

Bulletin

OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

Vol. 2, No. 11

June 14, 1965

10 Cents

Bolivian Workers Need Leadership

The recent events in Bolivia have once again placed that small landlocked country in the forefront of the world revolution. The cleverness of the imperialist enemy must not be underestimated. In the Dominican Republic, the U.S. has not been able to "solve" the governmental crisis, but it has been able to put the revolutionary forces on the defensive politically. While the workers have not been militarily disarmed, the U.S. has very carefully allowed and helped the counterrevolutionary forces to surround and isolate the rebels. Even more important, they have been disarmed politically, as the rebel leadership hastens to proclaim its anticommunism and its respect for the North Americans. Under these conditions the imperialists can wait with a certain degree of confidence for the revolutionary energy of the masses to ebb, at which time a solution acceptable to the U.S. and a temporary stability can more easily be achieved. This doesn't mean that the imperialists are all-powerful. A revolutionary leadership can bring them to their knees, and this is important to keep in mind in regard to Bolivia.

Participant reports

Conflicts Between

Martin Luther King & SNCC

There are many differences between the Bolivian and Dominican revolutions, as well as at least two important

similarities. First, the workers in both cases are playing a leading role in the revolution and are armed. Second, and most important, both lack a proletarian revolutionary leadership.

The Bolivian Revolution of 1952-53 was of a classic type, and had much in common with the earlier Mexican Revolution. In Bolivia the tin mines, accounting for the vast part of the poor country's industry, were nationalized. The tin miners were among the most class conscious and revolutionary minded workers in Latin America, and played the leading role in revolutionary developments. But the workers' leadership refused to give the power to the workers themselves.

The nationalist movement, the MNR, stopped the revolution half way. The workers became progressively more estranged from the nationalist leadership which had led the revolution. Though the workers remained armed, the government sought to safeguard imperialist interests through the machinery of the state-owned Bolivian Mining Corporation itself. This situation has continued now since the revolution, in a complicated and long drawn out form of dual power, the armed workers representing the embryo of the workers' state, and the government trying to extend its rule and definitively establish bourgeois rule over the entire country. The bourgeois regime has continually attempted to disarm the miners and bring the nationalized mines completely under its control. Up to now the workers have resisted successfully.

The Traitorous Role of Juan Lechin

The events of last fall have an important bearing on the latest developments. At that time, a military coup led by General Rene Barrientos Ortuno deposed the MNR President Victor Paz Estenssorro. Juan Lechin, leader of the miners, supported this military coup, which overthrew the regime of which he was a former Vice-President but which had openly turned against the workers. Barrientos made some vague promises of consideration and fairness to the workers. Lechin and the rest of the workers' leadership simply accepted this at face value and supported the coup, instead of preparing to strike out on the workers' own behalf, to complete the revolution which had been distorted and halted for so many years and had prolonged the suffering of the masses.

The combativity and the consciousness of the masses remained on a very high level. Preparation for the revolutionary seizure of power was in order, but Lechin instead offered support to a military strong man who was very shortly to show where he really stood.

The military junta, soon after it seized power last November, made clear its intention of disarming the workers and proceeding with a reorganization of the tin mining industry, aimed at higher profits. This plan, which is the immediate cause of the present crisis, involved a drastic restric-

tion of the role of the miners' union in management, a cut in wages, and some 7,000 layoffs.

The Workers Fight Back

Then this spring, the junta rewarded workers' leader Lechin for his early support by deporting him. The workers responded with a general strike. This set the stage for the government attack on the miners, in which 48 miners were killed by the Bolivian Army on May 23. But the determination and heroism of the workers forced the government to agree to a truce, one which continues on a very shaky day-to-day basis as this article is being written.

Spokesmen for the junta hinted that, while there were some policy differences among the military leaders, they hoped to use the truce as a tactical move to prepare for a further assault, catching the workers off guard.

The workers must also prepare for the battle. They must not let this truce, like the truce in the Dominican Republic, simply be used to disorient the workers and allow their revolutionary spirit to ebb. They must counterpose to the strategy of the junta and the imperialists their own revolutionary strategy, a strategy of no compromise with the imperialists and their stooges.

