

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Vol. 3, No. 17

April 30, 1965

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

<u>In this issue</u>	<u>Page</u>
World Opinion Resounds Inside the United States.....	1
Vietnam War Brings Indian Communists Closer Together.....	5
Vietnam Solidarity Demonstration in Belgium Sabotaged by Pro-Peking CP.....	6
A Lesson in Pentagon Arithmetic.....	9
In Vietnam with the American "Special Forces".....	10
Johnson's "Great Carrot" Was Only Peanuts.....	11
Opposition Rises in Chile to Vietnam War.....	12
Propose Joint Command of Kosygin, Mao and Castro in Vietnam.....	13
Johnson Finds One Friend in the World.....	14
Japanese Government Fearful over Vietnam.....	15
The Power Play Between Bonn, Cairo and Tel-Aviv.....	16
Conversations with Soviet Students.....	19
Indian CP Moves Toward Polycentrism -- by Kailas Chandra.....	23
Plotters of Coup Sentenced in Ceylon.....	25
Assassination of Delgado Confirmed.....	26
Can the Rev. King Capture SNCC Militants? -- by Evelyn Sell.....	27
Footnote on an SLL Headline -- by Joseph Hansen.....	31

WORLD OPINION RESOUNDS INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

In a nationally televised press conference April 27, in which he sought to defend his crimes against the Vietnamese people, President Johnson belligerently proclaimed, "I am not concerned with any friends that we have lost" around the world because of the policy of escalating the war in Vietnam.

Echoing in this declaration was the cynical slogan of America's robber barons, "Let the public be damned!"

In accordance with modern times, however, it is not just the fleecing of the public that is involved but their slaughter and the threat of converting our planet into a radioactive desert.

Other people in the United States are concerned about world opinion. This was evident above all by the magnificent demonstration which the vanguard students staged in Washington when they brought together 20,000 from all over the country on April 18 to protest on the single issue of the war in Vietnam.

James Reston, editorial writer of the New York Times, admitted April 22 that "the protest movement against the Johnson Administration's policy has swept the campuses of the country. There has been a sit-in on the driveway of the White House, and marathon protest meetings, usually dominated by teachers opposed to the Administration's Vietnam policy, have been held all over the nation."

Among the indications of what is happening among the students, Reston cites a leaflet circulated at the University of California on behalf of the march on Washington which said: "The war in Vietnam is a hideously immoral war. It is a losing war. It is a terrifyingly dangerous war. And it is a civil war in which the only outside forces are those of the United States."

"The Young Socialist Alliance," he continues, "is circulating from New York a pamphlet calling for 'immediate withdrawal of all American troops.'"

The swiftness with which the protest movement has developed among American students frightened the State Department, if it did not disturb the "Great Leader" of the "Great Society."

It was decided to send out squadrons of officials to all the universities to present the "case" of the White House for the war in Vietnam. Their reception by students and teachers who have been intensively studying all the available facts should provide an admirable lesson in the capacity of the Pentagon's war propaganda to withstand serious examination.

Political effervescence of this kind on the American campus is unusual under any circumstances. To find a parallel it would be necessary to go back to the thirties. It is highly symptomatic of deep changes in the American consciousness, clearly pointing in the direction of a new wave of radicalization.

To this should be added the results of the most recent Gallup poll of public opinion, released to the press April 23. Almost one-third of the public is in favor of an immediate end of the conflict, even if it means a general retreat. Another one-third, a surprisingly high figure, are undecided. While only twelve per cent favor Johnson's "escalation."

If these figures are compared with the vote in the presidential election last November, when Johnson received the largest majority in history because of his stated opposition to Goldwater's program of escalating the war in Vietnam, it is clear that public opinion has continued to shift still farther away from "Goldwaterism" in foreign policy and that Johnson's "popularity" has been most seriously undermined by his decision to launch a military assault on North Vietnam.

Such facts show how completely wrong was the feeling of a figure like Jean-Paul Sartre who cancelled a scheduled trip to the United States, giving as his reason "The policy of violence practiced in Vietnam by the government of the United States with the approval of the majority of the American people..."

Some additional indications of how the American people really feel are provided by the following facts: The State Department has received more than 20,000 letters -- without taking into account letters for or against U.S. involvement in Vietnam -- simply asking for information. Senator Wayne Morse filled sixty-six pages of fine print in the Congressional Record with samples of articles, petitions, letters and telegrams opposing continuation of the war in Vietnam; Senator Joseph Clark, a conservative Pennsylvania Democrat, revealed April 23 that he had received 1,390 letters from his constituents demanding American withdrawal from Vietnam (withdrawal, it should be noted) and only 16 letters supporting continuation of the war. He said that his mail showed support for negotiation or any way to bring the war to a close.

One of the reasons for the swift rise in opposition inside the United States to the war is the sensitivity of the American people to public opinion abroad. Vigorous statements in other countries, vigorous actions, militant demonstrations, even mild criticisms of White House policy such as those that have come from the Canadian, Japanese and French governments, resound in the United States.

The concern among the more enlightened sectors of capitalist opinion in the United States over the escalation of world opinion against the Johnson administration was well expressed in a melancholy article (April 23) by Walter Lippmann, the dean of American commentators, whose loyalty to the powers that be has been proved since the beginning of World War I.

"Why is it, it is time to ask, that our position in Asia has declined so sharply though we are widening and intensifying the war in Vietnam?" he begins. "According to the so-called domino theory, the United States would lose the respect and support of the peoples of Asia if, in confronting Chinese Communism, it showed itself to be a paper tiger and refrained from military action. For three months, since February, we have applied this theory ever more vigorously. And what are the results? Quite contrary to what was predicted:

today the United States is not only isolated but increasingly opposed by every major power in Asia.

"With the exception of Japan, which has a government but not a people who support our policy, all the Asian powers are against us on this issue -- not only China and Indonesia, but the Soviet Union, India, and Pakistan."

Lippmann, it is to be noted, made an exception of Japan. But since his article was written a change has occurred. The Japanese government, too, can be added to the list.

He notes that India, Pakistan, China and the Soviet Union are involved in one or another quarrel among themselves. "But they are united in condemning our February war."

He says that the puppet governments in Bangkok, Seoul, Taipei and Saigon are "aligned with us." But there is "the ominous, rising anti-Americanism in the Philippines."

Then Lippmann comes to his paradox: "The dominoes are indeed falling, and they are falling away from us."

What are the reasons? The root is the fact that the Asians "regard our war in Vietnam as a war by a rich, powerful, white, Western nation against a weak and poor Asian nation, a war by white men from the West against nonwhite men in Asia." You can talk all you want, but the Asian peoples cannot be convinced otherwise.

"In my view the president is in grave trouble. He is in grave trouble because he has not taken to heart the historic fact that the role of the Western white man as a ruler in Asia was ended forever in World War II. Against the Japanese the Western white powers were unable to defend their colonies and protectorates in Asia. That put an end to the white man's domination in Asia which had begun in the 15th century."

Lippmann believes that a purge is required -- a purge of "old conceptions and prejudices." How this is to be brought about, he does not indicate.

The pressures are rising around the entire globe against Johnson's course. The most heartening development is the quickness with which they have found a resounding echo in the hearts and minds of the American people.

It is quite clear that if world anger continues to mount as it has up to this point, the repercussions in the United States can begin to throw doubt into the minds of the warmongers who so blithely decided they could get away with attacking the tiny, weak Asian country that has now endured almost twenty years of assault by Western imperialist powers.

VIETNAM WAR BRINGS INDIAN COMMUNISTS CLOSER TOGETHER

Bombay

For the first time since the split in the Communist party of India last year, prominent leaders of the pro-Peking and pro-Moscow factions met in Calcutta April 19 "to explore the possibilities of evolving a common programme leading to a rapprochement."

The move towards healing the bitter conflict appears to be motivated by the desire to close ranks in face of the U.S. imperialist aggression against North Vietnam, the sweeping mass arrests of members of the pro-Peking group in India, and the victory of this same group in the recent elections in Kerala. [See World Outlook March 12.]

As an immediate step it was decided to launch a united campaign on a national scale to demand the withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam.

