

# The Week

A NEWS ANALYSIS FOR SOCIALISTS  
Vol. 7 No. 12. 23rd March, 1967.

6<sup>D</sup>

Y.S.  
National  
Committee  
Minority  
Report

## **VIETNAM :** **U THANT OR** **SOLIDARITY**

# THE WEEK

A NEWS ANALYSIS FOR SOCIALISTS  
Vol. 7 No. 15 3rd March, 1967  
6p

U.S.  
National  
Committee  
Minority  
Report

VICTIMS  
U THANT OR  
SOLIDARITY

# C O N T E N T S

Page	1	Editorial notes.	Page	2	LSE struggle.
"	3	Hull <u>Left</u> .	"	4	Scottish breakaway.
"	5	War Crimes Tribunal news.	"	6	Y.S. N.C. minority report.
"	7	Y.S. N.C. Minority report.	"	8	Students' militancy.
"	9	Thoughts on the March.	"	10	NALSO campaign.
"	11	NALSO campaign.	"	12	World call for Vietnam action.

## VIETNAM: U THANT OR SOLIDARITY

Many thousands of people will be taking part in Vietnam activity this week end. One of the main slogans of the CND contingent will be Support U Thant. Other will be marching with NLF flags and with solidarity slogans. Who is right? Is the difference really important?

The Week has been a supporter of the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign since it was formed and its supporters are marching behind the Campaign's banner. However, this support has been always on the assumption that the majority of people who support other organisations are very well-intentioned people whose desire to end the Vietnam war and help the Vietnamese people cannot be called into question. That is why we have always refrained from making attacks on other organisations even though we disagree with their line. We welcome what we consider a shift to the left in certain of these organisations on the question of Vietnam. But unless this shift to the left continues there is the danger of further confusion and a lot of work being dissipated along the wrong lines.

Point two of U Thant's proposals calls upon the North Vietnamese to stop supporting the NLF in the south in exchange for the cessation of the bombing of the North. This "reasonable" approach has been rejected outright by Ho Chi Minh and we believe he is absolutely correct. This approach confuse the nature of the war in Vietnam and helps Johnson to weaken resistance in the United States against the war. It helps Wilson to dismiss opposition to the Labour Government's support of Johnson by claiming that the solution to the war "lies in Hanoi." It is based upon the assumption that the American's right to be in south Vietnam should be negotiated by the Vietnamese. It can be argued that in a certain sense the Americans would welcome a cease-fire to regroup their forces which are increasingly feeling the strain of the war. Such a regroupment for the Americans would be very good providing they could stop the Vietnamese from also regrouping. An agreement by the Democratic Republic of Vietnam to stop supporting the N.L.F. would amount to just that.

Thus, despite their intentions supporters of the slogans about U Thant are giving a political cover to some of the objectives - political and military - of the American administration. That is why we instead advance the idea of consistent solidarity with the Vietnamese as the best way of fighting the war and helping the Vietnamese to win self-determination.

Really what we should be discussing is how we can - as Jean-Paul Sartre put it - escalate opposition to the war in direct relationship to the U.S. escalation of the war against the Vietnamese. We have already drawn attention to the nature of the Guam conference. Our worst fears were justified when we read the press reports of that conference. Sartre has posed the question of volunteers for Vietnam. This is certainly a question which warrants serious and concrete discussion. The moral effect alone of thousands pledging themselves to go if called for would be immense. In the meantime we have to step our exposure of the British Government physical and political complicity.

## BEHIND THE STUDENT STRIKE AT LSE

by Frank Gorton

The following press releases and appeal have come out of the LSE dispute, sparked in this instance by the suspension of Bloom and Adelstein, officers of the Student Union. These student leaders, by accepting a majority decision of the Union placed themselves at variance with the authorities.

The following excerpts are from a letter circulated by the "Committee of 34" on behalf of the LSE Student Union.

After much debate, Union decided on Saturday to continue the sit-in and boycott. We deeply resent being branded irresponsible, and hope in this letter to demonstrate why we feel our course of action is justified and necessary under the circumstances. We began these demonstrations in response to the Board of Discipline's decision to suspend David Adelstein and Marshall Bloom for three months. We opposed and rejected these decisions on three grounds.

