

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Vol. 3, No. 14

April 9, 1965

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

In this issue

Page

World Opinion Continues to Mount Against Johnson -- by Joseph Hansen	1
25,000 Belgian Youth in Antinuclear March	5
Frankfort Youth Protest Dirty War in Vietnam	6
Mexican Students Appeal for Immediate, Effective Aid to Vietnam	7
No Backing Down in Face of the Crimes of Imperialism	9
Three-Country Antinuclear Demonstration Planned	11
New Belgian Socialist Party Holds First Rally	12
Liège Miners End Sit-Down Strike	13
Appeal of Alexander Eleven Rejected	14
Why Sartre Won't Go to the U.S.	15
Italians Blocked Kremlin at March 1 Moscow Meeting	17
Brezhnev Promises to Make Good Where Khrushchev Failed -- by Pierre Frank	18
Italian Communist Youth Congress Postponed -- by Francesco Marchi	20
Nationalizations in Syria Remain Uncertain	22
John Baird	24
Congolese Repudiate Slander of Holden Roberto	25
Balance Sheet of the Chilean Election -- by José Valdés	26
American Socialist Youth Defend Vietnamese	33
New Pamphlet on Malcolm X	33

WORLD OPINION CONTINUES TO MOUNT AGAINST JOHNSON

By Joseph Hansen

The daring bombing of the U.S. embassy in Saigon March 30 and the aerial encounter in North Vietnam April 4 are substantial indications of stiffening resistance to Johnson's "measured escalation" of the war in Vietnam. The sudden squeeze play in Berlin

that began April 5 can also be interpreted as a warning that the period of paralysis in face of Johnson's monstrous decision to launch war on North Vietnam and to rattle H-bombs over China and the Soviet Union is coming to a close.

The attack on the U.S. embassy was reportedly carried out by two lone Vietnamese freedom fighters, one of whom gave his life in the action. The other is most likely being submitted to torture preparatory to execution in accordance with the barbarous custom of the South Vietnamese puppet government and their American "advisers." But the sacrifice made by the two is being hailed throughout the colonial world, and the effort of the war propagandists in the U.S. to utilize their heroic action to counter the repercussions to American use of noxious gas in the conflict is not getting very far.

To the Pentagon the defeat suffered in the air combat April 4 was even more stunning. A few obsolete MIGs, piloted by North Vietnamese, moved against a convoy of American bombers invading their country on a mission of death and destruction. The government of North Vietnam reported that 37 American planes were downed without the loss of a single North Vietnamese plane. The American planes were ultramodern, some of them with twice the speed of the Vietnamese planes and equipped with heat-seeking air-to-air missiles.

In Saigon the loss of two F-105s and two Skyraiders was admitted, but as for the other 33 planes, officials tried to get around this by saying some planes were missing; the number, however, could not be revealed "for security reasons." Since then the Pentagon has been busy explaining how the defeat could occur. The reasons are not without interest. The American pilots, it seems, were "caught by surprise." They hadn't expected any defense against their murderous mission. In addition, their planes were so heavily loaded with bombs that they lacked maneuverability. Besides which, some of the planes are so fast, have such fire-power and range that they are really effective only in fighting on an intercontinental scale, not on a local level.

The last argument has a familiar ring. When Johnson launched the war on North Vietnam in February, one of the reasons was the incapacity of the U.S. to fight the South Vietnamese by the rules of guerrilla warfare. As the Washington propagandists explained it, the U.S. was freeing itself from these limitations and widening the war to a scale better suited to American capacities.

Part of the explanation for the American air defeat thus constitutes the beginning of an argument for widening the war still further so that American methods of fighting will be better served.

Johnson plunged into this war without any real backing from his allies, without the services of the United Nations, with the American people opposed, and with sectors of the American capitalist class itself highly dubious about the advisability of the

adventure. This is unprecedented in American history.

Johnson's War can rapidly prove to be the most unpopular ever engaged in by American imperialism; and Johnson himself can become the most hated and despised president.

In foreign capitals, if we leave aside the puppets more or less directly on the American payroll, Johnson is vigorously supported only by Harold Wilson, and even this regime is finding that belly-crawling, if sustained too long, can prove to be uncomfortable. Thus Foreign Secretary Michael Stewart, who happened to be in Washington at the height of the world-wide storm over the American use of gas in Vietnam, felt compelled to declare [March 24] that he had told Secretary of State Rusk there was "very grave concern" in Britain and elsewhere, and that in the "choice of measures" the Pentagon should keep in mind "the effect on people around the world." "What I am, in fact, asking the United States to display is what your Declaration of Independence called 'a decent respect for the opinion of mankind.'"

Johnson was reported to have been furious over this remark, and Stewart did his best to make up for it while Wilson heroically sought to apologize even in Johnson's "choice of measures."

Canadian Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson, who talked with Johnson at Camp David April 3, proposed in a public speech the previous night in Philadelphia that the U.S. suspend bombings in North Vietnam, at least temporarily.

Johnson reacted with characteristic fury to the suggestion, and the Canadian government backed down fast, explaining that Pearson had meant no harm.

A petition signed by 17 nations [Afghanistan, Algeria, Ceylon, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, India, Iraq, Kenya, Nepal, Syria, Tunisia, the United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia, Zambia and Uganda], asking that "negotiations for peace" be opened "as soon as possible without posing any preconditions," was given to Rusk April 1.

The petition, drawn up in Belgrade in mid-March, deplored the "recourse to force" in Vietnam, and stated that the continued use of force in Vietnam "can only lead to the aggravation of the conflict in that area and to its transformation into a more generalized war with catastrophic consequences."

The pressure of world opinion is mounting heavily against Washington, but it remains to be seen whether Johnson is as yet prepared to make more than verbal concessions to the denunciations of his war policy and the horror over his course.

The truth is that the Pentagon and the White House, feeling that they were "getting away with it," that the aggression against

North Vietnam was "paying off," have been considering moving in still deeper.

The sinister General Maxwell D. Taylor, one of the architects of U.S. policy in Southeast Asia, flew into Washington for a week of "conversations" with the rest of the White House camarilla. The main topic was reportedly the failure to bring the North Vietnam government to its knees after two months of bombings. Every indication was that the warmongering crew around Johnson were unanimous on the advisability of stepping up the "escalation" still more. James Reston, one of the New York Times editorial writers said [March 29] that "new decisions have to be made in the next few days, and they may be among the most important political and military decisions since the last World War."

An editorial in the same paper on the same day, deploring the isolation of the United States and the need for a more flexible diplomatic policy, declared that support from world opinion "will be needed, especially if the war in Vietnam is about to enter a new and more virulent phase."

The venerable Walter Lippmann declared March 31 that Johnson is "wrestling with momentous and fateful decisions."

An editorial in the Paris daily Le Monde of April 3 suggested that Washington is faced with a "great temptation" -- the temptation of extending the war to China.

The influence of China is now widening throughout the colonial world, said Le Monde. "At the same time, the Chinese-Soviet differences, the present weakness of Peking in modern military means which Moscow is no longer furnishing her, constitute an occasion which, in the eyes of many specialists in both the State Department and the Pentagon, will perhaps never be repeated."

All the more ominous in the light of these indications, was Gen. Taylor's declaration just before he left Washington April 5. Asked about possible negotiations to end the war, he responded: "There is nothing and nobody to negotiate with."

This should be coupled with the disclosure March 26 by Arthur Krock, New York Times columnist who has long been an intimate of the State Department, that "world opinion" is now disregarded in State Department calculations. Krock is pleased with this. In his opinion it is a "sterile policy" to pay attention to what the world thinks.

The danger that American policy in Vietnam can touch off a nuclear conflict is clearly very high. The most vigorous efforts are required to convince the Johnson administration of the suicidal nature of its schemes. Only harsh experience will teach these "nuclear age" strategists that world opinion does count and that there is no realistic choice but to stop the war and get out of Vietnam.

25,000 BELGIAN YOUTH IN ANTINUCLEAR MARCH

BRUSSELS -- The fourth antinuclear march in Belgium, which took place March 28, was a huge success, centering on opposition to the colonial war in Vietnam and bringing prominently before the public the militant slogan, "Hands Off Vietnam!"

The first march, in 1962, was estimated at 4,000 participants. In 1963, the figure rose to 10,000. In 1964, it was 15,000. This year the estimate was between 25,000 and 27,000. Additional thousands lined the streets of the Belgian capital to cheer and encourage the young antinuclear fighters.