The meeting decided on a similar "united nation-wide campaign, in collaboration with other leftist parties, for the restoration of civil liberties and the release of detenus."

Another point on the agenda was a united movement for cheaper food.

There was a brief discussion about the dispute on the ideological level between the two factions. Although no common ground was established, "it was felt that bitterness should be kept out of the controversy over ideology."

The left faction was represented by E.M.S.Namboodiripad and Jyoti Basu (two centrist leaders who have not been jailed by the government) and the right faction by Bhupesh Gupta, Somnath Lahiri, Bhowani Sen and Biswanath Mukherjee.

Both sides "appeared satisfied with the trend of talks" and the meeting decided to hold fuller discussions at Madras on May 1.

Before the Madras meeting, the leaders of the two factions are expected to visit various states in India and hold discussions with spokesmen of the rival groups.

Significantly enough, S.A.Dange, chairman of the right-wing grouping, is not associated with these "rapprochement" talks.

VIETNAM SOLIDARITY DEMONSTRATION IN BELGIUM
SABOTAGED BY PRO-PEKING CP

The Brussels socialist weekly La Gauche reports [April 17 and 24] a setback in the campaign in Belgium for a united working-class front against the U.S. aggression in Vietnam. The setback is the clear responsibility of the pro-Peking Communist party.

According to Pierre Le Grève, chairman of the Brussels teachers union and one of the leaders of the newly formed Union de la Gauche Socialist [Union of the Socialist Left], who gives an account in the April 17 issue of La Gauche, the pro-Peking Communist party sent a delegation March 17 to consult with the UGS about organizing a demonstration in favor of Vietnam.

The UGS representatives held that it was impossible to organize a strong demonstration in three days but that they were ready to collaborate with them and anyone else who might be willing, on the basis of correct slogans, to show solidarity with the Vietnamese people. "It seemed to us, in fact," writes Le Grève, "that a larger demonstration would correspond better with the gravity of the cause it was designed to serve."

The date of April 24 was chosen by common agreement as the most suitable if the demonstration were not to be postponed until May 8.

The UGS and the pro-Peking Communist party joined in sending invitations to a number of organizations to participate in a meeting to consider plans. The invited organizations included the pro-Moscow Communist party, various youth and student organizations, the Committee Against Neocolonialism and Fascism, the Committee of Solidarity with the People of South Vietnam, the Committee of the Anti-Atomic March, Action for Peace and the Independence of Peoples, and various trade-union figures.

Two sessions were held to work out an appeal. In these sessions, the UGS representatives, together with the representatives of the pro-Peking Communist party, argued that it would be wrong to raise a demand for "negotiations" since this would serve the American propaganda.

"It is evident," writes Le Grève, "that the Americans are bombing North Vietnam with the aim of compelling the government of that country to negotiate behind the back of the popular insurrection which is developing in the south of Vietnam against the occupation by American imperialism and the puppet governments which it has been supporting."

The representatives of the pro-Moscow Communist party sought

to introduce at least an allusion to "negotiations" but finally gave up on this in face of the united pressure of the other participants in the discussion, particularly the representatives of the UGS and Young Socialist Guards.

A document for use in the demonstration was worked out in a commission, amended in a full meeting and finally adopted unanimously. The text of the document was as follows:

HALT
AMERICAN IMPERIALIST AGGRESSION
IN VIETNAM

"For months, despite growing world condemnation, American imperialism is continuing and intensifying its aggression against the Vietnamese people. It is conducting a ruthless war in the South (napalm, phosphorous, gas) and systematically bombing the Democratic Republic of North Vietnam.

"This policy of aggression conducted by American capitalism, threatens, in addition, to escalate until it ends in a world atomic conflagration.

"We appeal to the workers organizations and the Belgian population to demonstrate their active solidarity with the broad masses of South Vietnam who are struggling for their national and social liberation, as well as with North Vietnam, the victim of the terror raids.

"The solution of the Vietnamese problem demands, without any precondition, the immediate cessation of the intervention and the withdrawal of the American military forces as a primary condition for self-determination by the South Vietnamese people."

The meeting designated three members, one from each of the three political currents, to act as an executive committee and to negotiate with the city administration for a permit for the demonstration.

It was decided to meet with the city authorities five days later on April 12. But something unusual happened.

The Central Committee of the pro-Peking Communist party decided on the evening of April 11 to pull out of the joint committee. The excuse was that the pro-Moscow Communist party organ Drapeau Rouge Magazine was continuing to agitate in ambiguous terms for "negotiation" over Vietnam.

The next morning Pierre Le Grève, who had been chosen to represent the UGS, received a telephone call from the representative of the pro-Peking Communist party. He said that the joint meeting with the city authorities could not be carried through but that his

friends were ready to meet with a delegation from the UCS that same evening.

He also said that he had called the representative of the pro-Moscow Communist party to let him know about the change. However, this proved to be untruthful.

Later in the day when Le Grève went to the meeting place that had been arranged, he found the representatives of the pro-Moscow party there. They then got in touch with the police commissioner concerning the permit for the parade. They were told that this had been granted that very morning to the representative of the pro-Peking Communist party, who had appeared at the office and negotiated in the name of the Committee of Solidarity with the People of South Vietnam.

The astonished committee protested this unilateral procedure and went to the commissioner's office the next morning. He confirmed having granted the permit to the pro-Peking Communist party representative.

Pierre Le Grève then called Jacques Grippa, the head of the pro-Peking Communist party to find out what it was all about. "He told me that we didn't have the right to compel his party to sit with 'traitors,' that we were caught up in the elections, that we had never wanted to demonstrate since we had turned down the March 20 date. When I expressed regret that a joint action was not possible then, J. Grippa said that it was easy to see where I had come from and that I was steeped in the language of the Social Democracy.

Le Grève tried again, but was told that all the bridges had been burned.

All the members of the Committee Against Neocolonialism and Fascism were then called, and, following that, contacts throughout the labor movement, including the Flemish who wanted to demonstrate.

"The desire of the 'pro-Chinese' Communists to set up a monopoly ruined our hopes," Le Grève concludes. However, it only means postponement of a united demonstration, "because we will certainly regroup all those for whom the Vietnamese cause is more important than sectarian interests; and means will be found to hold a demonstration worthy of the cause."

The pro-Peking Communist party went ahead trying to build up an isolated demonstration on April 24. Besides appealing in its own press for a turn out, it issued leaflets in the name of the Belgian Committee of Solidarity with the People of South Vietnam, even including a form to be filled out and returned to the Liège secretary of the committee, Henri Vaume. (Vaume issued a press release denouncing the unauthorized use of his name and deploring the sectarian effort to stage an isolated demonstration.)

The result of this effort to capture control of the demonstration was to destroy the chances for anything on April 24 but the most limited show. In addition, the "clever" maneuver was most damaging to the reputation of the pro-Peking Communist party throughout the Belgian labor movement.

The tactic reminded all the old-timers of the foul practices commonly seen during Stalin's heyday when the Communist parties quite ruthlessly sought to wreck any movements in the working class which they could not bend to their arbitrary, bureaucratic purposes. It would seem that in Belgium at least, the effort mounted in Peking to put Stalin back on his pedestal has borne the kind of fruit to be expected.

Fortunately it is not possible in Belgium to refurbish Stalin and to revive his methods on an extended scale. The Belgian Committee of Solidarity with the People of South Vietnam is proceeding with its work for a powerful united demonstration. It announced in the April 24 issue of La Gauche that more than 300 responses had been received to its appeal. This figure includes individuals in the labor and radical movement as well as organizations.

A LESSON IN PENTAGON ARITHMETIC

The Washington correspondent of the London Times, in commenting on Defense Secretary Robert McNamara's April 26 presentation of the Pentagon's case for continued bombing of North Vietnam, indicated that he agreed with James Reston of the New York Times "that truth is the first casualty in any war."

At the press conference, McNamara stated that the present strength of the Vietcong was from 38,000 to 46,000 regulars and 100,000 local part-time guerrillas.

The Times correspondent notes: "The official White Paper, entitled 'Aggression from the North,' published on February 28, estimated the regular strength at 35,000 and the volunteers at from 60,000 to 80,000. Thus, if one arrives at a mean figure, in less than two months the hard-core has been increased by 20 per cent and the local volunteers by rather more than 40 per cent."

