

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Vol. 3, No. 18

May 7, 1965

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

In this issue

Page

Johnson Opens a Second Front in Santo Domingo -- by Joseph Hansen	2
"Get U.S. Troops Out of Vietnam!" Say Japanese Pacifists	6
British Union Denounces American Policy in Vietnam	6
State Department Sees "Communist Takeover" in Tokyo Press	7
Shouts of "Hands Off Vietnam!" Drown Out Labour Speaker	8
Johnson's War Policy Frightens Koreans in Japan	9
Japanese Merchants of Death See Bright Future	9
Talk in Japan About Volunteers for Vietnam	10
Japanese Unions Stage Half-Day Strike	11
U.S. Consulate Bombed in Montreal	11
Hugo Bressano Appeals Case to Argentine Supreme Court	12
Price Increases Spur Chilean Workers into Action	13
New Step Toward Socialist Unification in Chile	14
Discontent Grows in Bolivia	16
Speakers Call for Workers Government in Bolivia	17
Witch-Hunt in Mexico	18
Belgian Left Socialists Conducting Vigorous Election Campaign	20
Camille Huysmans Breaks with Belgian SP	22
Latest American Invention	23
Egyptian CP Commits Hara-Kiri -- by Pierre Frank	24
Bulgarian Political Lid Again in Place	25
Campus Revolt over Vietnam Worries Washington	26
Johnson Is Right on One Point	27
One of the "Major" Presidencies?	27
Permits to Stand or Sit?	29
Documents:	
End the Imperialist Aggression in Santo Domingo!	30
The Deepening Crisis over Vietnam	31

JOHNSON OPENS A SECOND FRONT IN SANTO DOMINGO

By Joseph Hansen

With his "measured escalation" of the war in Vietnam proceeding according to Pentagon blueprints, Johnson turned towards the rebellious-looking expanse of Latin America and on April 28 opened a second front in Santo Domingo. Within a few days some 19,000 Marines and paratroopers, with a fantastic amount of military equipment had occupied the tiny country.

Johnson's first excuse for ordering American troops to occupy the Dominican Republic was the hoary one of "protecting American lives and property." This was not believed by anyone anywhere since not a single American civilian had been killed or even wounded and no one had threatened to expropriate any of Wall Street's sacred holdings in the island.

On May 2, Johnson hastily switched his public excuse. He said he had sent the Marines and paratroopers to "prevent another Communist state in this hemisphere."

Juan D. Bosch, the exiled Dominican president, put it more accurately in a bitter protest May 2 against the landing of Marines. "I have lost my homeland," he said. "My country is occupied."

In opening his second front, Johnson tore up a solemn international agreement as casually as either Hitler or the Kaiser before him. Article 15 of the Charter of the Organization of American States reads specifically: "No state or group of states has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other state."

The real reason for Johnson's move was no secret. The May 3 New York Times summarized it in a single brief front-page headline: "U.S. Steps Were Inspired by Fear of Another Cuba."

It was, indeed, the fear of revolution that caused Johnson to respond with a military reflex although all that had occurred in Santo Domingo was the toppling of the junta that came to power in 1963 through a coup d'état that overthrew the legally elected government of the liberal Juan D. Bosch.

The popular uprising began April 25 when army officers ousted the regime of Donald Reid Cabral, key figure in the American-supported ruling triumvirate, and called for the restoration of the constitutional government.

General Elias Wessin y Wessin sought to maintain the military dictatorship representing the continuation of the Trujillo dynasty

and moved tanks and infantry into Santo Domingo April 27. The Navy and Air Force joined this counterrevolutionary effort. Planes strafed the capital. Casualties among the civilian population were listed as high as 2,000, including 400 deaths.

However, the "Constitutionalists," as the pro-Bosch forces call themselves, fought back courageously. They were joined by the army garrison in Santo Domingo and arms were distributed from the arsenals to some 10,000 citizens.

The forces of General Wessin y Wessin retreated in disorder and some of them went over to the "Constitutionalists" (or "rebels" as the State Department calls them).

Although Washington had previously declared that the "Communist" or "Castroite" component among the pro-Bosch forces was negligible (the top figure given out by government sources in Washington was fifty-three), Johnson now suddenly decided that things had got out of hand.

On April 30, in a television address, Johnson said, "there are signs that people trained outside the Dominican Republic are seeking to gain control." And on May 2 this was expanded into the claim that "a democratic revolution...committed to democracy and social justice" had "moved into the hands of a band of Communist conspirators."

What had happened, however, was merely that the ordinary people of Santo Domingo had joined in the fight against the State Department's man, General Wessin y Wessin, and had blocked any immediate possibility of setting up a new military dictatorship to continue Trujillism in Santo Domingo.

The strategists in charge of the preservation and advancement of American imperialism read the events quite correctly. In Santo Domingo a popular revolution had begun. The opening stage of this revolution clearly did not go beyond the demand for the restoration of constitutional government. All it asked for was democratic rights. But these, once gained, are not sufficient to solve the grave economic and social problems of a poverty-stricken country like Santo Domingo that has suffered a half century of American domination and one of the most brutal dictatorships of modern times. Such a revolution therefore tends to continue until it reaches the "take off" of a workers' government that can end capitalism and set up a planned economy. All the signs showed the beginning of such a process.

The White House answer to this was instantaneous -- crush it in the egg!

The reversion to Theodore Roosevelt's policy of the "Big

Stick" was noted throughout the world. This was the first time American Marines had been sent into a Latin-American country since 1928 when they landed in Nicaragua to fight Sandino's guerrilla forces. It was held to mean the end of Franklin D. Roosevelt's "Good Neighbor" policy, initiated in 1933 with the withdrawal of the Marines from Nicaragua.

These analogies are worth studying. However, they leave out something. The "Big Stick" policy was applied during the rise of American imperialism to world power. It accompanied the conquest of Latin America for Wall Street. Undertaken sometimes on the flimsiest of excuses, such as compelling the payment of debts to American interests, one of its purposes was to install governments of the most servile kind. The Somosas, the Batistas and Trujillos were the product.

Today the excuse has changed. It is to keep Latin America safe from "Communism"; i.e., safe for North American investments in the vast area extending below the Rio Grande. Wall Street and its political representatives in Washington are fighting to maintain a key sector of the American empire in an era when the peoples of the entire earth are on the march for political and economic freedom.

Against these mighty historic forces, not even the colossal economic and military power of the United States can hold out indefinitely. This is the explanation for the fear and the fury with which Washington reacts to revolutionary events in the smallest countries on the globe.

While American troops dug in, the Dominicans gave Johnson fresh cause to squirm. The Congress of the Dominican Republic elected Col. Francisco Caamaño Deno as provisional president May 3.

He took the oath of office in downtown Independence Square in the heart of the Dominican capital. Thousands cheered him to the cry of "Yankees, get out!" Juan D. Bosch approved this move and gave Caamaño his backing.

From Santo Domingo, Max Clos, the special correspondent of the Paris daily Le Figaro sent a graphic dispatch dated May 4. "It is a strange war," he reports, "that little resembles what the Americans imagine. I have just come from the rebel base, that is, the center of the city. It is not at all a hell seething with anarchy."

Good public services have been set up. Patrols guard the streets, and while most of the stores are closed, there has been little looting. Garbage is collected and burned in the middle of the street.

"In the old city people express violent hostility toward the Americans." When an American jet flew low over the houses, a man shouted, "Look at that dirty son of a bitch!" "Then from all the

roofs, from all the balconies, came a fantastic fusillade" from people shooting at the plane. Everybody seems to be armed.

"The headquarters of the rebellion is in the palace of justice. It is hustling and bustling with people, gesticulating and very agitated. They challenge each other. No one knows exactly who is in command. In fact, it is a kind of spontaneous revolution, without cadres and without a precise program. All this hardly resembles a Communist movement.

"In reality, it seems that the massive arrival of American troops touched off a mass uprising of all tendencies against a common foe. In this armed crowd, some organized centers are emerging. First of all are the frog-men in charge of actions against the American embassy. There are also movements of a Castroite coloration who are visibly trying to rake in the chestnuts from the fire. But it is probable that none of these movements could have brought out more than a few thousand armed men into the streets without the American intervention."