Lumumba, Jagan and Lechin

But for this revolutionary strategy a revolutionary Marxist leadership is needed. This is the kind of leadership which must be built in Bolivia, the Dominican Republic, the rest of Latin America and all over the world. The workers must learn from past mistakes and betrayals, from such disasters as Lumumba's call on the United Nations for protection, British Guiana's Cheddi Jagan's call on British imperialist troops for protection, and Juan Lechin's refusal to provide revolutionary leadership and his support to military strongman Barrientos last fall. Lumumba is dead, Jagan is out of power, and Lechin has been deported. Let these be lessons for all revolutionaries. We must build a new revolutionary leadership which will not make these mistakes, which will really lead the workers and peasants to successful socialist revolution.

SUBSCRIBE to the BULLETIN OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

____ Special Introductory
Sub - 10 Issues - \$.50

____ Full Year - \$2.00

Send to: BULLETIN, Box 721,
Ansonia Sta., NYC 10023

• Make checks payable to:
Wohlforth

Name.....

Street

City.....

State.....

SYMPATHY ALONE WILL NOT STOP VIETNAM RAPE

Cold-Blooded Economic Needs Compel Washington

To Crush Revolution in Southeast Asia

It is silly to expect to mobilize mass opposition to the Johnson war in Viet Nam on the basis of sympathy. Only a tiny minority, mainly students, can be mobilized on that basis. The average worker--including the black worker--has to feed his family, first of all. Anyone who condemns him for that source of backwardness is a fool. To accomplish great things it is indispensable to begin with people as they are. Can one honestly expect the same worker who knuckles under to speed-up and trade union bureaucrat's sell-outs to engage in a serious fight on the basis of something as vague as sympathy? Furthermore, anyone who imagines that Johnson can be stopped without support of just such workers is the biggest of fools.

To put it crudely, the socialist movement must make an end to the Vietnam war worth while to the worker in terms of his children's daily bread. That means that the fight to end the war in Viet Nam must be linked to fights against taxes, to struggles against unemployment, against speed-up. Any program that fails, for example, to unite black and white trade unionists with unemployed must inevitably fail to accomplish the more ambitious task of stopping the war in Viet Nam.

The danger to the radical movement at this stage is that it will become so narrowly involved in the protest movement that it will relegate to second place the socialist propoganda and agitation required to lead students and workers beyond the ineffective and primitive stage of amorphous protest.

If the war in Viet Nam is an essential part of the program of the imperialist financiers for their own survival, which this article will attempt to show, that it is idiotic to appeal to the financiers' "better nature" on such issues. Protest movements on Viet Nam are actually asking David Rockefeller & Family & Company to commit class suicide. So much for moral suasion.

* * * * *

The speeches of Senators Morse and Gruening tend toward the argument that U.S. policy in Viet Nam is misguided or even insane. Exactly the contrary is true. Johnson & McNamara are no more insane than any tiger who kills as the only way it can survive. What confuses the student protester about Viet Nam policy is U.S. economic prosperity: "How can the U.S., with its stock market soaring to all-time highs, its economy at the peak of a three-year boom, need anything from the poor people of the Mekong River Basin?" If this same student would pause to compare the present, "Kennedy," boom with the boom of 1926-1929, he would begin to discover the real reason for the desperation of Johnson's war in South Viet Nam. This student would then begin to see the truth behind that war: David Rockefeller and Company, the leading bankers, regard

that war as a key battle in their world-wide struggle for survival.

The ordinary man in the street, even the typical corporate economist and local bank officer, pays very little attention to the facts and problems of political economy. He generally concentrates on hoping for the best, and regards a new job, a recent increase in sales or in stock market prices, etc., as the beginning of a trend extending into the more or less indefinite future. In that respect, he has not changed much since 1929. For that reason, "high" government and financial policies are beyond his comprehension.

The situation is entirely different among the leaders in the banking system and their top banking and government staffs. Since it is the very essence of finance to speculate against the future, top financiers and government officials are directly conscious of and influenced by the projected rate of profit and interest on capital invested for repayment thirty days, one year, five years, ten years ahead. They watch trends in the "price of money" in all world markets with the greatest concern, knowing quite well the relationship between these trends and the arithmetic of boom-and-bust. Any student who doubts this should spend several evenings in a well-stocked library, reviewing the past eight years' copies of the Federal Reserve Bulletin, proceedings of the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress and similar publications circulated among top bankers, their government agents and related circles. The same student will find a slightly more candid discussion of the same issues in the London Economist for the same period. If he wishes to go further, the student will explore the publications of the United Nations on international capital flows and related questions. In that reading he will find himself in another world, entirely unlike the world as seen on the front pages of the New York Times, for example. Through such study, he will begin to understand the actual point of view of the central bankers who control Johnson and McNamara. He will also discover that the big worries among central bankers are exactly those matters explored **thoroughly** by Karl Marx in Volume III of Capital.