The Ministry of Education allows a message in favor of the march to be read in those schools where the principal grants permission. But no adult mass political party has ever offered official sponsorship. Thus the march has been organized each year by the youth organizations themselves. This year the work was done by the Jeunes Gardes Socialistes, the Flemish Young Socialists, the Socialist and Communist students, the Communist Youth (including both the pro-Moscow and the pro-Peking wings), the Catholic Workers Youth, the Metal Workers Union Youth, and some nonpolitical youth organizations. They did a remarkable job, bringing in more than 20,000 youth from the provinces to swell the contingents in Brussels where the march was staged.

The official organizing committee, in order to avoid antagonizing the more politically backward participating organizations like the Catholic Workers Youth, banned antigovernment and anti-American slogans in the march. But the youthful participants did not pay much attention to the ban. Thousands of voices joined in a mighty chant of "Let's Get Out of NATO" and "Hands Off Vietnam!"

Hundreds of banners and placards waved similar slogans in the colorful demonstration.

The use of gas by U.S. imperialism in Vietnam was another topic of bitter denunciation.

This militant and timely orientation of the march was inspired by the leaflets, banners and slogans of the Jeunes Gardes Socialistes, the new left socialist party [which has two sections, the Parti Wallon des Travailleurs and the Union de la Gauche Socialiste] and the pro-Peking Communists. The pro-Moscow Communist party which had favored restricting the slogans to "Peace in Vietnam!" became carried away by the infectious mood of the chanting youngsters. As a result, at the rally winding up the march, the CP spokesman departed from the party's position and adopted the line of the PWT-UGS.

After the march, some hundreds of young Socialists and pro-

Peking Communists demonstrated at the U.S. embassy. They shouted, "U.S. Go Home!" "Stop the War Crimes in Vietnam!" "Vietnam to the Vietnamese!"

The police moved in and scuffling broke out. As a result seven cops were injured, three seriously, according to the press. One demonstrator was arrested.

The development of the antinuclear marches in Belgium might profitably be studied by the left wing in other countries, particularly Britain. Belgian liberal and reformist circles have tried from the beginning to give the demonstrations an innocuous academic slant saturated with general pacifist nostrums and easily turned in a pro-government direction. The march this year testified to the failure of these efforts, thanks to the political capacities and energy of the movement's left wing.

The marches tend to become more and more anti-imperialist in character, against the government, in favor of unilateral disarmament, voicing sympathy and solidarity with colonial peoples fighting for freedom as in the case of the Vietnamese this year.

To make it decisively anticapitalist in character and to bring in broad layers of unionists and workers along with tens of thousands of marching youth -- that is one of the next big tasks facing the Belgian revolutionary Marxists.

FRANKFORT YOUTH PROTEST DIRTY WAR IN VIETNAM

FRANKFORT, Germany -- The Easter March Movement Against Atomic Warfare sponsored a demonstration March 27 against the dirty war in Vietnam. The police assigned streets for the parade away from the crowds. In addition the marchers were forbidden to take a position "one-sidedly either orally or in writing against one of the parties involved in the Vietnam conflict."

The sponsoring organization considered this order, quite correctly, to be a violation of the constitution since it would mean that only such demonstrations as conform to the foreign policy of the German government are permitted.

It was expected, under the circumstances, that not more than a couple of hundred demonstrators would show up.

To everyone's surprise about one thousand assembled. Most of them were youth, students, young socialists and young members of other organizations. The placards they brought along were directed quite one-sidedly against the makers of an inhuman war, against the

government that is using gas, napalm and phosphorous bombs and carrying the war deep into North Vietnam.

After the "official" part of the demonstration, which the police did not molest, a few hundred young people made their way to the U.S. consulate. The police, however, had anticipated this. They beat up many youth and arrested about seventeen demonstrators.

Thousands of leaflets protesting against the dirty war in Vietnam were distributed. They were generally received sympathetically. American officers in the U.S. Occupation Army, for whom Frankfurt is a big base, demonstratively argued with demonstrators that the fighting in Vietnam is directed against the "common" Communist enemy.

On the other hand, Negro soldiers in the U.S. army smiled at the placard reading, "Get Out of Vietnam; Take Care of Alabama!"

For the first time since the Occupation, the bourgeois press in Germany is voicing a quite critical attitude toward American policy in Vietnam. It is not easy to explain to the German people that they should defend "free elections" and "self-determination" in Eastern Germany while at the same time defending American policy against free elections and self-determination in Vietnam.

On the other hand, the government parties are disappointed over the Johnson administration letting them down in the reprisals they sought against Nasser for inviting Ulbricht, the head of the East German government to Cairo. Thus there is some spite in the criticisms of the bourgeois press over American policy in Vietnam.

The demonstration in Frankfurt was but a first small step in popular understanding of the implications of American imperialist policy. The fact that the police who beat up and arrested the demonstrators are headed by a Social Democrat will also help to bring about a better understanding of the role of this party, if only among the politically conscious vanguard.

MEXICAN STUDENTS APPEAL FOR IMMEDIATE, EFFECTIVE AID TO VIETNAM

MEXICO CITY -- Revolutionary-minded students here are circulating an "exhortation" to "the governments of the socialist countries and to the Communist parties" to mobilize immediate effective aid for North Vietnam and the guerrilla fighters in South Vietnam.

The appeal was adopted at rallies held in the University of Mexico March 25.

The full text is as follows:

The revolutionary students of the University, meeting in rallies March 25, 1965, conscious of their equality of standing as revolutionists, direct the following exhortation to the governments of the socialist countries and to the Communist parties:

- (1) Inasmuch as the principle of proletarian internationalism has been reduced to mere words;
- (2) Inasmuch as peaceful coexistence has been broken with impunity with the war in Vietnam as well as in many other places;
- (3) Inasmuch as the struggle of the Vietnamese people must be actively supported by all the socialist governments and Communist parties;
- (4) Inasmuch as according to proletarian internationalism an attack on a sister country is considered to be an attack on all the socialist countries;
- (5) Inasmuch as the socialist strength in armaments and technology is as great or greater than that of imperialism;
- (6) Inasmuch as imperialism has lost all restraint and since an aggression in Vietnam that is left without appropriate answer can give it the feeling that it can attack Cuba and other socialist countries with impunity;
- (7) Inasmuch as imperialism must be restrained if we do not wish to run the risk of global annihilation;
- (8) Inasmuch as imperialism has broken all the elementary rules of international treaties;
- (9) Inasmuch as imperialism has reached the point where reasoning is completely useless;
- (10) And, finally, inasmuch as the Vietcong (Front of National Liberation) has publicly stated that a negotiated settlement is impossible and has appealed to all the peoples and revolutionary forces to intervene directly in South Vietnam, we exhort the socialist governments and the Communist parties to:

Grant unconditional, active and immediate aid.

We exhort immediate effective aid from the socialist countries, and especially from the Soviet Union, for, as Che Guevara said: "It is the duty of the socialist countries to end their tacit complicity with the exploiting countries of the West."

Comité Ejecutivo de la Escuela Nacional de Ciencias
Políticas y Sociales.

Comité Ejecutivo de la Escuela Nacional de Economía.
Comité Ejecutivo de la Facultad de Derecho.
Nuevo Grupo de Ciencias.
Juventud Obrera de México.
Partido Estudiantil Socialista de Ciencias Políticas
y Sociales.
Partido Estudiantil Socialista de Economía.
Alianza de Izquierda Revolucionaria de Economía.
Partido de Reforma Universitaria Nacional.

NO BACKING DOWN IN FACE OF THE CRIMES OF IMPERIALISM

[The following editorial, translated from the March 20 issue of the Algiers daily Le Peuple, indicates the attitude of the Ben Bella government and the Algerian people to the American imperialist aggression in Vietnam. The title of the editorial is "Pas de résignation devant les crimes de l'impérialisme."

* * *

"You can get used to anything," a popular saying has it. Are we then going to become accustomed to the crimes of imperialism, to the assassination of Congolese patriots, to the bombing of peaceful villages in the Democratic Republic of Vietnam?

When the armed aggression of the Belgo-American imperialists in the first part of November enabled Tshombe to re-establish his tottering position, there was a general outcry of indignation among the peoples concerned about freedom and peace. Innumerable meetings were held throughout the world, particularly in Algiers, to denounce the foreign intervention and to demand an immediate halt to it. Intense activity stirred the chancelleries of the countries concerned, particularly the African countries.

On Monday, February 8, the day after the beginning of the "escalation" (in plain words, the dumping of tons of bombs on the peaceful and defenseless North Vietnamese inhabitants), the press featured the event in "scare" headlines and the number of columns was insufficient for the progressive newspapers to speak out against the criminal aggression of U.S. imperialism.