"What is certain in this whole affair," continues the French correspondent, "is that the Americans are treating the Dominicans as enemies and vice versa. The former feel threatened and are conducting themselves exactly like foreign troops occupying a hostile city." As yet, however, they have not sought to reduce the city by force.

The American spokesmen keep repeating, "We have no intention to conquer the old city. We want a democratic political situation."

To this the Dominicans reply: "To send ten thousand armed men here is a strange way of preparing a democratic solution."

Max Clos ends by reporting a "rather strange scene." He went with a truck to deliver American provisions to the people in a poor area. The food consisted of beans and powdered milk. The milk was in a plastic bag in a carton bearing the inscription in fifteen languages: "Gift of the people of the United States."

The people in the area stood aside, hesitant and mistrustful. An American photographer asked three men to come forward and lift their arms towards the cartons of food: "You understand," he said, "they've got to look like they're begging. That makes a better photograph."

But two men came forward, shouting: "Don't take that dirty American food. We have enough to eat. All the Americans have to do is go home and leave us in peace."

"Then," reports Max Clos, "they tore open the bags of powdered milk and threw it at the distributors like a film produced by Mack Sennett."

"GET U.S. TROOPS OUT OF VIETNAM!" SAY JAPANESE PACIFISTS

A three-day convention was held by the Japan Peace Committee at Kawasaki, near Tokyo, April 24-26. On the first day a call was issued to all Japanese pacifists to intensify struggles for the withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam.

Speaking before some 3,700 labor, youth and women delegates, Chairman Yoshitaro Hirano declared that "the only way for us to solve the Vietnamese problem is to step up our struggles to demand immediate withdrawal of all American forces from Vietnam."

He called for public campaigns against the use of American military bases in Japan and for struggles aimed at eventual scrapping of the Japan-U.S. Security Pact.

On the final day, on a special motion of the secretariat, a collection was taken up for relief goods to be sent to the Vietnamese freedom fighters.

Some fifty representatives were selected as a delegation to go at once to the U.S. embassy to protest continued U.S. military action in Vietnam. The delegation also protested to the Japanese government on its endorsement of U.S. policy.

A street demonstration was then staged to protest U.S. military action in Vietnam.

This was the third rally sponsored by the Japan Peace Committee. The first was held in Osaka in 1962 and the second in Shizuoka last year.

Among the leading sponsors of the committee present were Dr. Hiroshi Suekawa, president of Ritsumeikan University at Kyoto; Torazo Ninagawa, governor of Kyoto Prefecture; the Rev. Eijun Otani, Buddhist leader, and Dr. Shoichi Sakata, nuclear physicist and professor at Nagoya University.

BRITISH UNION DENOUNCES AMERICAN POLICY IN VIETNAM

After discussing the Vietnam war situation, delegates at the Margate conference of the Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers overwhelmingly carried a resolution April 25 condemning American policy and calling on the Wilson government to take an independent stand. The resolution, which was moved by Christopher

Norwood, Labour Member of Parliament for Norwich South, is as follows:

"This annual delegate meeting is appalled at the destruction of life in Vietnam and alarmed at the danger of the war spreading. It calls upon the Government to dissociate itself from present American policy in Vietnam, and to use all its influence to bring the fighting to an end and press for the withdrawal of all foreign troops from the country. It calls for negotiation to achieve an agreement that will leave the Vietnamese free to decide their own future."

STATE DEPARTMENT SEES "COMMUNIST TAKEOVER" IN TOKYO PRESS

In testimony before the Senate foreign relations committee, Douglas MacArthur II, former U.S. ambassador to Tokyo, and George W. Ball, under secretary in the State Department, alleged mass infiltration of Communist party members in the editorial staffs of the Mainichi Shimbun and the Asahi Shimbun, Japan's two foremost newspapers.

The news created a sensation in Japan where these journals are as "respectable" as the Paris Le Monde, the New York Times or the London Times.

The two newspapers held up publication of the Washington news item in face of the "acute embarrassment" of U.S. Ambassador Reischauer and only published their comments after receiving a "mollifying" statement from the American diplomat.

The Asahi staff, according to the Tokyo correspondent of the London Times [April 30], declared that the paper's "five million membership will be inclined to think, when it has the chance, that a communist in the American view is anyone who is against American policy."

The Mainichi said that the testimony constituted "a grave insult to Japanese public opinion and the Japanese people." The editors added: "It must be regarded as regrettable that American policy-makers, with such a meagre knowledge of Japan, are allowed to continue their Asian policy." [Quoted in the London Times May 1.]

The Tokyo correspondent of the London Times said: "The storm evidently arises from Japanese newspapers' sudden emergence from their non-committal shell to launch scathing attacks on American policy in Vietnam."

He added: "Particularly at this time of crisis in Vietnam, the United States could well have done without such State Department bungling, for it will be harder than ever to gain credibility here for anything coming out of Washington. As a lesson in how to lose friends it must be hard to beat."

SHOUTS OF "HANDS OFF VIETNAM!" DROWN OUT LABOUR SPEAKER

Representatives of the Labour government who appeared as speakers at May Day meetings in Britain did not fare well. The main reason was their brazen persistence in defending the U.S. imperialist attack on Vietnam.

Foreign Secretary Michael Stewart was drowned out, loudspeaker and all, by hecklers in Hyde Park. The reporter of the Guardian, who has very good ears indeed, got him down as saying, "South Vietnam with its frontiers guaranteed...relationship between West and China ...President Johnson...I am not going to be deterred by that sort of argument."

However, Stewart finally gave up and sat down "with a very white face."

"'Hands off Vietnam,' said the reporter, "was the chant which destroyed him, varied with cries of 'Condemn the napalm bombing' and 'Pockets of the Yankees.'"

Bessie Braddock then made a try at it, but did little better. She wound up appealing for three rousing cheers to lift off the roof of the Hilton Hotel. "This was a tactical error. The Hilton Hotel may indeed have been shaken, but it was again with immense chants of 'Hands off Vietnam.'"

In Hull Prime Minister Harold Wilson likewise ran into trouble at a May Day rally. Hecklers kept shouting slogans about Vietnam outside the hall before the meeting. Inside, Wilson tried to defend his belly-crawling at Johnson's feet by claiming that he was trying to get the conflicting forces in Vietnam "round the table to discuss ways and means."

In the London May Day march, the best impression was made by the Young Socialists. They had the most colorful and picturesque banners and floats and displayed the most enthusiasm. Six of them carried a coffin with a pensioner inside. The legend read, "This pensioner couldn't wait six months for his 12s 6d."

Among the banners carried by the Young Socialists on Vietnam, prominent display was given to "All power to the Vietcong."

JOHNSON'S WAR POLICY FRIGHTENS KOREANS IN JAPAN

In Japan one of the by-products of Johnson's escalation of the war in Vietnam has been a sudden rise in the number of resident South Koreans who wish to change their home address to North Korea. This requires permission from alien registration offices set up by the Japanese government.

At the Osaka and Kyoto offices alone, 180 insisted on changing their addresses after many others had bowed to arguments from registration officials to go home without making the applications.

"Alarmed at the situation," reports the April 24 Japan Times, "the Japanese Government as well as local authorities are determined to stick to their policy of refusing the shift of citizenship as a rule."

As to the reasons for this sharp shift, an officer at the Osaka prefectural policy headquarters said he thinks that "the Koreans fear they may be drafted into military service in South Korea..."

Besides this fact, "the recent move of the ROK Government to send troops to South Vietnam may have created the fear," according to the police.

At Amagasaki some thirty Koreans came to the city office in a body to demand certificates to prove that they had made the transfer requests. Another group in Osaka were reported to be planning to organize pressure on registration officers to accept their written applications.

JAPANESE MERCHANTS OF DEATH SEE BRIGHT FUTURE

"The United States intends to spread the war all over Asia." This is the opinion expressed by Haruo Okuda, a Socialist member of the Japanese parliament, as quoted in the April 25 issue of the weekly Asahi Geino.

"Japan's 'death merchants' such as Mitsui Bussan, Itochu and Mitsubishi trading companies," he continued, "are running wild now buying and stocking up on munitions of war, foreseeing that war will spread throughout Asia next month.

"For the same reason, the U.S. bases in Japan are cleared for action... Not only that all the Japanese Maritime Self-Defense Force

ships have been standing by near Kyushu ever since the American Seventh Fleet sailed from Japan...