JFK and the New Imperialist Policy

From such sources the student will discover that the central bankers recognized the approach of a new bust back in 1958. Their view was, correctly, that an immediate bust was unlikely unless the U.S. government and bankers fell into a blunder. However, it was equally clear that once the U.S. economy's basic crutch, European expansion, began to weaken the danger of a new 1929 would become quite real. This gave the U.S. about ten years, with two or three boom-recession cycles, in which to find a fundamental solution outside European expansion. As early as August, 1958, then-Senator John F. Kennedy gave a speech in the Senate (later republished in The Strategy of Peace) in which the basic features of the alternative were presented: a new imperialist policy for the peoples of the colonial and semi-colonial countries. The

U.S. present policy in Viet Nam is nothing more nor less than a carrying out of the new imperialist policy stated by Kennedy back in 1958. It is a struggle for the survival of the capitalist system.

The 1929 stock market bust and the new crisis threatening the U.S. in the period ahead represent the kind of crises which overtake a capitalist economy in its periods of greatest apparent prosperity when the stock market indexes are at an all-time high. One day industrial production and the stock market are apparently steaming ahead toward paradisaical upper reaches of national prosperity; on the next, financiers are leaping from skyscrapers, production slows toward a halt.

The mysterious nature of these crises can be understood by exploring the reasons for decline and bankruptcy of individual firms like Webb & Knapp--the latter the most famous of the great real estate speculators to come out of World War II. A financial crisis like 1929 is nothing more nor less than the crisis of Webb & Knapp extended to a majority of real estate and financial speculators, brought about by the same general conditions that produce the individual financial crises of firms like Webb & Knapp today.

In principle, we face a modern version of the national bankruptcy which struck Spain in 1557 and 1575, a crisis which wiped out most of the leading banking houses of Europe. Spain, which had financed the exploration and exploitation of the New World through Antwerp, Augsburg and Italian bankers, had lost not only all of its foreign profits on this investment, but the interest obligations of the Spanish crown had systematically ruined the domestic economy of Spain itself. In 1575, the Spanish government found itself owing almost forty million ducats to the bankers, against almost non-existent assets. Phillip II of Spain consulted his theologians on the immorality of usury, and on these moral grounds simply repudiated his debts, wiping out the bankers and paving the way for the rise of English commercial and financial power under Elizabeth I.

The Capitalist Poker Game

It is the nature of a capitalist that once he ceases to be only an owner of production and becomes a financier he uses his hoard of profits as his ante in a gigantic poker-game called speculation. Profits from production continually leave the process of commodity production and circulation to appear at the international gambling tables of the stock, money and real estate markets. Factory production, commodities, new productive investments become mere chips in this vast poker game, or like the "properties" of the household game, "Monopoly." This poker-game of speculation becomes a cancer on the national economy; each player at the "table" of international and domestic finance speculation finds that his existence depends upon bringing more and more funds to the

"table" as the only means of protecting his share of the "ante". In his zeal for funds for this game he puts not only his own factories, but the income of the national and state governments into hock. (At present the mountain of debt sitting on the U.S. economy has reached the staggering total of \$1.2 trillions and is still rising.) Because this "poker-game" obeys the law of compound interest, the amount of wealth that must be poured into speculation increases more rapidly than profits from real production. On the day that the profits from real production are no longer sufficient for the next "hand" of this international "poker" game, most of the players become bankrupt.

When that occurs production stops. Why? Is there a shortage of plants? Has hunger ceased? Is the need for clothing less? Is there a sudden shortage of workers? Quite the contrary. A majority of the capitalists are bankrupt, unable to continue their function of advancing capital to keep the means of production running. The only way society can start the wheels of industry moving again is to follow the example of the King of Spain in 1575--repudiate society's debt to the bankers. But, to wipe out the debt owed--on paper--to the bankers is to eliminate the capitalist class as a group of capitalists; capitalists and their bankers become nothing more than ordinary men and women, stripped of that mysterious power known as capital.