Today, the news concerning these questions is relegated to page nine, sometimes the space is doled out grudgingly. Perhaps as a result, public opinion has little by little lost interest. The protests have become so rare that one could imagine the problems had been resolved.

Nevertheless nothing has been settled, neither in the Congo

nor in Vietnam, and not only are the imperialists persisting in their aggression, but they are committing more numerous and more odious crimes. Thus the puppet Tshombe, still supported by the Belgians, without the aid of whom he would long ago have been liquidated by the Congolese people, continues to utilize foreign mercenaries to suppress them, and is multiplying his assassinations in order to perpetuate the exploitation of his masters, the monopolists of Washington and Brussels. Still worse, believing that he now has the situation "well in hand" in the Congo, and in accordance with the advice of imperialism which wants to sabotage African unity and to reconquer its lost positions no matter what the price, this puppet is now attacking the neighboring countries, and his repeated aggressions against Uganda and Congo-Brazzaville betray the real objectives of those who work the strings on which he dangles.

Far from disappearing, the threat in Africa is only growing and becoming more definite -- imperialism is becoming more virulent, encouraged by its first successes. The situation is worse than last November after the fall of Stanleyville.

In Vietnam, thirty school children were murdered a few days ago, killed by bombs made in the USA. Regularly, and each time farther to the north, American planes violate the territory of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, bombing this peaceful country.

The Pentagon aggressors even publicly avow their intention of continuing this warmongering and criminal policy indefinitely. Here, too, the progressive and peace-minded forces have not yet made imperialism retreat; instead, it seems to be hardening in its aggressiveness.

The repetition of the crime does not make it less reprehensible. Resignation must not give the stamp of acceptance to actions that increasingly threaten to unleash a world catastrophe. Any giving way is a victory of imperialism which counts precisely on the "force of habit" and its ominous effects in such circumstances.

As for Algeria, she never gave up during the eight years of the war for liberation imposed by colonialism. Now free, thanks to the perseverance and the spirit of sacrifice of which the Algerian people gave proof, our country does not intend, for its part, to close its eyes to the maneuvers and aggressions of the imperialists, who in the Congo, in Palestine and in Vietnam place our own freedom in danger, inasmuch as they strike at the freedom of our brothers and seek to sabotage our unity and to provoke a world war.

The consistency of the struggle of our people and our leaders is to be seen in the recent meeting at Conakry, where President Ben Bella worked to block imperialism, in our firm attitude with regard to the neocolonialist maneuvers in Palestine, in our complete support to the patriots of South Vietnam. In like manner, our representative at the United Nations tirelessly appeals for concrete

measures against the colonialism of Salazar and the racism of Verwoerd, whom some people, consciously or not, too much tend to forget, although both of them continue their foul rule in our continent.

But Algeria's consistent policy, which is likewise followed by other progressive countries, will be crowned with success the sooner all the peoples, all the revolutionary forces, energetically face imperialism, the sooner world public opinion, the power of which needs no underlining in the twentieth century, refuses to give up, to lose interest in the crimes of Tshombe's mercenaries, the hangings in Pretoria, the police raids of Salazar, the U.S. "escalation" in Vietnam, the misery of the Palestinian refugees, and in general all the crimes of an imperialism whose virulence increases the nearer it approaches its end.

No, we must not become "habituated." On the contrary, we must reinforce our struggle! Our final victory depends on this.

THREE-COUNTRY ANTINUCLEAR DEMONSTRATION PLANNED

BASLE, Switzerland -- German, French and Swiss opponents of nuclear weapons plan to meet here Monday April 19, the day after Easter, to stage a big demonstration against war and for peaceful collaboration among all peoples. Basle was the site of the famous 1912 Socialist Peace Congress.

The antinuclear fighters plan to come to Basle after participating in demonstrations in their own countries against nuclear armaments. Meeting in the outskirts of the town, they will march to the square in front of the cathedral. One of the main speakers will be the chairman of the Cantonal government of Basle.

The demonstration is being sponsored by the Swiss Movement Against Atomic Armament as the climax of a two-and-a-half day march under such slogans as "Bread for the Peoples -- Not War," "Switzerland to Act for Denuclearized Zones in Europe," "Against Atomic Weapons Both East and West," and others of a more local nature.

The Basle trade-union federations are actively supporting the march and the rally, much to the annoyance of the leading bourgeois newspaper Neue Zürcher Zeitung. This journal, along with most of the Swiss bourgeois press, has persistently denounced the Swiss Movement Against Atomic Armament as "antimilitaristic" and "Trotskyite-Communist" inspired, and has slandered it as being a "tool of Moscow."

Backers of the Movement hope that the encouragement offered by the Basle unions will help inspire similar support for the anti-nuclear movement in Germany. The movement there suffered a serious

setback when the Social-Democratic party gave up its campaign against "atomic death"; and since then the unions in Germany have been reluctant to support antinuclear activities.

NEW BELGIAN SOCIALIST PARTY HOLDS FIRST RALLY

BRUSSELS -- One of the largest halls in this city was packed at the first public rally of Belgium's new left socialist party March 31. Speakers at the meeting included Jacques Yerna, secretary of the Liège trade-union federation and member of the executive committee of the Liège section of the party [the Parti Wallon des Travailleurs -- Walloon Workers party], Robert Nicolas, member of the political secretariat of the Charleroi branch of the PWT, Pierre Le Grève, chairman of the Brussels teachers union, and Ernest Mandel, secretary of the Brussels section of the party [the Union de la Gauche Socialiste -- Union of the Socialist Left].

In Belgian political circles, the meeting of some 1,200 was considered to be a big success for the new party, clearly indicating its potential threat to the reformist Social Democracy. The audience was not artificially swelled by bringing in busloads of supporters from the provinces. It represented a genuine test of interest in Brussels itself in the new formation.

The audience was noticeable for its youth and its clearly working-class character.

The main themes of the speakers dealt with the anticapitalist character of the new party, denunciations of the reformism of the Socialist party and its betrayal of the program on which it was founded. Sharp criticisms were made of the two Belgian Communist parties for their incapacity to develop policies independently from Moscow or Peking. The speakers explained that the overwhelming majority of the Walloon working class favors federalism and that the party will fight for this goal, which is not incompatible with socialist aims.

One of the high points of the meeting was the denunciation made by Pierre Le Grève of the imperialist aggression in Vietnam. Strong applause greeted his expression of solidarity with the Vietnamese people.

Enthusiastic applause likewise greeted his forceful assertion, following criticism of the two Communist parties, that the new party will seek solidarity in action with all other working-class political tendencies.

Ernest Mandel, who made an analysis of the failures of the

social-democracy in Belgium and its incapacity to respond to such opportunities as the general strike in 1960-61, was followed with intense interest by the big audience. He was applauded many times, most strongly perhaps when he cited Fidel Castro, "The task of a revolutionist is to make the revolution."

He paid tribute to the example set by the Cuban revolutionists. While there are obvious differences, he said, between Belgium and Cuba -- as in the role that might be played by guerrilla fighters -- the Cuban Revolution nevertheless offers important lessons that deserve the closest study by the Belgian working class.

Scorning parliamentary illusions, he stated that it is in the factories and in the streets that the workers have made their most important gains. This was true in the past and will remain true in the future.

He lashed the role of American imperialism in Vietnam and the danger it has placed before the entire world of Johnson's "escalation" ending in a nuclear catastrophe. He hoped that the organizations of the left would give an answer to the Americans such as they deserved -- an answer in action.

The meeting ended with the entire audience joining in singing "The Internationale."

LIEGE MINERS END SIT-DOWN STRIKE

BRUSSELS -- The miners of the Batterie pit brought their sit-down strike to an end March 27 after almost two weeks underground. Their dramatic strike action won wide attention and publicity for their protest over the projected closure of their mine.

They had hoped that their example might be picked up by miners in other pits. But the official miners union, which refused to have anything to do with the Batterie strike, succeeded in blocking a chain reaction. The Batterie miners launched their action spontaneously.

The new left socialist party, the PWT-UGS [Parti Wallon de Travailleurs-Union de Gauche Socialiste], sought to rally maximum aid for the Batterie strikers. Money, food and other supplies were collected. Efforts to spread the strike, however, did not succeed. The new party is still too young to be able to bring out the big formations of the workers in the mining industry and in the strongholds of the labor movement in Belgium.

While the main responsibility for the failure to spread the

action lies with the reformist leadership of the miners union and the Socialist party, the centrist leaders of the Liège trade-union federation and of the Walloon Popular Movement were also discredited.

