

Anti-War GIs	
Defy the Brass	P. 3
Behind Suez, 1956	P. 4
Oil Co. Politics	P. 5
Yemen-Aden	P. 6

# U.S. Is the Real Sponsor Of Israel's Attack on the Arabs

## Workers World Party Statement on Mideast

The war in the Middle East is not so much a war of the Arab nations against Israel as it is a struggle of the incipient Arab revolution against U.S., British and French imperialism. Israel's attack on Egypt is not the desperate attempt of a beleaguered people to defend itself, but the first blow of a new imperialist onslaught against the oppressed Arab masses.

It is not "little" Israel against the manifold Arab peoples, but giant imperialism against the struggling Arabs. It is only a measure of the cynicism of the Western monopolists that they utilize their own victims, the more oppressed of the Jewish people, against those whom they are exploiting on the most grandiose scale—the super-oppressed Arab peoples.

### Soviet Leaders' Sellout

The UN Security Council "Cease Fire," announced as we go to press, is not an instrument of peace, but a weapon of further subjugation over the Arab countries. It is a result of the collusion of revisionist Soviet leaders with imperialism.

The Soviet leaders, who have every motive to defend the Middle East, including the motive of the defense of the Soviet Union itself, have capitulated to imperialism and sold out the Arab revolution.

Their vote for Cease Fire was a vote to validate U.S.-Israel's conquests. In explaining their vote, they continued to condemn "Israeli aggression," but in agreeing to a Cease Fire with no conditions, they really approved the aggression and guaranteed the fruits of aggression to Israel and the United States.

Moreover, in failing to condemn the United States by name, in failing to condemn the arrogant hypocrisy of the U.S. Delegate at the UN, who had the nerve (after Vietnam) to speak of his love of "peace," the Soviet UN Delegate gave proof positive of his capitulation.

### The Lie of U.S. "Neutrality"

The U.S. Government, which moved from "neutrality in word, thought and deed" to "non-belligerence" in a matter of hours, was in fact backing Israel from the beginning. And the U.A.R.'s charge of U.S. providing air cover for Israel must be given the fullest credence in the circumstances. Like the British-French role in 1956, the U.S. role is a key and vital factor. But since the great powers, including the Soviet Union, are unwilling to expose the U.S., the fiction of U.S. "neutrality" is fortified.

U.S. neutrality is a LIE. Both the Hawks and the Doves are in an unholy alliance to step into the war — but only if Israel does not win by itself. If Israel cannot keep the Arabs in line, then the U.S. will move to do so.

### The Oil Companies and Revolution

The capitalist rulers of the United States are determined to keep the Arabs subjugated for two main reasons: first, because the fabulous riches in oil mainly enriches those very U.S. corporations which have the greatest strength in the U.S. Government; second, because any revolutionary development anywhere in the world strengthens world socialism and weakens world capitalism. This is especially true in the Mideast, which has been for centuries and still is, a strategic pivot of world power.

Superficially, it appears that the oil barons are less anxious to aid Israel than are some of their opponents in the ruling class. Superficially, it appears that the Hawks on Vietnam are Doves on the Mideast (the reverse is only too true!) Superficially, it appears that the U.S. oil kings would back the governments in this war which guard the oil wealth and which guarantee the lush royalties for Wall Street — that is, some of the more reactionary Arab governments.

But such is not the case.

There isn't one single reliable prop for imperialism among the Arab states — aside from the most reactionary and decadent monarchies, whom the slightest revolutionary wind would blow down. The more unstable of these regimes have little stomach for a fight, and are frightened to death of revolution by their own people. If such a revolution develops, the present war will be intensified and the U.S. will inevitably intervene against the people's struggle.

Thus the U.S. is reduced to backing Israel, contradictory and embarrassing though it may be for the oil companies, because of the lack of any reliable Arab puppet. And it tries in vain to conceal its war alliance from the Arabs and from the anti-war masses in the United States.

### The Bigots Who Back Israel

Washington is not only not a friend of the Jewish masses; it is their worst enemy. Even an open war alliance with Israel would not alter and might even increase the anti-Semitism of imperialism. It is not the Jewish nation that Wall Street supports, but the Israeli bankers, puppet politicians and vassal warriors of the U.S. banks. The Jewish people are fully as expendable as the Arabs in the calculations of the oil companies and their Government.

Continued on Page 2

## SOVIET LEADERS JOIN U.S., BRITAIN TO CRUSH ARAB FREEDOM STRUGGLE

NEW YORK, June 7 — The Ambassador of the Soviet Union to the United Nations repeated his disgraceful performance at yesterday's Security Council meeting again today and agreed to a Cease Fire in the Mideast with no penalty for the aggressor in that conflict.

After sanctioning such a capitulatory Cease Fire last night, and after being confronted with Israel's ignoring of the Cease Fire, the Soviet Ambassador had called for another meeting of the Security Council today.

At this afternoon's meeting, however, Soviet Ambassador Nikolai Fedorenko contented himself with merely advising Israel to stop its military advance at precisely four p.m. today and threatened if this was not done, to break relations with... Israel.

This after six Arab nations had already broken relations with the United States (four more did likewise in the next three hours) and after the Egyptians had accused the U.S. of active collaboration with Israel!

Some UN observers suggested that the second position — that of today — arose out of pressure from other colonial and semi-colonial countries rather than from the difficult military situation in the Arab world.

True, the New York Times editorialized this morning that: "The Soviet backdown on the effort to add a troop withdrawal clause to the Cease Fire appeal in a form that would have indirectly endorsed Egypt's blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba was recognition of the military facts of life."

But the Arab Delegates to the UN did not react this way, and obviously, the still-fighting Arab soldiers in the Mideast, who refused to heed the Cease Fire did not, either.

The Delegate from Iraq said (but was not quoted by the Times): "The meaning of this (Soviet capitulation) will not be lost on the Arab people." And he later observed, "The Arab people will re-consider their position."

Fedorenko, it is true, told the Council that it was its "duty" to pass another resolution — after the Cease Fire — calling for the "immediate and unconditional withdrawal" of Israeli forces. But even this high-sounding (but weak, since it didn't call for restitution of the borders of June 4) statement of intention proved to be only that.

Clearly the Soviet leaders had given guarantees and had given the Arab leaders reason to think they would have offered some aid in an emergency like the present one. (President Nasser had highly complimented the Soviet stand just a week ago.) And for the Moscow leaders to bow out at this point is surely regarded as a betrayal in large parts of the world.

The Soviet motion at the Security Council today was all the more of an anti-climax, however, because it mended none of the political shambles of last night and showed little sign of preventing a still bigger political and military shambles tomorrow.

The UN, only a do-nothing talk shop at best and an open instrument of imperialism at worst, was treated almost as a personal parliamentary forum by the U.S. Ambassador, Arthur Goldberg, who was permitted to lecture the Arab Delegates and orate his Government's "opposition to violence" (!) with impunity again today, as he was last night.

This was obviously the fault of the Soviet Ambassador, who could have turned the tables by exposing the true U.S. role and who could have held out for a Cease Fire that included the provision of a return to the military positions of June 4.

The toothless resolution of the USSR today, demanding that Israel observe the Cease Fire by 4 p.m. (or else the Soviet Union would "break relations") was passed with obliging and relieved unanimity by the Security Council in a few minutes time. Not much is expected to come of it.

Israel has now taken nearly all of the Sinai Peninsula including its cities, and boasts that it will hold the Jordanian part of Jerusalem indefinitely.

The U.S., which is so loudly "neutral," is "expected" to sponsor some kind of a pull-back — later on. As the New York Times said today, "If the U.S. went along with too severe a pro-Israeli settlement, it might undermine political stability and American influence in the Arab nations of the region."

But even if a partial pull-back is actually effected, it will still leave the balance of power in the Mideast seriously altered — and altered in the disfavor of the Soviet Union, to say nothing of the plight of the Arab peoples.

Therefore it is highly probable that the Soviet leaders will make some new attempt to redress the balance — probably under less auspicious circumstances and certainly with less enthusiastic partners than it had yesterday.

