

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Vol. 1, No. 11

December 6, 1963

21, rue d'Aboukir - Paris-2°

The Dallas Police and Oswald

THEY HAVE NOT HESITATED TO FABRICATE "PROOFS"

PARIS, Dec. 1 -- Not a single publication here, newspapers or magazines, dailies or weeklies, from the far right to the far left, from the lightest to the most serious, accepts the version offered up to now by the Dallas police of the assassination of Kennedy.

This skepticism, probably expressed in this city in the greatest detail and with the coldest logic, reflects prevailing public opinion throughout Europe, the Soviet bloc and the colonial countries.

Writing about this from London for the American press, Charles Portis expressed some irritation. In an article published in yesterday's European Edition of the New York Herald Tribune, he said:

"Many Europeans are convinced there was a cabal -- probably political -- behind the assassination of President Kennedy. The less they know about the circumstances and the more remote they are from Dallas, the surer they become.

"Londoners are awfully suspicious, and the Parisians are pretty certain they know. In Budapest they're dead sure."

In what purports to be a survey of the press, Portis singles out certain questions concerning the evidence, bits of speculation, telephone calls he has received and even a conversation at a bar.

"No theory is too fantastic in this country of Agatha Christie and Ian Fleming," he says of England.

"The continentals," he declares, "simply cannot believe that a mighty Chief of State such as Mr. Kennedy can be cut down by a nasty little man with a mental problem. The French particularly -- they find it intellectually and dramatically unsatisfying."

This attempt at dismissing the universal skepticism by light-some ridicule is not likely to meet with much favorable comment. Outside of the United States the assassination of President Kennedy is taken most seriously.

The anxiety to know the truth and nothing but the truth derives from two considerations:

(1) The political use that is made of the assassination will indicate -- and even help determine -- whether another wave of McCarthyism is due in the United States. This is considered very important abroad both for its effect on domestic politics and for what it can signify in the atomic arms race and the drive toward a nuclear catastrophe.

(2) The world is sick to the marrow with judicial frame-ups and lynchings. Tens of millions of people outside the United States saw Lee H. Oswald shot in the stomach by a police stool pigeon as they watched in horror on their TV screens. What they saw of the working of justice in the United States frightened them as they haven't been frightened since the days of the Nazis. This is the law and order of the country that presumes to lead the world and on whom the fate of all mankind depends? Naturally they examined the evidence of Oswald's guilt offered by the Dallas cops and they did not approach it with any of the racist preconceptions which an American correspondent may have become accustomed to rely upon in handling "facts" dealing with such things as lynch murder in the South.

Day by day every paper in Paris kept its best men occupied in the past week sifting the facts. They did not even rely on the standard wire services or the big substantial American papers like the New York Times and the Herald Tribune. They had their own men in Dallas, Washington and New York. The Paris newspapermen are good -- make no mistake about it.

What they did to the "evidence" proffered by the Dallas cops was devastating. They proved from the internal contradictions of the evidence and from the self-evident contradictions in the declarations made to the public that evidence was being manufactured in Dallas.

For instance, Jacques Amalric, who has been following the development of the evidence day by day for Le Monde, which is undoubtedly one of the most serious and responsible bourgeois newspapers in the world, said flatly in his article in the November 28 issue: "It must be concluded that the Texas police have not hesitated to fabricate 'proofs' to cover up the real criminal." ["Il faudrait en conclure que les policiers texans n'ont pas hésité à fabriquer des 'preuves' pour couvrir le vrai coupable."]

Today's Le Journal du Dimanche stated its conclusion on the case very succinctly: "One has the impression of having a tangled ball of thread in which you can't find the end."

A similar conclusion was reached by Léo Sauvage, correspondent

of Le Figaro after a week in Dallas. His views, published in the week end issue of the Paris daily, carried the graphic headline: "Incompetence, minds made up, display of errors, of omissions, of contradictions and improbabilities -- The Investigation Has Bogged Down in an Impardonable Disorder."

Since the article by Sauvage provides a very good example of the type of material that has been appearing in the Paris press (although it is much shorter than many of the carefully worked out analyses) we are providing a translation:

THE CONCLUSIONS OF LEO SAUVAGE

[The following article, sent by Léo Sauvage from Dallas November 29, appeared in the Paris morning daily Le Figaro of 30 Nov.1-Dec. The conclusions to which Léo Sauvage came are similar to those expressed by all wings of the French press -- Editor.]

* * *

Where does the investigation on the assassination of the President of the United States stand today? In all honesty, without attempting to draw political conclusions yet, without attempting above all to follow those for whom the political conclusions were already drawn before the investigation began, the reply must be short, frank and brutal: the investigation of the assassination of the President of the United States has bogged down in total confusion. The reason for this is that the main lines of this investigation were posed with as much incompetence as fixed preconceptions, so that the display of errors, omissions, contradictions, improbabilities is such that it would be difficult to excuse it even in the investigation of a rural constable in the raid of a hen roost.

Doubtless, it is necessary to be objective, to note first of all certain character traits of the Texans, because these traits, sympathetic in other circumstances, are playing their part in the impardonable disorder that one finds here.

The reporters who were in Dallas, from the first day, have described with fright on looking back how they were able to walk around in the offices of police headquarters, sitting on the tables, helping themselves to the telephones, etc. I myself got declarations from the assistant prosecuting attorney, Jim Bowie, in the way I mentioned above, entering without any appointment and without being announced in his office, the door being open. I introduced myself, he offered his hand and invited me to sit down. The office crew had left when the conversation ended. We took the elevator together, leaving open all the doors of the Dallas courthouse, where the Oswald affair is considered closed, but where they are now undertaking the Ruby affair.

This "good Joe" side -- this Marseillais side, I would say, if I did not fear vexing my friends of the Old Port -- would be charming if the Oswald and Ruby affairs did not concern the assassination of President Kennedy, and also if the affable prosecuting attorney Bowie had shown

himself able in some measure, during a conversation of more than an hour, to give a satisfactory response to at least one of the five or six errors omissions, contradictions and improbabilities which I asked him to explain.

I had already indicated the incongruity of the chicken bones (and the bottle of Coca Cola and the package of empty cigarettes), since the witnesses mentioned by the authorities affirmed that they had left Oswald in the building at the time they went down to see the Presidential motorcade, hence a very short time before the attempt. The remains of the meal, which seemed to attest that the assassin had been there for a long time, were never again mentioned. I therefore asked prosecuting attorney Jim Bowie to tell me what had become of them. I transcribe the conversation literally:

"Oh, that. . . Those remains were old, the bones weren't fresh. It wasn't Oswald who ate the chicken. That was someone else, the evening before."