Only Jacques Yerna, the secretary of the Liège trade-union federation, went down into the mine to visit the strikers and offer his solidarity. He addressed public meetings in their behalf against the will of the centrist majority in his federation and did his utmost to mobilize mass support.

APPEAL OF ALEXANDER ELEVEN REJECTED

On March 22 the appeal of Dr. Neville Alexander and ten other opponents of apartheid was rejected by the appeals division of the South African Supreme Court. The Eleven were convicted in April 1964 under the "sabotage" law and sentenced to prison terms ranging from five to ten years. Since December, 1963, the male defendants have been held in the maximum security prison of Robben Island, much of the time in solitary confinement.

Dr. Alexander was the first non-White South African to receive a Humboldt Foundation scholarship for study in West Germany. After receiving his doctorate in German literature from the University of Tübingen, he refused several offers of academic positions in Europe to return to South Africa, where he became a high-school teacher. He was a co-founder of the National Liberation Front, to which the other ten defendants also belonged. At the trial of the Eleven, the prosecution made no attempt to prove that any overt acts of sabotage had been committed. The defendants were charged only with having studied Marxist works and books on guerrilla warfare and with having formed discussion groups to consider possible ways of conducting the struggle against apartheid.

Funds to meet the costs of the first trial were raised largely in West Germany. Action by individuals and organizations in England, Ireland, Japan, Algeria, Norway, and the United States, as well as Germany, made the appeal possible. Although, for the present, no further legal avenues are open, funds are still urgently needed. The families of the victims are destitute; in most cases, the defendants were the only breadwinners.

The Alexander Defense Committee in the U.S. has announced that it will continue to support the families of these valliant men and women. It will continue to focus attention on their plight and on the character of the apartheid tyranny.

Alexander Defense Committees in other countries are now con-

sidering further steps to be taken in the fight to win freedom for the Eleven.

WHY SARTRE WON'T GO TO THE U.S.

When Jean-Paul Sartre, the French philosopher and literary figure, cancelled a series of meetings in the United States March 18, he gave as his reason, "The policy of violence practiced in Vietnam by the government of the United States with the approval of the majority of the American people. . . ."

Sartre's decision made no sense to the growing number of Americans in active opposition to Johnson's war, who are very far from conceding that the "escalation" of the conflict represents the will of the majority. There is no doubt that in a national tour, halls would be packed to hear Sartre.

As a result efforts were made to get him to reconsider. The Students for a Democratic Society, for instance, cabled him March 25, inviting him to address a rally of 10,000 in Washington that is being organized April 17 to protest the war in Vietnam. The SDS offered to organize a speaking tour and forwarded invitations to Sartre to speak over WBAI in New York and KPFA and KPFK in California. These three stations have a wide audience interested in cultural and political topics.

In response to this pressure, Sartre wrote an article in the Paris weekly, Le Nouvel Observateur, of April 1, explaining his position. As justification for a tactic of abstention, the philosopher's arguments will not convince either natural-born fighters, trained political thinkers or those who really know the American scene. Nevertheless Sartre makes some observations about U.S. imperialism that are accurate and to the point and his position of opposition to the dirty colonial war being waged by America in Southeast Asia does him credit. As a reflection of the opinion of European intellectual circles, his article is of considerable interest.

Sartre holds that the extension of the civil war into an imperialist assault on North Vietnam profoundly altered things. The bombings "represent an irreversible qualitative leap inasmuch as they reveal with brutal clearness the fact that the structures of American society rest on imperialism."

Up to that point, he holds, the American position was becoming more and more untenable and it could be hoped "that the Americans would begin to take account of the absurdity of their position" and would seek to withdraw.

But the bombings changed all this. Sartre came to the conclusion that "the Americans understood nothing and there could be no common language between them and us."

He thinks it would be futile for him to go to America and try to make his voice heard. He sees the entire United States caught up in a war fever such as gripped France at the height of the Algerian war; and, the voice of opposition being feeble, it doesn't count.

Nevertheless he expresses alarm about the situation. Effective action against the escalation must take place within "three months," in his opinion. "The arousal of American opinion can be provoked only by an acute crisis -- a military disaster, the grave threat of a world war. The only way we can contribute to arousing this opinion is by indicating brutal, over-all condemnation of American policy in Vietnam and by trying to stir up wherever possible -- that is in Europe -- some protests."

Sartre condemns Washington's propaganda in the most cutting way: "What do the Americans say? That they are intensifying the war in Vietnam, that they are bombing the North, that they are utilizing gas in the South, in order to make negotiations possible. The enormity of this is sufficiently impressive. Because, if you think it over, what does this mean? War is always made in order to end in peace, obviously. In a certain peace. The one chosen. In certain negotiations. Those to be imposed. But the problem is to determine if an outcome is sought that is considered to be acceptable to the adversary or if the aim is to destroy the adversary so that his successors will accept an outcome that constitutes capitulation. The government in Washington is saying: We're waiting for a sign of good faith from North Vietnam. This must be translated: We're waiting for North Vietnam to admit defeat, entreat us to stop the bombings, and promise to no longer aid the Vietcong. In plain language this means that the Americans are for the extension of the war. It is necessary to grasp this. It is urgent. After grasping it, it is necessary to draw conclusions from it. This is what I have done."

In closing, Sartre describes the U.S. course in Vietnam as "an act of open, cynical, complete aggression, without justification or even a serious alibi." He agrees that the U.S. is the mightiest military power, but he denies that it is "the center of the world." It is even the duty of a European, he contends, to stop considering the U.S. as the center and "demonstrate his interest, prove his solidarity with all the Vietnamese, the Cubans, the Africans, all his friends in the third world who gain existence and freedom and who prove each day, precisely, that the greatest power in the world is incapable of imposing its laws, that it is the most vulnerable, and the world has not chosen it as its center of gravity. The United States will evolve, of course, slowly, very slowly, but more rapidly if you resist them than if you address them with sermons."

ITALIANS BLOCKED KREMLIN AT MARCH 1 MOSCOW MEETING

Among the leading circles of the 19 Communist parties who sent representatives to the March 1 meeting in Moscow [see World Outlook March 5] information is now being passed on as to what occurred there.

Before the delegates left, the participating parties received two documents drafted by the leaders of the Communist party of the Soviet Union. One was a resolution written in accordance with the Kremlin's line of severe condemnation of the Chinese; the other was a proposed letter convoking a conference of all the Communist parties.

Although a number of parties were not enthusiastic about the line proposed by the Russians, it was only the Italian Communist party that undertook to oppose it. The Italians criticized the political document and reaffirmed their well-known position against any early convocation of an international conference.

As usual, it was the French delegates, especially Jean Kanapa, who took a hard line, attacking the Italians, and even permitting some of the Soviet delegates to appear as moderates. At one point, a Soviet leader went so far as to remind Kanapa about the internal difficulties in the Italian Communist party and the problems posed by the existence of a strong Socialist party in Italy.

Before the end of the meeting a particularly virulent attack was launched against the Italian Communist party by one of the Polish delegates.

The Italians even declared that they would not sign any document without authorization from their leadership.

Finally a compromise was reached, favoring the Italian view. The political document was considerably modified before being made public and the idea of a letter calling for a conference was dropped. After waiting two days, a favorable reply was received from Rome to sign the document (with the reservation that the Italian leadership issue a parallel declaration).

The Cubans, it is reported, did not decide to attend until the last minute. It was quite clear that they were interested in only one thing, to get the situation in Vietnam placed on the agenda. The document finally adopted on this was the one they proposed. They considered all the rest to be useless arguments in which they did not seriously participate.

BREZHNEV PROMISES TO MAKE GOOD WHERE KHRUSHCHEV FAILED

By Pierre Frank

Some five months after Khrushchev's downfall, important additional light has been shed on the reasons behind that important event. In his report at the meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist party of the Soviet Union, which ended March 26, Brezhnev revealed a startling fact.

"Gross agricultural production, as projected by the seven-year plan (1959-1965), should have increased 70%," Brezhnev said. "But it increased only 10%. A noticeable increase occurred up to 1959, but after that, agriculture in actuality made no gains. A lot was demanded of agriculture, but the necessary economic support was not forthcoming. Thus state investments in agriculture which amounted to 11.3% of all investments from 1954 to 1958, did not rise above 7.5% in the following period (1959 to 1965)."

From this admission only one conclusion can be drawn about the results in agriculture -- it was a disaster. Not to reach the projected increase of 70% was bad enough; but to reach only 10% signifies failure to keep up even with the rate of growth of the population.