"Poison gas, which can kill the jungle trees forming a hide-out for Viet Cong guerrillas is manufactured in Osaka. Also war-damaged helicopters are being repaired around Tachikawa. We are also sure of Japan making napalm bombs. But because of the Security Treaty, Japan has no power to check shipment of munitions. That makes it difficult for us to grasp the real situation."

TALK IN JAPAN ABOUT VOLUNTEERS FOR VIETNAM

Neither the Japanese Socialists, Communists nor the big unions federated in Sohyo [General Council of Japanese Trade Unions] have as yet initiated a movement to send volunteers to help the National Liberation Front in south Vietnam. Their efforts have been directed toward constituting a united front to fight against American imperialism inside Japan itself.

Nevertheless a small movement has begun in response to the March 22 appeal of the National Liberation Front raising the question of volunteers. Kenji Yamaguchi, the leader of a group of Japanese youth, was quoted in the April 25 issue of the weekly Asahi Geino as saying, "We don't know what the Viet Cong wants from us. But since I don't agree with the American policy, I thought we'd better go and join it in response to its 'SOS.'"

Among the fascists of Japan, on the other hand, there is sentiment to send volunteers to fight on the side of the Saigon puppet government.

Bin Akao, leader of the Great Japan Patriots party, said that he had submitted a list of twenty volunteers to the south Vietnam embassy on April 9. He said the embassy officials were "grateful." As a token of sentiment, the action could be of "psychological benefit."

Akao declared, "The Vietnam war isn't a partial war. It is a war between two big blocs fighting a final war. Since the United States is in it, it should occupy Hanoi. Don't be tricked into negotiation through talks."

JAPANESE UNIONS STAGE HALF-DAY STRIKE

Symptoms of a rise in the class struggle have appeared in Japan.

A half-day strike called by the National Council of Government Enterprise Workers Unions [Korokyo] April 23 seriously cut into the country's telecommunication and postal services. Cigarette production, bank note printing and local train services were also affected.

The strike would have been still more effective if the National Railway Workers Union [Kokuro], the largest of the nine Korokyo unions, had not suddenly withdrawn its strike order on April 22, leaving the Japan Telecommunications Workers Union [Zendentsu] to spearhead the action.

As it was, about seventy per cent of telegraph services were paralyzed and all nondial telephone services went dead.

A spokesman for the Japan Postal Workers Union [Zentei] estimated that more than 3,000,000 letters and parcels were held up by the half-day walkout. It will take probably three days to catch up.

The National Railway Motive Power Union [Doro] staged a three-hour strike, delaying four passenger and two freight trains in six rural areas.

Korokyo is demanding a pay rise of about \$20 a month, retroactive to last November. Management is offering around \$2. The dispute is now before the Public Corporations and Government Enterprise Labor Relations Commission [Koroi].

One of the significant aspects of the action was that under existing law it is illegal for Korokyo to go on strike.

Thus Korokyo is also demanding swift ratification of the International Labor Organization Convention 87 on freedom of association. This would give them the right to strike.

U.S. CONSULATE BOMBED IN MONTREAL

A time bomb exploded in the U.S. consulate in Montreal May 1 at 1:30 a.m. Six doors were ripped away and 78 windows were shattered but there were no casualties. The American consul general expressed puzzlement over the why of the protest.

HUGO BRESSANO APPEALS CASE TO ARGENTINE SUPREME COURT

A serious setback has been suffered in the defense of Hugo Bressano against efforts of the Peruvian government to extradite him from Argentina for alleged participation in revolutionary events in Peru in 1962.

Well known in Latin-American radical circles under the pen name of "Nahuel Moreno," Hugo Bressano is the central figure in the movement formed around the Buenos Aires socialist weekly Palabra Obrera which recently fused with the Frente Revolucionario Indo-americanista Popular to form the Partido Unificado FRIP-Palabra Obrera.

The Peruvian government charges that Bressano transported guerrilla fighters in the Cuzco region in association with the peasant leader Hugo Blanco.

It also charges him with involvement in a bank hold up in a Lima suburb in 1962 organized by a Peruvian guerrilla movement.

A singular feature in both charges is that the Peruvian authorities have never brought the Peruvian defendants in either of the cases to trial. Hugo Blanco has been held in prison at Arequipa. Those alleged to have committed the bank robbery (Daniel Peyrera and his comrades) have been held in prison at Lima.

In the first round of the attempt to extradite Hugo Bressano, the judge in the lower court denied the Peruvian bid, upholding the defense in their contention that both charges involved political offenses. Article 23 of the 1889 Treaty of Montevideo rules out the extradition of anyone charged with a political crime or anyone charged with being connected with a political crime.

The Peruvian authorities, however, persisted in their efforts to get Hugo Bressano into one of their prisons where he could be held indefinitely without trial, and appealed the court's decision.

The Cámara Federal de Apelaciones [federal appeals court] has just handed down its decision. Instead of upholding the law, it reversed the lower court.

The arguments used were so novel that they were reported at some length in the press. The gist was that the alleged crimes in Peru -- which, it should be stressed, have not even been brought into court -- were not of a political character!

This will no doubt arouse cynical laughter in judicial circles in Peru. It is precisely because of their political character that top ruling circles have avoided having the cases brought to trial.

Hugo Blanco is immensely popular throughout the Peruvian peasantry. He is an avowed Trotskyist and a supporter of the Fourth International.

In the bank case, the participants turned out to be top-rank students from well-known families who proclaimed the political character of their deed, sending signed letters to the press which made headlines for days. Sympathy for the defendants was widespread, compelling the newspapers to write searching editorials about the political implications. It is because of this political sympathy for the defendants that the authorities have simply held them in prison since 1962 without bringing them to trial.

What is the source, then, of the pressure to extradite Bresano to Peru? And why would a high court bow to it?

The April 20 issue of Palabra Obrera names Washington and the national oligarchies, stating that they are collaborating in an unholy alliance against all the genuinely revolutionary tendencies in Latin America as in other sectors of the colonial world.

The case has become an important one. If the Peruvian government can get away with it, a new precedent will have been established. On mere accusation, without even the findings of a previous trial, it would be possible to "extradite" revolutionists from their own country and then hold them indefinitely in a prison like the one at Arequipa.

The defense has appealed the decision and the case now goes to the Supreme Court. The outcome cannot be predicted. Whichever way it goes, however, the repercussions will be felt in the status of civil liberties in Argentina.

PRICE INCREASES SPUR CHILEAN WORKERS INTO ACTION

Santiago de Chile

Eduardo Frei's Christian Democrat government was inaugurated last November 3 amid celebrations that were especially fervent in Washington. Frei seemed to have found the magic formula for effectively softening the class struggle in Chile.

On April 16 the euphoria came to an end when street demonstrations flared over a fifty per cent increase in bus fares. A tense situation had been building, however, over price increases in bread, cooking oil, meat, etc.

The street demonstrations were touched off under the initiative of the Partido Socialista Popular, Vanguardia Revolucionaria Marxista, and Espartaco. They were able to bring out a number of students who went through the streets, blocking the "micros"* and buses and slowing down traffic in general.

The Communist and Socialist youth then followed suit, making a united front with the groupings that had started the action.

Luis Hernandez Parker, one of Chile's most outstanding political commentators, observed: "The PSP, Vanguardia and Espartaco, after many months of activity, have finally succeeded in mobilizing broad sectors of the worker and student masses."

Later some violence occurred, although those responsible have not been identified. This included burning of sentry boxes, dynamiting of unoccupied "micros" and buses, some stone-throwing and breaking of bus windows, etc.

The movement spread into the provinces outside of the capital. The workers began a wave of strikes. These included oil workers, copper miners, Health Department workers, etc.

The Arauco peasants occupied land in Cañete on April 20, resisting the carabineros who were sent against them.

These new facts show that despite the defeat of Allende [the candidate opposing Frei in whom the Socialist and Communist parties placed great hopes as offering a parliamentary road to power], the masses of Chile remain ready for combat. In struggle and action they will gradually unmask the Christian Democracy, the new front of bourgeois liberalism, deepening the crisis of the Communist and Socialist parties and strengthening the revolutionary Marxist currents.

*Small, higher-fare buses that carry no standees.