"Has the person been found who went to eat a chicken, the evening before, close to the window from which President Kennedy was killed?"

"I don't know; I don't believe so."

"Are they looking for him?"

"Without doubt."

I will return in the next article to the other "explanations" of the same kind which I obtained around the Dallas court house, or which were published by the local authorities. The unacceptable improbability of most of these "explanations" casts suspicion on the whole collection of proofs furnished, even those relating to the gun in the crime, which all of us had considered, up to now, as overwhelming. All the more so, since each time the possibility opens of verifying the affirmations of the authorities, one runs into omissions, deformations, or even flagrant inexactitudes.

This morning, for example, the Dallas Morning News published an investigation by two of its reporters who, in passing, had interviewed the driver in particular of the bus taken by Oswald after the attempt. According to the driver, Oswald said absolutely nothing when he got on the bus. It was a man in the street who told the bus driver that the traffic jam that had stopped them was due to an attempt against the President, and when Oswald got off, he asked the driver for a transfer.

The Dallas Morning News is on excellent terms with the local authorities and refrained from insisting on the contradiction with "the incomplete reports published previously." Now these "incomplete reports" were in reality declarations made by prosecuting attorney Henry Wade in person, Sunday evening, during a televised press conference. The "grinning" Oswald announcing the assassination of the President to the passengers on the bus even held a place of honor among the prosecuting attorney's "proofs." Hence this proof, which proved nothing, now seems to be likewise revealed as false.

That's why if anyone were to ask me today to draw up a list indicating the certain facts in this affair, I would reply that the only absolutely certain fact is the assassination of President Kennedy on November 22 in Dallas.

JOHNSON PUTS EARL WARREN IN CHARGE

The ugly implications of the execution of Lee H. Oswald in Dallas police headquarters, in full view of all of America's TV screens, compelled President Johnson on the following day to order the Federal Bureau of Investigation to take over investigation of the assassination of Kennedy. The order was a tacit admission that the Dallas police were utterly incompetent, if not themselves involved in some of the darker aspects of the murder of the President.

However, this concession to public opinion did not prove sufficient. Abroad, especially, the general political level is such that it seems incredible that a crime, committed in the well-known pattern of racist lynch murder and in the miasmatic racist atmosphere of Dallas, should have been instigated by "reds," "Castroites," "Communists," or "Trotskyists." Competent reporters and criminal and political analysts submitted the "proofs" offered by the Dallas cops to logical examination. The proofs vanished like wax images under a blow torch. Fresh "proofs" were supplied and they went the same way, casting still more doubt on the whole case.

In addition to this, the Federal Bureau of Investigation was itself not entirely free of suspicion. It has a long record of the use of provocateurs and stool pigeons, particularly in witch-hunting activities against the radical and labor movement. Its admission that its agents had visited Oswald, the prime suspect, only shortly before the assassination of Kennedy was an ominous fact with sinister implications. The FBI needed a superior body of some kind to clear its skirts.

The Central Intelligence Agency was hardly the proper body to call in. Besides lacking jurisdiction, it has perhaps the foulest record of all with its partisans boasting of its dirty cloak-and-dagger work abroad.

Johnson's solution to this nagging problem came November 30 when he signed an order creating a special commission of seven prominent public figures, who are presumably above all suspicion, to undertake a complete investigation of the assassination and to draw the necessary conclusions.

Johnson appointed Earl Warren, the head of the Supreme Court, to preside over the seven. Such an appointment is without precedent in the United States. It testifies to Johnson's political adroitness.

Earl Warren has a strong reputation for liberalism. In fact, he is as much, if not more hated in the South than Kennedy. At the same time, it should not be forgotten that Warren catapulted into his political career in the thirties as a prosecuting attorney in Oakland, California, where he won convictions of union organizers on a murder charge in a case involving efforts to bring unionism to some of California's oil companies.

MARXISTS IN U.S. DENOUNCE ASSASSINATION

All the groupings in the United States of any significance whatever that proclaim adherence in general to Marxism united November 26 in explaining to the public that the assassin of President Kennedy could not be a "Marxist." If Oswald proves to be the actual killer, all of them held, then no matter what he asserted he was no adherent of Marxism.

The united front on this subject was reported in a rather lengthy article in the November 27 New York Times which, however, does not make clear whether the compilation of views was obtained by its reporter Peter Kihss or whether the representatives of the various groups participated in a public forum.

American Trotskyist Statement

Farrell Dobbs, national secretary of the Socialist Workers party and its presidential candidate in the last four elections, made the following statement:

"The only way that the political and basic social problems of the human race can be settled in a civilized way is for society to be guided by majority decision, which is reached after full and free public debate in which all points of view are heard.

"Individual acts of terrorism in the last analysis can serve only the forces of reaction who want to repress political and constitutional liberties because they seize upon the individual terrorist act as a pretext to attack the rights of society as a whole."

Dobbs cited a pamphlet written by Leon Trotsky on the assassination of Kirov in 1934 in which the founder of the Fourth International stressed "the negative aspect of Marxism towards the tactic of individual terror."

As to Stalin's use of assassination, Dobbs said that the killing of Leon Trotsky by one of Stalin's agents in 1940 "refuted Stalin's contention that he had remained a Marxist."

Views of Communist Party

Arnold Johnson, a long-time leader of the Communist party of the USA, said that the party's constitution advocates a peaceful road to socialism through "the developing constitutional process."

The party's constitution calls for expulsion of anyone "who advocates force and violence or terrorism."

"We constantly see the role of the working class and of the mass movements and mass struggles of the people as decisive," said Johnson. "We always warn against any short cuts, any methods of individual terror, individual acts which divert from and would basically prove defeating both as to immediate as well as to ultimate objectives."

Earl Browder, expelled former general secretary of the Communist

party, who still reflects the most crassly class-collaborationist sector of the party and its periphery, agreed that Stalin had "practiced" individual terrorism, but had "never defended it."

On the Marxist view concerning individual terror, Browder cited the eulogy which Karl Marx wrote in behalf of the Central Council of the International Working Men's Association on May 13, 1865, in relation to the assassination of President Lincoln.