- 1) We as a Union were responsible for the vote that was taken on 31 January. It was consequently a clear case of victimisation to single out two individuals for trial and punishment. It was indeed their duty as our representatives to act as they did.
  - 2) Even if they had been solely responsible for administering the vote, the precise point on which the decision was based was a highly technical consideration. After the appeal, the one remaining charge -- that of having disobeyed an order of the Director -- was based only on the fact that they had tried to take a vote. They had not been ordered not to take a vote. But because one of the possible outcomes of this vote would have been a decision to enter the Old Theatre, which would have been such disobedience, therefore, for this reason alone, they were suspended for three months. As the convictions were based on such a technicality, the sentences imposed seemed highly exorbitant and unjust.
  - 3) The whole procedure, as well as the convictions, implied an attitude to students of singular disrespect. Both the Board of Discipline and the Appeal Board were clearly structurally biased against us. Also, we saw that, while we are expected to have responsibilities within the LSE, our rights to free speech and assembly, as embodied in this challenge to the Director's order, were completely denied.
- These three considerations were fundamental in our minds as we began our demonstrations, and were indeed its causes. During the demonstration we have been making a great effort to communicate, both to the administration and the staff, our sense of urgency about these issues. This was indeed the central point of the sit-in and the boycott. On Tuesday, thirteen students began a ninety-six hour hunger strike. On Friday, the fact that over 1500 students from other universities supported us on the "Daffodil March" showed that the principles we were upholding were shared by students throughout the country. Also on Friday, Union officially sent a negotiating committee to discuss with these representatives of the Standing Committee of the Board of Governors our concern with these matters, and particularly to discuss possibilities for an acceptable compromise on the relevant issues.

As the meeting began on Saturday, Mr. Kidd arrived with a statement from Lord Bridges, the Director and himself. We were informed that the decision of the Standing Committee regarding the initial suspensions of Adelstein and Bloom will stand; that "They have never been, and never will be, a matter for negotiation."

This announcement was greeted with cries of "Shame". Mr. Adelstein said that "This is perhaps the most incredibly disturbing thing that has happened" Mr. Zander of the Law Department commented that "Just at the very moment when the whole situation could conceivably be resolved, Mr. Kidd's wretched little statement has put the whole thing in jeopardy."

Union could not accept Mr. Kidd's statement as final; nor, in the light of the near total rejection of our three original points, could we accept as final the findings of the Standing Committee. It was in the light of this verdict of the Standing Committee and the announcement by Mr. Kidd, that the decision to continue the boycott and sit-in was made.

LSE STUDENT UNION PRESS STATEMENT Mar. 20, 11.30 p.m.

LSE union tonight decided to suspend the boycott and sit-in from 5p.m. Mar. 21st for the duration of the vacation. A discussion whether or not to resume the boycott and sit-in will be taken in the first week of the Summer term.

Union continues to support its suspended leaders. Legal representations appealing against their suspensions are being made to the court of Governors of the college.

Lectures and seminars for the Open University will continue during the vacation. Latest information is that some 40 lecturers, including some from Essex University are considering offering their services to the Open University.

LATEST NEWS FROM LSE

Open University as a form of continuing protest will meet at the LSE March 22-23 and resume Friday, March 31. Seminars arranged so far will cover Fascism and Social Theory, Conflicts in Modern Britain, Anarchism, and Vernon Miner of the Seamen's Union may speak on topic of Trade Unions and the LSE. It is hoped that seminar topics will cover the Arts, Education and a variety of others. During the period that the LSE is closed, people who are interested in contributing to or attending the Open University should contact Doris M. Meibach, 19 College Cross, London N.1 or phone NOR 5976.

HULL "LEFT" ENTIRELY DEVOTED TO WORKERS' CONTROL from Tom Fawthrop

A special issue of Hull University's Socialist Society publication Left is coming out shortly. It is devoted entirely to workers' control. There are about 21 contributors, 96 pages for only 2/6.

We have to sell every copy to break even financially and consequently I would ask every reader of The Week to support the pamphlet by publicising it, handling it, etc.