The Soviet leaders may even be replaced by other leaders, and of course it is to be hoped that the replacements will be an improvement. But nothing can alter the fact of the present sell-out and nothing is likely to alter the fundamentally conciliationist character of Kossygin, Brezhnev and Co.

Since the Soviet Union is a socialist republic, the Soviet leaders have enjoyed the undeserved prestige of the October Revolution — whose 50th anniversary they are taking great pains to celebrate — even up to the present time.

Now, however, the likelihood is that things will be the other way around for a time. These leaders are likely to be in such disgrace among the oppressed that they will find it extremely difficult to get support — even when the issue requires it. And even those who succeed them, be they as militant and as revolutionary as they should be, will find it hard to convince the oppressed of the world of their devotion to Communism without new and tougher tests.

# WORKERS WORLD



Editorial office:

46 W. 21st Street, New York, N. Y.

Telephone: AL 5-0352

Editor: Vincent Copeland

Manager: Dorothy Ballan

Vol. 9, No. 12 — June 9, 1967

Published Twice Monthly

## Mideast Statement

Continued from Page 1

The rulers of the United States collaborated with Hitler before World War 2, just as Hitler's heirs in the West German Government now collaborate with Israel — the Israeli state, that is, not the Jewish people. The most oppressed of the Jewish people are now slated to become the victims of U.S. imperialism in the future, as they were the victims of German imperialism in the past.

Eshkol, Eban, Dayan and Ben Gurion are not the representatives of the Jewish masses, but the jingoistic tools of Washington. The state of Israel is itself a tool of imperialism, and all the more effective a tool because the age-old oppression of the Jews causes many of the oppressed to identify with Israel.

The so-called "Jewish question" can never be settled by Israel oppressing other nationalities on behalf of imperialism, but only by a struggle of the Jewish nation against the imperialism which subjugates all oppressed nationalities.

### What Should Be Done

The solution of the conflict should be effected along the following lines:

1. The U.S. should get out; out of the Middle East; out of the Mediterranean; out of Israel.
2. The Palestinian Arabs should be returned to their homeland on a status quo ante basis.
3. The Israelis should renounce all ties to imperialism and seek an alliance with the Arabs against it.
4. There should be no interference in the internal affairs of the Arab and Jewish nations by any outside power.
5. The oil of the Mideast should belong to the peoples of the Mideast and the oil companies of the U.S. should be made to return the property they have stolen.

—June 6, 1967

## Appeal From SNCC

Dear Editor:

Since you are one of the few progressive newspapers around, we have a special request for you. A group of citizens of Mill Valley, California are handling a National Stamp Drive to help equip our garage.

Over the past couple of years, we have been able to exchange the stamps for a great deal of the equipment which keeps our cars operational for our field workers. Among the things which we have acquired are: electrical tire-changing apparatus, several battery chargers, analyzing machine, an air meter, voltage regulator machine, a wheel balancer, and three '65 Falcon

Econoline buses. This has been of invaluable service to us and our work.

In this regard, I am requesting that you give a small space in the next available issue of your paper for the purpose of informing your readers of the Stamp Drive and asking them to send stamps to the:

Marin County Friends of SNCC  
P.O. Box 210  
Mill Valley, California

We have been accepting all kinds of stamps and will continue to do so. However, the S & H Green, Blue Chip, Top Value, Holden Red and Gold Bond have been the most productive.

Thank you sincerely for any help which you can give.

Yours in the struggle,  
Stanley Wise  
Executive Secretary



"Give Him a Fair Trial and Hang Him!"

## Three Years for Capt. Levy

By J. MOORE

The angry and fearful military brass has jailed a young anti-war doctor, a captain in their army. The U.S. Army (in the person of a colonel who looked like — and acted like — a transfer from the Nazi general staff) made a brutal display of its feelings when the colonel handcuffed and dragged Levy away.

The mild-mannered young doctor had refused to help train Green Beret troops for their killing operation in Vietnam. He had also spoken of his opposition to the war to individual soldiers. The military brass already hot and worried about the rising tide of opposition to the war from soldiers as well as civilians, decided to use the military heel.

The trial of Levy was, however, to be conducted as a showcase of fairness and justice — until the verdict.

Capt. Levy was able to bring in friends and relatives and even allowed to try (briefly) to prove that the Army Green Beret troops were committing war crimes. They weren't, of course, the Army judges decided — in spite of the fact that, in the short time allowed, Levy's defense had already brought forward such information as that concerning the bounty of ten dollars Green Berets offer mountain tribesmen for

each right ear of a Liberation fighter they have killed, and some reports of the cruel removal of civilians from their homes.

The strong anti-war feeling reflected itself in testimony by fellow officers. Another young doctor said he would not train Green Berets if the training aided them in killing.

A higher-ranking medical officer testified that other doctors had resisted the Green Beret training; he said he felt that jailing Levy would cause more problems among doctors.

Capt. Levy, who disclaimed any radical philosophy and proclaimed that he was a loyal American, was also allowed to have respectable anti-war Dr. Benjamin Spock as a defense witness — Spock did a rather cautious job.

Day after day the press carried the news of the Levy trial with the measured pronouncements of the Army judges appearing as the careful and just weighing of all evidence according to Army regulations, the U.S. Constitution and God Almighty.

But when the verdict of three years was announced the handcuffs were forcibly clamped on the unresisting young doctor, the Army's method was clear: give him a "fair trial" — and then hang him!

## "Muhammed Ali Is Being Framed!" Say Anti-War Demonstrators in Ohio

CLEVELAND, June 3 — A coalition of groups demonstrated for 2 hours here this afternoon in support of Muhammad Ali's refusal to be inducted into the U.S. Army and his opposition to the war in Vietnam.

The militant demonstrators chanted "Hell No, We Won't Go!" and "Black Power" as they marched in front of the Federal Building in downtown Cleveland. The pickets also carried signs bearing such slogans as "Smash the Frame-up of Muhammad Ali", "America is the Black Man's Battleground" and "Fight Against White Racism, Not Against the Vietnamese."

The demonstration was initiated by the Cleveland Committee Against War and Fascism which issued a leaflet denouncing the U.S. Government frame-up of the Black Nationalist Fighter as a

"blow to the anti-war movement." The leaflet also attacked the drafting of young men to make "The Rich Get Richer and the Poor Get Killed" in order to "help enslave the masses of Asia, Africa and Latin America."

Other groups which responded to the call and formed a coalition for the demonstration were the United Black Youth, The Committee to End the War in Vietnam and the Draft Resisters Union.

The Committee Against War and Fascism recently held its first demonstration against white supremacist George Wallace, governor-by-proxy of Alabama, when he appeared in Cleveland. The Committee may be reached at P.O. Box 91131, Cleveland Ohio, 44101 or Box 75, Youngstown, Ohio, 44501.

## Footnote on the Opportunism of SWP

Coalitions and united fronts are all right and sometimes excellent, including coalitions against the U.S. war drive.

But in the coalition known as the "Spring Mobilization Committee," much of the left has shown a tendency to capitulate to the right.

Last Sunday evening for example, at a meeting of the administrative committee of this coalition, Harry Ring, a leader of the Socialist Workers Party, nominated Al Evanoff, a representative of District 65, Retail and Wholesale Workers AFL-CIO, to be a co-chairman of the Spring Mobilization.

What is wrong with that? Only that Al Evanoff had just explained a half hour before that his organization was "somewhat to the right of the 'Negotiations Now' position!"

The SWP, which is opposed to the false position of "Negotiations Now"

in words, manages to conciliate with those who are "to the right" of this position in action.

Evanoff, of course, tries to create the impression that he himself is a true-blue fighter against the war, but "only" the organization he represents is weak on it. However, his standing in the Spring Mobilization Committee, which is a coalition of organizations, is directly related to his union. (Whether the worker members are really as backward as he tries to make out is another question.)

The SWP, which, like the revisionist CP, tells its members and friends it is for unconditional withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam, in practice manages to support those who oppose it.

They do not do this because they want to support the war, but because they want people to support the SWP more than they want to bring the troops home.