Once the capitalist has put himself head-over-heels into the game of speculation his survival as a capitalist depends upon increasing the proportion of national wealth diverted to profits. For twenty years, Western European cheap labor has been the critical margin of extra profits upon which U.S. finance has maintained its stability. (The cheaper labor is, the more profit per worker flows into the capitalist speculator's poker game.) Now, as the supply of European cheap labor approaches the point of diminishing returns, the survival of the speculator--postponing the crash--depends upon opening up a new investment market for vast quantities of even cheaper labor. This market exists nowhere but among the 2 billion most poverty-stricken peoples in the world. To be concrete, the U.S. atrocities in Viet Nam.

Why U. S. Needs Southeast Asia

What the late John F. Kennedy and others began pointing out in mid-1958 is that imperialism had failed thus far to open up the internal economies of the "under-developed" countries for profitable investments. Instead, as Lenin showed in his Imperialism, capitalist investments in Africa, Asia, Latin America had been mainly in raw materials and plantation crop production, in the production of commodities consumed by the industries and populations of the advanced countries. The super-profits milked out of these countries by imperialism resulted in the ruin of native industries and stripped those countries of the capital which would have been necessary to develop the internal economy in a capitalist fashion. Kennedy and others proposed to change that policy,

to milk surplus production off the backs of U.S. workers for the purpose of "priming the pump" of Latin American and other colonial economies, pouring in the wealth needed to provide profits there for runaway shops from the U.S. and Western Europe. This is the way, a "Third Stage of Imperialism," in which U.S. financiers hope to save themselves, by seizing a new source of super-profits from the backs of the cheapest and poorest labor in the world.

This policy was spelled out in rather clear terms by Eisenhower's 1960 State of the Union Address on Foreign Policy. At the very instant Eisenhower was giving that address, U.S. State Department representatives were putting it into effect in India, negotiating with the Indian government a treaty which gave necessary concessions, protection and bonuses to both U.S. and Western European capital. Kennedy's notorious "Alliance For Progress" and his Cuban Invasion were abortive efforts to apply Eisenhower's "Third Stage of Imperialism" policy to Latin America. The recently pressed Latin American "Common Market" scheme is only a much better planned attempt in the same direction. The U.S. atrocities in Viet Nam are another essential leg of that same Eisenhower-Kennedy-Johnson policy.

The only hope for U.S. capitalism today is the vast labor market found in India and in the more advanced sectors of Latin America. Yet, the possibilities of opening of India for intensive imperialist investment are held back by the present fact that the Indian economy cannot feed its population; it is out of the question to hope to divert India's labor into industries until a source of food can be found. In the last days of British Raj, Burmese rice was a cornerstone of British imperialist investment. Today, Burma is not sufficient. However, the rich Mekong River Basin of Southeast Asia, Cambodia, South Viet Nam, etc., could readily supply that need. That is the reason for the \$2 billion Mekong River Development Project--which has continued through the recent years of war--and the war in Viet Nam. If the U.S. does not gain control of the Southeast Asian deltas, its schemes for imperialist exploitation of India go out the window.

The "Managed Social Revolution"

In his recent address to Latin American ministers, Johnson underlined the urgent need for a "managed social revolution" in the backward countries, such as Latin America.

In the old days of "United Fruit" Imperialism, the U.S. State Department (or CIA) changed governments in Latin America by a friendly chat with a colonel commanding a barracks near the national capital, or dug up some fascist adventurer, like Castillo Armas in the overthrow of Arbenz in Guatemala, and put a State Department official, such as the late John Peurifoy, in charge of the reorganization. That was good enough for the old kind of imperialism.

However, the new stage of imperialism finds its old allies, the juntist colonel cliques and the latifundists, the greatest social and political obstacles. The internal capitalist development of an economy requires an agricultural policy like that of the "free soilers" to replace the plantation serf-slave system. In effect, present U.S. imperialist policies require a reenactment of the U.S. Civil War of the 1860's in Latin America, Africa, Asia, to eliminate the military-slaveholder class there as U.S. industrialists were compelled to destroy its own such class before. Johnson & Company are therefore compelled to seek a new revolutionary force which will overthrow the juntists and latifundists, but they demand assurances that this new revolutionary force will submit entirely to U.S. imperialist policies and interests. That is what Johnson means by a "managed social revolution."