How is this to be explained? "The Secretary blamed what he called an intelligence lag, but insisted that the Vietcong had been greatly reinforced. No explanation was offered for the increase of South Vietnamese support, although a picture published in the New York Times today of a terrified peasant woman clutching a baby and fleeing from American marines as they charged into her hut is perhaps one explanation."

An additional explanation comes from the National Liberation Front which is leading the fight for liberation of South Vietnam from the American occupation. In a dispatch relayed through Peking, they announce that during the first three months of 1965, no less than 12,400 soldiers deserted the ranks of the forces under the command of the puppet Saigon government.

In one instance, on February 10, three days after the Pentagon escalated its intervention in the civil war into a war on North Vietnam, an entire company killed its three American "advisers."

"American imperialism," said Hsinhua by way of comment, "always underestimates the strength of the people."

IN VIETNAM WITH THE AMERICAN "SPECIAL FORCES"

[How are the Americans with special training in antiguerrilla warfare doing in Vietnam? A report by Max Clos in the April 27 issue of the Paris daily Le Figaro provides a good indication. He visited several outposts on the fighting front where it was possible for him to make first-hand observations. His report of the situation at Souy Da, where a Captain Ekman is in charge, is particularly illuminating. We have translated the following extracts.]

* * *

The training center of the special forces is at Fort Bragg in the United States. The idea is to provide the men who are to engage in teamwork with advanced technical training in various military specialties, while they are at the same time taught to serve in a definite geographical area. They learn the language and study courses in the civilization of the countries in which they are to serve. Captain Ekman told me:

"Our mission is to be parachuted into a country that we know well. There we recruit and organize troops to make up a maquis. We now have enough men trained to make up 300 battalions and we are able to work in any country in the world, in France or Russia or Africa."

Vietnam is evidently considered to be a marvelous training ground for the special forces. All the members of this service must take a turn there whatever their geographical specialty. I have met men there who spoke Arabic, Russian and even Swahili perfectly.

But in Vietnam the experiment has ended in almost complete failure. Wherever the special forces have their cantonments the

population complains about their exactions. Recently the community leaders of Nhatrang sent the Saigon government a memorandum asking for closer surveillance of the comportsment of "certain troops from abroad." At Souy Da, Captain Ekman observed with some sadness that his balance sheet was a modest one. He said:

"Twelve of us Americans make up an 'E' team. Normally our base should expand into a certain number of 'F' teams that keep on leap-frogging. But each time I send out any 'F' teams more than a dozen kilometers, you never hear of them again. I don't know what becomes of them."

There are a number of reasons for this of which the main one is from all evidence political. The formula for the "maquis" created by the Americans, but commanded by nationals, assumes a strong will to fight among these partisans and solid support by the population. It is clear that in the Tayninh region, as almost everywhere else, it is not the special forces that "swim like a fish in water" but rather the Vietcong. The Vietnamese who join the special forces are not patriots fighting for an idea but mercenaries who wear a uniform to earn a living.

There is something else. Revolutionary war is based on close ties among the fighters. Concerning this, my visit to Souy Da was not without surprises. It began with latrines divided into two groups -- American and Vietnamese. Next, blockhouses had been constructed at each point of the star-shaped post. Each night four men were stationed in them with two automatic arms. The arms were chained to the wall and the only door to each blockhouse was barred from the outside. "That way they can't turn their guns against us and they have the choice of fighting or being killed like rats." Finally, the post was divided into two zones. When you enter the camp you go through a network of barbed wire sown with mines. Within this first network the Vietnamese have their huts. Next, still moving toward the center, you go through a second network of barbed wire behind which are the ammunition dump, the radio installations, a central concrete redoubt where the Americans can find refuge in case the post is overwhelmed, and the huts. The Vietnamese have no right to enter there without being invited. "Precautions must be taken against treason," the captain explained.

JOHNSON'S "GREAT CARROT" WAS ONLY PEANUTS

In his April 7 Baltimore speech, Johnson offered the "great carrot" of \$1,000,000,000 for long-range peaceful use in all South-east Asia. In a press conference April 26 Defense Secretary McNamara revealed that the bill to maintain the Saigon puppet government for the single fiscal year of 1965 is \$1,500,000,000.

OPPOSITION RISES IN CHILE TO VIETNAM WAR

Santiago de Chile

A number of meetings and street rallies of students and workers have been held here to demonstrate solidarity with the guerrilla fighters of South Vietnam who are struggling for national and social liberation. The anti-imperialist mobilization began March 16 with a mass meeting at which an effigy of Uncle Sam, symbolizing Yankee imperialism, was burned in the Plaza de Armas. Following this, participants went through the streets shouting for the withdrawal of the North American troops. This action was sponsored by socialist groups (Partido Socialista Popular, Vanguardia Revolucionaria Marxista, Espartaco).

In succeeding days, the university contingents of these groups organized various actions such as those at the University of Chile and the Instituto Pedagógico where the North American flag was burned.

The Juventud Comunista, under pressure from the revolutionary Marxist sectors, then undertook various anti-imperialist actions, among them a meeting in the patio of the Escuela de Economía de la Universidad which ended with the burning of a paper effigy of the United States.

At the end of March a bomb was set off in the Teatro San Martín where a pro-U.S. film was being shown called "Commandos in Vietnam."

In the streets of Santiago the walls are covered with slogans accusing the United States of murdering the Vietnamese people.

At the beginning of April a Committee to Support the Revolution in South Vietnam was organized.

Similar actions are certain to continue. They are linked with the domestic problems now perturbing the people of Chile. It is encouraging to see that the revolutionary Marxist groups have been able to initiate anti-imperialist mass demonstrations and have been able to give an impulse to the Socialist and Communist youth who are going through a phase of criticizing their revisionist leaderships.

One of the outstanding features of the actions that have been carried out is that for the first time they brought the pro-Peking group (Espartaco) into a common front with the revolutionary Marxist sectors. They had previously refused to join a revolutionary united front because of anti-Trotskyist prejudices.

The pro-Peking group has not only participated in common

actions; it has also signed a joint declaration with the Partido Socialista Popular, Vanguardia Revolucionaria Marxista and Izquierda Socialista demanding that the Frei government come out publicly against the North American aggression in Vietnam in the name of the right to self-determination.

PROPOSE JOINT COMMAND OF KOSYGIN, MAO AND CASTRO IN VIETNAM

[The following is a translation of a front-page editorial in the April 6 issue of the Buenos Aires socialist weekly Palabra Obrera. The title of the editorial is "Ayudemos a Vietnam!" (Let's Help Vietnam!).]

* * *

The March 31 issue of the evening daily La Razón carried a public appeal signed by a number of figures, including Alfredo Palacios and Paulino Niembro, against the aggression of Yankee imperialism in North Vietnam. Individuals generally and organizations of the people were invited to support the appeal. Our Central Committee decided to give its backing because it holds that the fate of North Vietnam is intimately linked with that of all the colonial peoples in the whole world and with the perspectives of all the socialist countries.

It is not a question of issuing mere declarations with the names of petitioners or declarations signed by outstanding personalities, although these are very useful in unmasking the imperialist plans. The only language understood by the Yankee imperialist aggressors is that of deeds. That is why effective actions are required to halt the Yankee aggression against the Vietnamese people.

These deeds must be in two areas -- in domestic and foreign policy. Inside our country we must struggle tirelessly to bring the unions, political parties and student organizations who are against the aggression into a united front to aid the Vietnamese people of both the North and South. The best aid is to succeed in getting our country to break the pacts tying us to imperialism, such as the OAS [Organization of American States], Río de Janeiro and Cono Sud. This must be the main task of the united front in the long run. And, as the immediate task, Argentine goods or soldiers must be prevented from being sent to Vietnam in support of the imperialist aggression.

As for international policy, we must demand that mere verbal support for North Vietnam be replaced by deeds. We must demand that the impressive example of Cuba be followed as the first workers' state, and up to now the only one, that has aided North Vietnam.

