about the Trotskyists being "agents of Franco" and "fifth columnists," false charges on which revolutionists in Spain were executed by Stalin's agents. She does display a certain sprightliness and sureness of touch in precluding any ambiguity about her opposition to appealing to the Spanish workers to establish a revolutionary government. She is still an ardent partisan of the "Popular Front" in Spain that diverted the workers from carrying their socialist revolution through to success. She is still a devoted backer of the capitalist government in Spain in which the Stalinists, Social Democrats and Anarchists placed political confidence and which facilitated Franco's drive to power.

So what does all this have to do with the antiwar movement in Britain today? Isn't it a mistake to permit Betty Reid to divert us into discussing these ancient differences?

Unhappily, the fact is that Betty Reid is speaking very much to the issue. What she proposes for the antiwar movement in Britain is the very same policy that was followed by the Stalinists in Germany, in France and Spain. The name given to this policy today by the Kremlin and its followers is "peaceful coexistence." They mean by this maintenance of the status quo, continuation of the present balance of class relations on a world scale. Just as Stalin sought "peaceful coexistence" with the German, French, and Spanish capitalists and their political representatives, so Brezhnev-Kosygin seek "peaceful coexistence" with U.S. imperialism and its political representatives today. Betty Reid's article is intended to defend and to advance this policy.

Thus we come to the heart of the question -- the real reason for Betty Reid's flattering interest in the 1965 World Congress of the Fourth International. She, in the example set by her ideological mentors in the Kremlin, follows the activities of the world movement founded by Leon Trotsky with the closest attention. This is out of recognition of the fact that the Fourth International embodies the living tradition of the Bolsheviks who guided the Russian Revolution of 1917 to victory. The Fourth International offers the most articulate political expression of the revolutionary aspirations of the masses in all countries whose elemental outbursts continually upset the status quo from the left\* just as the expansionism of imperialism upsets the status quo from the right.

The account given by the British representative of the Kremlin concerning the position of the Fourth International on Vietnam warrants no comment beyond the observation that it is dishonest from beginning to end.

The Fourth International noted immediately after the event that the strategists of U.S. imperialism had decided to escalate the war in Vietnam because of the belief they could get away with it. The imperialist rulers of America thought that the conflict between Moscow and Peking provided a favorable opening for a military advance in Southeast Asia. They judged that the Kosygin-Brezhnev

team was so incompetent that it could be discounted. These two paragons of bureaucratic mediocrity would not even dare to put up a bluff. Khrushchev had threatened to resort to nuclear weapons if the imperialists proceeded with their military adventure against the United Arab Republic in 1956 and this threat was taken seriously, leading to swift de-escalation of the blitzkrieg. But Kosygin and Brezhnev, the Pentagon calculated, would confine themselves to purely verbal denunciations softened with placating gestures.

The Fourth International advocated a number of steps, including sending massive material aid to Vietnam, forming a united front on the state level between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China, launching a vigorous campaign of international solidarity with the Vietnamese, and heightening the intensity of revolutionary struggles wherever feasible in the world.

The Fourth International predicted that the Pentagon would continue to escalate the war until resistance was encountered on a scale sufficient to make further military expansion unduly hazardous.

The Fourth International also warned that the longer adequate countermeasures were delayed, the more dangerous the situation would become because of the increasing loss of face it would signify for Washington to back down. If things were permitted to drift, the Fourth International warned, it could touch off a nuclear catastrophe.

As to the specific countermeasures that the allies of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam could take, the Fourth International stated that this was a tactical problem which the Soviet staff was quite competent to work out if a political decision was made calling for such a course. Among the indicated countermeasures was to reaffirm the Soviet-Chinese alliance -- no matter what the position of Mao Tse-tung -- and openly emphasize this in an unmistakable way; for instance, by offering to supply nuclear arms to the government of revolutionary China.

What the Fourth International advocated, in short, was to step up the class struggle on an international scale and advance the program of socialist revolution as the only realistic alternative to the suicidal course of "peaceful coexistence."

Other forces besides the Fourth International were thinking along parallel lines in 1965. Fidel Castro, for instance, appealed for a closing of ranks in the socialist camp and the immediate organization of massive aid for the Vietnamese people.

---

\* This includes the Soviet Union. Instead of lifting her hands in horror at the thought of a political revolution in the Soviet Union that would restore proletarian democracy on the basis of the planned economy established by the October 1917 Revolution, Mrs. Reid would do better to consider how to restore that proletarian democracy without a political revolution. Does she have any suggestions? Her reply should prove instructive. Even more instructive may be her delay in replying.

This line of thought received one of its finest expressions in Ernesto "Che" Guevara's message on the need to help the Vietnamese by stepping up the revolutionary struggles in other lands. "The slogan," he said, "is to create two, three...many Vietnams."

Where does Mrs. Reid stand in relation to the slogan proposed by Guevara? She stands in embarrassed silence. There is not a word in her article about the Cuban position on how best to defend the Vietnamese people and their revolution.

That does not mean she does not have a position on what the Cubans advocate. Her article fits into the barrage directed by the leaderships of the right-wing Communist parties against the Cubans and their promulgation of socialist revolution and armed struggle. Instead of singling out the Cubans, she points her finger at the Trotskyists.