The Trotskyist movement has continually stressed that agriculture has been the Achilles' heel of the Soviet economy under the bureaucracy. With Khrushchev's accession to power, the Trotskyists held that his fate would be linked primarily with his success or failure in the agricultural domain where Stalin's heritage is a particularly heavy millstone. Khrushchev resorted to various measures during the years he headed the government. But after some progress due to certain reforms and particularly a rise in the prices of agricultural products, Soviet agriculture fell into dangerous stagnation. Khrushchev made grandiloquent promises which could not be kept. Inevitably he had to serve as the scapegoat.

Brezhnev's report likewise clearly alluded to "scientists" of the Lysenko type. "Many solutions -- let's say thoughtless and often opposed to both the kolkhoz administration and the facts of life -- were imposed on the leadership in agriculture," Brezhnev said.

Administrative measures, insufficient investments, official support for theories and dogmas lacking any scientific basis -- this was the indictment once levelled by Khrushchev to some extent against Stalin after the death of the dictator. Khrushchev's successors now level it against him.

It should be recalled that whatever official Soviet propaganda says about it, Soviet agriculture is by far the most backward part of the country's economy. An excellent description can be found in

the book by René Dumont which appeared last year, Sovkhoz, Kolkhoz ou le Problématique Communisme [Sovkhoz, Kolkhoz or Questionable Communism].

"Soviet agriculture," writes Dumont, "remains largely underdeveloped." (p. 179.) "Since 1930, none of the Soviet agricultural plans have been fulfilled. Since 1958, progress has again become very slow. Too ambitious, the agricultural plans for '1970' and '1980' will surely not be fulfilled, without extremely profound structural reforms that are not realizable in the present circumstances." (p. 262.)

For a long time, agriculture has been the principal source of accumulation in the Soviet economy. Dumont mentions this fact likewise in his book. "Up until 1953, agriculture paid much more in taxes to the state than it received in investments. Can the two figures now be brought into balance?" (p. 53.) Dumont refrains from answering in the affirmative.

Until the full text of Brezhnev's report has been released, it is not possible to draw definitive conclusions about the measures he proposes. However, their nature is indicated by the promise to invest during the next five years 71,000,000,000 rubles [one ruble = \$1.11], the equivalent of everything that has been invested in the past nineteen years. A promise was also made to the peasants to cut down on obligatory deliveries. (The figure for 1965 will be lowered from 65,500,000 tons of grain to 55,700,000 tons, where it will stand until 1970.) The incomes of peasants will not be lowered since higher prices will be paid by the state for deliveries.

Brezhnev made a very imprudent assertion in his report. "Noticeable increases in prices in relation to current quotations will be offered, but will have no repercussions on the price of bread, cereal products, meat and meat products."

Khrushchev proceeded in a similar way in 1962 to raise the prices paid by the state for meat and milk products. The result was a rise in prices for the consumers. This gave rise to discontent among the workers, even touching off strikes (in the Zis plant in Moscow and in the Donetz coal basin) in the months preceding the downfall of Khrushchev.

Brezhnev did not say how he expected to avoid having increases in the prices of agricultural products affect the prices paid by consumers. At the moment it is not known where the increased investments for agriculture are to be drawn -- the field of consumption, heavy industry, or defense expenditures.

This involves the problem of general policy and government relations with Soviet society. The press has commented on the removal of the "ideologist" Ilyichev from the post of secretary of the Central Committee during the meeting and his replacement by a

"technician," Ustinov, stressing that in general "technicians" are replacing the "ideologists."

This is badly formulated. Since Stalin established the bureaucratic regime in the USSR; that is, an oligarchical power of top leaders who determine policy, there have been only "technicians" -- technicians of ideology, technicians of production, etc., who are compelled to serve the ruling power.

As a consequence, the bureaucratic system has put the most mediocre technicians in the field of "ideology," where the task was to liquidate Marxism. The more competent technicians were drawn into production where positive results had to be shown and progress made. The field of ideology has now reached such a point that it no longer serves the bureaucracy as it did in the past. To achieve the goals that are set, the development of Soviet society requires something more than the insignificant documents produced by the "ideological" services of the Communist party of the Soviet Union.

Technicians from the field of production can take the place of the technicians of ideology. But what has to be determined is policy. And the technicians from the field of production cannot propose anything at present but a bureaucratic policy offering, as in Khrushchev's case, only temporary results that open no real perspective inasmuch as Soviet society is still deprived of the fundamental element that is indispensable to give Soviet economy an irresistible impetus in all fields; that is, democracy -- democracy both economic and political, from the lowest level of production to the summits of government.

ITALIAN COMMUNIST YOUTH CONGRESS POSTPONED

By Francesco Marchi

ROME -- Relations between the Italian Communist party and the youth reached an uneasy level with rumors that the national congress of the youth would not be held this year. [See World Outlook March 5]. The rumors were confirmed by an official decision of the National Council of the Italian Communist Youth at its meeting on March 12-13.

As its reason for requesting the FGCI [Italian Communist Youth Federation] to postpone their congress, the party bureaucracy adduced that the basic documents which had been drafted in preparation reflected a line deviating too far from the official party line. A compromise was then reached, the substance being that the FGCI is to participate in the next party congress with delegates having both voice and vote.

This was included in the report of Achille Occhetto, National Secretary of the FGCI, who openly stated that the proposal to postpone the congress came from the party leadership who had proposed "a more intensive and engaged participation of the FGCI militants in the preparations and debates of the Ninth Congress of the PCI than in the past."

After disposing of this question in an impersonal and almost detached way, Occhetto went on to some political questions, once again taking up positions he had already expressed in speeches and articles published in Città Futura (the monthly review of the FGCI). Despite its uncertainties and ambiguities, Occhetto's report hewed, as in his previous declarations, to a line to the left of the party's official line.

Most of the National Council members who took the floor spoke about the congress. Quite a number were against postponing it. Some prominent figures of the national FGCI leadership did not speak, in this way indicating their disagreement with the proposal made by the party bureaucracy.

Some of the speakers took up the question of Vietnam, criticizing the Soviet Union for not providing substantial aid to the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. During one of these speeches, Luigi Longo, national secretary of the Italian Communist party, interrupted to say that there were difficulties which could not be imputed to the Soviet Union. Asked what they were, he said, in a vague way, that the Soviet Union had offered aid to North Vietnam but that China had apparently denied transit permission for such supplies across her territory and that further details could not be given for "obvious military reasons." Although Longo's statement made a certain impression, the majority of those present remained skeptical.

Occhetto's report was put to a vote as a whole instead of on its political aspects and on the postponement of the congress. The left wing was embarrassed. If they voted against the report because of their views on the congress postponement it would weaken a leftist (although limited) position with regard to the party's leadership. A small group of right oppositionists were also embarrassed. If they voted against the report because of their views on its political content, this could be interpreted as a criticism of the proposal of the party bureaucracy to postpone the congress. With a few abstentions, Occhetto's report was therefore carried by a large majority and the existing differences were hidden.

By a unanimous vote, the National Council protested the removal of issues of Clarté from the headquarters of the French student union containing documents written by the opposition and other "subversive" literature. [See World Outlook March 12.] It was reported at the meeting of the National Council that this literature had been dumped in the Seine! This so shocked the party

leadership that they sent a letter of protest to the leadership of the French Communist party.

The postponement of the FGCI congress has only postponed an open political confrontation. Meanwhile, in spite of threats, the FGCI is maintaining Città Futura. Its contributions can enliven the discussion in preparation for the next congress of the Italian Communist party.

NATIONALIZATIONS IN SYRIA REMAIN UNCERTAIN

DAMASCUS -- The nationalization decrees* touched off a strong capitalist reaction in Syria which was reflected in this city by a long strike of merchants that was finally crushed by the army. Among the workers and peasants, on the other hand, the decrees inspired a revolutionary mood.

The Communist party supported the nationalization measures and its members took part in the demonstrations in support of the government during the merchants' strike. There has been talk of a front between the Baath party and the Communist party.

The following observations can be made about the situation.

(1) The nationalization decrees were undertaken in reply to capitalist preparations for a coup d'état against the ruling Baath party.

(2) The regime in Syria is now under the control of the lower officers who led the March 8, 1963, coup d'état that brought the Baath to power. In the majority, they are of peasant origin.