Imperialism is taking advantage of the Sino-Soviet dispute. We must demand that the most powerful socialist states unite in a common declaration and program to resist the imperialist aggression with deeds, and likewise with deeds to come to the aid of any socialist country attacked by imperialism.

We consider it very good and a sign of the strength of the world revolutionary movement that the Chinese and Soviet Communist parties engage in debate. We would suggest still further that this polemic be as wide as possible and include the participation of the revolutionary militants of all countries in the world. But this polemic must be accompanied by a united front of all the socialist states against imperialism, beginning with the two strongest, the USSR and China. It is a crime not to do this, a great service to the imperialist aggressors, as is the case at the moment, since China and the USSR as yet have not sent any concrete aid to North Vietnam.

The Central Committee of our party believes that a joint declaration by the USSR and China is called for, categorically stating that independently of their political differences, as socialist countries they are firmly united against the imperialist aggression and will grant unconditional aid to any workers' state threatened or attacked by imperialism.

And, still on the level of deeds, we believe that a pact should be signed at once uniting all the armed socialist forces into a single body, under a single command to help repel the Yankee occupation forces in North Vietnam.

We believe, in addition, that to avoid quarrels between the Chinese and Russians, this command should be composed of a Russian, a Chinese and a leader of a socialist country that is neutral in the dispute between them, such as could be provided by Cuba or North Vietnam.

The mere constitution of a single command of the armed socialist forces made up, for example, by Kosygin, Mao and Fidel Castro, would terrorize imperialism and inspire the revolutionary forces throughout the world, who would feel that they were being backed in their struggle.

JOHNSON FINDS ONE FRIEND IN THE WORLD

In Paris April 27, Barry Goldwater said "my President has done the right thing in the right way" in Vietnam. He joked over being the candidate named last year as "the trigger-happy, war-mongering S.O.B. who wanted to do something about supply routes in North Vietnam."

JAPANESE GOVERNMENT FEARFUL OVER VIETNAM

One of the consequences of the war launched by the United States government against North Vietnam has been a swift rise in anti-American sentiment in Japan.

On April 26 some 15,000 demonstrators milled around the American embassy in Tokyo trying to get through police lines in order to make sure that the diplomats inside got their message about stopping the aggression and pulling American troops out of Vietnam. Three policemen were injured and six students were arrested.

The Paris daily Le Monde observed in a front-page editorial April 28 that it is quite probable the Americans will have to face "a big organized movement of demonstrations against the United States, perhaps even acts of sabotage against their logistic supply lines -- strikes and boycotts in the ports, incidents in the bases and on the railways, etc."

Disquieted by the developments in Japan, Washington decided to send three special envoys to argue in favor of Johnson's policy, Cabot Lodge, former ambassador to Saigon, Marshall Green, subsecretary for the Far East in the State Department, and Walter W. Rostow, the well-known economist.

Rostow was asked by three big universities to cancel the conferences which had been scheduled for him.

Cabot Lodge decided it would be diplomatic to not appear in public and to avoid meeting the press. In his talks with Premier Sato, he was able to observe, according to Le Monde that while "the Japanese government remains a faithful partner of the United States" it is "embarrassed, if not even irritated, by the development of the situation in Vietnam." Le Monde said that "Mr. Sato went as far as possible in expressing the official disagreement of Japan by asking the United States to make a new effort to reach a peaceful settlement. A halt to the bombings, negotiations, admission of the Vietcong as one of the partners in negotiations -- this is, in fact, the Japanese position, closer to the French thesis than to the American position."

"The Japanese, moreover, know what they are talking about," continued Le Monde. "The semi-official Japan Times recalled the other day that in 1937 Japan, entangled in what was then called the 'China incident,' likewise proclaimed a policy of 'nonextension of the conflict,' but soon found itself in an escalation and in a war. The influential magazine Bungei Shunju recalled in its April number that the next to the last step in the escalation was the landing in Indochina, and that this led Japan to the final step -- world war."

THE POWER PLAY BETWEEN BONN, CAIRO AND TEL-AVIV

Jerusalem

Western Germany's effort to establish diplomatic relations with Israel, and the concomitant worsening of its relations with the Arab states, occur against a background of deep-going social transformations among the Arab states and the complete isolation of Israel, both economically and politically, from its Arab environment.

To survive, Israel has had to lean heavily on the United States for financial and political support. But the regime is not satisfied with this. It is seeking connections in Europe, particularly with France and Western Germany, to secure armaments and political and diplomatic backing.

As long as the Algerian war lasted, Israel and France maintained close relations. They assisted each other in a common struggle against the Arab liberation movement. Israel's army, especially the air force, was supplied with matériel by France (with American dollars, of course). Israel has two atomic reactors, one at Nachal-Rubin, the other at Dimona. The Nachal-Rubin reactor, the smaller of the two, was built under American licensing and was designed mainly for scientific work. The Dimona reactor, built with French help, has been used at least partially (if not mainly) in a project to manufacture nuclear arms.

The Israeli government has never publicly admitted this. The most that has been said was Ben-Gurion's guarded statement, when he was still head of government, that the Dimona staff was also working for "defense." Newspapers abroad, especially in the U.S., have published sensational articles about efforts to "make atom bombs" at Dimona. Well-informed Israeli intellectuals, especially university professors, became quite worried. A committee was set up to oppose making nuclear weapons, and a special book was written on the subject to prove how insane such a project was.

But when the Algerian war came to an end, France suddenly lost interest in the romance with Israel. Delivery of arms stopped and the French withdrew from participation in the Dimona project. Perhaps, with production of their own bomb under way, it was no longer useful. France began mending relations with the Arab states, and de Gaulle stated that France would no longer provide arms for the Israeli forces.

Israel turned to another West European NATO power -- Western Germany. The Israeli army now began getting arms from there, scientists came to fill out the staff of the famous Weizman Research Institute at Rehovot, and there were indications that the Germans replaced the French in staffing the Dimona reactor. It is no longer a secret that the bill for West German arms deliveries to Israel was

footed by the USA.

In 1964 a clamor was made over German scientists and technicians working in Egyptian rocket research and production. Threats were made against them and Israeli agents even organized some raids.

As a result, the following occurred: (1) Washington called a halt to Israel's attempt to produce nuclear weapons. (2) The West German government, however, continued to participate in the Dimona center as part of its preparation to produce weapons forbidden under the Bonn and Paris treaties. Its activities in Egypt have the same objective. (3) A sharp conflict broke out between the Ben-Gurion-Peres group, which favored continuing the attempt to produce nuclear weapons with West German support against the desires of Washington, and the Eshkol-Meier group, which preferred not to resist Washington, although it wished to maintain friendly relations with West Germany.

When he still held the posts of prime minister and minister of defense, Ben-Gurion forced the head of the Israeli Security Service to resign. He did this, he said, because of "fundamental differences in political conceptions." What was really involved was the publicity released by the Security Service about actions against German scientists and technicians in Egypt. Ben-Gurion and his ally, assistant defense minister Peres, stated several times that in their opinion German activities in Egypt constituted no danger for Israel and that relations with West Germany were excellent and valuable. Although it seems to be in contradiction with Ben-Gurion's hatred of Nasser, the declaration was quite understandable. Wanting to cooperate with West Germany, he could not, of course, stir up trouble for the Germans elsewhere.

It is worth noting in passing that although the Israeli Security Service is directly under the Ministry of Defense, it is no secret that it co-operates closely with U.S. "intelligence" services. By releasing the information about the activities of its agents against German scientists and technicians in Egypt, the head of the Israeli Security Service helped the Americans put pressure on the Israeli government to end German co-operation in Dimona. By forcing the resignation of this high official, Ben-Gurion wanted to demonstrate that he was not ready to bow to Washington's orders. He did not score a great success in this.

To stress their political orientation, Ben-Gurion and Peres invited the former West German minister of defense, Franz-Joseph Strauss, to visit Israel. Strauss was no longer minister, but he had been instrumental in organizing German-Israeli co-operation in the military and nuclear field. He was received with high honors by the Israeli government and military chiefs and, of course, he was shown around the nuclear reactor at Dimona. One of the spearheads of West German neomilitarism, under a cloud of scandal concerning corruption in office, this man was treated by the Israeli authori-

ties as an exceptional guest of honor! This is understandable, since Israel's whole orientation in foreign policy continues to be directed toward a close alliance with Western imperialism.