### SUBSCRIBE NOW!

A 6 mo. sub to WORKERS WORLD for only \$1.25 — 1 yr. for \$2.50.

Fill in coupon and mail to:

Workers World, 46 W. 21st St., N.Y. 10, N.Y.

NAME .....

STREET .....

CITY..... ZONE..... STATE.....



# Soldier Defies Brass as He Fights for Right Of All GIs to Resist the U.S. Imperialist War

## YAWF Organizes Defense With ECLC Lawyer, Demonstrates in Army Court Against Verdict

By JOHN MOORE

FORT SILL, Okla., June 1 — A group of anti-war youths interrupted an Army court-martial of a soldier opposing the war here this afternoon. Their angry anti-war chants followed the announcement by Captain Daniel E. Bartholomew that the soldier Pvt. Andrew D. Stapp, was guilty of refusing an order to open his foot-locker and turn over anti-war literature in the locker.

When Captain Bartholomew announced the verdict of "guilty" a group from Youth Against War & Fascism who were sitting in the courtroom and who had earlier applauded Pvt. Stapp's attack on the U.S. war policy, burst into angry shouts. First Mrs. Maryann Weissman, spokesman for the group, broke into the measured phrases of the Army captain and charged in loud tones that shattered the quiet of the hot, humid courtroom: "It's not Pvt. Stapp that is on trial here but the U.S. aggressive war policy and you are a tool of that policy!" Though Captain Bartholomew ordered a sergeant to remove Mrs. Weissman from "my" courtroom if she did not stop her attack, she defied him and continued her charges and the captain did not carry through his order. The group of four young men and three young women then began to shout, "The brass is the tool of Wall Street rule" and other chants such as "Big firms get rich, GI's Die"

and "GI's, Don't be cannon fodder in Vietnam!"

The shouting reverberated through the hallways and through the open windows to the surrounding area where many GI's drawn by curiosity had managed to get within hearing distance. Inside the courtroom a number of soldiers sympathetic to Pvt. Stapp leaned forward in tense support of the chants. They had been warned previously not to participate in any demonstration but at least one could not prevent himself from joining.

Earlier in the trial Pvt. Stapp had taken the witness chair and after answering questions of the defense lawyer, David Rein, had made a statement in which he denounced the trial as an attempt to intimidate the "growing anti-war feeling in the battery" but, he said, "We are not going to let ourselves be intimidated." He concluded his statement with a demand that U.S. imperialism get out of foreign countries including Vietnam. His words were followed by a prolonged applause by the YAWF group.

In the tiny courtroom there were twenty-five chairs for observers, most of them filled by supporters of Pvt. Stapp. Pressmen from local papers and CBS sat in the front. One had a tape recorder but cameras were barred by the military authorities. During pauses in the early part of the

trial reporters turned to whisper questions to YAWF coordinator Maryann Weissman.

The trial itself was an amazing display of military "justice." Sitting at a front table was Captain Bartholomew who according to military methods was both judge and jury but when puzzled as to what to do he recessed the trial and asked his superiors what ruling he should make. During much of the trial he read from a prepared script in robot-like fashion.



Pvt. Andrew Stapp

In the trial, held in one of the large yellow concrete, red tile roofed barracks, as an occasional plane flew over and the "hup-hup-ho" of a marching unit passed nearby, it was brought out by Emergency Civil Liberties Committee defense lawyer Rein that the breaking open of Pvt. Stapp's army foot-locker and the confiscation of pieces of literature inside was not only a violation of the First and Fourth Amendments of the Constitution but that no Army regulation authorized such action. It was the lawyer's contention, therefore, that the order to Pvt. Stapp to open his foot-locker, and which he refused, was not a lawful order as required by military law.

In a blundering attempt to conceal the army chain of command in the action against Pvt. Stapp, Lt. John W. Urquhart, who gave the order, first claimed that he alone had originated the idea on his own. When a later witness, Sergeant Daniel E. Carnes, pointed to Lt. Col. John T. Price Jr. as the originator of the idea, Lt. Urquhart was recalled. After considerable prodding he then admitted that his previous statement was false. Presiding officer Captain Bartholomew then decided to call Col. Price. When defense lawyer Rein objected to the procedure of the captain being the judge, pointing out that he

would find it extremely difficult to rule against Price who was his commanding officer, Bartholomew blandly assured Rein that he would find no difficulty in being impartial.

It became more and more evident that the verdict was already written in advance, no matter what the evidence, (in the usual military manner) but even so the blunt statement by the captain after a scant five minute recess that Pvt. Stapp was guilty, in spite of the farcical evidence and blundering perjury of a principal prosecution witness, hit spectators as an absurdity. It was at this point that Mrs. Weissman began her denouncement of Captain Bartholomew, the entire military sham, and the war policy.

During the chanting, Captain-Jury-Judge Bartholomew attempted to continue the formalities of the trial, rising from his bench and shouting into the ears of lawyer Rein and Pvt. Stapp. The trial ended in this fashion.

The sentence of the court stripped Pvt. Stapp of his one grade, took two-thirds of his pay for a month, and put him on 45 days of hard labor without confinement.

Pvt. Stapp was immediately cornered by the press and TV men to whom he announced his determination to appeal the verdict and to continue his fight for social justice. He had previously announced that he was a revolutionary socialist who was working closely with Youth Against War & Fascism and Workers World Party.

A number of public actions, letters and statements, had testified to the fact that Pvt. Stapp was the leader of a considerable group of GI's in his battery who oppose the war. Following the trial it was clear, after talking to Pvt. Stapp and the other GI's around him, as well as observing the obvious sympathy of the many GI's who are becoming aware of what is going on, that the trial has succeeded in raising and widening the resistance of the GI's at Fort Sill.

In the confusion as the trial ended and the room was cleared, Pfc. Paul Richard Ilg, one of the GI's in the room, angered by the proceedings went up to Captain Bartholomew and allegedly charged him with tearing up the Constitution and throwing it on the floor. He also allegedly charged Lt. Urquhart with perjury.

Pfc. Ilg has stated that he would go to Leavenworth before he would go to Vietnam. He has now been arrested, as a result of the above encounter after the trial, and charged with insulting an officer.

## Now Pvt. Ilg Faces Court Martial

FT. SILL—Pfc. Richard Paul Ilg was placed under arrest last week and is now facing a court martial after he protested the kangaroo sentence given to Pvt. Andrew Stapp.

Witnesses report that Pfc. Ilg was highly incensed when Pvt. Stapp was sentenced to 45 days at hard labor despite the fact that the key witness against him, Lt. John W. Urquhart, was shown to have perjured himself.

After the trial was over, Pfc. Ilg is reported to have expressed strenuous

indignation to Lt. Urquhart, his battery commander, and told him "You perjured yourself."

Pfc. Ilg then is said to have approached the court martial officer-judge, Capt. Daniel E. Bartholomew, and told him "You tore up the Constitution and threw it on the floor!"

Later on, when an officer approached him with an offer to let the whole matter pass, Pfc. Ilg is said to have told him that he would rather go to Leavenworth.

## Other GI's Say: "Put the Brass on Trial, Not Ilg!"

FORT SILL, OKLA. 3 135P

(BY WESTERN UNION)

JUNE 3, 1967

WORKERS WORLD

46 WEST 21 ST NYK

WE MUST STRONGLY PROTEST THE UNJUST PERSECUTION OF PFC ILG. IT WAS NOT ILG WHO BROKE THE LAW BUT HIS BATTERY COMMANDER, ILG SHOULD BE EXONERATED AND LT URQUHART ARRESTED FOR PERJURY.

DENNIS MARTIN RA19862170

ANDY STAPP US52666589

DICK WHEATON RA16829142

PAUL GAEDTKE RA16833992, HQS BTRY 2ND HOW BN 2ND ARTY (52).



Pvt. Stapp, GIs in civilian clothes and YAWF supporters

## "Wall Street's War, Not Ours" Says Pvt. Stapp

Pvt. Stapp made the following statement to the press, which was passed out in the courthouse just before his trial.