*On January 3, 1965, the Presidency Council nationalized 107 industrial enterprises comprising the country's main industries. One decree established full state control over 22 factories in Damascus, Aleppo, Hama and Homs. A second decree established 90 per cent nationalization of 24 enterprises in the same areas, leaving 10 per cent in private hands. The same decree nationalized 75 per cent of holdings in 61 private industrial firms, leaving 25 per cent to private stockholders. A third decree provided for immediate compensation to small stockholders whose livelihood depended entirely on their investment in the affected firms. A fourth decree warned that "obstructionist attempts of any kind" are punishable by life imprisonment and even death. The nationalized fields include building materials, textiles, production of edible oils and synthetic rubber. Two breweries were included. Compensation was promised within 15 years at 3 per cent interest.

At the moment they are in conflict with the "civilian" leadership, especially the right wing led by Aflak and Bitar. They represent the more resolute and fierce elements of the ruling class but are decidedly erratic in behavior. Like all the Baathis they lack a clear doctrine and strategic line. At best they believe in a kind of state capitalism with a strong military and bureaucratic grip on the people.

(3) As regards the nationalization decrees themselves, the situation is still very confused. The decrees provide for self-management by the workers in the nationalized industries; but up to now all that has been done is to appoint students, teachers and party men as managers. The confusion is pointed up by the nationalization of many very small shops. These come close to the artisan level; i.e., enterprises run by a man and his family and undertakings, the shares of which are held by people of quite limited incomes. This has tended to alienate wide sectors of the petty bourgeoisie, turning them away from socialism and the Baath and in the direction of semifascist and strongly religious organizations, especially the Moslem Brethren. Such people are numerous in the urban areas, particularly Damascus.

The government also issued a decree forbidding former managers to work in the nationalized industries. This could be disastrous in some industries. (In leather-making, for instance, the owner was often also the manager and the only one who knew the process of tanning.)

It should also be noted that the nationalization decrees stand in isolation; i.e., they are not part of a socialist or even broadly democratic plan to reconstruct Syria's economy on a new basis. That the decrees warrant critical support is beyond doubt. But the price Syria's workers and peasants are paying for the Baath's erratic policies cannot be compensated for by these nationalization decrees alone. With regard to the required main course, the Baath lacks everything -- a clear ideology, definite planning, an efficient, strong party dedicated to socialism, and, most important of all, the determination to take the road of socialism without looking back.

(4) At the Baath congress these issues will be up for discussion but not much should be expected to come from it. The prospects for a coalition with the Communist party do not appear to be high. While the rank and file are not against it, they are not prepared to go beyond representation in the cabinet and Revolutionary Council and are at the same time against granting the Communist party the right to independent political action. But the rank and file of the Baath is the last thing that counts with the Syrian government in determining policy.

On the other hand, the Communist party is not enthusiastic about granting this kind of support. Both leaders and rank and

file have had unhappy experiences. They lent both Nasser and Aref full support and in return were served with repressive measures. In Iraq the attack mounted by the Baath took barbaric dimensions. In Egypt, after fierce persecution, Nasser relented; but recently another campaign was opened against them in Cairo under the joint auspices of Hassanein Haikal, Nasser's press adviser, and the Egyptian police.

JOHN BAIRD

We learned with sadness of the death of John Baird in a London hospital March 21 following a long illness.

Born in 1906, he worked for a time in the coal mines in Scotland, later becoming a dentist. He joined the Labour party at a very young age and remained in its extreme left wing from the beginning to the end. After having been drafted during the war, he became a candidate for parliament from Wolverhampton East, winning from the Liberals in the general election of July 1945. He was re-elected in 1950, 1951, 1955 and 1959. He did not run in the election last October.

John Baird was close to the Trotskyist movement, and on numerous occasions displayed his solidarity with it. During the war, Pierre Frank, a leader of the French Trotskyist movement, was imprisoned in Britain where he had gone to escape the Nazi occupation of France. When Baird became an MP, he intervened in the case to help win legal standing for the refugee Trotskyist leader. Baird was a strong witness in behalf of Michel Pablo and Sal Santen at their trial in Amsterdam for activities associated with the Algerian Revolution. In Great Britain he took the initiative in organizing aid for the Algerian cause. He visited the Algerian workers and fighters who operated from Morocco. After Algeria won freedom, he participated in the conference at Algiers in June 1963 which sponsored nongovernmental aid for Algeria.

His position in the extreme left of the Labour party won him some brickbats from the parliamentary group under Gaitskell's leadership.

Although he suffered from an incurable illness, he continued his work for causes of the vanguard up to the last moment. A few days before his death, he sent a letter from his hospital bed to the British socialist publication The Week, appealing for aid to the Vietnam revolution.

Those who knew John Baird will remember him as a good friend, a good comrade and a loyal militant of the working class.

CONGOLESE REPUDIATE SLANDER OF HOLDEN ROBERTO

According to a March 26 press release issued in Algiers by the Revolutionary Government of Angola in Exile [GRAE], headed by Holden Roberto, the Congolese National Liberation Council [CNL] has repudiated a January 13 communiqué issued in its name which accused Holden Roberto "of putting his soldiers in the service of the Léopoldville killers in order to combat the patriotic forces, particularly in the province of Kwilu."

The January 13 communiqué echoed an attack against Holden Roberto levelled in Pravda December 16, 1964, but went much further in citing alleged incidents.

These accusations were indignantly denied by representatives of the GRAE who sought to answer them in detail. [See World Outlook March 5.] They claimed that the January 13 communiqué was put out by a few members of the CNL living in Brazzaville and that Christophe Gbenyé, head of the Revolutionary Congolese Government, had declared that he did not know anything about it.

The GRAE now states in its March 26 press release that in an interview in Cairo, Davidson Bocheley, chairman of the CNL tendency with headquarters in Brazzaville, told GRAE representative Leopoldo das Chagas Trovoada that his movement was not responsible for the declarations made in the communiqué in question.

"In addition, Mr. Bocheley told the GRAE representative that the Congolese revolutionaries had at last understood the Angolan question," the declaration continues, "and he charged Brother Trovoada to offer his apologies to President Holden Roberto for the damage which the communiqué in question had caused him." [Emphasis in original.]

The interview took place in the presence of Théodore Gbongo, personal representative of Mr. Bocheley and former confident of Patrice Lumumba and Major Wembo of the Revolutionary Congolese Army of Stanleyville.

"The revolutionary leaders," concludes the dispatch, "promised the GRAE representative in Cairo to do everything possible to discover the source of the slanderous communiqué published in Brazzaville."

Meanwhile, inside Angola a rise in guerrilla activities has been reported. The National Liberation Army of Angola [ALNA] listed recent encounters at Cahungala, Nova-Gaia, Quibala, between Bula-Atumba and Golungo-Alto, at Cachimo, Tomboco, Damba and Lombe. Fighting even occurred close to Luanda on a plantation near Mabuba.

BALANCE SHEET OF THE CHILEAN ELECTION

By José Valdés

Santiago, Chile

The outcome of the parliamentary elections held March 7 was as follows:

	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Senators</u>	<u>Deputies</u>
Partido Demócrata Cristiano	989,626	11	82
Partido Radical	308,583	3	20
Partido Comunista	286,157	2	18
Partido Socialista	245,500	3	15
Partido Liberal	175,400	0	7
Partido Conservador	129,312	0	3
Partido Democrático Nacional	74,402	1	3
Other parties	75,000	0	0
Blank ballots	34,300		
Void ballots	35,789		
Abstentions	20%		

From these results we can draw the following conclusions:

(1) The bourgeois and imperialist forces gained a considerable electoral victory, since some 1,700,000 votes were cast for the bourgeois parties and scarcely 600,000 for the FRAP [Frente Revolucionario de Acción Popular, a front backed by the Communist, Socialist and other parties].

(2) The Christian Democracy [CD] now constitutes the main party in Chile with 42% of the vote and enough members in parliament to assure an absolute majority. The outstanding fact in its victory is that a big part of the votes came from workers, peasants and white-collar layers, to which must be added the massive backing of the petty bourgeoisie. Thus the CD gained control of the popular movement, taking it away from the FRAP. In the proletarian and peasant zones, the CD obtained approximately 60% of the popular vote against 40% for the Communist party [CP] and Socialist party [SP], a higher proportion than it received in the 1964 presidential election.

(3) The traditional rightist parties (the Liberals and Conservatives) suffered a considerable decline, losing -- perhaps definitively -- the support of certain layers of the petty bourgeoisie which now prefer to vote for the spare party of the bourgeoisie, the CD. The vote for the Radical party dropped from 21% to 12.8%; but, with some 300,000 votes, it still has a certain standing among sectors of the urban middle class.