In these terms the reader can understand two remarkable contradictions in U.S. foreign policy since 1958. First, the case of the Castro Revolution, which the U.S. State Department and New York Times supported up to about the third month of the regime. Secondly, the fact that U.S. pressure forced the Belgians to grant power to the same Lumumba government that the U.S. connived to overthrow and massacre a few months later. The U.S., out of necessity, is constantly dabbling in experiments with native revolutionary movements. However, at the instant that these same native movements even tend toward the Castro road, the U.S. reverts to alliance with the same old gang it was conniving to overthrow a few moments before! The recent history of Viet Nam is filled with such contradictory shifts in U.S. policy. This is also the recent history of the Dominican Republic, for example.

The Growing Desperation in Washington

Whenever the danger of a new 1929 is discussed in official circles, there is a spate of whistling in the dark about the so-called "built-in stabilizers." It is usually argued that the past twenty years of U.S. prosperity have proven the powers of these so-called stabilizers. In fact, these stabilizers have never been put to a real test. Furthermore, one of the most important of these stabilizers, the 1946 "Full Employment Policy," was peremptorily junked in mid-1958.

In general, these stabilizers work like a dike before a river flood. They lessen the danger to the community from minor floods, but make the force of a more powerful flood all the more deadly once a flood arises with sufficient force to overcome the dikes. These "stabilizers" can also be compared with the use of aspirin and other drugs which ease the symptoms of a disease without curing the disease itself.

The real danger to the U.S. economy does not show nor arise in a clear form in the U.S. economy itself. In fact, the U.S. economy appears to be rather strong and stable internally. The growing threat to that economy is most visible

in the international money markets.

One must recognize that the margin for U.S. prosperity in the past two decades has been mainly the success with which U.S. capital has found super-profits in Western Europe, Canada, Japan. As long as that expanding foreign investment continues to provide sufficient new super-profits each year, the grave internal weaknesses in the U.S. economy simply do not come to the surface in a way that will leave an impression upon the U.S. worker enjoying full employment. However, to the U.S. financier, the persistence of the U.S. and British balance of payments crisis since 1958 is a sure sign of an approaching repetition of 1929 on a vast scale and depth. (Just as Marx described this process in Volume III of Capital)

In fact, the last of the European economies to "boom," Italy, has been in a process of contraction for two years. The French franc is particularly strong at this moment because the French economy is stagnating in its industrial sector and enjoying a temporary boom in the market for such commodities as French wheat. West Germany is entering the first stage of an inflationary crisis like that which preceded the 1957-58 recession in the U.S. In fact, a recent improvement in the U.S. balance of payments position is partly a result of the inability of Western Europe to absorb a growing flood of U.S. investment and speculative capital. The most striking warning signs come from Britain, still muddling precariously in the after-effects of the November Sterling Crisis. The collapse of the British Pound is increasingly probable, a collapse which could easily trigger a worldwide depression.

While these signs of an approaching crisis in the Advanced capitalist countries grow more frequent, the U.S. is faced with a record of failure to date in its schemes for launching the "Third Stage of Imperialism." Particularly, the U.S. faces a decisive crisis in the Mekong River Basin, the key to its whole policy for India. It would be absolutely naive to preclude the U.S. resort to an exemplary demonstration of force, even limited nuclear bombardment, in its determination to terrorize resistance through the colonial and semi-colonial countries. If this is madness, it can only be that the very existence of the capitalist class today is madness.

Civil Rights and the Witchhunt

The military forces which the U.S. has committed to Viet Nam today are plainly only hostages "American boys" readily overrun if massive countermeasures are taken by the Chinese. The next step is to convert Southeast Asia to a new Korea, with these present Marines to offer the blood with which to whip up a war-fervor for that involvement. It can not be denied that such token forces are being introduced just at the time that the U.S. systematically approaches the point at which it will compel China to defend itself.

However, the draft-age American student's opposition to that war suggests a more significant source of resistance at home than Truman experienced during his Korean Adventure, when leading writers were complaining that U.S. troops weren't pulling their triggers as frequently as they should. The focal point of social ferment at home is the Civil Rights struggle, to which the student movements tend to attach themselves.