Contributors include: Vic Allen, Ken Coates, Jack Ashwell, Tony Topham, Paul Derrick, Richard Fletcher, Walter Kendall et al - it is intended to be a comprehensive guide to the subject. It is hoped to have it out for sale on the Easter March.

Copies obtainable from: The Editor  
Left,  
55, Stawbury Crescent,  
Folkestone,  
Kent.

THE SCOTTISH BREAKAWAY by Nan Milton.\*

I agree up to a point with Tony Southall's analysis of the Pollok by-election results, but I am quite sure that the large vote for George Leslie, the S.N.P. candidate, was not merely a protest vote against the vote for Scottish self-government, and one which should have caused no surprise. A recent survey showed that 80% of the Scottish people want Home Rule of some sort.

I also strenuously deny that there is anything "basically reactionary" about S.N.P. policy. It was the Labour candidate who advocated support for the Americans in Vietnam and Scottish entry into the Common Market. I heard Leslie say he wanted to see all foreign troops, including American, out of Vietnam and the Vietnamese allowed to solve their own problems with the help of U.N.O. He also stated that he would like to see Scotland part of a European co-operative community which included the East European countries. In passing I might mention that last week the "Labour" Government turned down a bill to abolish hereditary titles but that in 1965 the S.N.P. at its annual conference unanimously passed a resolution pledging itself to abolish all hereditary titles.

Home Rule for Scotland was at one time an integral part of Labour policy, but after 1945 it was quietly shoved under the carpet along with Clause IV. In 1918 the annual conference of the British Labour Party formally endorsed the principle of a separate Scottish Parliament, and this was formally re-endorsed in 1928. Although it was not included in the 1945 election programme "Let us Face the Future", practically all Labour candidates in Scotland circulated during the election a list of objects for which they stood. Second in importance to the defeat of Japan was "A Scottish Parliament for Scottish Affairs"! During the election Clement Attlee wrote to the Maxwelltown Labour Party giving full assurances that the Labour Party in office would implement its old pledges on Scottish self-government. The failure of the Labour Party to implement these promises is now coming home to roost. I myself agree with Tom Johnston, the war-time Scottish Secretary, when he said in Glasgow in 1946 "I am certain that any effort to deprive Scotsmen inside Scotland of control of their own affairs will in the end fail".

Scotland's most famous pioneer of Marxian Socialism, John Maclean, lived and died in Pollok, but he died through separation from Tory England. He wished Scotland to follow Ireland's heroic example, and for that purpose organised in 1923 the Scottish Workers' Republican Party. Had he not died that very year it is possible that Scotland might have had her republic by this time, but it won't be long now, according to Scotland's most popular folksong "The Scottish Breakaway" which ends like this -

\* has been a member of the Labour Party since 1936, and for the last three years a member of Stirling County Council.

## The Scottish Breakaway - Cont'd

"So here's tae the lion  
The bonny rampant lion  
A lang stretch tae it's claw.  
Gie a Hampden roar and it's cot the door  
And ta-ta tae Charlie's Maw."

"Nae Liz the twae  
Nae Lilibet the wan  
Nae Liz will ever dae  
for we'll make oor land republican  
In the Scottish Breakaway."

In conclusion my warning to the Labour Party, and particularly to the left wing, is this. Remember the fate of the Irish Labour Party. Because it failed to support the Irish fight for freedom and allowed Sinn Fein to lead it, it lost its influence with the Irish people, and has not yet regained it. If the Labour Party continues to ignore the fundamental Socialist principle of the self-determination of small nations and fails to support Scotland's desire for freedom, then it runs the risk of losing all influence in Scotland for a very long time.

### VERY SUCCESSFUL VIETNAM SOLIDARITY MEETING IN HULL from a Hull reader

The mass meeting\* support of the International War Crimes Tribunal in Hull was very successful. Both the attendance (over 120) and the spirit of the meeting were encouraging.

The main speakers were Lawrence Daly, general secretary of the Scottish mineworkers and a member of the War Crimes Tribunal, and Ken Coates, director of the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation. Lawrence Daly was able to report on his recent visit to Vietnam in a highly authoritative manner. The chairman, Tom Watkinson of the N.U.R., was an indication of strong local trade union support. Apart from him other sponsors of the meeting included George Andrews, TGWU; Jack Ashwell, TGWU; Dan Brown, Foundryworkers; Tony Clarke, CAWU; Dave Godman, GMWU, Walt Joester, AEU; Alf Mellors, TGWU; Barry Nettleton, AScW; and David Shenton, TGWU regional secretary.