But Washington didn't give in. Kennedy sent a letter to Ben-Gurion asking for American control over the Dimona reactor. A spy plane was sent over Israel to photograph the project. Israeli military aircraft forced the plane to land and it was released only after many hours of discussion and consultation.

While Israel could continue flirting with Franz-Josef Strauss, it could not hold out long against Washington. This tiny country, completely isolated from the surrounding world, and in a state of permanent war varying from cold to hot, is wholly dependent on economic and political protection from Uncle Sam. The U.S. was even paying for the weapons furnished by West Germany! Ben-Gurion had to resign and Eshkol replaced him as head of government.

It seems that German-Israeli co-operation at Dimona did actually come to an end; but West Germany continued to supply armaments. The "secret" leaked into the world press. This was too much for Egypt. Nasser countered the arms deals of Western imperialism in the Middle East by inviting Ulbricht to Egypt.

The truth is that good relations have existed between the United Arab Republic and the German Democratic Republic for some time. Nevertheless this public move confronted Bonn with something new. According to its own "Hallstein Doctrine," Bonn had no choice but to break off all relations with Cairo if the UAR recognized East Germany. As retaliation, it decided to grant diplomatic relations to Israel.

The establishment of diplomatic relations with Tel-Aviv is of no great importance in itself. Unofficial, multiple relations have already existed for a long time. Moreover, Israel has diplomatic relations with most countries of the West and East. But the timing was significant. It had the effect of brandishing a whip against Egypt which is undergoing an economic, social and political upheaval. The enthusiastic response of the Israeli government should be noted. It is reminiscent of its attitude during the Suez crisis of 1956 when Israel acted as an open agent of Western imperialism in the Franco-British aggression against a people seeking freedom from colonialism.

When Birrenbach, the delegate of the West German government, came to Tel-Aviv to negotiate establishment of diplomatic relations, representatives of the Arab governments met in Cairo to decide how to answer. They did not succeed in reaching agreement on a joint reply. But the reactions of the various governments were quite significant.

Egypt, Algeria, Syria, Iraq and Yemen, the politically most advanced governments of the Arab world, said that they would cut off relations with West Germany and recognize the German Democratic Republic if Bonn carried through its plan to recognize Israel.

Tunisia, Morocco and Libya, which are still in the grip of neocolonialism and which still maintain good relations with the European Common Market powers, voted against severing relations with Bonn and against recognizing the GDR.

Saudi Arabia, Lebanon and Jordan, which are ruled by reactionary pro-imperialist regimes, but which don't depend on the European Common Market countries, were ready to break with Bonn but against establishing relations with the "Communist" regime of the GDR.

At the moment, the outcome is still uncertain. Birrenbach is still negotiating in Tel-Aviv, and Bonn has sent emissaries to try to convince the Arab world not to break off relations.

However it turns out, one thing is clear. West Germany's recognition or nonrecognition of Israel is not decisive. What is decisive is whether Israel intends to continue to play the role of an imperialist cat's paw in the Middle East or whether it will look for ways and means to become an integral part of those forces in the Arab East which have inscribed the slogans of anti-imperialism and social revolution on their banners.

April 12, 1965

CONVERSATIONS WITH SOVIET STUDENTS

[The following report was sent to us by a Scottish student who recently returned from a visit to the Soviet Union.]

* * *

We visited Leningrad, Moscow, Smolensk and Minsk. This was my first visit to the Soviet Union and I was especially interested in meeting Soviet students and exchanging views with them.

Most of the students we met were agreed that there was now more intellectual freedom in the Soviet Union. People like the poet Joseph Brodsky, who was sentenced to four years in the Arctic, was released after serving only eight months of his term, shortly after the fall of Khrushchev.

About this event there was a general feeling that Khrushchev

had "been getting above himself." His portrait appeared everywhere and "a new cult of the personality was developing around him." One student, speaking for a number of them, said:

"We are now going through a very interesting period. For the first time in Russian history we have no recognized top man. We feel that this can be the beginning of genuine people's participation in the organs of government. The next two years will be crucial."

There was no hesitation to talk about Stalin. The Stalin period is euphemistically referred to as the "cult period." Criticism tends to be indirect and almost nonpolitical. Thus the young girl student who acted as one of our guides in Moscow asked me what I thought of the Moscow underground with its stately marble halls and elaborate chandeliers. I replied cautiously that it was certainly impressive. "Yes," she said bitterly, "but why build palaces under the ground when the people above were crying out for simple homes to live in?"

In Leningrad a student asked me what I thought of the China-Soviet question.

"Can I speak frankly?" I asked.

"Please," he replied. "Please speak frankly."

I told him that as a socialist I never conceived the possibility of a conflict between two workers' states. We always took it for granted, I added, that the establishment of workers' rule would end the antagonisms between countries, antagonisms which had their roots in capitalism and the imperialist struggle for the major share of the world market. He nodded in agreement. I decided to take the plunge.

"All this," I said, "is not accidental. Under Stalin the Soviet Union turned its back on internationalism when it adopted the policy of socialism in one country. Trotsky (I looked him in the eye as I uttered the forbidden name but he never blinked) warned in 1936 that the national chauvinism engendered by Stalin would be reflected in the international Communist movement, that each national Communist party would become nationalist-Communist in outlook. We are now paying the price for this policy in the awful prospect of a Soviet-Chinese conflict."

"Our leaders will never allow it to come to that," he replied, while agreeing with most of what I said. Throughout one's talks with Soviet students and Komsomols, one got this complete reliance on the "leaders" rather than on the need for action from below to control the leaders and to correct their mistakes. The seeds of Stalinism were sown deep and all the crops have not yet been harvested.

Another interesting side light on life in the USSR today came from a meeting with a Jewish student in Leningrad. He asked me if I could get him a Teach Yourself Yiddish book and a Russian-Yiddish dictionary as he was anxious to learn Yiddish. I asked him why.

"I feel the need to belong to a national group. At the university all the other Jewish students speak Yiddish. Like the Ukrainians, the Uzbekistans, the Georgians and others they have a national life of their own. I feel out of it -- a Jew who only speaks Russian and English."

This, almost fifty years after October! He also told me that his parents, of the generation which grew up since the Revolution, objected strongly when he married a Russian (that is non-Jewish) girl.

At the Moscow State University, what impressed me most was the almost complete control which the Komsomol organisation has over all student activities. Here were young bureaucrats of tomorrow in the making. Some foreign students we spoke to complained of feeling always being overlooked. We met some African students who felt that they were not socially acceptable. One of the mistakes the African states make is to send only male students to the Soviet universities and colleges. A fair proportion of girl students would remove one of the main points of friction between Soviet and African students.

On a short visit to the Lenin Library, I asked the English-speaking guide if the works of some of the earlier revolutionary writers were available. He looked puzzled. "Who do you mean?"

I gulped and shot out as rapidly as possible, "Kamenev, Zinoviev, Trotsky, Bukharin, Preobrazhensky and so on."

He collected himself and replied quite calmly, "Yes, their writings are available but only to students of the period." I tried to convince him that I was a student of the period; but, as I know no Russian, that was as far as I could get with that line of questioning.

When we were leaving Moscow for Smolensk, one of the party of students seeing us off asked me whether I had enjoyed my visit to the Exhibition of the Achievements of the USSR. I replied that we had time only to visit the Cosmonaut Pavilion. "Ah," he answered, "but what did you think of the architecture of the pavilions?"

I told him that, like the Moscow University, this was not my favourite type of architecture. "Yes," he agreed, "but it is a good thing we have it. It will remind future generations of the period of the cult and the sort of man Stalin was."

At Smolensk the only real point of interest was the visit to the National History Museum. Yuri Gagarin, the first man in space, is from the Smolensk region and in the hall devoted to the Cosmonauts he is prominently featured. But there is not a single picture of Gagarin being received by Nikita Khrushchev. "Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose." [The more things change, the more they're the same.]

At Minsk we met the top Komsomols of the Byelo-Russian Republic. In the course of our talks, I asked if there was any discussion of the "cult period," how it arose and how it could be prevented from happening again.