Johnson's obvious policy is to combine a program of cheap concessions to the Civil Rights struggle, such as the right to vote in the South, with a hand-in-hand policy of stepped-up witch-hunts against the radicals. Johnson must fear most the possibility that the broadly-based Civil Rights and student struggles will take an openly socialist character.

Johnson's legitimate fears on this account are of two kinds. A linking of the socialist struggle with the Civil Rights and student ferment would transform that ferment from amorphous protest, easily dispersed and frustrated, into an organized principled opposition with a mass base. Secondly, the American ruling class is in no serious danger, even from a depression, as long as there is no organized movement ready to replace the capitalist class in running production. People have to eat; an advanced industrial society like the U.S. represents an urban population which begins to literally starve very soon once production and transportation come to a halt. Out of the very need to eat, U.S. workers and others will make every concession to Johnson & Company up to the point that there exists an alternative mass organization capable of keeping the wheels of production and distribution turning.

It is a cruel fact that the U.S. has enough terror-power to destroy the VietNameese people. The only force that can stop that destruction in its tracks is a political movement that fights such a war to the last ditch at home.

A campaign against this war must not be directed to the conscience of the King, but is only significant as a call to smoke the King out of his lair, a call for the mobilization of students and workers to replace the financiers' government with one of their own. Such a campaign is obviously bankrupt unless each step of it is accompanied by organization of the students and workers for a new government, a new industrial management to fill the vacuum left by the defeat of the financiers'.

This campaign must show that the war in VietNam is part and parcel of Johnson's policy (as it was Kennedy's before him) to hold down the wages and working conditions of trade unionists, to increase tax burdens at Federal, State and Local levels and to send their sons and brothers to slaughter. This campaign must prove and make clear that finance-capitalism is fighting for its survival, and that nothing will stop the war and the anti-labor campaign except the out-and-out defeat of Johnson and his masters. Again, all that is meaningless, ineffective, unless it produces an alliance of workers and students confident of its ability to run the means of production and government if Johnson and his masters resign or go bankrupt.

A STUDY IN CONTRASTS

BEHIND THE CLASHES BETWEEN SNCC AND SCLC

A Participant's Report

The differences between Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee are most apparent in the structure and philosophy of the organizations. SNCC tries to build a grass roots movement from the bottom. Rather than working with the established "leaders" of the black community, SNCC tries to get the people involved in making the movement's decisions. SNCC seeks those local people who have real influence, whether or not they are recognized by the established leaders and the white power structure. Consequently SNCC's community leaders are as likely to be sharecroppers and bootleggers as they are to be preachers and dentists.

SNCC has found that many of the traditional leaders--preachers, insurance salesmen, undertakers, etc.-- all of whom have achieved some kind of prominence and security in the white-ordered black world -- may often stop short of the most militant goals, in order to protect the measure of respect, influence or prosperity that they have achieved. On the other hand the poorest Negroes, once their fears are overcome, are usually more militant, more willing to see large-scale changes, less likely to be satisfied with bones thrown them by moderates and liberals.

Many liberal politicians who supported the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party's challenge of the Mississippi delegation at the Democratic National Convention were quite shocked when the MFDP refused to accept the compromise consisting of mixed MFDP and regular Democratic representation. As usual, SNCC leaders were accused of being overly militant at the expense of their people, but it was the delegates themselves (against the opposition of some SNCC leaders) who rejected the compromise. The Freedom delegates, most of whom had never before left the state, and who had embarked on this venture knowing that upon their return their jobs, homes and lives would be in jeopardy, indignantly explained that they, who were willing to risk everything for their rights, would not compromise with evil.

SCLC, which is led by the more respectable, established elements of the Negro community, can not take such an uncompromising position. The SCLC people can not afford to lay everything on the line, for they have too much to lose. They can not declare, as did the Freedom delegates, that since they have so little, they might as well lose everything in hopes of gaining victory, rather than gaining half a victory and still losing everything.

SNCC asks the people to make policy decisions. This

summer SNCC will hold people's conferences in which the people of the various SNCC areas will convene to decide what work is to be done. As it looks now, Northern summer project volunteers will be sent to Washington, D.C. where they will lobby their Congressmen. If a people's conference decides that it wants Northern volunteers, it will request their aid. The volunteers will be sent South from Washington and will be under the direction of the local people.