The film Threatening Sky was also shown, and was very well received. The collection of £10 was an indication of the lively character of the meeting - in contrast to some held on Vietnam locally.

\* Held on Friday, March 17th.

### DAVID HOROWITZ INTRODUCES HIS BOOK AT WEEK FORUM

Last Friday, March 17th, some 40 to 50 people attended a meeting at which David Horowitz introduced his book: "From Yalta to Vietnam." He explained both how he came to write the book and the basic ideas behind it. A very lively question and answer session followed which covered the whole range of questions connected with the cold war and post war international politics. Several people have asked about the possibility of David Horowitz speaking to their organisation since the meeting.

# NATIONAL COMMITTEE MINORITY REPORT

The Report which will be presented to the Sixth Conference of the L.P.Y.S. by the National Committee is, we feel, quite inadequate, and purposely so. It omits to report many of the decisions taken or not taken by the National Committee about which, we feel, the Conference should be informed. Our intention in presenting this report is merely to put the report of the National Committee in its true context so that this Conference can judge for itself the actions and, therefore, the value of the present National Committee.

## DEMOCRATIC ELECTIONS

Despite the resolutions passed at the last Young Socialists Conference the National Committee have ignored the undemocratic nature of their 'selection'. At the very first National Committee meeting Mike Caffoor moved a resolution calling on all National Committee members to submit themselves to endorsement by their Regional Conferences - these to be specially convened if necessary. The Resolution received only one vote - that of the mover - Mike Kalaher being absent from this meeting. Furthermore



## Young Socialists National Committee Minority Report Cont'd

when Mike Caffoor asked that N.C. members should state the process by which they came to be on the National Committee he was told to, "mind his own business".

Conference Decisions - It is important for Young Socialists to realise that their National Committee have taken absolutely no action on the resolutions passed by the last Young Socialist Conference. At the first meeting of the National Committee several members wanted to submit the Conference decisions to the N.E.C. with the proviso that they, the N.C., disagreed with, and deplored, the decisions. It was only when two N.C. members threatened to resign that this course of action was dropped.

Political Resolutions - Also at the first meeting political resolutions received from Young Socialist branches were discussed. However, since that first meeting the National Committee have steadfastly refused to discuss political resolutions sent to them from branches. The N.C. also defeated a resolution asking them to inform Y.S. branches of their intention not to discuss the resolutions sent to them.

Young Socialist Journal - The N.C. have discussed the supposedly Y.S. journal Focus but have only been allowed to make suggestions. Resolutions passed at the last conference calling for a democratically controlled Y.S. journal and resolutions submitted by Y.S. branches making similar demands since Conference have been rejected.

Youth for Peace in Vietnam - It was moved at the second N.C. meeting that the Y.S. should support Y.P.V., the programme of which is based on dissociation by the British Government from American policy in Vietnam, a programme which we feel would have the support of the majority of Young Socialists. Yet the N.C. rejected this resolution and went on to ignore completely a proposal that the Y.S. should have its own campaign on Vietnam.

Pro-Smith Rhodesia Rally - A resolution calling for all Young Socialists to demonstrate against the Duncan Sandys rally was carried only on the Chairman's casting vote, and even then, only after a motion deploring those who sought to destroy free speech was rejected.

International Conferences - As you will see from the N.C. Report Mr. Collins and Mr. Holland attended the 60th Congress of the Jong Socialisten of Belgium. What is, however, conveniently not mentioned is that at this congress the two N.C. members spoke in direct opposition to the declared policies of the Young Socialists as a whole.

### Conclusions.

We consider that a time when there has been considerable activity on the political scene the National Committee has failed to give a lead to the Y.S. movement resulting in the failure of the Y.S. to establish a National identity. Consequently at a time when the Y.S. desperately needs to recruit more people into the movement, the Y.S. finds itself not only unable to interest Young people, but also losing many of its existing members to other political organisations.