As an example of Marx's view, Browder said that the eulogy "could be applied to Kennedy."

He quoted Karl Marx's tribute to Lincoln in part as follows:

"Even the sycophants who year after year and day by day stuck at their Sisyphus work of morally assassinating Abraham Lincoln and the great republic he headed stand now aghast at this universal outburst of popular feeling and rival with each other to strew rhetorical flowers on his open grave.

"They have now at last found out that he was a man neither to be browbeaten by adversity, nor intoxicated by success, inflexibly pressing on to his great goal, never compromising it by blind haste, slowly maturing his steps, never retracing them, carried away by no surge of popular favor, disheartened by no slackening of the popular pulse, tempering stern acts by the gleams of a kind heart, illuminating scenes dark with passion by the smile of humor, doing his titanic work as humbly and homely as heavenborn rulers do little things with the grandiloquence of pomp and state, in one word one of the rare men who succeed in becoming great without ceasing to be good.

"Such indeed was the modesty of this great and good man that the world only discovered him a hero after he had fallen a martyr."

Former Left-Wing CPers

Milton Rosen, chairman of the Progressive Labor Movement, a new grouping that emerged from the Communist party under the impact of the Cuban Revolution and the Sino-Soviet conflict and which has some forces in a few areas, said that an attempt was being made "to utilize the alleged acts of Oswald to whip up further the anti-Communist hysteria in the country."

"This," he said, "is all part of the atmosphere that lends itself to these acts of violence. Marxist-Leninists find it necessary to reject assassination as a conceivable form of political struggle. The killing of a man cannot alter the course of history."

Rosen pointed out that "assassination and individual violence is part and parcel of the capitalist system."

De Leonist Opinion

Arnold Petersen, national secretary of the Socialist Labor party, which was founded by Daniel De Leon and which still confines itself largely to promulgating his doctrines, cited Marx's hostile attitude toward the

anarchists of his time who "preach tyrannicide as a 'theory and panacea.'"

The coming issue of The Weekly People, the newspaper of the Socialist Labor party, carries an editorial denouncing the assassination of Kennedy.

"It is this deep-seated, guilt-inspired, ruling class fear," the editorial says, "that created the climate in which it is commonplace for overwrought, unstable and mentally unbalanced characters to commit irrational acts of violence.

"They have had it drilled into their weak minds by the incessant propaganda of capitalism that, on the one hand, the individual is the architect of his own fate, and, on the other, that evil men (or those whom the irrational victims of capitalist madness imagine to be evil) are responsible for their private miseries and for the world's woes."

View of Norman Thomas's Party

Miss Betty Elkin, national secretary of the Socialist Party-Social Democratic Federation, whose leading figure is Norman Thomas, said that her organization contains both Marxist and non-Marxist members.

"The Socialist party has always firmly and unequivocally rejected violence such as assassination and terrorism, against political opponents, as being utterly contrary to Socialist principles and incompatible with membership in the Socialist party," she declared.

"Assassination, terrorism and all such forms of personal violence contribute nothing to social progress. It only strengthens the forces of reaction and repression."

Dr. Sidney Hook, professor of philosophy at New York University and a former Marxist who is still considered among his fellow liberals to be an authority on the subject, said that "Marxist theory does not believe in individual violence as a method of social change and transformation."

"However, many Marxists would on occasion not condemn an individual act of violence if it served some important social purpose. But they would condemn most actions of violence, especially on the ground that they would act as provocations or pretexts for repressive measures."

Hook referred to the assassination of Trotsky as an example of "hundreds" of such individual killings.

He sought finally to picture the guerrilla warfare now flaring up in Venezuela as another instance of the same kind of tactic.

GEN. FRANCO SATISFIED

New legislation against political opposition was passed by the Cortes in Madrid November 28 after a Franco spokesman said Kennedy had been struck down by the "perverted ideology" of Communism which "prompts crime."

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL ANSWERS MOSCOW SLANDER ON OSWALD

When the Dallas police reported that they had found "Communist literature" in the room of Kennedy's alleged assassin, Lee H. Oswald, both Pravda and Izvestia, the two main publications of the Khrushchev government, reacted in a not very credible way. They said that if Oswald had any Communist connections they were of the variety espoused by Leon Trotsky.

While the Moscow press had insisted that in all likelihood Oswald was the victim of a frame-up plotted by racists, an imputation such as the above was already an admission that he might be guilty, but if he was then he was a "Trotskyist."

This, of course, fits in with the new slanderous campaign against Trotskyism and the Fourth International launched by Izvestia and Communist in relation to the Sino-Soviet conflict. [See World Outlook September 27, October 4, November 8 and November 22.]

In Paris on November 28 the United Secretariat of the Fourth International denounced the attempt by Moscow to implicate the Trotskyist movement. The attempt, said the highest body of the Fourth International, "in place of helping to expose the hand of the racists and the police in this affair, seeks to continue the campaigns of slander against a wing of the workers movement which, for more than thirty years, has been systematically made victim of such slanders and provocations."

Meanwhile, in New York, the allegations of the Dallas police that they had found copies in Oswald's quarters of The Worker, the weekly publication which reflects the views of the Communist party of the USA, and The Militant, the weekly Trotskyist newspaper which has been published since 1928, as well as correspondence on letterheads of the American Communist party, led to official statements to the press from these two movements.

The publishers of The Militant said that they had found that Oswald had been briefly a subscriber. In December 1962 he sent in \$1 for a four-month introductory subscription and renewed for another four months at \$1, the subscription expiring in September with no further communication indicated in the records.

"The mere fact that a person subscribes to a publication," a representative of The Militant said, "is no indication of whether or not he is sympathetic to any position the publication espouses -- sometimes just the opposite."

Arnold Johnson, a leader of the Communist party of the USA made the following comment: "We get many letters every week from people who are not Communists including students, faculty members and others who are interested in the subject and from many also who are anti-Communist, who ask for information.

"I answer all such letters from the public asking for information, and it is possible his letters are among those. This does not make Lee Oswald in any way associated with the Communist party -- no more than it

makes the hundreds of others who write for information or than it makes the newspapermen who call up for information."

The American Civil Liberties Union, the largest organization of its kind in the United States, also reported that Oswald had sent in a \$2 cash contribution on November 4 along with a filled-out membership application.