NEW STEP TOWARD SOCIALIST UNIFICATION IN CHILE

Santiago de Chile

The Partido Socialista Popular [PSP] was formed just a year ago through the fusion of the Partido Obrero Revolucionario [POR], a Trotskyist formation, and some groupings which had left the Socialist and Communist parties, of which the principal one was the Movimiento Revolucionario Comunista [MRC]. [See World Outlook March 6, 1964.] On April 16-17, the PSP held its first national congress.

Delegates were present from the provinces of Coquimbo, Santiago, O'Higgins, Linares, Talca, Llanquihue and Aysén. A most encouraging rise in recruitment in recent months was reported, the new members being mostly young workers, peasants and students.

An outstanding success in the past period was the unification of the MIDI [Movimiento de Independientes de Izquierda, Regional Santiago] with the PSP. This movement crystallized from the Comités Allendistas [committees that campaigned for Allende for president in the 1964 election].

Humberto Valenzuela was re-elected secretary general of the PSP. In the election for the central committee, José Valdéz received the highest vote and was named political secretary.

Documents on the international and national situation in relation to the mass movement in Chile and the program of socialism were discussed and approved. One of the main points was an appeal to other revolutionary Marxist groups to join in creating a United Party of the Chilean Socialist Revolution.

In connection with this, a "socialist round table" ["Encuentro Socialista"] was held April 18. Besides spokesmen of the PSP, the Vanguardia Revolucionaria Marxista was represented, sectors that have left the Socialist party and the well-known labor figure Clotario Blest.

Agreement was reached on convoking a founding congress of the proposed new party in the near future. The Vanguardia Revolucionaria Marxista will take up the question of ratifying the call at its national congress on May 1.

The Committee of Socialists, which is organizing a rank-and-file congress, particularly of the Juventud Socialista, against the reformist leadership of the Socialist party, has settled on May 21 as the date for this gathering. At that time they will consider the programmatic base on which they could unite with the other Marxist-Leninist sectors.

The unification process going on in the revolutionary left and the actions they have initiated are of national interest, being handled with more and more attention in the press and on the radio. For example, the Catholic magazine La Voz, which supports the Frei government, placed a feature headline on the front page of the current issue, "The Secret Life of Extremism." This referred to a two-page spread on the positions of the Marxist-Leninist groups, presented in a style that sought to appear objective.

The article reported the PSP congress, particularly the meeting open to the public on the first day. It gave the texts of speeches by Clotario Blest, Martín Salas, Enrique Sepúlveda (of

Vanguardia Revolucionario Marxista), Oscar Waiss (PSP), a delegate of the Socialist writers and artists who greeted the delegates, and remarks by a spokesman of the Espartaco youth who were present.

La Voz ended its lengthy article: "The three movements of major importance in the world of political extremism are: Espartaco, the Partido Socialista Popular and Vanguardia Revolucionaria Marxista." [La Voz, No. 403, April 22, 1965.]

DISCONTENT GROWS IN BOLIVIA

La Paz, Bolivia

The circumstances of the attempted "assassination" of General René Barrientos Ortuño, president of the Junta Militar de Gobierno, March 22 has not yet been cleared up. It was reported at the time that he had been hit a number of times while riding in a jeep near Cochabamba but had been saved by a bullet-proof vest.

Rumor has it now that only one shot was fired. The mystery is heightened by the location of the wound. Why would a would-be assassin aim at the seat of the general's pants? Even murkier is the fact that the general was seated behind the steering wheel, driving the jeep himself.

Unkind critics say that the true story is that the general had had one too many before hitting the road, that he ran off the shoulder into a ditch and that his own pistol accidentally discharged.

Whatever the truth, the military caste closed ranks in face of the hair's-breadth escape. General Ovando Candia, who had been making moves toward some of the political parties, was forced to beat a retreat.

Its "unity" thus reinforced, the Military Junta stiffened its line toward the masses. A strike of the oil workers was met with military occupation of the refineries and other oil centers. The workers demands were rejected and the dispute was referred to the Ministro de Gobierno and the Ministerio de Defensa for solution.

The general political situation leaves much to be desired from the viewpoint of the military caste.

Discontent is growing at a rapid rate. The popularity reaped by Barrientos upon the downfall of Paz Estenssoro is vanishing and the political opposition is growing.

Barrientos and the Military Junta have tried various maneuvers such as a "dialogue" with the political parties, a political "truce," etc., but these efforts have not succeeded.

Barrientos is now declaring that his "program" is "left center"; i.e., against "Communism," against "extremism," against strikes, the trade-union leaders, etc., but at the same time against reaction and against the tin barons. He has even set up a new party, the "Movimiento Popular Cristiano"; but this has proved to be still-born.

In his search for a social base, the general is even projecting construction of an army of "50,000 men."

The workers are against the Military Junta. The broad peasant masses feel that the agrarian reform is endangered by pressure from the reactionary forces behind the Falange Socialista Boliviana [FSB] and are suspicious of the Military Junta. But some of the peasant bureaucrats have granted support to Barrientos and thus the peasants remain undecided.

Among the middle classes, the upper layers are with the FSB but are suspicious of Barrientos and his claim to have made "a revolution within the national revolution." The poverty-stricken layers are against the Military Junta.

It would thus seem that a period of grave confrontations lies ahead. If the government decides to mobilize the army in order to occupy the centers where the workers are entrenched, sharp struggles will most certainly break out.

SPEAKERS CALL FOR WORKERS GOVERNMENT IN BOLIVIA

La Paz, Bolivia

At the beginning of April, the left wing of Juan Lechin's Partido Revolucionario de Izquierda Nacionalista [PRIN] staged a celebration in honor of the party's first anniversary. Invitations were sent to the Communist party, the Partido Obrero Revolucionario [the Bolivian section of the Fourth International], the group headed by Guillermo Lora which also claims to be Trotskyist, and some smaller groupings.

The meeting was held at the headquarters of the COB [Central Obrera Boliviana] and the hall was packed.

A leader of the PRIN spoke on the need for the left to unite in order to struggle for working-class power. He criticized the way

power was turned over to the bourgeoisie when the revolution broke out on April 9, 1952. He then invited representatives of the other parties to take the floor.

A representative of the Communist party spoke first and was well received. However, the warmest response went to Hugo González Moscoso who spoke powerfully for working-class unity in face of the Military Junta and for militant struggle for the formation of a Workers and Peasants Government. González is head of the POR.

A number of trade-union leaders took the floor to emphasize the same theme.

The meeting ended with the shouting of slogans for a united front of the working-class parties, for a workers government, and against military dictatorship and Yankee imperialism.

The speeches were taken down on tape and later broadcast over the Continental station.

Neither Lechín nor the other petty-bourgeois leaders of the PRIN attended the celebration.

WITCH-HUNT IN MEXICO

The escalation of the war in Vietnam by U.S. imperialism has aroused deep uneasiness in Mexico as in most other countries in the world. The indignation and fear became translated into an increasing number of demonstrations in the latter part of March. On April 6, students assembled in various parts of Mexico City, rather large groups appearing in some of the main streets like San Juan de Letrán, Avenida Juárez, Paséo de la Reforma and Casco de Santo Tomás.

The latter group swelled to some 2,000 students who carried placards with such slogans as "Vietnam Sí, Yanquis No" and "Yanquis Fuera de Vietnam." [Vietnam Yes, Yankees No; Yankees Get Out of Vietnam.]

Alleging that a plan was afoot to bring the students together in front of the American embassy, police detachments, wielding clubs, iron bars and chains, charged the students, breaking up the demonstrations with unusual violence. They picked up many and hauled them away but released them without making any arrests.

In Mexico where the constitutional right to organize assemblies and rallies has long been vigorously practiced by all political tendencies, the police violence aroused widespread protest.

The government answer came April 12. Some 100 police "visited" the headquarters of the Partido Comunista Mexicano, the Central Campesina Independiente and the Frente Electoral del Pueblo [Mexican Communist party, Independent Peasant Federation, and People's Electoral Front]. They arrested thirty leaders and members of these organizations and hauled away an estimated 3,000 pounds of literature to be used as "evidence."

The motive given by the authorities for the raid was the continued efforts of these organizations to promote "disorder." This was held to be part of a "Communist plot."