It is our opinion that the National Committee members have not acted in accordance with the wishes of the majority of Young Socialists and have been more concerned with acting as agents of the N.E.C., than as representatives of the Y.S. In doing so we feel that they have failed to take a golden opportunity to build a strong Y.S. movement.

We hope that the Sixth Conference of Young Socialists will take up the points which we have raised and accord to the National Committee the criticism it justly deserves.

Mike Caffoor  
(Nat. Comm. member for London & Middlesex Region)

Mike Kalaher  
(Nat. Comm. member for Eastern Region).

#### STUDENTS' MILITANCY by Julian Atkinson

The rise in militancy amongst students during this last few months as shown by the rise of the Radical Students' Alliance and the present conflict at the L.S.E. - seems to basically arise from Government's long-term policy towards higher education. The students have good reason to believe that, in common with Trades Unionists, they will have to pay the bill for revitalising British capitalism.

Mr. Crossland's recent speech at the University of Lancaster would seem to underline these fears. He devoted a considerable portion of his speech to giving figures on the growth on public expenditure on the universities. This year this bill stood at £207million - a miserly per capita amount compared with Russia or the U.S.A. Mr. Crossland did not see the figure in this light, but considered it as being too large! Specifically he thought that costly features such as the student-support system, the present student-staff ratio and the proportion of residential accommodation should be revised.

It is fast becoming apparent that the miserable decision about raising overseas students fees is merely to be the precursor to a whole host of attacks on higher education. Mr. Crossland will, no doubt, be only happy when he has imposed the teachers on all students and when his student-loans scheme has negated the promise of comprehensive education and has depressed the opportunities for working-class students.

#### A CONFERENCE IN NORTH WEST? - a letter from Miss Maureen Roberts (Cheshire).

Having been a subscriber to "The Week" for almost two years now, I am writing to offer a small "plea from the heart"!

At the end of this week's edition you stress the necessity of a conference being convened to put forward various points in opposition to the Labour Government's Wage freeze and its anti-union attacks. I should like to ask if it would be possible to hold this conference in the North West such as Manchester or Liverpool? I have always been disappointed by the fact that so many demonstrations, meetings etc., of the left have been held so often in London or the Midlands, and I feel it would be in the way of a change if this particular conference were to be held up here in the North. I am certain there are many supporters of the left living in the North who would agree with me.

## THOUGHTS AT THE TIME OF THE EAST R MARCH, 1967

It is beyond doubt that the American Government is guilty of war crimes in Vietnam and Cambodia. We, in Britain, have a duty to expose and oppose this American aggression as well as the lies and complicity of Wilson, Brown and the Labour Government. As the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign has cogently argued, the most effective way in which we can show our opposition to imperialist aggression is by uniting with the resistance of the Vietnamese National Liberation Front and with the North Vietnamese. There is no doubt that this policy is gaining more and more support in Britain.

But, despite the daily evidence of U.S. war crimes in Vietnam, our solidarity with the human targets of imperialist forces is frustrated. We are frustrated by policies of those on the 'Left' which can only be described as 'defeatist', 'capitulationist' and 'statesmanship'.

As yet, the policies of the British Communist Party, C.N.D. and the Parliamentary Labour 'Left' have mainly been confined to acting as public relations agents for U Thant's pontifications on Vietnam.

How presumptuous such people are! Comfortable, complacent outsiders telling the heroic Vietnamese resistance what to do. We know how the British people responded to such outside interference when we were under Nazi attack in the Second World War. We rightly rejected it.

So now we should not rally round the reactionary diplomatic advice of U Thant on Vietnam for the same reasons. We should not urge the Vietnamese resistance to come to any conference table on any terms but their own.

Whatever political impact the Vietnam solidarity campaign can make in Britain, world opinion will depend on the Vietnam policies of the Communist countries, notably that of the Soviet Union. On his recent visit to Britain, Kosygin did not criticise the Labour Government's complicity in U.S. war crimes, neither did he pledge full solidarity with the Vietnamese resistance. (Kosygin did visit the City of London, Buckingham Palace and the Carlton Club). It was not surprising to hear Wilson say on television recently that he was sure that privately Kosygin would not want Britain to disassociate from U.S. actions in Vietnam, even though the Soviet Leader may not say so publicly. No denial of Wilson's remarks has come from the Kremlin. It would seem that the small amounts of Soviet Union aid that do go to Vietnam are partly in response to the revolutionary noises from the People's Republic of China.