The ACLU is nonpolitical and nonpartisan. It has defended victims of all political persuasion, including avowed fascists. Ernest Angell, board chairman, said that the ACLU is "concerned solely with the defense of the Bill of Rights" and believes in "free speech, advocacy of opinion, reason and open debate." It intervenes in cases where it has reason to believe that the constitutional rights of a defendant have been infringed.

V.T. Lee, national director of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, on November 25 once again denied that Oswald had ever "represented" the organization. He made a plea for "understanding, integrity, justice and peaceful resolution."

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL DISAVOWS "ALVAHUETE" STATEMENT

A November 26 dispatch from Mexico City, carried on the wires of the United Press International in connection with the assassination of Kennedy, seems to have been planted in order to damage the Fourth International and the world Trotskyist movement. The full dispatch is as follows:

* * *

"A secretary and aide of the late Leon Trotsky said today that there was 'a revealing similarity of circumstances' in the slaying of Trotsky and that of President Kennedy.

"Felipe Alvahuete said that the 'liquidation' of Oswald by 'the gunman Jack Ruby' was a 'classic measure' of Communism.

"Mr. Alvahuete, identified as a leader of the Fourth Internationale, told the newspaper El Universal that 'the tactics of the Communist party were the same the world over; they still have not renounced terrorism or personal attacks.'"

* * *

Pierre Frank, a member of the United Secretariat, highest body of the Fourth International, said in Paris November 30 that "Felipe Alvahuete" is unknown to him and that his declarations appear to have been designed for no other purpose but to do injury to the world Trotskyist movement.

Joseph Hansen, who was a member of Trotsky's staff in Mexico at the time of the assassination of the founder of the Fourth International, declared that no one by the name of "Felipe Alvahuete" was either a "secretary" or "aide" of Trotsky and that the statements which UPI reports "Mr. Alvahuete" to have made do not correspond to the opinions of any leaders of the Fourth International.

Efforts are being made to ascertain the source of the UPI's dubious
dispatch.

The American Way of Life

YOUR COUNTRY, TOO, NEEDS A VICE-PRESIDENT

Some Americans abroad, finding little else to point to with pride in the monstrous Dallas affair, in which the assassination of a president was followed by a lynching of the alleged killer in police headquarters, for all of America and a good deal of the rest of the world to see live on TV, have stressed the advantages of the American Way of immediately swearing in a new president.

Some French politicians were polite enough to applaud briefly and to say that it should be considered for adoption as another possible improvement in the constitution granted to France by de Gaulle.

It is doubtful, however, that this bit of the much boasted American Way of Life is likely to catch on. The accompanying publicity does not seem to have taken into account the tastes of the audience that exists outside the United States.

For example, Godfrey Hodgson, writing from Washington for France Observateur [November 28] describes the arrival of Kennedy's body at the windswept airport the night of the assassination. The removal of the coffin from the plane was "macabre."

"Adding to the horror, Mrs. Kennedy appeared in the light of the projectors, still wearing her pathetic small strawberry outfit stained with the blood of her husband. The powers of the kingdom, the senators, the high functionaries, and the reporters -- who are called here the representatives of the fourth estate -- rushed forward to shake the hand of the new president."

He had arrived, of course, on the same plane.

Others were even quicker on the draw. Jimmy Breslin of the New York Herald Tribune, in a November 28 Washington dispatch, reported that within five minutes after the assassination was confirmed, a lobbyist for "an important industry" called the public information of a Senate subcommittee.

"It's terrible, isn't it?" said the dazed Senate employee.

"Yes it is," the lobbyist said. "Now tell me something. We would like to know what effect Kennedy's death is going to have on this investigation of our industry that you've been planning. I'd like to discuss the implications of this death."

The atmosphere peculiar to the American power structure was evident even inside the plane that brought the dead Kennedy and his successor back to Washington. Federal judge Sarah Hughes swore in Johnson on the plane as President. He happened to be the same politician who had done his

utmost to prevent her from being named to the bench. He simply didn't have enough power to block Kennedy.

"She was weeping when she swore him in, and people were wondering whether she was weeping because of Kennedy or because she was making Lyndon Johnson President."

A White House staff member told Breslin: "On Friday night, while the body was being prepared for burial, there were people sniffing around asking what kind of furniture I have in the office here so they could get an idea of what they'll have when they take my job."

Things went very fast, according to Breslin. "On Saturday night, while the body of John F. Kennedy was lying in the East Room of the White House, while candlelight flickered against the wood of his coffin, workmen sent by some nonthinker [nonthinker?] were in the President's oval office, removing the books and paintings and models of old frigates which Kennedy kept there.

"They took them to a storage room in the Executive Office Building across the street. Kennedy's rocking chair went, too." [Johnson's rocking chair came in.]

Efficient as it was, none of it really caught Kennedy's intimates by surprise. They know the system. They were born and bred in it. For example:

"Evelyn Lincoln, Mr. Kennedy's private secretary, knew enough to get into her office Saturday night and clean out her desks and files and have everything moved over to an office across the street. She was getting out of the way before the first of the hungry people started piling into her office."

STUDENTS AND TEACHERS STRIKE IN FRANCE

PARIS, Nov. 30 -- The National Union of Students of France [Union Nationale des Etudiants de France] and the Trade Unions of the Personnel of Higher Education [Syndicats des Personnels de l'Enseignement Supérieur] organized a one-week, nation-wide strike to protest the government's policies toward education which have led to both a lack of teachers and school buildings. There is never enough money, it seems, while billions are being spent for the "force de frappe" [atomic striking force].

The strike was a success throughout France. Very few teachers showed up at the universities and many students were on the picket lines.

The week of demonstrations was to end yesterday with a rally in the Latin Quarter of Paris. Under the pretext that it would block traffic, the Minister of the Interior banned the gathering. But the organizations decided to go ahead anyway.

Yesterday afternoon some ten thousand students assembled at the edge of a zone guarded by large numbers of police.

When the police sought to disperse the students, violent incidents flared up. For more than three hours the Left Bank was the scene of demonstrations and scuffles in which the police used their lead-weighted capes against the students.

Some groups of students crossed the Seine to demonstrate along the Grands Boulevards.

The strike and yesterday's demonstrations testify to the hostility which the campus feels towards the regime and also toward the civil authorities.

The workers' organizations are expressing solidarity with the teachers and students. But these big organizations, which encompass the majority of the working class, content themselves with expressing verbal solidarity and make no call for action to support the right to demonstrate.