I refused to let them take my literature because the First Amendment of the United States Constitution guarantees the right of All Americans to free speech. This guarantee certainly includes the right of revolutionary socialists to organize within the army against America's imperialist war of aggression in Vietnam.

We GIs say that this is not our war. It is Wall Street's war. To cite an example: Dow Chemical's stocks have soared as a result of the 25,000,000 pounds of napalm it sells each month to the military for use in Vietnam. At the same time, the death toll of American GIs has risen in proportion to profits and has now reached the new high last week alone of 337. One is haunted by the thought that such companies as Dow profit by the

use of napalm whose only target is man and has killed our fellow GIs (16 GIs of the First Infantry Division last fall) and innumerable Vietnamese.

Such thoughts prey on our minds and we begin to question and seek answers. Many men in the Unit are opposed to the war and have literature similar to that which was in my foot-locker.

I was singled out at random for punishment as a example to others for the purpose of intimidation.

The ruling class needs robots in its army but we refuse to be unthinking cannon fodder. We are learning every day that until the criminal capitalist system which breeds war, racism, and poverty is replaced by socialism, the working class youth of America will be impressed into the imperialist army and forced to die for Wall Street profits in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.



# Behind 1956 Attack on Egypt: Britain, France Used Israel as Pawn to Get Suez for West

## British Ex-Foreign Secretary Tells the Facts

By MILT SEAMAN

Washington is plotting and scheming at this moment on how to keep Wall Street's Middle East imperialist holdings intact.

These last few weeks in closed-door meetings, Johnson has been web-spinning with British and Israeli leaders and those of other governments to resolve the Arab crisis without increasing the flood of Arab nationalism and thus endanger the billions in profits that roll in from the Middle East.

Imperialist intrigue over the Middle East did not always center in Washington. In the summer of 1956 the centers were in London and Paris. The Suez Canal had just been nationalized by President Nasser, who had seized ownership from an Anglo-French company.

At that time the machinations were conducted by Anthony Eden, British Prime Minister; Guy Mollet, French "Socialist" Premier; and Ben-Gurion, the Israeli head of state.

The conspiracy hatched by these men to get back the Suez Canal for the West and overthrow the Nasser government somewhat resembles Washington's Bay of Pigs fiasco a few years later.

The story of the British-French-Israeli 1956 plot to invade Egypt has been more or less understood in political circles for many years. But now it has been publicly told in detail, naming the names, giving the dates and places.

Just before the present crisis, it was announced in Britain on May 1 that an expose was going to be published. A book appropriately named, "No End of a Lesson" and written by no less than Anthony Nutting, Minister of State for Foreign Affairs in Anthony Eden's Cabinet, is to be published later this summer. It is currently being serialized in the London Times.

Nutting describes the plan submitted by General Challe that called for a surprise attack by Israel in the Sinai

desert on Egyptian territory, to be followed by a joint Anglo-French ultimatum for a cease-fire by both parties. This was to give the appearance of not taking sides and of wanting only to stop the fighting.

Convinced that Nasser would not stop until Israeli forces were thrown back from Egyptian territory, the British-French forces would move in, "claiming to be separating the combatants" and "extinguishing a dangerous fire," as Nutting puts it. At the same time, the helpful imperialists would take over the Suez Canal, occupying the terminals at Suez and Port Said, break the Egyptian blockade of Israel, and then press for the overthrow of Nasser's regime.

As Nutting describes it, Eden was doing his best to control his excitement until he could call a Cabinet meeting to get complete approval. Then a hitch in the plans developed when Ben-Gurion stated he had grave misgivings about the plot.

The military advisers, among them General Dayan, the "hero" of that 1956 Sinai campaign (now appointed by the Eshkol government to head the "defense") did not like the plan because it didn't provide "adequate air cover" for the Israeli attack. Ben-Gurion wanted assurance that the Egyptian Air Force would be destroyed as soon as the Israeli force attacked. He wanted a further guarantee that the attack would also free the Egyptian blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba.

At another top-level secret meeting, this time in France, Ben-Gurion received complete assurance from Selwyn Lloyd, the Foreign Minister, that Britain would lend its fullest support and would back an Israeli attack that would seize Sharm El Sheikh, the Egyptian post that protects the entrance to the Gulf of Aqaba.

Israel agreed to go along with the plot and on October 29 it invaded Egypt and crossed over into the Sinai desert. At 4:30 p.m. the next day, following the plan exactly, the two imperialist powers delivered their ul-

timatum to Israel and Egypt to stop the fighting.

The book describes how, before Nasser could muster any military force to defend Egypt against the Israeli attack, British aircraft "in fulfillment of our pledge to Ben-Gurion" bombed four Egyptian airfields and followed with "attacks on a total of nine Egyptian aerodromes." The Israelis could now "continue their advance across the Sinai, safe in the knowledge that Nasser could neither retaliate against their cities, nor harass their progress in the field."

Although the military campaign was going according to schedule and British-French forces were getting ready to take the terminal posts at Port Said and Suez, a sharp split developed between them and the U.S., which Nutting says was furious that this dangerous plan had been undertaken without consultation in Washington.

Nutting, although very voluble on some phases of the plot, shows his British "reserve" on this question and says little about U.S. aims in the Mideast. Both the U.S. and the Soviet Union, for opposite reasons, opposed the coup and collaborated in quashing it, but with no comment by Nutting.

Then-Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev publicly threatened Britain and France by implication—with a rocket attack on their shores and then teamed up with the U.S. against the two countries in the UN.

The U.S., as a much stronger imperialist than France and Britain, was more interested in maneuvering with the Arab national revolution than in crushing it, and in elbowing its "allies" aside to some degree in the process.

The Soviet Union was interested in an alliance with Arab nationalism against imperialist penetration and at the time, undoubtedly viewed the association with the U.S. as a fortuitous but temporary alliance.

Nutting doesn't mention this, but complains mightily about U.S. economic pressure on Britain, reduction of oil shipments and a Wall Street squeeze on the pound. He is clearly part of that

faction in Britain which opposes helping the U.S. get any of its chestnuts out of the Mideastern fires.

Nutting describes Anthony Eden's anxiety and desire to pull back after his fingers were burnt.

The idea was to get Lester Pearson, then Canadian Foreign Minister, to put a plan forward in the UN Assembly for a UN force to take over from the British and French. Nutting tells how the French with the concurrence of the Israelis opposed this and proposed to speed up the military plan.

London reacted negatively to this. "Ministers felt that it would give the whole show away. The French were told bluntly that it would be impossible to answer the mounting accusations of collusion if the Israelis were now to advance to the Canal itself in a move palpably intended to cover the landing of the French troops. How could then we claim to be 'separating the combatants' and 'protecting' the Canal? Thus the French maneuver collapsed."

Nutting describes his feelings: "For myself this dramatic change of policy came as a great relief. But it still did not—and could not—expunge the stain which our collusion with France and Israel had left upon our record. Nor did it make amends for our bombing attacks on Egypt nor cancel the act of aggression which we were still to launch against Port Said and the Canal Zone." (This all to be "accomplished" before the UN take-over.)

Whether or not he would have resigned had the scurrilous plan succeeded is another question.

It was more than "the trust we had shattered and the moral leadership we had forfeited" that was lost. The many decades of British influence in the Middle East and the concomitant reward from those rich oilfields was the real loss for Nutting and his masters.

The British star was falling and the rising star was that of U.S. imperialism. The center of imperialist intrigue over the Middle East has moved from London to Washington. And the British-French flop in the Israeli attack on Egypt in 1956 is the proof of it.

# U.S., Britain Knew Israel Was A Death-Trap for Jewish Masses

## The "Homeland" Is in Somebody Else's Home Land And Hypocritical Imperialists Planned It That Way!

By PETER STORCH

The U.S. Government is covertly backing Israel in the Middle East crisis. But has U.S. imperialism ever given a damn about the plight of the Jewish people? Is it the Jewish people the U.S. supports or the exploitation of the wealth of the Middle East?