King Replaces the People with a Messiah

SCLC does not leave decisions up to the people. Martin Luther King, introduced as the "Twentieth Century Moses," comes to town with great fanfare; his staff works through the established organizations, usually the churches. The SCLC staff harangues the crowd, building up their enthusiasm, prior to the arrival of the great Dr. King. By the time King arrives the people are screaming to be led.

Dr. King talks to the crowd for a few minutes prior to conferring with his staff and local leaders. In conference a plan of action is presented, after which King tells the people what to do. In contrast, SNCC tries to put as much responsibility as possible in the hands of local militants. SCLC subordinates the local leaders. SCLC leads the people; SNCC trains the people to lead themselves.

Due to its smoother, more professional organization, SCLC is more likely to impress outside observers. Newsmen are not kept waiting while two sharecroppers with the aid of a SNCC field secretary try to decide what to do and then ask for support from the crowd, and likely as not be questioned by the crowd on their proposal. SCLC's well-considered advance plans, responsible leaders, highly developed, smoothly running organization, and clear chain of command make it easier for observers to grasp what is going on.

In comparison, SNCC looks ragged, haphazard, unorganized and irresponsible. However, when King's circus has left town, SNCC will still be there, slowly and patiently developing the local people. Because it has no personality cult comparable to the King worship in which the Southern Negro (and the Northern white) are encouraged to engage, SNCC people suffer none of the demoralization comparable to that found in SCLC towns when King leaves.

The Messiah Leaves But the People Are Not Free

When Dr. King comes to town the people expect Moses to lead them to their freedom. They think it will be easy, necessitating only the courage to demonstrate. However, when King leaves, the local leaders who lack King's personal magnetism, the outsider's mediating disinterest (enabling him to rise above petty jealousies), the ability to devote full time to the job, and the requisite leadership experience, are left in charge of the movement. Consequently, the movement

sinks into lethargy and dissolves into petty quarrelling while the mass of the people feel betrayed for though Dr. King has come and gone they are still not free.

The white power structure takes advantage of this demoralization to renege on what few concessions the demonstrations had gained which causes further demoralization. Those who demonstrated and worked so hard begin to lose faith in the movement. This is especially true of the militant youth whom SNCC recognizes as being the most valuable to the movement.

Many of the students who demonstrated in Birmingham two years ago are today dispirited and contemptuous of the movement. Since the demonstrations stopped, civil rights progress for the mass of the Negroes has been negligible. The same old leaders, mostly ministers, are using the same worn out slogans on a dwindling number of supporters. The militant youth are being used for voter registration campaigns (to elect who?), while they see the white power structure renege on its agreements. The students watched stores refuse to upgrade negro personnel. They watched while Jim Crow signs were ostensibly removed, but in many buildings portions of the former lettering were left in place to remind all which facilities were restricted to whites. The heralded biracial commission which was to institute the "dialogue" between black and white never even met! Is it any wonder that people are demoralized?

Because SNCC recognizes the danger of demoralization, it does not emphasize leading the people through spectacular mass actions for short term gains, concentrating instead upon building a mass movement with indigenous local leadership.

What Happened In Montgomery, Alabama

The situation in Montgomery, Alabama last March represents the failure of SCLC to sustain a living mass movement. Montgomery was the scene of Martin Luther King's first triumph. In 1955 the Montgomery Improvement Association staged the first mass civil rights action in the deep south. When SNCC sought to resume mass action, it found that there was no longer any movement in Montgomery. Ten years after its victory the MIA had become moribund and stagnant. SNCC was even denied use of Dr. King's old church, the Dexter Avenue Baptist Church!

In the face of this apathy and hostility SNCC turned away from the recognized leaders and looked to the students of Alabama State College. The college students were joined in the streets by high school students. Volunteers poured in from the north. Even the older Negroes participated in what was by now a truly mass movement by feeding and housing the demonstrators. The people of Montgomery who for so many years had looked to a stodgy group of do-nothing leaders were now moving on their own.