This failure is another expression of the lack of will among the traditional leaders to struggle against the Gaullist regime. They salute partial movements that seek limited objectives in this or that area, but open up no real perspective for these struggles, not trying to raise them to a political level. They seek only to draw electoral gains. Something else is needed to bring an end to a bonapartist regime.

LABOUR PARTY DELEGATION TO VISIT ALGERIA

LONDON, Nov. 29 -- The National Executive Committee of the Labour party decided this week to send three of its members, Barbara Castle, M.P., Jennie Lee, M.P. and William Rathbone, president of the National Union of Railwaymen, as a delegation to Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia.

The decision was taken during a discussion of resolutions submitted to the last annual conference which were not considered then because of lack of time.

Two resolutions were involved. One submitted by the West Lewisham Constituency Labour party asked the labour movement to organize sending technicians to Algeria on a nongovernmental basis. The other, from the South Nottingham Constituency party, asked for governmental aid to Algeria.

Following the decision by the National Executive Committee, the West Lewisham Constituency decided to write to the members of the delegation, asking them to make a point of discussing the organization of direct assistance from the Labour movement with the Algerian government.

Plans of the delegation have not yet been made public. It seems likely that Morocco and Tunisia were included in the projected itinerary to sound out the reaction of the feudal and bourgeois regimes of these countries to a decision to press ahead with assistance to Algeria.

The decision to send a delegation shows that the leadership of the Labour party is not openly hostile to the Algerian Revolution and that pressure from trade unions and local Labour parties could do much to

counteract any opposition which might be displayed by the Tunisian and Moroccan regimes.

MOHAMED BOUDIAP RELEASED

Mohamed Boudiaf, arrested June 21 on the charge of plotting against the Algerian government, was released November 16.

Boudiaf is considered one of the "historical" leaders of the Algerian Revolution. He shared captivity with Ben Bella and others who were kidnapped by French imperialist forces in October 1956 from a Moroccan plane. They were held in prison until the Evian cease-fire agreement was signed last year.

When Boudiaf was placed under arrest last June, the United Secretariat of the Fourth International, among other forces, took the position that he should be either given a public trial, if evidence existed to substantiate the charges levelled against him, or he should be released.

Upon being freed in Algiers, Boudiaf held a press conference in which he pledged continued political opposition against the Ben Bella regime. His criticisms of Ben Bella's course followed the general pattern of those made by Ait Ahmed's "Front of Socialist Forces," the right-wing opposition which recently sought to mount an armed rebellion based in the Kabylie region.

Boudiaf was reported by the Paris daily Le Monde [November 19] as charging Ben Bella with attempting to build "a hasty and precipitate socialism." He denied that a class struggle existed in Algeria because "there are no structured social classes in Algeria."

This appears to echo Ait Ahmed's denunciations of Ben Bella's "hasty and exaggerated nationalizations."

Along with Boudiaf, other prominent political prisoners were released in Algeria, among them former Wilaya II commander Col. Saout El Arab.

There has been considerable speculation over the possible significance of these releases as well as the negotiations between Ben Bella and such opposition leaders as Ait Ahmed (who was permitted to come into Algiers for the conversations without any embarrassing questions being asked about his appeals for the armed overthrow of the government), Belkacem Krim and Ferhat Abbas (who also returned to Algiers), and former general secretary of the FLN [Front de Liberation Nationale] Mohamed Khider, who still retains his post as member of the Political Bureau.

The speculation centers on the possibility that Ben Bella might have made an agreement with the "Kabyle Opposition," not only to free the political prisoners but also to create a commission to prepare for the coming FLN congress in which all tendencies would be represented. This would signify a shift to the right.

Imperialist circles have expressed the hope that such an agreement

might signal a halt at last to the continual evolution of the Ben Bella government toward the left. The November 18 New York Times noted the view among Western observers that the liberation of Boudiaf was a move by Ben Bella intended to placate opposition demands that he foster a more "moderate" political climate, thus countering the charge that he is a "dictator."

However, such speculations were cut short when President Ben Bella, speaking in the Algerian National Assembly, stressed that Algeria was not giving up its "socialist option."

As for the conferences and discussions of recent days, he alluded to these by saying that he stood for the free and clear expression of all socialist and revolutionary points of view at the coming FLN congress. Nonsocialist opinions, however, would not be tolerated at the congress.

It is significant that none of the "moderate"; i.e., right-wing tendency leaders were named to the preparatory commission of FLN cadres. Prominently missing from the list of those charged with organizing the next FLN congress are the names of Ferhat Abbas, Mohamed Khider, Ait Ahmed, Belkacem Krim, Bentobbal, Boussouf, and other prominent former FLN leaders who consider Ben Bella's course to be "precipitate socialism."

On the other hand the list includes some cadres known to be close to the "Kabyle opposition" but who never identified themselves with Ait Ahmed's political views. A prominent one is Bel Hocine Mabrouk, the Tizi Ouzou member of parliament. Other names of interest on the list include Salah Louanchi, the most pronounced left-winger of the FLN cadres, and Mohamed Harbi, the editor of the weekly Révolution Africaine.

According to an article published in Révolution Africaine, three tendencies can be distinguished among the FLN cadres: one favoring state capitalism, another standing for a socialism that is vague and ill-defined and a third that is militantly Marxist.

BRITISH PRO-CHINESE COMMUNISTS HOLD MEETING

LONDON, Nov. 29 -- The pro-Chinese wing of the Communist party of Great Britain [CPGB] held its first meeting last night. Calling themselves the Committee to Defeat Revisionism, for Communist Unity, they called on the audience of some 200 to help them in their fight against the revisionist policies of the Khrushchev leadership and their counterparts at the head of the CPGB. "The need now is to build an alternative leadership based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism," said the leader of the committee, Michael McCreery. All six speakers on the platform attacked the main policy statement of the CPGB, The British Road to Socialism, as "Fabianism" and "luke-warm social democracy."

McCreery claimed that peaceful coexistence as practiced by Khrushchev and British CP leader Palme Dutt means class collaboration of the worst kind. He continued by claiming that the parliamentary road to socialism was impossible in imperialist Britain and that anyone who proclaimed this to be true was sowing terrible illusions about the nature of the capitalist state.

West Indian Johnny James drew laughter and applause when he exposed the British CP's support of Cheddi Jagan, head of the British Guiana government. "Jagan came here a few days ago to kneel at the feet of his imperialist master and asked advice on how to run a government!". . . "and the CPGB supported him," quipped James.