(4) The percentage of votes for the FRAP parties was smaller

than in the previous elections. The CP dropped from the 12.8% which it won in 1963 to 11.87%; while the SP went from 11.47% in the 1963 councilmanic election to 10% despite being favored by compensating deals which it succeeded in getting from the CP. Still worse, the FRAP leaders proved incapable of winning the independent masses who favored the candidacy of Allende for the presidency, the vote dropping from 975,000 in the 1964 contest to 597,000 in the current one.

(5) An important sector of workers -- although still a very small minority -- repudiated the bourgeois electoral system and the reformist leadership of the FRAP. This was shown by the figure of 20% abstentions (in contrast to 9% in 1964) and the appreciable number of blank and void ballots. In the September 1964 election there were 7,408 blank ballots in contrast to 34,300 six months later in March. The 15,350 void ballots in 1964 contrasts with 35,700 in the current election. A big part of the void ballots came from workers who wrote revolutionary slogans across their ballots. The groups of the revolutionary left who called for blank ballots (Partido Socialista Popular, Vanguardia Revolucionaria Marxista, Espartaco (pro-Chinese), and MIDI [Movimiento de Independistas Allendistas de Izquierda]) stated in press declarations that "a considerable part of the politically conscious workers responded to the revolutionary appeal." The blank and void ballots were cast primarily in areas where these revolutionary groups have a base as in Coquimbo, Valparaíso, Santiago, O'Higgins, Concepción, Talca, Cautín, etc. An additional indication was the 4,335 votes cast for the independent Socialist member of parliament, Rigoberto Cossio, who lacked but few votes to be re-elected from Osorno. Cossio, together with many of his comrades in the province, have applied for membership in the Partido Socialista Popular.

The Frei Government

The Christian Democracy is the spare bourgeois party which imperialism had to wheel out in order to maintain the capitalist system and to channelize mass discontent through a reformist, demagogic program. The Frei government represents the general interests of the bourgeoisie and the new plans of Yankee imperialism expressed in the "Alliance for Progress." It would, however, be grossly mechanical to affirm that it is an unconditional or puppet government of the oligarchy and imperialism. Frei represents the interests of a bourgeoisie in a semicolonial country that is incapable of freeing itself from the foreign monopolists but which wishes to play the role of junior partner in an active way, seeking better prices for raw materials, a guaranteed market, ample credits and foreign investments, aspiring to negotiate the division of the national income with imperialism under better conditions. Frei's measures with regard to copper and the electric and telephone companies prove that the CD is not an anti-imperialist movement; but they show at the same time that it is not an unconditional servant of Wall Street.

The rise of the CD to power testifies to the displacement of the old land-holding oligarchy which shared power with the industrial bourgeoisie up until recent decades. However, a sector of modern agriculturists (in the south) support the government, since the projected Agrarian Reform will not affect holdings that are in full production. The industrial bourgeoisie support Frei because in the final analysis he guarantees continuation of the policy followed by the best exponent of this class sector -- Jorge Alessandri, the former president. The most favored sector will be export industries (paper and cellulose products, steel from Huachipato, fish meal, etc.). It is not by accident that Frei is giving special backing to the Asociación Latinoamericana de Libre Comercio [ALALC], as a means of boosting the Chilean export industries. Light industry, which is concerned about the internal market, likewise supports the government's agrarian plans in the illusion that these will widen the market and increase the buying power of the small landholders envisioned by the projected Agrarian Reform.

The CD enjoys the backing of imperialism and the bourgeoisie, but this is not sufficient to characterize the Frei government with precision. To gain power, the CD was obliged to stand on a demagogic platform voicing popular aspirations. This succeeded in winning the support of the majority of workers, peasants and white-collar layers, in this way committing the government to certain promises. Frei's popular support introduces a social element that suggests the following question: Can Frei establish a "sui generis bonapartist" government? That is, a government representing the general interests of the bourgeoisie, but playing the role of arbiter between the classes, which, basing itself on the support of the popular sectors, could blackmail and pressure the old oligarchy in order to advance its own plans? This question, along with a precise characterization of the Frei government, is of decisive importance for the policy that a revolutionary Marxist party must formulate for the mass movement which in its majority supports the government.

It can be argued that this government cannot be characterized as "sui generis bonapartist" because, unlike the governments of Perón, Vargas, etc., it is not based on the organized trade-union movement. The objection, in my opinion, is a formal one. What is to be noted is the content -- Frei's popular support whatever its form.

In addition, it is possible that with a new trade-union project which Frei has placed before congress, he will gain the support of big union sectors following a possible split in the trade-union movement. If the CD does not win the next congress of the CUT [Central Unica de Trabajadores], it will surely provoke a split and create a dual trade-union center which the government will recognize as the legal one. The yellow unions will be inclined to favor this new Central supported by the government. In that case, Frei will succeed in adding an important part of the trade-union movement to his present base among the unorganized sectors of the population.

Frei's popular support is a victory for the political demagoguery of the CD and a demonstration of the incapacity of the bureaucratic leaders of the FRAP, but it brings in a contradiction that will begin to stand out in coming months when the masses demand fulfillment of the program. Thus the contradiction will sharpen between the militant base of the CD, which is popular in character, and the bourgeois leadership. This will be shown in the formation of tendencies and wings within the government party.

Government plans are projected along the following lines:

(1) In economics: To increase agricultural production by means of credits and a mild agrarian reform that will not substantially change land ownership; to foster the export industries as indicated above; to overcome the crisis and deficit in foreign exchange, increasing copper exports through new contracts or projected combinations with the Yankee companies. Our prognosis on the economic perspectives of the country is that the government will not be able to overcome the stagnation of the productive forces, that it will not be able to halt the inflationary process or to increase the standard of living for the masses. The national return on foreign investments, promised by Yankee and German imperialism, could increase somewhat, but in the long run this, like the projected increase in copper production, does not depend on Frei's "good" intentions, but on the world market and prices, which continue to be controlled by imperialism. Agricultural and industrial production, with the exception perhaps of the export industries, will continue to stagnate, because the inflationary process -- at a higher rate than the 25% envisaged by the government -- will reduce the buying power of the masses.

(2) In the social field: The government will try to widen its basis of support by creating some thousands of small landholders, but its success will prove to be limited, since the moderate agrarian reform will not affect the producing latifundios [big estates] but only uncultivated lands. This is insufficient to satisfy the aspirations of the peasants who voted for Frei.

(3) Among the trade unions: The CD will foment a split in the labor movement if it does not succeed in capturing a majority at the next congress of the CUT which is scheduled later this year. The government has already sent a project to the congress aiming at dividing the unions along the lines practiced by the CD in Italy, Belgium, etc. The CD will seek to penetrate the popular movement not only in the unions but in the villages where the majority of the workers are unorganized. But its housing plan, supplying of sewing machines, food handouts, etc., will not succeed in satisfying the aspirations of the workers. These superficial reforms do not touch the foundation of the present system and do not signify a real improvement in the standard of living.

In the next period, we will witness the failure of the so-

called "Revolution in Freedom" ["Revolución en Libertad"] and see the bourgeois democratic revolution frustrated once more, since, as in other semicolonial countries, the bourgeoisie is incapable of carrying out its own historic tasks. Contemporary history has demonstrated that these can only be accomplished by the proletariat at the head of the peasantry and the impoverished middle class. The Frei government, in which imperialism is placing such hopes, will fail to meet the challenge issued by Fidel Castro as to which will prove superior -- the reform in Chile or the revolution in Cuba? The Latin-American peoples will soon see the difference in rate of progress between socialist Cuba, with its planned economy based on a worker-peasant alliance, and Christian-Democrat Chile, which seeks to patch up and reform a decadent capitalist system.

The Present Stage and Immediate Tasks

The fundamental lines characterizing the present stage are: (1) the strengthening of capitalism through assumption of a new mask -- the Christian Democracy -- which succeeded in gaining the support of big sectors of the population through a demagogic and reformist program; (2) the crisis of the Communist and Socialist parties; and (3) the tendency toward regroupment and unification of the revolutionary Marxist forces.

The fact that the FRAP was defeated has led to speculations about having entered a stage of retrogression. This is due to a formal and mechanistic criterion which identifies the FRAP with the working class as a whole. We believe that the masses who voted for Frei did so because of the program of changes and reforms which the CD promised. Big sectors of the population made a mistake in placing confidence in bourgeois reformism, but they do not feel defeated; instead they expect the promises to be carried out. These layers did not vote for Frei for rightist and pro-imperialist or anti-Communist reasons, but in hope of a "Revolution in Freedom," as the CD called it. The victory of the CD did not signify a social defeat for the working class as a whole. The trade-union and political organizations of the working class are intact, able to initiate a counteroffensive, as was shown by the mobilization of the trade unions at the end of the year for wage adjustments.