The reply came pat from the secretary. "No, we are not discussing this. This matter was settled by the Twentieth Congress of the party and there is no need to discuss it further."

When another student asked what happened when there were differences between the Komsomols and the party, such as happened between the Young Socialists and the Labour party in Britain, the bureaucratic reply was: "It is not possible for differences to arise between the Komsomols and the party." And that was that.

One of the most surprising experiences in the tour of our group came when one of the girls was asked, quite out of the blue, by a youth she met, "Do you think you can get me Trotsky's History of the Russian Revolution?"

There is an awakening among Soviet youth and a sense of enquiry; but it would be utopian to expect that after the long torpor of Stalinism they have suddenly rediscovered international socialism. They eagerly discussed the Sino-Soviet dispute, Vietnam and so on but completely failed to see these problems within the framework of developing world revolution.

Their greatest concern was lest Chinese "intransigence" would lead them into war against the United States. Fear of war was the main impression one carried away, perhaps understandable in a people whose land had been so savagely ravaged only two decades ago. But there was no hesitation that if war should come between China and the United States the Soviet Union would range itself on China's side. Let no one be under any delusion about this.

It is facts like these which gives one hope about Soviet youth, their instinctive solidarity with the other workers' states and the colonial revolution. That, and when people like Yevtushenko speak out boldly and proclaim that "We must learn our politics from our grandfathers (that is, the generation who made October) and not from our fathers!"

INDIAN CP MOVES TOWARD POLYCENTRISM

By Kailas Chandra

Bombay

The seven-day session of the 101-member National Council of the pro-Moscow Communist party of India [CPI], which ended in New Delhi April 15, made a "comprehensive review" of the entire political line of the party since its Bombay congress held only four months ago. [See World Outlook January 15.]

The discussions were reportedly "long and often heated." According to Link, a left Congress weekly printed in Delhi, at least three fairly clear trends emerged, including a vocal left-wing tendency. Although each trend affirmed its loyalty to the programme favoring a National Democratic Front adopted at the Bombay congress, no unified understanding was reached on the basic policy issues confronting the party.

The authority of the Dangeite leadership as represented by the Central Secretariat was clearly at a discount. Almost all the important drafts prepared by the Secretariat and presented to the National Council were summarily rejected. Though at the end, a consensus was achieved and the Council was able to adopt certain resolutions, there was an unmistakable impression that the Dangeite leadership does not command the respect of the majority of the members in the Council.

The main issue under discussion was the situation created in the country after the dissolution of the elected legislature in Kerala in which the pro-Peking Communists emerged as the largest single party. The imposition of presidential rule in the state was a grave development since it is a clear indication that the bourgeois rulers of India are moving toward winding up the country's parliamentary institutions.

The resolution prepared by the Secretariat on the Kerala elections and their aftermath upheld the party's tactical line of "simultaneously fighting" against the Congress party and the communal and reactionary parties (Muslim League, Swatantra party, etc.) and approved the position taken by the leadership against any electoral alliance with the Muslim League which led to the break-up of the Left United Front in Kerala.

The stand taken by the Secretariat was supported by a majority in the Council but it was challenged on two levels. One tendency held the view that the Left United Front in Kerala should not have been allowed to be broken on the grounds that one of its constituents (left CPI) was attempting to enter into electoral adjustment with the Muslim League.

Another tendency thought there were certain positive qualities in the Kerala Muslim League as a party representing the minority religious community. This tendency favoured an electoral understanding with the Muslim League in order to give an "absolute priority" to the fight against the Congress party.

There was yet another tendency in the National Council which favoured treating the "communal and rightist parties" as the main enemy in Kerala, especially after the more reactionary wing had split away from the Congress party to form the "Rebel Kerala Congress party."

The Secretariat resolution on Kerala was passed after a division and by a narrow majority.

The rightist leaders realised that the rank and file were swinging to a "more leftist and anti-Congress position," particularly after the Kerala elections. Apparently to mollify this sentiment, the Secretariat put forward a draft resolution on the political situation which took a sharply critical attitude towards the Congress government.

The resolution said that "the influence of reactionary forces both Indian and foreign" on the Congress party's policies had greatly increased. The conclusion drawn by the Secretariat was that "although the basic positive policies have not been abandoned or reversed (by the bourgeois Congress leadership) certain serious shifts have, however, taken place within the framework of these policies and that the danger of a shift to the right has greatly increased."

The Secretariat's draft was rejected and a fresh one prepared in the light of the discussion which emphasised the further swing of the Congress leadership to the right and the necessity to organise mass movements to combat the reactionary forces.

The Council decided to launch a mass campaign on solidarity with Vietnam and defense of civil liberties and parliamentary democracy in India.

Parliamentary illusions persist among the leaders of the right-wing Communist party, but they now recognise the danger to "parliamentary democracy" at the hands of reactionary forces both within the Congress and outside.

The campaign is expected to begin on May Day. It will be specially directed against the imposition of president's rule in Kerala and the use of emergency powers against the Communists. The co-operation of "all left parties, democratic mass organisations and progressive individuals" is to be sought in the movement.

The resolution was approved with only about two members dissenting.

The resolution on the Moscow "preparatory" meeting adopted by the National Council was significant inasmuch as it indicated the swing of the Communist party of India toward polycentrism and its intention to establish closer relations with the Communist parties of neighbouring countries.

This was taken as recognition of the fact that the possibility of a world conference of Communist parties was slight and that there is strong opposition among them to any "single world centre of the Communist movement" being created.

To vindicate its own position in relation to the Chinese leadership and the left CPI, the rightist CPI had at first supported the Soviet proposal to hold a world conference; but it now feels that the preparations for such a conference might be more effective if a beginning is made at the regional level.

Consultations are already said to be under way between the right-wing CPI and the Australian and Ceylonese parties to hold a meeting in support of Vietnam and against the Anglo-American intervention in Southeast Asia.

The CPI has also made a proposal to invite the North Vietnamese Communist party to attend such a regional Communist conference as an observer.

PLOTTERS OF COUP SENTENCED IN CEYLON

A verdict of guilty, handed down by a Colombo court April 6, in the case of eleven army, navy, police and government officials charged with plotting a coup d'état in Ceylon, served to remind the country that it is not immune to the danger of a military-police state.

The coup d'état was plotted for January 27, 1962, but was exposed in time and a number of arrests were made.

In passing sentence, the court recalled the general political situation. A general strike had flared and the working class was pushing toward power. "That a critical state of affairs was imminent if not already existing, is obvious," said the judges.

"A Censorship was introduced; trade unions were restive at the failure of the Government to consider their demands and at the use of the Armed Services for work in the Port. Opposition M.P.s spoke of 'arrangements with the Army and Navy to rule the country and to arrest even members on the Government side' and 'that somebody in the Government was preparing to set up a Military Dictator-

ship. Similar accusations were made in other public speeches. There was unfortunately a hook on which to hang these allegations. Mr. Felix Dias Bandaranaike had at a meeting some time earlier in reference to conditions in Russia, stated that a little bit of Totalitarianism might be of benefit to Ceylon.'

"There is some evidence that in Army circles in Ceylon during this period suggestions were in fact being made that one solution of the current difficulties might be some form of arbitrary rule in which the Armed Services would be associated. The Defence position at this trial had been that Mr. Bandaranaike did in fact intend to set up a Military Dictatorship."

The eleven defendants were sentenced to ten years in prison on each of three counts, the sentences to run concurrently, and confiscation of their property.

ASSASSINATION OF DELGADO CONFIRMED

With the accidental discovery of two bodies near Villanueva del Fresno, thirty-five miles south of Badajoz, the disappearance of General Humberto Delgado and his Brazilian secretary, Sahaira Campos, appears to have been solved.

A leader in the opposition to Portuguese fascist dictator Salazar, Delgado had been missing since February 14 when he disappeared near Badajoz while on a clandestine trip to meet partisans of his near the Portuguese border.

Followers of Delgado in Morocco charged on February 23 that he had been arrested in Spain. A few days later members of the Venezuelan parliament charged that Delgado had been arrested by the Spanish Civil Guards and handed over to the Portuguese secret political police. The Venezuelans said they were in possession of information that Delgado was shot without any pretense at a trial. They sent messages to President Johnson, Prime Minister Harold Wilson and Secretary General U Thant demanding an investigation of the assassination of General Delgado.