We must not fail the Vietnamese resistance as we failed the Spanish in the 1930s. Johnson and the Pentagon are now intensifying the imperialist war. Socialists must respond by intensifying their own efforts in solidarity with the Vietnamese resistance.

### AN IMPORTANT CORRECTION

from Tony Topham and Ken Coates.

An unfortunate misprint in our article las week made it say the opposite of what we meant: we wrote that it was important to separate "control" ideas from "participation" blandishments: seizing the one in order to better attack the other. We have no wish to attract participational support as the misprint implies - on the contrary we think it vital to draw a very sharp division between workers' control and domestication of unions in participation which we oppose.

## A PROGRAMME FOR THE "SAVE NALSO CAMPAIGN"

We have received the following statement from the "Save NALSO Campaign", Cambridge University Socialist Club:

At the second meeting of the Campaign, representatives of a number of Universities discussed the nature of the Campaign's Platform. It was agreed that the SLL would attempt to discredit our stand on the grounds that it was playing into the hands of Transport House. While, as our previous statements have indicated, nothing could be further from the truth, we felt there was a need for those present to formulate a principled platform beyond the relations with the Labour Party, although we affirmed that this was central to our aims. Accordingly, the following statement was drawn up to indicate our general positions, but without committing comrades who had to seek approval from their Clubs.

### Statement of Aims of the Save NALSO Campaign.

We affirm our belief that there is a need for a National Organisation to express the views and wishes of the Student Socialist Movement. We believe that this organisation should not be isolated from the mainstream of the Labour Movement and should avoid the kind of impotent sectarianism which such isolation brings. At the same time we do not call for the acceptance of any terms which Transport House may offer to NALSO when we seek to re-establish links with the Labour Party. We reject the Labour Party plan to destroy the National Framework of NALSO and to tie Clubs to Regional Youth Officers' dictates. The control of NALSO by any one faction would be disastrous and so we ask all who agree with this statement to come together at the April Conference to elect a non-sectarian platform. The object of this would be to implement the principles outlined in this statement and to negotiate for a new relationship with the Labour Party (based on genuine representation of students in all sections of the movement). The platform would also seek to forge new links with the left Trade Unions etc., and to run NALSO on such contributions as the Left and the Clubs might be able to provide. We call upon the rank and file of the Labour Party to aid NALSO in the struggle to re-establish links with the Labour Party by raising the issue at Annual Conference. We also endorse the position of critical support for the Radical Student Alliance in order to link the students' struggles with the fight in the Labour Movement, and bearing in mind the ultimate aim of forming a National Students Union affiliated to the TUC and the Labour Party.

### Eight Point Programme Outlined

1. Opposition to the Wage Freeze and to all anti-Trades Union legislation. Support for all rank and file movements in their struggles in defence of workers' rights and against the victimisation of trade unionists.
2. We call for the implementation of the Labour Party Programme in regard to nationalisation of the Basic Industries, and further call for the Nationalisation of Growth Industries like Chemicals, together with the Banks and Insurance Companies and the Big Monopolies. We call for these measures to be implemented under Workers' Control.
3. We oppose the restrictions upon Commonwealth Immigration and call for an end to this racist policy.

"Save NALSO Campaign" Programme /Continued

4. As an answer to the present housing crisis we ask for the Nationalisation of Land and the Municipalisation of all Rented Accomodation as part of a planned implementation of a Socialist Housing Programme.

Foreign Affairs

5. We support the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam in their great and courageous defence of their land against the ever-increasing commitment of the American Imperialists.

6. We support the demand to withdraw all British Troops from Abroad where they are a drain on the economy and an empty gesture to an Imperialist Past. We call for a British withdrawal from the NATO farce and from SEATO whose objects now include the use of Thailand as a forward base of American aggression against the people of Vietnam.

Students' Affairs

7. We call for the formulation of a Students' Programme based on the handing over of some power to democratically elected student unions in regard to the appointment of staff, production of syllabuses and disciplinary matters. We express solidarity with comrades threatened by dictatorial powers in L.S.E.