More than three years have passed since Johnson escalated the war in Vietnam. This is sufficient time to test the positions that were advanced at the beginning by the various tendencies. Who proved to be right?

One fundamental fact provides answer enough. The Washington strategists did not begin to hesitate or to think of drawing back until the opposing forces, including the antiwar movement in the United States itself, became so formidable as to indicate that the dangers had risen to a point outweighing any possible gains from further escalation.

That the Soviet and Chinese governments did finally begin to increase the flow of material aid -- although

still at an utterly inadequate rate -- pays tribute to the foresightedness of the Fourth International which urged vigorous counterescalation from the beginning.

Most significant of all has been the rise of popular opposition to the war inside the United States and the other imperialist countries, including Canada, Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Belgium and elsewhere along the lines projected by the Fourth International as offering the only possibility of proving productive. The growth of the demonstrations in size and militancy constitutes the most promising and inspiring development in these lands in many decades. The Vietnam Solidarity Campaign is entitled to take pride in what it has done to further this process in Britain.

And the fact that the old Communist and Social Democratic bureaucrats are being by-passed, that new young militant leaders are appearing and gaining wide recognition in the course of the struggle is of the utmost political significance. These new leaders are open-minded. They scorn the slanders handed down from the twenties and thirties and are impatient with those who still try to purvey them, even if in diluted doses. They are willing to listen to and work with Trotskyists or anyone else on the basis of what they have to offer in the way of ideas and practical activity.

That is precisely what disturbs the Betty Reids. They are against the changing times and the advancing future. They want the status quo. "Peaceful coexistence at any price!" is their slogan. How little time is left these pitiful vestiges of the heyday of Stalinism...

#### "OPEN REBELLION" SEEN AS "GENUINE POSSIBILITY" AMONG U.S. TROOPS

A psychiatrist who interviewed hundreds of U.S. soldiers in Vietnam says that "a lot of people in Washington are worried" about rising antiwar sentiment among GI's.

Dr. John W. Rosenberger said in an interview published in the March 30 Toronto Star that soldiers are going absent without leave, speaking out against the war, and registering their opposition in other ways in unprecedented numbers.

Rosenberger said stories of defecting servicemen "have led some to wonder if open rebellion might be a genuine possibility in the military."

The former army psychiatrist described dissent in Vietnam:

"Those with experience in Vietnam

have felt that the United States has almost no support from the local Vietnamese. The second and more subtle reason is that the Saigon government, the U.S. administration, and the army hierarchy in particular are manifesting more and more hypocrisy in an attempt to justify the American position in Vietnam."

A U.S. officer told Rosenberger how figures are set for Vietnamese dead:

"They go out on a patrol. There's a skirmish. They may see two V.C. drop. They say to themselves, 'This is not enough to please the higher-ups.' So, they report four killed to the company leader. He figures that's not enough so he reports eight to the battalion commander....ultimately, main headquarters is told the figure was 32....This, incidentally, happens time and time again."

ONCE AGAIN -- HOW MANY MORE TROOPS WAS THAT?

The Pentagon strategists have repeatedly indicated that to really do the job they want to do in Vietnam -- crush the revolution and convert the country into an American colony and military base for further adventures in Asia -- they may need as many as 1,000,000 U.S. troops.

This estimate is one of the factors that have heated up opposition to the war among the American people. With each "request" from Westmoreland for more troops, the clamor mounted. It has reached such proportions that Johnson finds it increasingly embarrassing to raise the "ceiling" he sets each time after responding to the demands of the Pentagon.

But this has not meant that the professional butchers have given up their plans. They have gone ahead just the same, rounding up conscripts to be trained and sent to Vietnam. However, they have learned to proceed more cautiously than is their custom in such matters.

This surreptitious tactic received glaring publicity when it was revealed April 22 that Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, director of the U.S. Selective Service System, had told a congressional committee in secret session earlier this year that the army will draft 61,000 more men than had been scheduled for the fiscal year ending this coming July.

The general's admission made headlines when it was released to the press. The impact was not lessened by his further admission that next year the "unplanned" figure for conscription could exceed the "planned" figure of 240,000 men by more than 100,000.

In the present fiscal year the army will draft 346,000 instead of the 285,000 announced to the public. The only explanation offered for the jump is an "inexplicable" drop in reinlistments among GI's who have been to Vietnam.

Another 5,900 men will be drafted into the Marine Corps in April and May because of the "manpower strain that the Vietnam war has placed upon the 297,000-man corps." The Marine Corps normally rely entirely upon volunteers.

Hershey told the House Appropriations Committee that "if the war doesn't get over," the projected draft of 240,000 for fiscal year 1969 will have to be increased by "another 100,000."

This revelation elicited a sharp



LT. GEN. LEWIS B. HERSHEY

denial from the Pentagon. The top brass intimated that Hershey was simply making out a case in order to get the maximum appropriation for his department and had not considered the political repercussions of his maneuver.

A Pentagon spokesman, who insisted on remaining anonymous, assured the press: "We have not changed our estimate that 240,000 will be called up in the 12 months beginning July 1." Presumably the Pentagon's estimate of 285,000 for this year had also not been changed until Hershey spilled the beans to the congressmen on the real figure.