The daily Mexican papers, which are unusually lurid, reported that nation-wide raids had occurred; but this was denied by government sources. From indications given by Excelsior, however, the raids might well be the beginning of a nation-wide witch-hunt decided on by Mexico's new president, Gustavo Díaz Ordaz.

One of the pieces of "evidence" seized by the police, said Excelsior [April 15], was a list of financial contributors for a "campaign undertaken in Mexico to protest against the intervention in Vietnam."

Excelsior also said that the Procuraduría General de la República was weighing reports on the activities of the following organizations:

"Movimiento de Liberación Nacional, Juventud del Partido Comunista Mexicano, Liga Obrera Marxista, Consejo de Coordinación Sindical de la Línea Santa Julia, Partido Obrero Revolucionario, Partido Comunista Mexicano, Central de Estudiantes Democráticos de la UNAM, Partido Popular Socialista, Frente Electoral del Pueblo, Escuelas Rurales Normalistas, Movimiento Revolucionario del Pueblo Cubano, Comité Nacional de Mujeres, Unión Nacional de Mujeres Mexicanas, Central Campesina Independiente, Magisterio en General del Partido Estudiantil Socialista, Consejo Nacional de Ferrocarrileros Vallegistas, Sociedad Mexicana de Amistad con China Popular, Organizaciones de Acción Social Rural, Comité de Ayuda al Pueblo Español, Instituto de Intercambio Cultural Mexicano Ruso, Mexicano-Cubano y Mexicano-Checoslovaco, Liga de Servidores Leninistas del Pueblo, Comité de Ayuda a Países Subdesarrollados, Unidad de Pensadores Libres and the Agrupación Pacifista de Oriente.

This list extends from trade-union to peasant organizations, and includes all kinds of political tendencies from the Partido Popular Socialista of Vicente Lombardo Toledano, which supported the candidacy of Díaz Ordaz, to the reformist Frente Electoral del Pueblo, which ran Ramón Danzós Palomino as an opposition candidate, to the Partido Obrero Revolucionario which adheres to the ultra-leftist Latin-American Posadas grouping. The Trotskyist Liga Obrera Marxista, which is affiliated to the Fourth International, is also

included in this sweeping list.

The charge that such disparate organizations were involved in a "conspiracy" is, of course, absurd. Such a charge is itself evidence that the Díaz Ordaz government is experimenting with the methods of McCarthyism. What are the reasons?

The biweekly Mexico City magazine Política [April 15] pointed to the most likely explanation. In an open letter to the president, Editor Manuel Marcués Pardiñas charged:

"It is affirmed, in the first place, that the country's financial situation is difficult; it may even be impossible to find a way out if new credits cannot be obtained from North America to meet the obligations that are now due. It is affirmed by those who hold this view that credits are now being processed in North America and that the repressive acts referred to in this letter constitute a way -- certainly not an honorable one -- to demonstrate solidarity with the government of the U.S. in carrying out genocide in Vietnam, so that, in fair payment, the credits will be granted...."

"In the second place, sources connected with the State Department affirm that the conviction exists there that your government will break with Cuba 'without injury to Mexican nationalism,' by eliminating all possible opposition in advance. According to this, the current repression constitutes the first step toward neutralizing -- with the weapons of slander, vile anonymous charges, the jails or terror -- all those who might be in disagreement with a break in our foreign policy, and discrediting them in the public mind with the tall tale about 'serving foreign interests.'"

In face of this grave charge Díaz Ordaz remained silent.

BELGIAN LEFT SOCIALISTS CONDUCTING VIGOROUS ELECTION CAMPAIGN

BRUSSELS, May 3 -- The general elections in Belgium are scheduled for May 23. Although many signs indicate a turn in the economic situation, full employment is still general and no decisive change in the political relation of forces will be registered at the polls. The present coalition government, in which the two biggest parties in the country -- the Catholics and reformist Social Democrats -- are participating, holds a comfortable majority in parliament that cannot be upset even by heavy losses.

Particular interest therefore centers on the probable losses. It is expected generally that the Catholic party will lose rather heavily to the old Liberal party which is campaigning among conser-

vative middle-class voters with a straight anti-union line. It is also expected to lose some seats to the Flemish nationalists.

As for the Socialist party, the expectation is that it will lose some seats to the left Socialists and the Communist party, both of whom are denouncing the antiworking-class character of many policies of the coalition government during the past four years. The size of the losses will provide some indication as to the degree of working-class discontent in the country and the extent to which the vanguard of some tens of thousands of workers have broken loose from reformist influence.

The young left Socialist party, formed only a few months ago, is meeting its first important test in campaigning during the electoral contest. Although it is still in process of getting itself organized, it has ambitiously decided to run virtually a full slate (there are but few exceptions) in the Walloon part of the country and in the Brussels area.

In the Liège region, where the party has its strongest mass base, it is contesting all the seats for the House of Representatives, the Senate and the Provincial Assembly as an independent party. The same course is being followed in the near-by Verviers area. In all the other areas (Charleroi, Borinage, Namur, Brussels, etc.), the left Socialists have formed an electoral bloc with the Communist party in order to prevent the left vote from being split.

Negotiations were conducted with both the pro-Moscow and the pro-Peking Communist parties, but the latter refused to join.

The bloc was formed on a principled basis; i.e., a minimum program in general conformity with the left Socialist program and much to the left of the official Communist party line. For instance, in place of the traditional CP formula of "antimonopoly structural reforms," the electoral bloc stands on "anticapitalist structural reforms"; in place of "for a broad coalition of democratic anti-monopoly forces," the bloc calls "for a workers' government"; in place of the official CP slogan "for a nonaggression pact between the countries of the Warsaw pact and the NATO countries," the slogan of the bloc is "Get Belgium out of NATO," a slogan long defended only by the left Socialists.

Most significantly, in place of the CP line favoring "peace negotiations in Vietnam," the platform of the electoral bloc has the following two slogans: "Get American troops out of Vietnam! For the right of self-determination by the Vietnamese people!"

Besides the political success in negotiating the platform of the electoral bloc, the left Socialists also made significant gains in working out the common slate. In the contests for seats from the provincial assembly level on up, the number of candidates is evenly

divided between the Communist party and left Socialists.

In Brussels the list of candidates for parliament is headed by Pierre Le Grève, chairman of the Brussels teachers union. Le Grève is very well known for his trade-union activities and sympathy with the colonial revolution. A few years ago, during the Algerian war, he was nearly killed by a bomb planted by the French secret service.

The left Socialists also head the slates in Seignies (the candidate is a worker in the Boël steel works, the main plant in that area) and in Namur.

They were also granted top place in the senate contest for Charleroi, Borinage, Thuin and Nivelles.

The left Socialists have made clear that they are engaging in a purely electoral bloc and not a political alliance. They are maintaining the complete autonomy of their organization and are not conducting a common electoral campaign with the Communist party. In fact in their election propaganda they stress the points separating them from the Communist party, especially the fight for workers democracy in the Soviet Union and the other workers states and the struggle against the opportunist policies of the Communist parties in Western Europe.

CAMILLE HUYSMANS BREAKS WITH BELGIAN SP

On the very eve of filing candidacies for the May 23 elections, the official Socialist party in Belgium suffered an unexpected blow. Camille Huysmans, the patriarch of the international Social Democracy, the secretary of the Second International before World War I and chairman of the Second International during the thirties, broke with the party.

The reason for his break was the refusal of the top bureaucrats to include him on their slate of candidates in the important Flemish industrial center of Antwerp where Huysmans has been leading the party for more than half a century.

Their excuse was that Huysmans was too old to make a good member of parliament. However, they are finding it difficult to explain why it was that only six months ago -- when Huysmans was a bare 93 and a half years old -- they beseeched him to head their slate in the municipal elections.

The real reason for their decision was the fact that the

94-year-old veteran was getting too "young" for them. He published a book in which Lenin is lauded. He came out sharply in favor of recognizing China. He has condemned the West German bourgeois regime in violent language. And -- crime of crimes -- he has been criticizing the current "youthful" leadership as being "much too petty-bourgeois and right wing."

Huysmans, of course, is no revolutionist. He is not even a centrist. He is a traditional reformist. But nowadays the new reformist leaders on the continent have moved so far to the right that even a traditional reformist like Huysmans finds it hard to stomach them.