It was the monopoly interests in Britain and in the U.S. that provoked hostilities between the Arab and Jewish peoples in the first place. It was British and American imperialism that helped force one million Arab refugees to be driven out of their homeland, as the U.S. and Britain carved out Israel from Palestine. But the U.S. Government did little or nothing to help the Jewish masses find a home in the United States.

U.S. imperialist hypocrisy on the Jewish question has never changed, and rarely is it ever exposed.

In 1920, as the League of Nations was handing out colonies (mostly former German ones) to the major imperialist

powers, the British Empire was given Palestine to add to its collection of colonies.

At the time, out of a population of 700,000 Palestinians, only 56,000, or 8 per cent were Jews. Yet, the cynical designs of British imperialism to divide and exploit the oppressed peoples of the Middle East, called for a Jewish state and encouraged the migration of Jews to Palestine.

The British never even consulted the 92 per cent Arab population of Palestine. In 1934, Eliezer Liebenstein, a leader of the Mapai (Ben-Gurion's party), made this startling admission: "England needs the Jews in order to prevent the Arabs from becoming too strong, and in order to have an added protection against an Arab movement which aims at the emancipation of a united Arab 'middle Orient' from English domination."

By 1931, still only 15 per cent of the Palestinian population was Jewish.

However, as the persecution and oppression of Jews increased severely in Germany and other European countries, many Jews were desperately in search of a home where they could live without persecution.

Many had asked to immigrate to the U.S., which already had a large Jewish population (4,350,000 by 1930). But the U.S., as well as Britain, turned its back on these immigrants and, instead, urged them to migrate to Palestine.

By 1939, Britain feared that too large a Jewish population in Palestine might threaten its own very existence, militarily and economically, in the Middle East. Therefore, the new British policy prevented any further Jewish immigration to Palestine except for a final total of 75,000.

The British imperialists had once again provoked hostilities between Jews and Arabs with their "divide and conquer" policy.

But U.S. imperialism had begun to compete with British imperialism for the economic domination of the Middle East, and found it in its interests to support Jewish immigration to Palestine as a way to get the allegiance of the

Zionist movement, so as to help drive the British out of the Middle East.

U.S. policy towards the persecuted Jews of Europe was never motivated by any humanitarian feeling for the plight of the Jewish people. As a matter of fact, many Jews in the U.S. complained, and protested that the U.S. Government made no efforts to accept Jewish DP's (displaced persons in Europe) after WW II, when an emergency appeal was made throughout the world.

A total of only 6,213 of all European refugees were accepted in the U.S. in 1946! While more than 200,000 Jewish DP's remained in European camps and tens of thousands more throughout Europe, Truman allowed only 39,000 visas for Jewish immigrants over the next two years.

Several bills brought to the House of Representatives for open immigration of 400,000 non-quota refugees were smothered on different occasions.

By 1948, U.S. capitalist might had prevailed over British imperialism, and the British were forced, in effect, to hand over Palestine to the U.S. in the UN after the Israeli war against the Arabs. The UN partition plan, as designed by the U.S. and Britain, called for 54 per cent of Palestine to be a Jewish state, and the rest an Arab state.

This imperialist gerrymandering caused one million Arabs to be driven

Continued on Page 8





# Black Students Framed After Cop Rampage in Houston

By ELLEN PIERCE

HOUSTON, June 2—Five Afro-American students at Texas Southern University were indicted today for the slaying of a white policeman.

One of the accused, Douglas Wayne Waller, was actually in jail at the time the policeman was shot. But according to Texas law, "One who engaged in any riot whereby an illegal act is committed shall be deemed guilty of the offense of the riot..."

The policeman, Louis Kuba, was shot and killed as he and a hundred other

Houston police attacked the TSU men's dormitory with over 3,000 rounds of ammunition on May 17.

During the subsequent police invasion of the dormitory, 488 students were arrested and several badly beaten, according to the house mother. Cops also ransacked the place, smashing students' radios, television sets, and other belongings. A grand jury investigating the wrecking of the dormitory by police found that "our law enforcement officials acted with due restraint."

In the week preceding the police

attack on the campus, students from predominantly Black, Texas Southern had participated in demonstrations protesting racism at a nearby junior high school. Arrests were made and when students called a night rally to protest police action, another arrest was made.

Adding to student anger was the failure of University officials to stop armed police from patrolling the campus, and the administration's attempts to block the formation of militant Black Power groups on campus.

The foreman of the jury which cleared

the cops of blame called the student demonstrations the work of "a few agitators and troublemakers."

The indictment of the students, stating that the men "did then and there with malice aforethought kill Louis Kuba by shooting him with a gun," is an attempt to terrorize the Black community with the specter of a legal lynching.

Long-time observers of the Southern scene, however, expressed serious doubts about the effectiveness of all this. Black militancy is on the rise. And it is very probable that this latest racist outrage will result in new waves of organized protest rather than in the intimidation of the Afro-American people.

Those named in the indictment are Trazawell Franklin, Jr., Floyd Nichols, Charles Freeman, Douglas Wayne Waller and John Parker.

# Why U.S. Helps Yemen Royalists in War on Republicans (After Recognizing the Republic!)

By V. COPELAND

One of the keys to understanding the Mideast crisis is the situation in Yemen and the neighboring port city of Aden, both on the southeastern portion of the Arabian peninsula.

There was a revolution in Yemen during 1962 and a continuing civil war there since that time. The masses in the city of Aden, although not yet as successful, have been in similar revolt against the British for the past four months and more. U.S. and British intrigue has been hard at work to check the liberation drive of the Yemeni and Aden Arabs by maneuvering between the governments of the UAR and Saudi Arabia as well as shooting down or helping to shoot down the Arab masses.

The American people are among the least informed about the area, as they are about the Mideast generally. But the U.S. ruling class is more informed about it and more involved in it than any place else in the world, with the possible exception of Vietnam and those parts of the Mideast now in the eye of the global hurricane.

One way the people of the United States are kept misinformed can be illustrated by the following words of a New York Times editorial on May 16. Speaking of Yemen, that paper said:

"It is ironical that the United States, having rushed in to recognize the Yemen Republic, is now being calumniated by the incredible charges against two American foreign aid officials."

Earlier, on April 17 of this year, the same supposedly objective and truthful journal said:

"(In this) isolated, feudalistic, poverty-stricken kingdom that belonged back in the Middle Ages, the possibilities were so murky that the Kennedy Administration quickly recognized the newly-formed republican government in Sana. (The capital of Yemen)."

The words, "rushed into recognize" and "quickly recognized," which we have underlined, are virtuous-sounding phrases, as the Times meant them to be. But the fact is that the U.S. recognition of the Republic of Yemen was a very slow rush indeed.

The revolt, the overthrow of the Imam and the declaration of the republic took place by September 19, 1962. And the "quick recognition" was accorded by Washington on December 19, 1962. This was after all the Arab countries (except the Jordanian and Saudi Arabian monarchies) had recognized the new republic, after the Soviet Union and People's China recognized it, and after the U.S. chargé d'affaires in Taiz (a Yemeni city) urged recognition in order to promote a "moderate policy" by the new regime and "prevent it from turning to the United Arab Republic for support."

But since UAR troops were already marching into Yemen by this time — to help the republicans against the feudal Imam, who had taken to the hills — Washington was undecided. The British, who had also held back on recognition, tried to get the U.S. to delay it further.

According to Bartlett and Weintal, in their new book, "Facing the Brink,"

of Yemen, a truly "Middle Ages" monarch. The Imam would have long ago been executed — or even worse, condemned to work for a living! — if it were not for this U.S.-British arms aid.

In addition to the latest British supersonic planes with British "civilian" pilots to fly them, King Faisal is now getting U.S. Hawk



Young men exhort marchers at funeral of six victims of a terrorist bomb. Two snipers who fired into the crowd were caught and slain.

however, there were other important considerations.

"Having committed himself in Yemen, Rusk argued, Nasser could not afford a setback and might attack Saudi Arabia if he were pressed too hard. (And don't forget all that oil in Saudi Arabia! — ed.) Moreover, withholding recognition might cause the UAR and the new Yemen Republic to appeal for help to the Soviet Union and extend Moscow's foothold in the Middle East."