Other speakers went on to explain how there is no real party democracy in the CP. (Some of their forces have already been expelled, others have been suspended because of their pro-Chinese views.)

McCreery did a good job in showing exactly how the press and internal journals of the CPGB are pre-empted by the bureaucracy.

Spokesmen of the committee attacked Yugoslavia for capitulating before American imperialism while Hoxa's Albania came in for much praise. Stalin and the Chinese government were presented in the same breath as the "true revolutionaries."

There was a sharp division amongst the six on the question of Trotskyism. Most of them attacked the Trotskyists, as being ultra left and super-critical, or even out-and-out reactionary. (The advertisements that have been appearing in the name of the Committee have included a note on how anti-Trotskyist they are.)

Immediately after the previous speaker had attacked the Trotskyists in the most crude way, long-time CP member A.H. Evans, who delivered the most fiery speech of the six, said that as long as he was connected with the committee and its intended paper, "he would fight for their articles to be printed."

The chairman publicly disassociated himself from Evans' point of view.

The question and discussion period lasted about forty-five minutes and was varied and lively.

A further meeting of the committee is scheduled to take place on December 12 to help rally support against the American State Department's blockade of Cuba.

CEYLONESE COMMUNIST GROUP CONVOKES CONGRESS

COLOMBO, Nov. 23 -- A proclamation was issued yesterday by 118 members of the Communist party of Ceylon to all Marxist-Leninists inside the party announcing their decision to convoke the seventh congress of the organization at an early date.

Premal Kumarasiri was named by the group as the secretary in charge of organizational and political preparations.

The full text of the declaration is as follows:

* * *

We the undersigned Marxists Leninists in the Communist Party do hereby accuse the present majority of the Central Committee of the C.P. of having destroyed the unity of the party and brought it to the verge of split and reducing its influence by the following actions.

1. Failure to hold the 7th Congress of the party within 2 years of the previous Congress, i.e., before December 1962 as demanded by party constitution.
2. Abandoning the genuine Marxists Leninists standpoints as embodied in the Moscow declaration of 1957 and Moscow statement of 1960 and adopting false positions of Modern Revisionism.
3. Taking disciplinary action against Kumarasiri, Shanmugathasan and E.T.Moorthy for having advocated revolutionary policies in full confrontation with Marxism and Leninism.
4. Refusal to heed the request of many District Committees of the Party and written requests by more than half the membership of the party to settle the present dispute in the party.
5. Failure to build a strong powerful Communist Party and for suspending recruitment to the party at a time when the most favourable conditions exist for the boldest recruitment to the party, reducing the number to a paltry figure never reached even under the difficult days of the U.N.P. -- thus objectively placing the party organisation disarmed and weakened so that it lost its independence and identity.
6. Opportunism in the refusal to lead the workers struggle particularly, the betrayal of the Ceylon Transport Board strike of Jan.-Feb. 1963 and the present reluctance to organise a national struggle around the 21 demands approved by the All Island Congress of the Trade Unions.
7. Exclusive reliance on parliamentary method as the means of winning power peacefully for the working class and refusal to prepare the working class and gather all revolutionary forces for the possibility of non-peaceful transition to socialism.
8. Failure to organise the peasantry.
9. Failure to provide party members and the working class with Marxist education, failure to translate Marxist Classics into Sinhalese.
10. Failure to produce a daily working-class newspaper.
11. Attempts to disrupt mass organisations and fronts under the party leaderships.
12. Resorting to communal propaganda to discredit and isolate comrades fighting for revolutionary principles.

We hereby declare that these charges are sufficient and serious to warrant a loss of confidence by the rank and file in the leadership of the party.

We further declare that the Central Committee is unconstitutional as it has outlived its constitutional span of life and that it has no right to speak on behalf of the party.

Desirous to rectify the mistakes of the present leadership of the party and of ridding the party of the dead wood of revisionists, and deeply conscious of the necessity to give new leadership to the revolutionaries and genuine Marxists Leninists elements inside the party who are a majority and thereby provide a revolutionary leadership to the proletarian movement in our country, and convinced that the present leadership will never convene a democratically constituted Congress; we hereby decide to convoke the 7th Congress of the Communist Party at an early date.

We call upon all genuine Marxists Leninists groups inside the Communist Party to accept this invitation and nominate delegates to this congress and also give us full support for the summoning of the congress.

We hereby appoint a committee consisting of the following:

Premal Kumarasiri	Dharmadasa	K.V.Krishnakutty
N.Shanmugathan	S.M.P. De Silva	S.Janapriya
D.N.Nadunge	S. Abeygunewardene	K.Abeysekera
Higgoda Dharmasena	D.Alwis	E.T.Moorthy
D.K.N.Jindrapala	Sivadasan	D.Jayakody
K.Manikavasagar	S.De Silva	A.De Silva
N.L.Perera	Wickremasinghe	M.Mohideen
K.Wimalapala	A.Jayasuriya	S.Ramaiah
K.Kulaveerasingham	D.A.Gunasekera	Manohar
W.Siriwardene	C.Kulatunga	S.Wijetilleke
A.D.Charleshamy	K.A.Subramaniam	
Watson Fernando	S. De Silva	

NEW BLOOD IN AMERICAN BUSINESS

The desire of America's latest generation of Robber Barons to be as respectable as the descendants of their models is causing some dismay among American business circles.

Narcotics pushers and prostitution operators of the Mafia are moving into the fashionable suburbs which were once "exclusive" to the industrial giants. And they're elbowing their way into the regular business world.

How do the gunmen finally make the leap into legal business? Through factoring, says the Wall Street Journal. They buy "accounts receivable" from business firms and then go out and collect them. They are adept at finding just the right kind of appeal in collecting from a slow account. And if a businessman can't pay up, the hoodlum will lend him money -- at high rates. If he can't pay back, the hood moves in and has a business for a respectable front.

They're even showing up in banker's suits. One government official said, "As sure as I'm sitting here, two banks in New York City are controlled by hoodlums."

NO JUBILATION ON NEHRU'S BIRTHDAY

By Kailas Chandra

BOMBAY -- New Delhi has become an ideal experimental ground to "test" the theory of "peaceful coexistence" and "nonalignment" and with it the slogan of Nehru's "democratic socialism." It is indeed a bewildering spectacle.