On April 28, Léo Collard and Achille Van Acker themselves came as heads of the party, hat in hand, to plead with Huysmans not to run in the election. The press reported a "particularly stormy" session that lasted one hour before the "turbulent youth" threw out the senile ancients who sought to talk him into being "reasonable."

Huysmans was expelled from the party for running for office without the permission of the leaders. He is now campaigning as an independent. Young socialists of his area who have helped pass out his campaign literature have also been expelled.

Through his move, the Antwerp workers got an unexpected opening to express their discontent with the SP leadership and policies and there is a good chance that Huysmans will win office once more despite his "age."

LATEST AMERICAN INVENTION

[The following observations, evidently inspired by recent events in the Dominican Republic, appeared in the May 5 issue of the Paris daily Le Monde under the title "Diabolus Ex Machina." The author is the rather cynical commentator Robert Escarpit.]

"The machine to foresee revolutions, just invented by the Americans it seems, doesn't surprise me. It's not up to me to talk up the merits of an epanastasotron (oh, for the love of Greek...).

"The time can easily be foreseen when a magnetic tape containing the complete data on a country is fed into a machine and you instantly get a plastic package containing the number of divisions of Marines necessary to restore civil peace, along with the prefabricated dictator required to maintain democracy.

"All this is no problem for a sophisticated technique. What is difficult in a revolution is not to foresee it but to make it."

EGYPTIAN CP COMMITS HARA-KIRI

By Pierre Frank

On April 25, the Cairo daily El Ahram confirmed a report published two weeks before by the political weekly Ros El Youssef that the Egyptian Communist party has decided to dissolve.

Al Ahram printed excerpts from a declaration made by the central committee of the Egyptian Communist party. For some months the organization had refused to dissolve. Party members had criticized a "bureaucratic right wing" which, they said, was slowing down if not sabotaging the "socialist policy of Nasser." But, the declaration continued, the central committee had decided that the "Arab Socialist Union," that is, the political organization set up by Nasser, could carry out all the tasks of constructing socialism. Therefore the central committee was dissolving the party and inviting all the members to join the Arab Socialist Union individually.

So far as we know, this makes the second Communist party to commit hara-kiri, the first one being the Algerian Communist party which gave up existence last year, its members joining the Algerian Front de Libération Nationale individually. There have been plenty of fusions between Communist parties and other political organizations; for example, in Cuba. This has always involved an operation organization to organization, the Communist party generally gaining in the process. This time we witness the dissolution of the party pure and simple, the members being released from discipline.

The first question that arises is whether this is not a ruse, a dissolution in words only, the Communist party members maintaining a secret organization. Although this hypothesis cannot be completely ruled out, it is not very likely. Even under extremely difficult conditions, even under the worst repression, it is well known that the Communist parties have traditionally rejected any kind of move that would have brought their existence to a formal end. What the Algerian and Egyptian parties have done is primarily a consequence of special political situations in which they reached an impasse.

In Algeria two things in the record of the Communist party barred it from any perspective in liberated Algeria. It played practically no role in the revolution; it never cut the umbilical cord tying it to the French Communist party whose traitorous role in the freedom struggle is well known to the Algerian people.

In Egypt the problem is more complex. The Egyptian Communists began by denouncing Nasser as a fascist, which is politically absurd. Then in face of the considerable social transformations which have occurred in Egypt and Khrushchev's baptising Nasser a

"socialist," the party was caught short and without an independent program.

In this trap, having neither a domestic nor an international program of their own, they found themselves with no choice but to fall into line behind the government. The Stalinist concept of a single party, in which they had been brought up, left them with no justification for any party except the one holding government power.

Finally, all this occurred at a time when the unity of the official Communist movement is shattered, when the concept of a Communist International is flouted by the main leaders on both sides in the Sino-Soviet dispute, each of the contestants putting national interests above international considerations.

Lacking deep roots in their own countries, finding themselves by-passed and without perspectives, aware of the tendencies toward liquidation even in the big Communist parties (for example, Amendola in Italy), left only to themselves and lacking cadres with a good Communist education -- under these conditions the two Communist parties had no solution but to proceed with the ceremony of harakiri.

We can thus note a new form in the decomposition of international Stalinism. Up to now the main feature has been the break up of monolithism on an international scale with attempts to retain a more or less monolithic structure on a national level. Now some of the weaker parties are addressing themselves to conducting their own funerals. Until the tendency toward the rebirth of the Communist movement appears in a powerful way, we will most certainly be provided with other instances of disintegration due to Stalinism.

BULGARIAN POLITICAL LID AGAIN IN PLACE

In Bulgaria April 7-8 some fifty to a hundred arrests were reported to have been made, including General Tsvetko Anev. In addition, Ivan Todorov-Gorunya, a member of the central committee of the Communist party and assistant minister of agriculture, was said to have committed suicide. According to the rumors, other top figures had also taken their own lives or been executed.

No official news about all this was issued until April 22 when a government "clarification" denied the rumors of an attempted coup d'état which were circulating abroad. The statement admitted only that certain people had "violated the law" and that they were under prosecution.

The embarrassed clarification sought to counteract the report that there had been an attempt to change the government and that the target had been Todor Zhikov, first secretary of the Communist party.

The first rumors -- some of which may have been "planted" -- indicated that what was involved was a "pro-Chinese" plot. Nothing has come to light to confirm this, and the most likely hypothesis is that the operation aimed at bringing Bulgaria into a position like that of Rumania within the COMECON and system of European workers states instead of that of a mere satellite of the Soviet Union, no matter what the changes in regime there.

Whatever the truth may be, one thing is certain: in Bulgaria, as in the other workers states where Stalinism has held sway, no political democracy exists. Those who are in disagreement with policies have no means of expression or of appealing to public opinion. The masses are not consulted except to approve the winner in corridor moves or palace overturns. While economic progress has been registered in Bulgaria as in the other countries of the Balkan peninsula, on the political plane no great changes have occurred.

CAMPUS REVOLT OVER VIETNAM WORRIES WASHINGTON

The rising domestic opposition to the escalation of the war in Vietnam is disliked by Johnson, according to Richard Reston, Washington correspondent of the Los Angeles Times. "The President's fear," he writes [April 25], "is strong domestic opposition to this country's course in Vietnam will mislead Hanoi, Peking, Moscow and other Red capitals about the firm U.S. commitment to defend South Vietnam against Communist aggression."

Still worse, this firm commitment may not prove to be so firm under domestic attack. "The worry among officials here is that adverse American reaction to the crisis will either collapse the present U.S. policy or at least force the President to shift his position somewhat."

What especially shocked Johnson was the "large-scale organized discussions, debates, demonstrations and rallies at more than 50 universities and colleges."

The "growing campus revolt against the conduct of American policy in Vietnam" has "serious dangers." Not only have the "U.S. air strikes against Communist North Vietnam" been brought under attack, but a question has been placed on the "broader American attempt to prevent a Viet Cong takeover in South Vietnam."

JOHNSON IS RIGHT ON ONE POINT

What did Johnson mean when he said in his press conference April 27, "I am not concerned with any friends that we have lost" around the world because of escalating the war in Vietnam?

A Washington correspondent of the Associated Press, John M. Hightower, explained it this way: "President Johnson clearly wants to win as much support as possible around the world for his policies in Vietnam, but he is also grimly determined not to run U.S. strategy in the Vietnamese war as a popularity contest."

Johnson's reasoning is quite clear. The people in the rest of the world don't vote in the election of an American president; they only suffer the consequences.

Thus the popularity contest is not being held now; it was held last November. At that time Johnson was "grimly determined" to appear as the man of peace, crusading against the "trigger-happy, war-mongering" Senator Goldwater, who wanted to launch a war on north Vietnam.

Having won that popularity contest, Johnson did what capitalist politicians always do. He tore up his campaign promises and went ahead with his imperialist chores.

While Johnson is accurate in his judgment that he is not engaging in a popularity contest at the moment -- the next one not being scheduled until 1968 -- it would nevertheless be untrue to say that his course is utterly without approval.

On April 27 no one less than Goldwater himself enthusiastically proclaimed, "My President has done the right thing in the right way."

The American voters might well ponder these consequences of their famous two-party system.

ONE OF THE "MAJOR" PRESIDENCIES?