Thus, it was not out of any desire to get Yemen out of the "Middle Ages," but out of a determination to keep Saudi Arabia in the Middle Ages — and the U.S. oil companies in Saudi Arabia — that the U.S. finally recognized the Republic of Yemen!

But even at that, the oil companies outsmarted themselves. Or rather, their hard-working Secretary of State and his staff did, and they have been spending a great deal of time and an even greater amount of U.S. money to correct that mistake.

The U.S. and Britain have both stepped up their military aid to King Faisal of Saudi Arabia, for example, who is helping the overthrown Imam

ground-to-air missiles. The increased build-up is also related to Britain's highly-advertised coming military evacuation of its military base at Aden, just to the south of Yemen.

The U.S. oil sharks have been trying to conceal their teeth in the whole affair and are using their now-junior partners, the British, to front for them in at least part of this dirty work.

The British, just three weeks ago, sent Sir Humphrey Trevelyan as the new High Commissioner for the synthetic stooge South Arabian Federation they created eight years ago, which includes Aden and 16 other small principalities adjacent to Yemen.

Sir Humphrey was Ambassador to Cairo at the time of the 1956 British-French-Israeli invasion of Egypt. He was an Under Secretary of the United Nations and a former British Ambassador to the Soviet Union. A distinguished, but very strange choice to preside over a "desolate" area that the British are supposed to be evacuating by next January!

Now, the British, of course, do have their own problems and can't preoccupy themselves too much with pulling Wall

Street's chestnuts out of the fire at the expense of getting needlessly burned themselves. There is a considerable amount of mass pressure in Britain to bring home the 14,000 troops still stationed in Aden facing the wrath of a revolutionary citizenry. And all the more so, since it is not clear what British imperialist interests are being protected in Arabia where all the oil belongs to U.S. companies.

At one point, the U.S. actually planted a story in the New York Times (May 8) to the effect that "Britain May Slow Her Aden Pullout."

"Mounting violence among rival Arab groups," said the account, "is reported to have forced Britain to adjust her plans for speedy withdrawal of her 14,000 troops from Aden and ... South Arabia, after she grants independence to the region."

The very next day, the British denied there was anything in the story, but added that the pullout was already planned to be a slow one anyway!

Actually, the British were being extremely careful and had no intention of making a sudden withdrawal. But so tenuous was its relation to the Arabs and so explosive was the situation that it had to express "puzzlement" over the Times report — knowing that the Times is read in the Mideast as well as in London.

Since the port of Aden is so located as to be highly strategic for the whole Mideast, and the South Arabian Federation (made up of feudal sheiks, emirs, sultans, etc.) so important as a reactionary buffer against the Arab revolution, the British are moving very cautiously and even, perhaps, with more skill than the U.S. could. But the U.S. is most jittery, because the U.S. capitalists have more to lose.

Aden, of course, has been in the throes of rebellion, general strikes and general uprising for months. Hundreds, perhaps thousands of its citizens have been killed and wounded by British colonial troops during that time.

Why don't the 14,000 British troops (some of whom have already been killed) get out immediately, if they are going to get out at all?

Because of the oil.

As the New York Times said on April 17:

"Since the glittering prize on the horizon is the oil of the Arabian Peninsula and the Persian Gulf, this is a conflict that involves the United States, Britain and France. A part of the prize could be command of the Middle East...."

"It is as futile to say, 'Leave Yemen alone,' as it is to say, 'Let Vietnam alone.' Pawns are sacrificed in power politics as in chess."

These frank and brutal words were spoken before the present crisis. Let those who think that the U.S. ruling class is now fighting for "little Israel" against the wicked Arabs, ponder them well.

# Syrian Revolution Against U.S. Oil Monopolies Sparked the First Stage of the Present War

By FRED GOLDSTEIN

Washington's pious pronouncements in favor of the "integrity and sovereignty" of small nations notwithstanding, U. S. oil billionaires precipitated the present war crisis in the Mideast when they first mobilized their puppets in Tel Aviv to destroy the Syrian government.

U.S. imperialist propaganda has tried desperately to put the responsibility for the present struggle on Egyptian President Nasser's "aggressive seizure" of Egyptian territory in the Gulf of Aqaba. But in truth, Arabian armies are now mobilizing against U.S. imperialism to a large extent because the oil monopolies consider the Syrian government a menace to their domination in the Mideast and Washington has been striving for over a year to destroy the revolutionary regime in Damascus.

To be sure, the oppressed Arab peoples have the revolutionary right to take any measures necessary for their own liberation, and no one should demand that they confine their struggle within the ever fluctuating framework of the international "legality" of the Rockefellers, the Morgans and the Mellons. But even from the standpoint of "international law" and the "sovereignty of independent nations" in the Mideast, of which the murderers McNamara, Rusk and Johnson have recently become the champions, Washington still stands out as the criminal.

## HYSTERICAL U.S. THREATS

The capitalist press unleashed a barrage of hysterical threats and denunciations when President Nasser explained that Egypt was in a state of war against Israel and would therefore have to assert control over its own territory in the Strait of Tiran.

But the literary corps of U.S. big business avoided all news or comment on the specific charges by Nasser that Washington and Tel Aviv had already declared war, de facto, on Syria.

On May 26, Nasser told a world press conference:

"On May 12 a very impertinent statement was made... The statement said that the Israeli commanders have announced they would carry out military operations against Syria in order to occupy Damascus and overthrow the Syrian Government.

On the same day, Israeli Premier Eshkol made a strongly threatening statement against Syria. At the same time, the commentaries said that Israel believed Egypt could not make a move because it was bogged down in Yemen...

"On May 13, we received accurate information that Israel was concentrating on the Syrian border huge armed forces of about 11 to 13 brigades. These forces were divided into two fronts, one south of Lake Tiberias and the other north of the lake.

"The decision made by Israel at this time was to carry out an aggression against Syria as of May 17. On May 14, we took our measures, discussed the matter and contacted our Syrian brothers. The Syrians also had this information.

"We told them that we had decided that if Syria was attacked, Egypt would enter the battle...

"We had no war plans before May 13...

"We note that there is a great deal of talk about peace these days. Peace, peace, international peace, international security, UN intervention and so on...

"Why is it that no one spoke about peace in the United Nations when on May 12 the Israeli Premier and the Israeli commanders made their statements that they would occupy

Damascus, overthrow the Syrian regime, strike vigorously at Syria and occupy a part of Syrian territory?"

## THEY DIDN'T DENY IT!

Not only have these very grave and serious charges been completely buried in the capitalist press, but neither has one word of these accusations been denied either in Tel Aviv or Washington.

Washington defends the "sovereignty and integrity" of its puppets in Tel Aviv while these same hirelings work overtime to overthrow the government in Damascus at the bidding of the oil barons.

The threat which precipitated the present crisis was only the latest in a long series of Washington's intrigues to crush the revolutionary government of Syria. From the moment the left wing of the Baath Party took power in Syria in February, 1966, the Government of Dr. Nuradin Attassi has been high up on the "most wanted" list of the State Department.

The leftist regime opened up a militant propaganda campaign against U.S. imperialism, sent numerous delegations to China, the USSR and Eastern Europe, and launched a series of nationalizations.

Armed trade union detachments were called out to enforce the expropriations on recalcitrant bosses and the workers were given free rein to participate in the struggle against imperialism and particularly the oil companies.

## AGREEMENT WITH SOVIET

In the Spring of 1966, to the deepest chagrin of the oil companies, Syria signed an agreement for the Soviet Union to provide the necessary technical assistance for the development of Syrian oil fields in the northeast of the country. Syria simultaneously intensified its attacks on imperialism.

In August, Damascus further infuriated the oil companies by demanding an increase in royalty payments from the Iraq Petroleum Company (one-quarter owned by Mobil Oil and Standard Oil of New Jersey, both Rockefeller companies). Damascus demanded a 50 per cent increase in payments on oil flowing through IPC pipelines in Syria to the Mediterranean and retroactive payments for ten years of cheating on the existing contract. IPC was intransigent against this.