The joint exercises of the Indian, U.S., British and Australian Air Forces have just concluded. As "raiding" and "defending" planes were taking to the sky, the Soviet cosmonauts were being lavishly feted on the ground -- stealing the headlines in newspapers. What better demonstration of "nonalignment" could one ask for?

General Adams, commander in chief of the U.S. Strike Force in south and southeast Asia, was in Delhi for talks. On November 19, the concluding day of the joint air exercises, General Walter Sweeney, commander of the USAF Tactical Air Command said, "Cooperation between the Indian Air Force, U.S. Air Force, RAF and Australian Air Force appears to have been superb. Our men are professional airmen, here to do a training job. This they have done in a fine manner to what, I am sure, is our mutual benefit."

General Taylor, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, is expected on a three-day visit to India in December at New Delhi's invitation to discuss "future military plans" as a sequel to joint air exercises.

Elusive African Market

Against this rather ominous background, Indian diplomats in Arab and African countries assembled at the Ministry for External Affairs to receive a pep talk on how to "devise nonaligned attitudes which will be consistent and relevant in the situation now unfolding." Prime Minister Nehru is rather worried over the newly independent African states pursuing their own domestic and foreign policies, quite embarrassing to his "nonalignment." The Indian traders, despised by local populations among whom they settled in Africa, are messing up things for him.

In the wake of a drive towards "Africanisation" of the administrative services in the newly independent states like Kenya, there is of late a steady stream of Indian settlers returning home from Africa. The long-cherished dreams of Indian industrialists of capturing the new and still undeveloped African market are being shattered.

Nehru's seventy-fourth birthday November 14 was celebrated as "Children's Day" throughout the country. But the occasion did not generate as much enthusiasm in the faction-ridden ruling Congress party as it did among the amorphous mass of nonparty "Nehrute socialists" and "fellow travelers" around the Communist party of India [CPI].

In Bombay, the day was celebrated with two mass rallies organized under the auspices of the "Blitz National Forum." (Blitz is a popular pro-Nehru English weekly edited by R.K. Karanjia, who is often described by conservative Congress members as pro-Communist.) The official Congress

organization, controlled by right-wing critics of Nehru, however, ignored the occasion.

Former Defence Minister V.K.Krishna Menon, elected to parliament from Bombay city, "the lone defender of Nehru socialism among Congressmen," spoke at both rallies. His theme was: "If you don't build socialism and remove economic inequalities you will go down as a nation." But he did not explain exactly how India is to achieve the goal of socialism.

Incidentally, Menon, who was being witch-hunted as a "crypto Communist" by the right-wing Indian press immediately after the Sino-Indian border conflict last year, is drawing large crowds at his Bombay meetings.

"Kamaraj Plan" Proves Disappointing

Meanwhile Prime Minister Nehru, reportedly "spending anxious hours wondering how to reorganize his government" -- after he had relieved some of his unpopular colleagues from the Central Cabinet under the so-called "Kamaraj Plan" -- does not seem to have made much progress. By the time parliament assembled for its winter session, he had announced the inclusion in the Central Cabinet of a jurist, Mohamadali Chagla (former Chief Justice of Bombay High Court and till recently India's High Commissioner in London), to take charge of the innocuous Education portfolio.

There was not much "reorganization" of the Cabinet either. The only change is that the former Education minister, Humayun Kabir, has been placed in charge of a separate Ministry for "Petroleum and Chemicals." The office of another minister, C. Subramaniam (from South India) hitherto in charge of "Steel and Heavy Industries" has been "redefined" as minister in charge of "Steel, Mines and Heavy Engineering"!

A newcomer from Uttar Pradesh, Bhakt Darshan, has been asked to take over as deputy minister for Education.

The Kamaraj Plan which was inaugurated with a bang thus ended with a whimper. The master plan aimed at resolving the political and organizational crisis facing the ruling party and the Nehru government. Its collapse came as a big surprise to even the staunchest supporters of the Prime Minister. The only real change that has taken place during the last two months is that Kamaraj Nadar, author of the plan, who surrendered the chief ministership of his home state of Madras, has been persuaded to accept the presidentship of the ruling Indian National Congress.

There are of course still rumors that the Central Cabinet will be further "reorganized" with perhaps new additions. But those "leftists" who expected the Nehru government to move leftward on the exit of Morarji Desai and S.K.Patil have been sorely disappointed.

Krishnamachari on the Trumpet

The new finance minister T.T.Krishnamachari, who replaced Morarji Desai, is going out of his way to please the capitalist class. Even the pro-Nehru Link, a New Delhi weekly, could not help complaining about the "new turn" towards reaction. Reviewing the "State of the Economy," Link

said November 17: "He [Krishnamachari] blew hard on the trumpet of socialism and withdrew a few of his predecessor's more indefensible levies to give an impression of difference. But he went even farther than his predecessor ever dared to provide both moral support to the private sector's arguments and steps to boost the capital market."

The credit liberalization measures announced by the finance minister had made it possible for the scheduled banks to increase their borrowings from the reserve bank by about fifty per cent, benefiting only the speculators. This "turn" cannot be explained away by "Nehruite socialists."

Here is how Romesh Thapar, a "Nehruite socialist" (and also a "Dangeite Communist") gives expression to his own sense of frustration in the Economic Weekly of Bombay [November 16]:

"In a sense, Nehru is the master architect of the labyrinthine of economic, political and social structure which baffles those who try to see order in the disorder. Significantly despite his physical and spiritual exhaustion he alone at the moment possesses these qualities which can bridge the gulf between the rulers and the ruled and assist a breakthrough to new perspectives. Yet, he is also the major obstacle to such a breakthrough. His inaction reduces India to impotence."

The same writer further says: "Consider the reality as Nehru enters his 75th year, more than any other Indian of his time, he has devoted his energies to planting the seeds of democracy in the authoritarian hothouse that is Indian society. . . Almost single-handed he has campaigned for secular, civilised attitudes, against communalist and caste divisions. And with many others, he too, has confused and blunted those movements which sought to strike at the roots of these national aberrations. Over the years he has urged his people to espouse socialist remedies to eliminate poverty and destitution, to usher in an egalitarian humanist society.

"Over the years, too, he has acted to prevent the laying of a firm foundation for such a society. This startling ambivalence in his attitudes, and consequently his total neglect of the need to support institutionally the processes of democracy, secularity and socialism, also finds full reflection in the formulation of his foreign policy. In this complex manner Jawaharlal Nehru has become not only a bulwark FOR progress but also a bulwark AGAINST progress. This, perhaps, explains his towering strength in the past and his pathetic weakness today."