The Washington columnist Joseph Alsop, who was highly critical of Johnson up to the moment when American planes began bombing north Vietnam February 7, is now one of the president's most ardent admirers. In his column of April 29 he holds that Johnson has removed the "last doubt that, with any luck at all, his time in office may prove to be one of the major presidencies."

As part of the evidence, which he has been industriously assembling, Alsop reports Johnson's personal role in the military aggression on north Vietnam: "It is hard to believe, but it is a fact that the president follows the bombing missions attacking targets in North Vietnam almost in the manner of a field commander."

Johnson is "customarily notified when the planes have gone out. He often stays up, or has himself called, or is wakened by his own internal alarm clock, to hear the mission's results."

Since the bombings are now being conducted on a "round-the-clock" basis in accordance with the present phase of the "measured escalation" of the war, Johnson has been missing sleep. "He has been looking a bit tired recently, and no wonder: for his new role as a field commander of operations halfway round the world must clearly cut substantially into his always minimal daily allowance of rest."

Johnson's passionate involvement in Operation Slaughter is not that of a mere amateur following the moves on the map. "The significant point to note is that the president, in some sense, really is the field commander of these remote, delicate and crucial military operations."

Alsop, who apparently has inside sources of information, knows whereof he speaks: "All targets are, in the first place, personally approved by him, in committee with the secretaries of state and defense."

Of course, minor details are left to minions actually in the field: "The operational plans for each attack, the choice between approved targets dictated by weather and other considerations, the estimates of forces needed for each mission -- all these matters, very naturally and properly, are left to the air officers and naval officers on the spot, who have direct operational responsibility." Very naturally and properly!

Alsop is quite interested in the psychological effect of all this on the great leader. "Like the man who has never been in combat, President Johnson before Pleiku had never taken quite the sort of decision that he took when the attacks on North Vietnam were ordered at last."

Johnson tells "all and sundry" that his decision to start a war "involved no change of policy." Alsop smiles indulgently: "But in fact a very major Rubicon was crossed." The man from Texas gets "none of the exhilaration that another sort of national leader might have felt." Being "field commander now does not excite him as it would have excited Franklin Delano Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy.... But one suspects, nonetheless, that he has somehow been liberated, and even enlarged, by making a cruelly hard decision

that was foreign to his previous experience..."

Also, unfortunately leaves out two important details which he ought to have reported in order to leave his readers with full assurance that the scene is completely natural and proper. (1) When he enters the War Room, does Johnson take off his cowboy hat and put on something more closely resembling the headgear worn by Napoleon? (2) To protect the great leader of the "Great Society" in case a sudden emergency occurs, are the walls sufficiently padded?

PERMITS TO STAND OR SIT?

The May issue of Anti-Apartheid News reports that the Cape Town city council expects the Verwoerd government to clamp down soon on the last forty-nine "multi-racial toilets" kept open by the South African city as a public service, compelling the council to segregate them.

However, a tricky legal problem is involved that has constitutional authorities scratching their heads:

"Lawyers say there are two Acts of Parliament under which the Government could act against the toilets. There is the Reservation of Separate Amenities Act of 1953 and the Group Areas Act No. 77 of 1957.

"In the Group Areas Act 'occupation' is the operative word as far as the toilets are concerned.

"So far, the provision which defines occupation has been directed at people of different races sitting down together in cinemas and restaurants.

"They only break the law when they are seated, but when they stand up they are in the clear. Lawyers say that if the same criterion is applied to the multi-racial toilets, then standing in them would be legal, but sitting down in them would not."

Anti-Apartheid News reports one lawyer as offering the opinion: "The Government could, of course, issue permits for the people to use the toilets but this is not likely."

Such a perfect refinement of the South African pass system should nonetheless be considered. The permits might be still further refined by issuing one for apartheid sitting and one for apartheid standing only.

END THE IMPERIALIST AGGRESSION IN SANTO DOMINGO!

[The United Secretariat of the Fourth International, the world-wide revolutionary-socialist party founded by Leon Trotsky in 1938, issued the following statement May 2.]

* * *

The United Secretariat of the Fourth International denounces the landing of U.S. Marines in the Dominican Republic as a cynical attempt by American imperialism to maintain a military dictatorship against a popular movement that sought to restore to constitutional office a regularly elected president; one, moreover, who is merely a liberal bourgeois.

This intervention opens a new stage in the hardening of American imperialism with regard to all the colonial and semicolonial countries that do not servilely obey its orders. After the military coup d'état in Brazil, the intervention in the Congo, the crisis over Cambodia and the aggression against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, Yankee imperialism is again displaying its decision to utilize direct military force against any new forward step of the world revolution -- even if it is a step taken under a liberal bourgeois regime. Washington is aware that such a regime can constitute only an interlude with an outcome towards the extreme right or towards permanent revolution.

In this way Kennedy's liberal camouflage ("Alliance for Progress"), which sought especially through massive economic aid to contain the colonial revolution at a bourgeois "democratic" stage, is progressively being replaced by a policy which is openly and directly counterrevolutionary, which returns to the "gunboat diplomacy" of the rising and triumphant stage of imperialism.

But the world has changed in a decisive way since that era. The political cynicism of Johnson and the Pentagon is arousing mass indignation on a wider and wider scale, compelling even pro-imperialist governments like those of Chile and Peru, which are desirous of maintaining a certain amount of popular support, to oppose the American policy, thus creating the danger for Washington of deeper and deeper isolation in Latin America.

The United Secretariat of the Fourth International appeals to the masses of Latin America to exert the utmost vigilance, because the aggression against the Dominican Republic can be the prelude to a direct attack against socialist Cuba.

The United Secretariat of the Fourth International appeals to the masses everywhere to mobilize and express their indignation over this new imperialist crime, to redouble their blows everywhere against

the reactionary and pro-imperialist governments and regimes, and against the foundations of imperialism.

The best way to weaken the imperialist policy of direct military intervention is to increase the number of revolutionary centers, to compel the Pentagon to extend its forces more and more, and to confront them with new fronts each time they think they have "restored" the situation in a country.

Get the American Marines out of Santo Domingo!

Get Yankee imperialism out of Latin America!

Go forward in speeding the Latin-American revolution in accordance with the teachings of the Second Declaration of Havana!

THE DEEPENING CRISIS OVER VIETNAM

[The following statement was issued by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International May 4.]

* * *

Johnson's "measured escalation" of the war in Vietnam passed another milestone with the announcement April 29 that the Australian government will send a battalion of infantry to join the American occupation forces. The action of Prime Minister Menzies constitutes a victory, if a minor one, in Johnson's efforts to involve his allies openly in the conflict.

The rate of escalation is most ominous. The New York Times admitted April 26: "The pace of the war in Vietnam is accelerating. Time is a relative factor, so that 10 days in this April have been like 10 weeks last year and 10 months in previous years. There is an awareness now...that the drama is building toward its climax. There is a sense of grim determination on one side and defiance on the other. And there is also the sense that the world may be moving toward a still distant holocaust that is, however, visible on the horizon."

To this must be added increasing pressure from the most reactionary forces in the United States to employ nuclear weapons. The New York Daily News came out flatly April 17 for dropping the "hydrogen" bomb on Hanoi. Former Senator Goldwater said April 27 in Paris that he had been praying that China would provide a "pre-text" for massive bombing of its nuclear installations. Pentagon spokesmen have not lessened world-wide fear by their assurances that

use of nuclear weapons is not contemplated "at present."

The need to mobilize effective opposition against the aggression of U.S. imperialism thus becomes clearer each day. The fate of all humanity is involved.

Do "Negotiations" Point the Way Out?

Certain pitfalls must be noted by opponents of the dirty war which Johnson is escalating in Vietnam.

A dangerous trap is the cry for "negotiations" rather than immediate withdrawal of American troops. One of the sources giving weight to the appeal for "negotiations" as the "only possible" way to end the war comes from a sector of the American imperialists -- the bourgeois opposition inside the United States.