SNCC suggested, but rarely led. SNCC encouraged, but did not order. Decisions on whether to march or not were left to mass meetings. In doing so SNCC encouraged the people of Montgomery, especially the youth to assume leadership, not by tagging after the celebrities and watching their methods, but by having the situation handed over to them. Their oratory did not compare to Dr. King's. Their leadership qualities did not develop overnight, causing occasional confusion and delay, much to the chagrin of many northerners who stressed "organization," not realizing the need for the new leaders to test their wings.

SNCC assumes that the only successful mass movement will be one which satisfies the needs of the people. SNCC is guided by the people's desires, and by working with them for many months helps the people devise the methods for obtaining their goals. SNCC's way is one of slow trial and error, but the final results are the ones most directly beneficial to the people, because the people themselves have formulated their destinies. In contrast, SCLC's master plans tell the people what to do. This "painting by numbers" can not develop artistic skills any more than leadership and goals imposed from the top upon a sheep-like following can develop a self-sustaining, dynamic, mass movement.

SCLC leaders, for instance, would not allow their people to behave as did the **Mississippi Freedom Delegates**, in rejecting a chance to become a part of the power structure. SCLC's basic premise is that equality can be achieved within capitalistic society. Though King denounced Roger Blough of US Steel for refusing to intervene in Birmingham, King is in the paradoxical position of still desiring to integrate into the very society whose interests lie in preventing integration. SCLC is still involved in the "hamburger-hotel" phase of civil rights activity, which means that they are fighting for black and white equality in both the country clubs and the relief lines. SNCC is interested in basic changes in society and is active in other humanitarian causes, such as aiding the miners of eastern Kentucky and speaking out against US aggression in Vietnam. King, however, prefers to remain aloof from any controversies not connected with Negro rights, a strange position for the recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize!

ON THE ROLE OF NORTHERNERS

Their belief in the possibility of equality within the present system often leads SCLC to pander to northern liberal elements to a degree detrimental to the movement, as can be seen in the manner in which SCLC encouraged press coverage of northern volunteers in Selma. Thenorthern papers were filled with stories and pictures of the many heroic northerners who poured into Selma. In Montgomery, on the other hand, SNCC tended to deemphasize the role of the northerners, perhaps to highlight the actions of the Alabama State College Students and the people of Montgomery. SNCC Deemphasized the northerners, not because of any "black racism", as the unimformed often assert, but because SNCC recognized the

need to strengthen the pride and self-image of the people of Montgomery who would have to bear the racist counter-attack long after the northerners had gone home. While SNCC did not mean to **disparage** these northern allies, SNCC made it clear that it was not running a movement to enhance the **egos of friendly northerners**. SCLC's emphasis on white volunteers **no way strengthened** the resolve of the people of Selma. Once again, in an effort to court northern liberal support, SCLC sacrificed the best interests of the movement, in this case the strengthening of the emerging southern Negro.

There are instances where SCLC's spectacular campaigns with their massive press coverage and hundreds of short term northern volunteers are valuable to the movement, so long as they are properly handled. Shortly after the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Bill, SNCC which had been in Selma since 1963, decided to test the public accommodations section at a local theater. As the black people lined up at the ticket booth, Sheriff Jim Clark announced that the queued Negroes **were unlawfully assembled** and set his club wielding posse upon them. The posse proceeded to attack not only those at the theater, but to beat every Negro they could find!

A BODY WITH ITS HEAD CUT OFF

The press never reported this incident which equalled "bloody Sunday" of March 7, 1965. SNCC knew that unless there was more extensive press coverage, future demonstrations would result in massacres. The press seemed disinclined to waste their time on any deep south actions in which northern whites were not involved. Consequently, it was desirable for Martin Luther King to come to Selma, for only a spectacular campaign could attract the press coverage needed to prevent a massacre. SCLC specializes in these campaigns which are necessary to the movement. Unfortunately, SCLC's methods in the long run serve to negate many of their short-term gains, and by being **too willing to compromise** (placing too much faith in the white power structure which in all cases has reneged on agreements), **SCLC** raises the movement to new heights and leaves it hanging in the air, as soon as the white power structure reneges, as soon as the racists counter-attack, the leaderless movement collapses like a body with its head cut off.

SNCC on the other hand, develops local leadership, and works to fulfill the desires of the people by refusing to settle for half a loaf in detriment to a long term goal. SNCC operates behind enemy lines and works with the people like a guerilla force, while SCLC acts like a fire brigade.