Several weeks later a pro-U.S. right wing military clique of the Baath Party attempted a coup against the Attassi Government. Damascus called the workers out to defend the regime and distributed arms through the trade unions. The coup was crushed and its leaders fled to the sanctuary of the U.S. puppet Hussein in Jordan.

## DENOUNCE 6th FLEET

Syria stepped up its denunciations of imperialism and its protectors — Eshkol, Hussein and Faisal. On November 2, the anniversary of the Balfour Declaration, before a mass demonstration rally of workers, Dr. Attassi denounced the Sixth Fleet "goodwill" visit to Lebanon as a threat to Syria.

The Syrian leader denounced the UN as a tool of imperialism and called for an Arab war of liberation to restore the Palestinians to their homeland and to sweep away the "traitors and reactionaries" Hussein and Faisal. Dr. Attassi called on the Arab workers and peasants to mobilize in a popular army and announced that 150,000 Syrians were already under arms for the coming struggle against imperialism.

Two weeks later, on November 13, Israel attacked the Jordanian village

of Es Samu with the clear understanding that it was a warning to Syria to get in line with imperialism.

(There is strong evidence that Israel's attack on Jordan was made with the complicity of Hussein. Despite previous warnings from Eshkol that the raids would take place, Jordanian troops were nowhere near the Israeli border. They were concentrated on the Syrian border instead!)

The Syrians charged that the raid was staged so that the U.S. could rush more arms to Hussein, who was under attack from the Jordanian masses. And the U.S. did rush arms to Hussein — on the condition that they would not be used against Israel.

## JORDAN FIRED ON SYRIA!

At any rate, on December 2, three weeks after being attacked by Israel, Jordanian (i.e. U.S.) tanks fired on the Syrian border killing Arab commandos from the Palestine Liberation Organization!

Syria responded on Dec. 8 by calling on the masses to overthrow Hussein as a puppet of U.S. and British imperialism and offered arms to the masses for the undertaking.

On Dec. 13 Damascus threw down the gauntlet to the Rockefellers by closing down the IPC pipeline, seizing the companies' assets and dispatching an oil workers' militia to protect the pipeline from imperialist attempts to open it up. Damascus raised the slogan which struck terror into the hearts of the oil monopolies, "Arab Oil for the Arabs!"

On Jan 9 Israeli tanks fired across the Syrian border.

Syria refused to be intimidated and Washington changed tactics. The day after the Israeli attack on Syria, Eleizer Ben Moshe, Tel Aviv's "expert" on Arab affairs, gave an interview in which he declared that Syria would be the "next Cuba" and that he expected the Mideast to have its first "People's Democracy" within 18 months. For that reason, revealed Ben Moshe, "American counter intelligence had been trying to topple the Damascus government..."

## CIA IN JORDAN

On Jan. 23 the PLO confirmed that a CIA plot was in the making. And a PLO dispatch printed in Cairo reported that the CIA was working with Hussein to "protect Israel," i.e. to overthrow Attassi.

The plot was broken on Feb 7 when a Jordanian major in charge of coordinating the assassination of the Syrian leader defected to Cairo. The assassinations were to be carried out by the pro-U.S. Baath Party leaders based in Jordan, who were crushed in the September coup.

"The entire Jordanian army" was to move in on Syria and take Damascus. Syria seized the funds for the plot and the CIA was effectively blocked.

Syria's resistance to the counter-revolutionary machinations of Washington puppets in Tel Aviv and Amman was steadfast. So on April 7, the imperialists virtually declared open war on Damascus. Israeli Mirage jets invaded 60 miles into Syrian territory after provoking a border "incident."

Israeli "farmers" had moved into a disputed demilitarized zone on the Syrian border and began "plowing" the border — with tanks! When Israel ignored a warning to pull the tanks and tractors back from the border, the Syrians fired on the tanks. Israel then "retaliated" with a full scale air attack carried out by a squadron of jet fighter-bombers.

According to Israeli chief of staff Gen. Itzhak Rabin "The Air Force was authorized to patrol a certain distance

inside the Syrian border (!)" and if the Syrians put up any resistance "they were under no restrictions — they could go to Damascus." And at least two Israeli planes made it past Syrian MIGs to the outskirts of the Syrian capital.

But to the horror of U.S. imperialism, all the intrigues of the CIA, all the threats and near invasions by Washington's puppets in Tel Aviv and Amman have not intimidated the Syrian masses one iota or caused the government in Damascus to abate its attacks on U.S. imperialism. On the contrary, the hatred for imperialism grows deeper the more its counter-revolutionary sabotage is exposed.

## INTERNATIONAL SOLIDARITY

Damascus has become a Mideast sounding board for the liberation struggle in both North and South Vietnam. The Attassi Government broadcasts vitriolic denunciations of U.S. aggression in Indo-China.

Damascus has become the nemesis of the CIA in the Mideast, and has publicly exposed its role in the Indonesian massacre and the overthrow of Nkrumah in Ghana. The exposures of the CIA in the USA were given broad publicity in Syria.

The revolutionary militance of the Attassi Government comes through powerfully in a statement published in the Syrian newspaper Al Baath on March 14, just a few days after the defection of Stalina.

## STALINA - SO WHAT?

"During the past few days," stated the editorial, "the world reactionary press has been filled with big headlines on Stalin's daughter and her escape to the West... Its main aim has been to exploit it politically.

"Imperialism wants to claim in its press that Stalin's daughter has fled the hell of socialism. This may be true insofar as socialism may be a hell to her as it is a hell to Johnson and to General Ky. But what imperialist centers fail to notice is that what constitutes hell to Stalin's daughter is not a hell in the view of the world's peoples.

"The Vietnamese people would continue to struggle against American imperialism even if Stalin came to life, 'escaped' to Washington, and held a press conference at the White House... The colored people in South Africa do not remember Stalin's daughter, nor do they pay attention to such news when they see the pampered whites trampling on them and shooting them dead."

Thus Damascus has become an armed center for revolutionary anti-imperialist agitation for 80 million Arabs in the Persian Gulf region and its attacks have been increasingly focused not on Israel as such, but on Eshkol, Hussein and Faisal as birds of a feather — i.e. fronts for the U.S. corporations.

## OIL CO'S TRUMP CARD?

All of Washington's plots to overthrow the Attassi Government having failed, the oil companies turned to their trump card in the Mideast — the same trump card used by the French and the British in 1956 — a mobilization and a sneak attack by Israel.

Nasser charged U.S. imperialism with doing precisely that and the U.S. never denied it.

The government of the UAR saw clearly that the occupation of Damascus by imperialism would be the opening gun in a bloody counter-revolution throughout the Mideast and Nasser said no to the U.S. by signing a defense pact with Syria and by denying Israel the Gulf of Aqaba in time of war.



## A GI Writes From Vietnam

## "We're Completely Surrounded"

The accompanying text is from a letter by a GI in Vietnam who is obviously not a Marxist, but who, as a normal, wide-awake and perceptive young man, has made his own conclusions about the war and writes them to a friend. There are probably few U.S. soldiers who would express themselves as clearly and positively on this. But there must be many indeed who have similar thoughts.

In Vietnam I have temporarily discontinued "sedition" although I have been unable to resist a few discussions and have begun "Operation See it like it is." Several interesting facts have come to me since I came here.

First the situation. (Here follows a description of his exact location, which we omit—ed.) Just like the rest of Vietnam, this is Charlie country. The camp seems secure but it's completely surrounded by VC in tunnels and holes and towns. They probe the perimeter about three times a week and mortar us about once every three months.

The first couple months here I was a cook and successfully brought a new dimension to grub, namely, love, even though it was burned. The advantages of being a cook were tremendous since I had every other day off and was free to go into town, which I did. Here I found several really good contacts and learned a great deal about Vietnam. No. 1, no surprise to either of us, the people are not free to say how they feel about Ky.

Diem they aren't afraid to talk about. He's gone. And he's number 10. Questions about Ky however stop the conversation. After several minutes of cajolery she (a Vietnamese girl) would admit that some Vietnamese are for Ky and some are against. But she would never give her own opinion of him, and we were damn good friends.