Delgado was a colorful figure who began by supporting Salazar's uprising. In 1958 he entered the presidential election as an opposition candidate. He claimed to have won a big majority but Salazar falsified the election results. Going into exile, Delgado master-minded the seizure of the Santa-Maria on the high seas in 1961 as a way of calling attention to the struggle against Salazar. Recently he shifted farther to the left, even speaking of Portugal's need for a "Fidel Castro."

CAN THE REV. KING CAPTURE SNCC MILITANTS?

By Evelyn Sell

Rev. Martin Luther King's call for a nation-wide economic boycott of Alabama has received a great deal of attention and much adverse criticism from political and business spokesmen, civil-rights leaders and newspaper editors. Speaking over national television on March 28, King said that his organization, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference [SCLC], would soon approve an "economic withdrawal program" to bring pressure for social reforms "on Wallace (governor of Alabama) and other officials responsible for the reign of terror" against Negroes.

The boycott would be maintained until at least fifty per cent of all Negroes of voting age in every Alabama county are registered and certified as voters by the United States Civil Rights Commission. King said labor unions would be asked to refuse to use or transport materials grown or manufactured in Alabama; consumers would be asked to abstain from buying Alabama goods; the federal government would be asked to withdraw funds from federal projects within Alabama and withdraw federal deposits in the state's banks.

Alabama businessmen quickly cried out against the boycott plan. Crawford Johnson III, a soft-drink executive and president of the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce, declared, "If the boycott should be successful it can serve no other purpose than to worsen race relations."

President Lyndon Johnson withheld comment but cautioned, "I think we must be very careful to see that we do not punish innocents in this country while we are trying to protect all of our people." When asked what he would do if Johnson requested cancellation of the boycott, King replied, "I'm afraid I would have to say no to him."

It might seem at first glance that Nobel prize-winner King intends to defy business and political authority in this country. A more careful study of King's past civil-rights activities and a realistic appreciation of the growing civil-rights tension in America would indicate, however, that King and the SCLC have been encouraged and groomed to help head off what is expected to be the longest, hottest summer of civil-rights demonstrations throughout the nation.

The hue and cry over King's proposed economic boycott has served to feature him as a fearless fighter and leader of the Negro people and has helped cover up the more significant plans announced by King a few days after the March 28 television appearance. In a speech given in Baltimore on April 1, King stated that the SCLC would extend its work into 120 counties in seven southern states: Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama

and Louisiana. Voter registration campaigns will aim at doubling the number of Negroes now registered in these states.

Manpower for these campaigns will come from the academic community. King explained, "The call has been sent to 860 key college communities, North and South, to recruit 2,000 volunteers from student body and faculty to spend 10 weeks this summer working with the drive."

Summer campaigns were also projected for a number of northern cities: New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit, Baltimore, Los Angeles, Washington and Cleveland. Rev. Ralph Abernathy, SCLC vice-president, said the Northern protests would concentrate on slum housing, job discrimination and school segregation.

Rather than being aimed at racial discrimination, King's summer plans are aimed at the militants within the civil-rights movement -- particularly the youthful ranks of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee [SNCC] and the inhabitants of the Negro ghettos of the North who exploded so forcefully during last year's long, hot summer.

King's plans fit right into the pattern of preparedness undertaken by the federal government. Just prior to King's announcements, more than 400 mayors and municipal officials met in Washington March 30 for the first legislative conference of the National League of Cities. In a separate meeting the mayors of the nation's 100 largest cities were given special briefings by Vice-President Hubert Humphrey, Labor Secretary Wirtz and other top officials in the federal government. Humphrey told the mayors that he had appointed Leroy Collins, director of the new Federal Community Relations Service, to head a special "summer task force" aimed at the expected civil-rights demonstrations this year.

Collins urged the mayors to be prepared for "a new urgency" because the "frustrations may be greater in parts of the North than in the South." He warned the audience that they must get ready for "what happens...as the marchers from Selma [Alabama] return and the weather gets hot...If we don't find new ways [to cope with racial frustrations] the events in Selma may be pale in comparison."

One week later Rev. Andrew Young, executive assistant to Rev. Martin Luther King, told a Detroit audience that the SCLC summer program in the North was designed to avoid "rioting and outbreaks of violence."

SCLC vice-president Rev. Abernathy commenting on the Northern program explained, "We hope to establish nonviolent channels in these cities that will enable the people there to express their discontent and their frustrations. We want to accomplish this through negotiations, but it may be necessary to demonstrate."

"Negotiation" for King has always meant working with and through federal and local politicians and officials -- and by-passing real grass-roots organizations of the Negroes in the area. "Demonstrate" for King has always meant that Negroes "are going to suffer some more" from the beatings, tear gas and killings of racists. His philosophy of nonviolent mass suicide was clearly enunciated in Selma when he stated, "We have no alternative but to leave our opponents glutted with their own barbarity." This statement was followed by racist murders, bombings and heightened harassment of civil-rights workers.

Attempts by SNCC workers in the South to defend themselves by such simple means as wearing protective helmets were denounced by King's assistants...who ordered the youths to march against armed racists with bared heads and the promise to turn the other cheek when struck.

The voter registration drives in Selma and Marion, Alabama, were actually organized originally by SNCC -- but taken over by King and the SCLC. The methods of SNCC run counter to King's; SNCC sends workers into a Negro community to live and work with the people over long periods of time in order to help build an indigenous leadership and organization capable of transforming the political and economic situation in that area. Although SNCC has affirmed and reaffirmed its allegiance to the philosophy of nonviolence, its youthful leaders are much more militant and radically inclined than King's SCLC -- so that King and his aides have had to repeatedly debate against SNCC criticisms of the Johnson administration and SNCC threats of leading "the most massive civil disobedience this nation has ever seen."

Since SNCC is a student organization and recruits its workers from college campuses of the North and South, it is important to remember that King's summer plans call for thousands of students to work in SCLC projects this year. In past summers most of the students going into the South for civil-rights campaigns were involved in SNCC Freedom Schools and voter registration drives. King's wife stated at an April 4 meeting in Detroit that "at least 5,000 students" were wanted for SCLC summer campaigns -- and the students she referred to specifically were "the dedicated young white people who have previously volunteered for the freedom movement."

The question of who leads the voter registration drives in the Negro communities of the North and South can have serious political effects in the near future. Once a Negro is actually registered to vote, the logical question -- which many are already asking -- is: "Who shall I vote for? What party should I support?" King was extremely busy campaigning for Johnson and the Democrats during the 1964 election campaign. SNCC, on the other hand, was involved in the Mississippi Freedom Democratic party which challenged the seating of the all-white delegation at the Democratic National Con-

vention and which is currently challenging the legality of Mississippi's congressional members.

Washington SNCC leader Jim Monsonis has said, "The established parties are both racist in the South and both closed to Negroes." He talked about running third party candidates in "whole congressional districts all across the black belt which have Negro majorities." He concluded, however, on the subject of a third party, "That's a question for the future. I don't think we know yet what to do."

In those activities which SNCC does carry out, however, they repeatedly come into conflict with the maneuvering and tactics of King. During the critical days in Selma, Alabama, the SNCC leaders wanted to march to Montgomery despite federal court orders and Sheriff Clark's deputies. King rejected this plan and met with Leroy Collins, who worked out the compromise that kept the civil-rights demonstrators in Selma -- barricaded in one section of Selma, actually -- until the march could be regulated and stifled by President Johnson's clever stratagems. Johnson ended up getting more credit for the march to Montgomery than the courageous Negroes who suffered tear gas, whips and clubs.

King proclaimed great victories when Negroes were allowed to kneel and pray for a few minutes in the streets of Selma and when President Johnson made a speech deploring the situation in Alabama. SNCC members, on the other hand, continued to picket the White House. SNCC leader Monsonis commented, "There was a lot of feeling in Washington that you shouldn't demonstrate against the President because he had made a speech. But that same Monday, people were still getting arrested in Alabama. The original demand still had not been met. The question is whether you should keep pressuring or call it off when some segment of your demand is met, hoping for good will."