8. We support students struggling for their rights and freedom of expression and organisation all over the world. We especially wish to emphasise our support with those fighting Imperialism in the Third World and those fighting Fascism in Spain and elsewhere.

We recognise this programme is not a policy statement but merely an expression of the agreed views of those who attended the meeting on March 11th to which all clubs affiliated to NALSO were invited. We hope it will form the basis for a more detailed programme at NALSO Conference and to give the lie to the inevitable charges and slanders which will come from both Left and Right. We therefore reiterate our request for support and information concerning the April 3 - 6 Conference. All information, queries, etc should be addressed to the Cambridge University Socialist Club. c/o Terry Bull, Pembroke College, Cambridge.

The basis of our position is the CUSC resolution to Conference: "This Conference deplures the hasty action of the NEC of the Labour Party in repudiating the bi-lateral agreement with NALSO, but also believes that the student socialist movement must retain links in some form with the Labour Party at national level. It therefore instructs the new E.C. to immediately seek affiliation or some other form of association with the Labour Party, preferably one which gives NALSO speaking and voting rights at LP Conference."

We think there is a middle way between a stooge organisation tied to Regional Youth Officers and a front for the Socialist Labour League. We hope that socialists at University and College will support our stand. If we are to succeed, delegates must get to Conference and National Contact must be maintained.

A CALL FOR WORLD STUDENT DEMONSTRATIONS FOR VIETNAM WEEK (April 8-15)\*

We, as American citizens, condemn our government's role in Vietnam. We condemn its support of puppet regimes in Saigon, the massive troop and arms intervention, the daily bombing attacks on the people of North and South Vietnam. We condemn our government's acquiescence in the torture of prisoners. We condemn the use of chemical warfare and the napalm, phosphorus, and "lazy dog" bombs, which together with other innovations in weaponry mark American intervention in Vietnam. The United States government is conducting a criminal war against the Vietnamese people, which is every bit as horrible as the French operations in Algeria, and the Nazi atrocities in World War II. This war against the Vietnamese people is being carried out in violation of the Geneva Accords, the United Nations Charter, our nation's own Constitution, and all standards of humanity.

Periodically, our government has issued declarations of peaceful intent, and has stated its willingness to hold "unconditional" discussions. But these hypocritical declarations are almost always followed by new escalation of the war. Thus far, our government has been unwilling to put an end to this horrible war, by getting out of Vietnam and letting the Vietnamese people determine their own destiny. The overwhelming majority of mankind, from Melbourne to Moscow, from Manila to Montevideo, have justly condemned the war in Vietnam. And never in our nation's history has a war been so unpopular among our own people.

The peace movement in our country continues to grow as thousands upon thousands of people come to learn the truth about the war. We realize that, of all the world's peoples, it is ourselves who have the primary responsibility and burden to bring a halt to this war. Toward this purpose, we are calling for a nationwide student week of protest, April 8-15, culminating in massive demonstrations in New York and San Francisco on April 15th. This will be the largest expression of anti-war sentiment among students ever held in our nation's history. We issue this statement to call upon the peoples of the world to join us during Vietnam Week in an international demonstration against U.S. aggression in Vietnam. We ask the students of the world to join us April 8-15 in making our protest an international student protest against the war. We ask this expression in the name of International brotherhood and peace, in the name of humanity. Enclosed is our call for action within the United States. Please wire or write us of plans you have to join our protest.

The key part of the American call for action reads:

"We, the Student Mobilization Committee, urge all those students who wish to oppose the criminal war in Vietnam to dedicate themselves anew to the task of ending the war. Specifically we propose that April 8-15th be designated as Vietnam Week which will culminate in the transportation of as many students as possible to New York and San Francisco as part of the general Spring Mobilization of the antiwar movement on April 15th. Finally, we propose that the focus of End the War in Vietnam Week be on: (1) Bringing the GI'S home now; (2) Opposing the draft, and supporting the right of individuals to refuse to cooperate with the military system; and (3) Ending campus complicity with the war effort..... We American students, .... support the right of self-determination throughout the world....."

\* From the STUDENT MOBILIZATION COMMITTEE, c/o Linda Dannenberg, 29 Park Row (5th Floor), New York, N.Y. 10038.