Incidentally, I have some pictures of a Buddhist temple burned by Diem. Ky is apparently clever enough not to fool with the Buddhists.

Anyway the "election" was a farce. Anti-Ky means VC which means napalm.

And three weeks ago I began (another assignment). This brought me into contact with an Aviation Detachment which is attached to our battalion. This bunch consists of three Chinooks armed to Max gross weight with rockets, high explosive 20MM cannon, 50 calibre machine guns and a 40MM grenade

Around here the average sized job is taken care of by (these pilots). One guy's targets have been old women, old men peddling bikes down a highway and (the) people busy farming. After telling about how he shot the old fellow on the bike and how the bike kept going down the road while the Vietnamese tumbled through the air and into the ditch, somebody commented that it was too bad and this guy said "No it's not



A people in arms: N. Vietnamese building trenches.

launcher, and crews of pirate cowboy types...

Anyway these fellows' job is to create refugees. This was a big discovery to me. We make much of the number of "refugees fleeing from Communism" in our propaganda but I have just discovered the source of these refugees. A village is told that it is to move to a refugee camp if it is pro-government. And it works because people have found that to stay is to die.

too bad. They were told to move out."

Burning hooches is everyday fare. So now I know where the refugees come from. In other areas and in bigger jobs other methods are used.

Three F-104's flying in a great circle and dropping a bomb at each pass is a favorite.

I just noticed red smoke halfway around the camp which means Charlies inside the fence. Mortars come in often enough that they're routine. Yes, it's

different here than home, somehow. But the country is beautiful as well as the people. Their disposition is good, unbelievable, considering the humiliation they suffer.

On a ridge about one mile away I can see artillery or mortar shells hitting a Korean camp. And it's only 4:30.

Here's an amusing situation. One night last week a Huey was coming back to camp when it took some rounds from a 50 cal. They spotted the muzzle blast and took after him. Four M-60's and 2.75" rockets they fired at him. They were pulling away when they took a few more rounds from a location not far from the first. They turned and fired at the second location. As they were pulling out of this run they were hit again, from a third position.

This was repeated several more times before the gunship gave up and headed for home.

The only thing they could decide was that the gunner had fired his burst and then had taken off with his gun to a new position each time.

The 50 calibre (actually a 12.6 mm) used by Charlie is mounted on small wheels and is the best weapon he has. This is just a sample to me of the determination of these people.

Another thing you may be able to use is the fact that we broke the Christmas truce. I personally know that our artillery fired about 11:00 Christmas eve, and that we had infantry patrols out, which was against the truce.

\*\*\*\*\*

It's 8:30 Monday night now. Supposedly we have an NVA battalion trapped (near) here. For the past half hour people from the village, which is about 200 yards from this tent, have been shooting at us with an M-79 grenade launcher. This is really hilarious. We haven't had the weapon long ourselves and already the Vietnamese have it!

This reminds me of something else. Our aircraft avoid flying over (a town) at night because they often get shot at. Now it's just impossible for somebody in that town to shoot at a helicopter at night without everyone else in town knowing who it is.

This to me is the valid election, not the one Ky's soldiers held in November.

## Why the Puppets Wouldn't Fight

Why do half a million U.S. soldiers have to "help" half a million South Vietnamese soldiers fight a quarter of a million Vietnamese liberation fighters?

One answer was supplied on May 17, when the NLF attacked a command post only 25 miles south of Saigon, overran it, killing 29 South Vietnamese and 3 Americans with the number of wounded not listed.

Three companies of South Viet puppet troops were less than 300 yards away and didn't bother to come to the aid of their comrades. Nearly 80 weapons were lost to the NLF which indicated that most of the men at the command post ran away from the NLF rather than toward them during the engagement.

The three companies were units of the ARVN's 25th division, which is notorious for its bad combat record. But if the 25th is so unreliable, the question naturally arises: why do parts of it have to be stationed so close to the capital of the country? And the answer must be that not many other detachments are much better.

"Why did it happen?" a reporter asked a U.S. officer. The latter replied: "Because there was no leadership, no alertness and no motivation."

The commander of the 25th, Brig. Gen. Pham Trong Chinh is close to puppet Premier Ky and a big wheel in Saigon politics, but obviously has little influence upon his troops.

## U.S. "Aid"

ALGIERS, May 31 (Hsinhua) — U.S. agreed in March to deliver 200,000 tons of wheat to Algeria. But they held up the agreement. Today Algeria denounced U.S. imperialism's intervention through "economic aid."

"Out of the Trenches by Christmas (1965, That Is!)"

# Warmakers Still Lie About It

The most important weapon of the U.S. ruling class in its drive to war is not its multi-billion dollar war machine nor even its atomic and hydrogen bombs, but its control of a gigantic lie machine and through it, the minds of the American people.

Neither draftees nor volunteers would fight if they knew that their leaders were congenital liars and robbers, merely using them for pawns and cannon fodder. And the United States President and the ruling class he serves are lying to the people on the great issues that bear upon the people's lives, lying just as deliberately as they are robbing them and plundering the peoples abroad.

"We are there" (in Vietnam) said Johnson last month, "because we have a promise to keep."

But he gave a promise to the people of the United States, including millions of potential soldiers too young to vote, in the election campaign of 1964 when he said:

"We are not going to send American boys nine or ten thousand miles away from home to do what Asian boys ought to be doing for themselves." He also said: "We are not going north and we are not going south; we are going to continue to try to get them" — the puppet U.S.-paid South Vietnamese official armies — to fight the war.

And just like Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt on similar occasions, he was re-elected with his "peace" program.

However, Johnson knew at the time that he was lying. He had held a council of war on Vietnam just five days after the Kennedy assassination in 1963, in which the decisions were made to stay in that country at all costs.

In a little-noted speech in Chicago on May 24, Bill Moyers, former Presidential assistant, tells a little bit of the story.

"The Viet Cong, it was reported at the conference, had made far greater progress in the preceding six months than had been realized."

"Unless the current trend could be reversed in 60 to 90 days, the President was told by his civilian advisers, a Communist-controlled state was practically inevitable."

Ted Lewis, writing in the New York Daily News on May 31, said that Johnson's real commitment was made at this meeting and added that Defense Secretary McNamara at about this time tried to make things look "better than they were" for the U.S.

"There was definitely a deliberate effort by Defense Secretary McNamara, going back to two days before the Kennedy Assassination, to make things look better than they were...."

"Yet in Honolulu on Nov. 20, 1963, McNamara announced that American troops would start being withdrawn before the first of the year."

And just a month earlier McNamara had joined Gen. Maxwell Taylor in saying that "the major part of the U.S. military task can be completed by the end of 1965."

Many of the bourgeois liberals have commented upon this promise, but always with the view that it was just a blunder rather than a lie. The truth is that it was a calculated deception of the masses rather than a mere military miscalculation.

When Johnson in his address to both houses of Congress on November 27,

1963 said, "This nation will keep its commitments from South Vietnam to West Berlin," the die had already been cast. Or rather, he showed that he knew the die had been cast — as it was cast long before.

Bill Moyers, in the speech quoted above, went on to say that it was only after Johnson was elected in 1964, after all his peace demagoguery, that "events required a reappraisal which led him to conclude that only a large expeditionary force could prevent the Communists from seizing South Vietnam."

Such "reappraisals" are always conducted after elections are over, in the lands of imperialist democracy, because it is only thus that the rulers can keep on deceiving their subjects.

## — U.S.-British Trap

Continued From Page 4

out of their homes, and once again, the Jews and Arabs were the victims of a "divide and conquer" policy, except this time under the hegemony of the U.S. instead of the British.

Since 1948, the Israeli semi-puppet government has mainly served U.S. interests in stifling Arab liberation. Rather than helping the cause of oppressed and persecuted Jews, it has led them into a trap.

Making them fight and oppress a much more oppressed people than themselves, it has turned the natural allies of the Israeli working class into the mortal enemies of Israel and staked the Jewish future on a pact with its inevitable betrayer, U.S. imperialism.