King's summer plans in the South will bring him into increasing conflict with the more militant youth in SNCC. His moves into Northern Negro ghettos will pit him against already established civil-rights organizations, newly created grass-roots groups led by local militants and strong black nationalist sentiments that favor self-defense. King has bitten off a very big job for this summer -- too big. President Johnson, already under tremendous pressure because of nation-wide opposition to the war in Vietnam, is hoping to avert racial clashes by diluting the civil-rights movement with King's nonviolence philosophy and work-through-government-channels strategy. The stage is being set for a showdown struggle between the more conservative pro-administration civil-rights leaders and the militant spokesmen for the restless Negro masses.

King may very well start off with a few token victories handed to him graciously by local and federal agencies; he will probably be reviled and threatened by racist extremists. All of

these things will help build his image as the fearless civil-rights leader who deserves the support of all right-minded people, North and South, black and white. A clever plan of moderating civil-rights explosions was offered by the New York Times in a March 14 editorial:

"The United States has been extremely fortunate that the struggle for Negro rights has remained up to now under mature responsible leadership which always seeks peaceful solutions by legal and political means. If that leadership is to be vindicated, then those means must be seen to be working. Otherwise the young Negro hot-heads thirsting for a dramatic showdown for its own sake will be encouraged, and the white demagogues and their police henchmen will be emboldened to new acts of violence and repression."

A clever plan -- in which Rev. Martin Luther King is striving to play his role. But no one has been able to write the script for the oppressed Negroes of the South or the seething ghettos of the North.

FOOTNOTE ON AN SLL HEADLINE

By Joseph Hansen

Several weeks ago, in an article dealing with the partial paralysis displayed by the leadership of the Socialist Labour League in face of the opening of the imperialist war against North Vietnam,* I credited them with having finally given evidence of an effort to correct their course. There were encouraging signs that they might at long last elevate this great world crisis from peripheral attention in their press to the central position it demands.

Among these signs was an article by Robert James in the April 3 Newsletter reporting how "over 300 Young Socialists" from "London, the Midlands, Yorkshire and South Wales" had joined a march of some 2,000 members of the Indian Workers Association demonstrating in London against the jailing of Communists in India. After participating in the march and attending a rally at Hammersmith on the situation in India, the 300 Young Socialists went to an SLL meeting at the New Ambassadors Hotel to protest the imperialist aggression in Vietnam. The banner headline over this report in The Newsletter was a novel one. The first part, in very large type, read: "3,000 MARCH AGAINST VIETNAM WAR." The second part, in much smaller type, read: "and imprisonment of Indian Communists."

*"Once Again -- the SLL and Vietnam." World Outlook, April 16.

From the headline, one could conclude that 3,000 demonstrators had marched against the war in Vietnam and had also protested the imprisonment of Indian Communists. The article itself, however, did not clearly bear this out. It was curious, for instance, that the accompanying pictures did not show banners against the Vietnam war at the head of the procession. The photographs, in fact, did not correspond with the headline, but appeared to be in harmony with a brief statement by James in the body of his article that the 2,000 Indians marched "Behind IWA banners and posters demanding the restoration of civil rights..." It was good that Young Socialists should display solidarity with Indian workers in London protesting the unjust imprisonment of Communists in India; but what about the headline representing the march as mainly against the war in Vietnam? This remained obscure.

It was with some interest, therefore, that we awaited the report of the Young Socialists themselves, which could be expected to appear in the next issue of their monthly paper Keep Left. This, no doubt, would clarify the ambiguous handling of the demonstration in The Newsletter, since the Young Socialists actually participated in the march and would have first-hand knowledge of the facts.

Unfortunately, the April issue of Keep Left only deepens the mystery. On the front page an excellent photograph shows a section of the demonstration. The main banner, held by two demonstrators for what looks like a posed shot by the cameraman, reads: "INDIAN WORKERS ASSOCIATION FOUNDED 1938. GREAT BRITAIN." The caption under the picture declares: "Over 300 Young Socialists, fulfilling the promise made at their conference, supported the demonstration by Indian workers on March 28 (reported on page 8). Young Socialists will again show their solidarity with the international working class on May Day in massive demonstrations up and down the country." Excellent as is this display of class solidarity, we note with some astonishment: not a single word about the war in Vietnam!

Turning to the report on page 8, we have no difficulty in finding the headline; it is at the top of the page: "YS and Indians unite to demand freedom for jailed communists." That is all. Not a single word about the war in Vietnam!

Reading through the article, we do find mention of Vietnam. It appears at the end of the following sentences:

"Well over 2,000 Indian workers set off from Waterloo Bridge, London, to march through the city to Hammersmith Town Hall.

"As they approached the Albert Hall, they were cheered by over 300 Young Socialists from London and other areas. They added their chanting demands to those of the Indians to release the Indian Communists and end the brutal war in Vietnam."

That finishes the mention of the war in Vietnam. It is the

first mention and the last mention in the article. There is no other mention. The figure of "3,000" marchers does not appear. Nor is there any account of the SLL meeting that was held after the protest rally about imprisonments in India.

The latter omission is even more surprising, for, to believe the April 3 issue of The Newsletter, the SLL meeting was an important and significant affair, protesting the American imperialist attack against North Vietnam and the role of the Labour government in covering it up. No one less than Gerry Healy, national secretary of the SLL, was the featured speaker. Why then did Keep Left fail to report this in an article dealing with the very same actions that led the editor of The Newsletter to proclaim in very large type, "3,000 MARCH AGAINST VIETNAM WAR" and in much smaller type "and imprisonment of Indian Communists"?

The conclusion is inescapable. If the Keep Left account is accurate, and we have no reason to doubt the honesty, good intentions, or eyesight of the revolutionary-minded Young Socialists who publish this paper, then 3,000 did not march against the war in Vietnam; and The Newsletter is guilty of using a headline that borrows from the sensationalist -- not socialist -- school of journalism, to say the least. Moreover, it must be concluded that the youthful editors of Keep Left considered that neither the SLL protest meeting nor the remarks of the national secretary of the SLL were important enough to report -- unless, of course, there was something about the meeting that was embarrassing to them and they felt constrained to maintain a diplomatic silence.

If we assume the opposite to be true -- that The Newsletter used an accurate headline, and, in reporting the day's events, presented what was politically important in relation to the march and the two meetings that followed it, then we are reluctantly forced to conclude that the editors of Keep Left are sadly remiss in their socialist duty. Not only are they incapable of getting the most important facts straight about a demonstration in which they participated, they have not yet learned the importance of presenting a correct stand in their press when an imperialist power launches war on a colonial country and a workers state.

We cannot exclude this possibility. In carefully reading the April issue of Keep Left, we could find only a routine article dealing with the situation in Vietnam, a small item shoved down to the bottom of page two. More column inches are devoted in this issue of Keep Left to what is going on in the field of British sports and the scooter market than to the world crisis over Vietnam.

But if this is the truth of the matter, we cannot place all the blame for the abysmal default on the editors of Keep Left. They may have thought it was their duty, or a matter of discipline, to imitate the sluggish, routine approach to Johnson's escalation of the war in Vietnam which the leaders of the SLL displayed during

February and March. At the time the Keep Left staff made up the April issue they still may not have grasped, or been told, that the SLL leaders had been tail-ending events in the greatest crisis since the end of World War II and that this was a very grave error, revealing something about the political level of this leadership.

Meanwhile we are left with the unsolved mystery of the strange headline in The Newsletter. How many was that again -- 3,000? When that article came across his desk, was the editor perhaps suffering from a bad case of split vision with overcompensation in the left eye? Perhaps that headline should have read: "2,000 MARCH AGAINST IMPRISONMENT OF INDIAN COMMUNISTS and 300 against Vietnam war."

If this is so, we are glad that at least 300 could be got together from "London, the Midlands, Yorkshire and South Wales" to come in on a march for a good cause; and to stay over for a protest meeting on Vietnam. But we do think that it is not in the interests of revolutionary socialism to exaggerate or to use misleading headlines. The movement is only made to look ridiculous by such practices and even a modest action loses the effectiveness it could have had.