We are not in a period of liquidation of the conquests already won by the proletariat, nor in a period of repression and persecution of the workers' movement. We are not living in a stage of retrogression nor of bourgeois counterreform compelling the workers to fall back and stand on the defensive. On the contrary, we believe that the reformist and demagogic plan of the CD and the state of mind of the Freista and Allendista workers favors mobilizing the workers for strikes in behalf of immediate demands, occupations of the land and blocks of houses under construction, etc. These struggles will be spurred by the deterioration of the economic situation, since the government will be unable to counter the inflationary process. The rise of the world revolution, the victories of

the colonial and backward countries, and any noticeable advance of the revolution in any Latin-American country, will likewise encourage the Chilean workers to engage in struggle.

In the stage now opening, the political front will shift to the level of the unions and the villages. The process of politicalization will not automatically be wiped out among the masses who were preoccupied with the political-electoral problem during 1964; it will be displaced toward their class organizations which can battle for immediate demands. The key to the situation is to accelerate the experience of the popular sectors with the Frei government through a common struggle of the workers, peasants and white-collar layers for wage increases, the unity of the CUT and the unions, the occupation of the land in the villages. This should be waged through a united front of the ranks with the Freista workers, joint action in occupying the land with Freista peasants who still believe in the agrarian reform and in the land promised by the CD, and any kind of action that tends to unmask the Frei government.

The crisis of the Communist and Socialist parties, which is part of the world-wide breakup of revisionism and reformism, has deepened in Chile since the defeat of Allende on September 4, 1964.

The ideological clarification around the Sino-Soviet conflict and, fundamentally, the revolutionary methods of struggle generated by the Cuban Revolution, precipitated a crisis in the old political superstructures of the popular movement in Latin America. The programmatic revisionism of the Communist and Socialist parties no longer holds sway, because the Cuban Revolution posed with razor sharpness the immediate perspective of the workers and peasants taking power through insurrectional struggle in contrast to the impracticality of the peaceful and parliamentary road. There has been a sharpening of the contradiction between the ranks who want to take the revolutionary road and the bureaucratic leaderships that hold them back. Hence the innumerable splits in the traditional workers parties in Latin America in the past five years which have given birth to new class and revolutionary formations.

The Chilean Communist and Socialist parties have also been affected by this general crisis. For some time sizeable sectors have been shifting away from the SP in the provinces of Coquimbo, Santiago, Valparaíso, Talca, Concepción, Llanquihue, Osorno, etc., leaving the SP practically without any youth in these areas. In the Communist party, an important split occurred with the departure of Senator Barros, the writer Portnoy and many militants in Valparaíso. As yet a mass desertion has not occurred in the ranks of the CP, but a molecular process has begun of criticism of the leadership and open disagreement with the peaceful and electoral road. The crisis in the two parties deepened after the disastrous Allendista presidential campaign, since the September 4 defeat meant the defeat of the line advocating the peaceful road. Many militants of the CP and SP, who believed in this line, or at least accepted it

temporarily, were disillusioned and have begun intensive criticism of the line imposed by the leaderships.

The task of the revolutionary Marxist groups is to appeal, tactfully but firmly, to the rank-and-file Communists and Socialists, redoubling the ideological propaganda, the publication of books, pamphlets and journals, directing pages, handbills and circulars especially to them, organizing courses and meetings, and in particular carrying out joint actions among the worker and student sectors.

Unity of the Revolutionary Forces

The new Marxist-Leninist groups, born in the crisis of the traditional parties and the advance of class forces inspired by the Cuban Revolution, show a marked tendency toward regroupment in all the countries of Latin America. They pose unity in order to end the period of atomization, because they understand that only the fusion of the revolutionary forces can accelerate the overthrow of the pro-imperialist bourgeoisie. In the process of unification many prejudices have already been overcome with regard to older revolutionary formations such as Trotskyism, and old cadres have been impelled to break with sectarianism and to end squabbles and secondary differences. The regroupment has led to the formation of strong parties of the extreme left in various Latin-American countries, around which the best of the vanguard have begun to gather. The working-class and student youth are beginning to see through the traditional workers' parties and to look with sympathy at the formation of the new revolutionary parties.

In Chile the revolutionary regroupment coincided, as in other countries, with the rise of the Cuban Revolution. The efforts of the Movimiento de Fuerzas Revolucionarias, organized by Clotario Blest in 1961, have been followed by other unifying steps fostered by the Trotskyists such as gave rise to the Partido Socialista Popular in 1964. This process toward unification of the revolutionary left has registered fresh successes in recent months. The following groups are close to unification on the basis of a Leninist-Marxist program: Vanguardia Revolucionaria Marxista, Partido Socialista Popular, MIDI, revolutionary trade unionists like Clotario Blest, and dissident Socialist sectors that have recently left the SP.

The national congresses of these groups, scheduled for April, project ratifying the proposal to unite, enabling a relatively strong revolutionary Marxist party to be created, since the forces already assembled in these groups would make possible a party of national scale, well based in the main provinces of the country and the trade-union and student movements. The fundamental task faced by the Marxist-Leninist groups at present is to rapidly go ahead with the formation of the united party of the Chilean Socialist Revolution, to overcome the crisis in leadership of the workers' movement and guide the workers to power along the road of the proletarian revolution.

March 20, 1965

AMERICAN SOCIALIST YOUTH DEFEND VIETNAMESE

THE WAR IN VIETNAM, by Douglas Jenness and Robin Martin. A Young Socialist Pamphlet. The Young Socialist, P.O.Box 471, Cooper Station, New York, N.Y. 10003. 1965. 16 pp. \$.10.

This small pamphlet written by two American university students, is a compact review of the background of the present colonial war conducted by U.S. imperialism in Vietnam.

The authors sketch the role of French imperialism in conquering this land and finally losing it to an insurgent, freedom-seeking people.

In such a short work, the authors, of course, could not make a detailed analysis of the reasons for U.S. entry into this theater, but they indicate the main reason. It was "part and parcel of the strategy of waging a ceaseless war against struggles for economic and political independence by the Asian peoples most directly influenced by the Chinese Revolution."

The Vietnamese freedom fighters are urged to study the example set by the Cuban revolutionists and "take the economic and political power away from the capitalist landlords." Land reform and national independence can be achieved only through socialism.

The pamphlet scores the "horrifying brutality of the American war against the Vietnamese people and the threat that this conflict might escalate into a nuclear war. . . ." It defends the right of the Vietnamese people to decide their own fate.

"Every American who supports the right of the Vietnamese people to self determination must be opposed to American intervention in Vietnam," the final paragraph states. "A national protest must be raised against the American government, calling for immediate withdrawal of all American troops."

NEW PAMPHLET ON MALCOLM X

MALCOLM X, THE MAN AND HIS IDEAS, by George Breitman. Pioneer Publishers, 5 East Third St., New York, N.Y. 10003. 1965. 24 pp. \$.25.

This is one of the best appreciations of Malcolm X made since the martyrdom of the outstanding leader of the Negro people. It is the text of a speech made by George Breitman March 5 at the Friday Night Socialist Forum in Detroit.

Breitman is one of the leading authorities in the American radical movement on the freedom struggle of the Negro people and his contributions are generally of special interest as expositions of the Trotskyist view on this subject.

In this speech, he outlines the life of Malcolm X, particularly the development and maturing of his political outlook. Breitman holds that the evolution of Malcolm X, despite its unique aspects, epitomizes the logical course of the freedom struggle of the black people as a whole in the United States. The direction, as Breitman proves in the case of Malcolm X, is from individual rebellion, towards cohesion in the pattern of black nationalism, then towards alliance with other rebellious sectors of society, and finally towards socialism.

The tragedy in the life of Malcolm X was that he was not permitted to complete this perfectly natural evolution. It therefore cannot be said positively that he would have completed it although there is every reason to believe that his intelligence, honesty and talents were such that his next great step forward would have been a deep study of socialism and its relevance for the freedom struggle in the United States.

The death of Malcolm X was a "stunning blow to the Negro people and to those white Americans who want to eradicate the system that breeds racism," says Breitman. "Men like Malcolm do not appear often, or in great numbers."

However, the struggle will go on. "Malcolm cannot be replaced overnight, but meanwhile we all can and should strive harder, work harder, fight harder, unite more closely to try to fill the gap left by the death of this man we loved, and give help and encouragement to those destined to replace him."

This is a fine tribute to Malcolm X and a good short account of the development of his views and the point he had reached when he was struck down.