"A Nation Stands Leaderless"

The average petty-bourgeois intellectual who has no faith in the revolutionary potential of the proletariat to change society is disillusioned and frustrated because he had pinned too much hope on Nehru to achieve a miracle for him. Thapar also complains that a "modern Indian who has been nourished on the thought and activity of Nehru, and who has still half his life to live, is unable to go beyond the man who in a sense moulded him."

He strikes a despondent, yet correct, note when he says that "there are no organised mass movements, no dynamic institutions, no basic propul-

sions, to carry forward the gains of the Nehru era." He bemoans the fact that "a nation stands leaderless even as the leader goes through the motions of leading."

This, according to him, "is in essence the root cause of the paralysis, the crisis, the tragedy of India, in her sixteenth year of freedom."

As a member of the Communist party of India for years (at any rate till recently), Thapar ought to know better. The responsibility for sabotaging the creation of an alternate leadership capable of "carrying forward the gains of the Nehru era," must lie with the traditional left parties, including the CPI which sought to create an illusion around the personality of Nehru.

Only a genuine working-class party armed with the ideology of Marxism-Leninism can rise above the limitations imposed on the Indian society by "Nehru socialism," which aims fundamentally at consolidating a capitalist economy in a backward country like India.

Productive forces, and along with them social forces capable of ushering in a new era, can be liberated from the stranglehold of backward capitalism only by means of a socialist revolution in India.

AFL-CIO BUREAUCRATS FEEL PRESSURE OF "FREEDOM NOW"

By Evelyn Sell

DETROIT -- In mid-November the largest labor organization in this country held its national convention and adopted the strongest civil-rights policy in its history. This was the fifth convention of the AFL-CIO since 1955 when the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations merged. The AFL, organized in 1886, covered skilled trades and craft unions, most of which have maintained long-standing discrimination against Negroes to this day. The bulk of the unskilled and semiskilled workers remained unorganized until the 1930's when a split in the AFL led to the formation of the CIO. From its inception the CIO pursued more militant organizing tactics (the great sit-down strikes) and cultivated healthier Negro-white relations in their integrated unions. As the CIO became more and more bureaucratized, the differences between the top AFL and CIO leaders softened until they were able to end their twenty-year separation with the merger in 1955. Today the AFL-CIO has about 130 affiliated unions which claim 12,500,000 workers or about seventy-three per cent of organized labor in the United States.

The resolutions passed at this most recent convention are not strikingly different from those in the past but some significant departures from past practices were noticeable in the handling of the civil-rights discussion.

Plea for End to Discrimination

The resolutions called on all unions to eliminate "the last vestiges of racial discrimination from within the ranks of the AFL-CIO" (as of

July 1, twenty-four of the 130 national affiliated still had some segregated locals); asked that unions "cooperate with our neighbors in the general community to assure every American the full rights of citizenship"; endorsed passage of the compromise civil-rights bill now in Congress with the hope that the measure would be strengthened; urged the President of the U.S. to use his powers to ban discrimination in those hospitals financed with federal funds.

The civil-rights issue was prominently featured during the convention in contrast to proceedings in past years. At the November 18 session the subject was made a special order of business and placed at the head of the agenda -- the first time the agenda has been so arranged.

Another first was the role played by A. Philip Randolph, head of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters and the only Negro vice-president of the federation. Convention after convention has heard him speak from the floor about discrimination against Negroes within the trade-union movement. Four years ago his remarks provoked AFL-CIO President George Meany to storm at him, "Who the hell appointed you the guardian of all the Negroes in America?" Now Mr. Meany refers to him as "our own Phil Randolph" and at this convention, for the very first time, Randolph led the civil-rights discussion.

A "business as usual" note was struck, however, when Meany led the fight to defeat a proposal that Randolph's speech be adopted as official AFL-CIO policy. Randolph in his speech had urged Meany, Reuther (United Auto Workers president and former head of the CIO) and other labor leaders to go to "Birmingham, Danville, Houston and some areas of the North" to lead the fight for civil rights. He warned of "a growing feeling of alienation from the labor movement in the Negro community" which has been the staunchest supporter of unionism during the past few decades. Emphasizing the idea that it is in labor's own interest to strengthen its alliances with Negroes, Randolph stated, "As the Negroes have taken to the streets, so will the unemployed of all races. To discuss the civil-rights revolution is therefore to write the agenda of labor's unfinished revolution. The labor movement cannot ignore this under-privileged class. It cannot degenerate into a mere protective association, insulating the 'haves' from the 'have-nots.'"

The spotlight on civil rights at the convention is evidence of the increasing pressure of the Negro masses on all American institutions. True, the resolutions were general, limited and powerless to effect the practical changes needed in the day-to-day existence of Negro unionists and would-be unionists. Local autonomy of affiliated unions can still preserve traditional segregation patterns. The fine resolutions were mostly talk and talk is cheap. The AFL-CIO is still evading meaningful actions -- and action is what counts. However, the very fact that this cheap talk was squeezed out of the reluctant labor leaders is an indication of the compelling force of the Freedom Now revolution.

White Power Structure Concerned

The sudden importance of Randolph is part of the pattern adopted by the white power structure this past year to choke off the ever-widening

militancy of the Negro masses. As the tide of civil-rights demonstrations surged forward in 1963, the powers-that-be saw that the traditional Negro leadership was not in control of the Negro masses but was, in fact, being forced to accommodate itself more and more to the militants in the streets. The white power structure threw its weight behind those Negro leaders who tried to channel the mass activities into traditional patterns of protest with limited changes as their goal. When you read American newspapers you will see this type of Negro referred to as "a responsible leader." Responsible, that is, to the white rulers of this country.

What are the "irresponsible" leaders going? They are involved in the construction site demonstrations in Philadelphia, Chicago and New York. People lie down in front of trucks, climb onto cranes and generally disrupt work in order to protest job discrimination.

Here in Detroit the militant Group on Advanced Leadership [GOAL] has organized an International All-Trades Union to break down discrimination in the apprenticeship programs in the skilled trades. The apprentice training program in this city is run by the skilled trades unions, the employers and the city's Board of Education. GOAL has organized picket lines around the apprentice school and has demanded that all city-contracted construction projects employ Negroes as forty per cent of their workers.