Besides prominent members of Congress, the views of this opposition have been voiced principally by the New York Times. This influential newspaper has printed truths about Johnson's course and has helped to restrain repression of critical voices. Its fundamental position, however, does not differ essentially from that represented by Johnson. It insists on keeping troops in Vietnam for the present. It ignores the right of the Vietnamese people to determine their own fate. It is merely critical of Johnson's relying exclusively on military rather than political means in his efforts to win in Vietnam. By political means the New York Times refers to a policy of maneuver in which an attempt would be made at the conference table to win what American imperialism and its puppets have lost to the revolutionists of the National Front of Liberation in the long civil war.

This bourgeois opposition, harking back to the policies employed by Franklin D. Roosevelt in his relations with Stalin, favors utilizing the services of Stalin's heirs in trying to cheat the Vietnam revolutionists of their hard-won victory.

A similar bourgeois opposition current exists outside the United States, particularly in the so-called "Third World" of semi-colonial countries. Its outstanding representative is General de Gaulle, who has pressed for "negotiations" to reach a "settlement" in Vietnam. De Gaulle's aim is to restore French prestige and influence in the colonial world. He is also seeking a decisive voice in European affairs, playing the role of an opponent of American domination the better to achieve this. Inside France, his stance has undercut the oppositional role of the French Communist party. It is noteworthy, for instance, that despite its huge size and influence in the labor movement, the French CP has done virtually nothing in organizing demonstrations over Vietnam.

Bourgeois opposition currents of this kind both in the United States and abroad are a source of embarrassment to the Johnson admin-

istration. Such opposition is symptomatic of the deep division within the country, the unpopularity of the war, and the international isolation of the United States. It foreshadows the rise of a substantial opposition on a class basis, both at home and abroad, and helps to facilitate its appearance. Never in American history has an administration moved toward a war of such fateful import in the face of such doubts and resistance among the population at the outset.

The bourgeois opposition to Johnson's course is superficial, being concerned with tactics in defending the capitalist system. Not the slightest political confidence can be placed in it, although it would be a mistake to simply dismiss it; since, in accordance with the Leninist method, revolutionary Marxists must not only note but seek to utilize whatever divisions are to be found in the enemy camp.

Trade-union bureaucrats like George Meany in the United States and Social-Democratic leaders like Harold Wilson in Britain and Paul-Henri Spaak in Belgium stand to the right of the bourgeois opposition on Vietnam. A curious result is that a centrist publication such as the British Tribune points to de Gaulle as an enviable example in the conduct of foreign policy in contrast to Wilson. This does not prevent the Tribune from echoing Wilson in its view that what is needed is to get the "contestants" to "the conference table."

An ambitious move in this direction was the appeal of seventeen "nonaligned" countries which was initiated by Tito after Johnson launched the imperialist war on Vietnam. What was called for was the strongest condemnation of the aggressor and the mobilization of maximum moral and material aid for the colonial victims of the imperialist attack. To demand "negotiations" instead was of service to the aggressor, whatever the intentions of the signers of the appeal.

Negotiations in a struggle between revolution and counter-revolution cannot be excluded in principle, of course, any more than negotiations can be excluded in a strike struggle with bosses out to smash a union. But it is up to the revolutionists themselves to decide whether or not to enter into negotiations. It is the business of their supporters to do their utmost to weaken the enemy -- in this case to compel his withdrawal from an area where he is nothing but a bandit, attempting to shoot his way into a position of "negotiating from strength" with the victim. Up to now, however, the Johnson administration has refused to negotiate with or even to recognize the National Front of Liberation as the legitimate representative of the south Vietnamese people.

A prime example of how the pressure for "negotiations" at the expense of the Vietnamese revolution has debilitated the struggle

against the imperialist aggressor in Vietnam is provided by Great Britain. In return for American support in maintaining the pound and the still existing outposts of empire, particularly Malaysia, the British bourgeoisie rallied to Johnson. The mass news media, playing on the insularity of British public opinion, have handled the war in Vietnam as if it were a mere local struggle, not an issue of life-and-death concern to all of humanity.

The Wilson government has played its part by issuing reassuring hints about taking "secret" steps through diplomatic channels. "No nation has played a greater part than Britain in trying to get them round the table," Wilson has boasted. Since "negotiations" were presumably being conducted in secret to reach a deal, public apprehension was allayed.

The centrists carried this game further by coming out strongly for "negotiations" -- as against Johnson's warmongering -- and by publishing tidbits about the secret moves and secret diplomatic feelers. This helped to heighten the public impression that however reprehensible the American role might be, still there was no immediate danger of an enormous and sudden rise in radioactivity in the British Isles.

As a consequence the protest movement in Britain remained at a relatively low level while the worst crisis since the end of World War II steadily grew worse and the danger of a nuclear disaster rose.

The Vietnamese Position

In the theater of war itself, the Vietnamese revolutionists have stood up heroically against the American military colossus. All reports, including those from correspondents in the imperialist camp, indicate that their resistance has been stiffening instead of crumbling despite the rain of high explosives, noxious gases and napalm.

Their response to Johnson's April 7 speech offering "unconditional discussions" was formulated by the government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and approved by the National Assembly in a session held in Hanoi April 8-10. This stand is as follows:

"(1) Recognition of the basic national rights of the Vietnamese people which are independence, sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity. In strict conformity with the Geneva agreements, the U.S. Government must withdraw its troops, military personnel and weapons, ammunition and war materials of all kinds from south Viet Nam, dismantle the U.S. military bases there, abolish its military alliance with the south Viet Nam administration and at the same time stop its policy of intervention and aggression in south Viet Nam. The U.S. Government must stop all its acts of war against

north Viet Nam and put a definite end to all acts of encroachment upon the territory and sovereignty of the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam.

"(2) Pending the realization of the peaceful reunification of Viet Nam, while Viet Nam is still temporarily divided in two, the military provisions of the 1954 Geneva agreements on Viet Nam must be strictly respected: the two zones must refrain from joining any military alliance with foreign countries, there must be no foreign military bases, troops or military personnel in their respective territory.

"(3) The affairs of south Viet Nam must be settled by the south Vietnamese people themselves in accordance with the programme of the South Viet Nam National Front for Liberation without any foreign intervention.

"(4) The realization of the peaceful reunification of Viet Nam must be settled by the people in the two zones without foreign intervention.

"The National Assembly and Government of the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam hold that the above stand constitutes the basis for the most correct political settlement of the Viet Nam problem. Only when this basis is recognized can there be favourable conditions to achieve a peaceful settlement of the Viet Nam question and is it possible to consider the convening of an international conference of the type of the 1954 Geneva conference on Viet Nam."

The National Assembly appealed to all the parliaments in the world to communicate this stand, as well as the facts about the U.S. aggression, to "the deputies and people of all strata in their countries so that everybody can see the sinister aggressive design of the U.S. imperialists..." The National Assembly also appealed to the assemblies of other countries "to take appropriate actions to support our just stand vigorously and at the same time to raise their voices to demand resolutely that the U.S. Government end at once its aggression in south Viet Nam, stop its provocations, air and naval attacks against the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam."

This four-point stand is presented as being in accordance with the Geneva agreement, which was violated by Washington. However, the argument leaves unexplained why Johnson, too, refers to the Geneva agreement in talking about "unconditional discussions." The truth is that while the Geneva agreement recorded the victory gained by Vietnam over French imperialism, it also registered heavy losses suffered in negotiations. The country was arbitrarily divided in half; a counterrevolutionary regime was installed in the south; and the entry of American imperialism on the scene was facilitated. Thus was the time bomb planted that exploded in the present

dangerous conflict. The principal responsibility for this lies with Khrushchev and Bulganin who utilized the relative weakness of the north Vietnamese forces to practice "peaceful coexistence" with Eisenhower. The Peking leaders are silent about this deal because of their own role in it.

When Johnson talks about the Geneva agreement, he is referring in reality to a new sell-out, which he would find acceptable. The Vietnamese and Chinese, on the other hand, specify that by "living up to the Geneva agreement" they mean complete withdrawal of American imperialism. This, in fact, would register the new relation of forces in south Vietnam gained at immense cost to the Vietnamese people. It corresponds with the determination of the freedom fighters not to lose their victory at the conference table. That is one of the reasons why Johnson is trying to change the relation of forces by escalating the conflict.

"Aggression Against China"

On April 20 the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress of China adopted a resolution approving the four-point Vietnamese stand.

"We hold," the resolution stated, "that the necessary conditions for a political settlement of the Vietnamese problem can be created only by resolutely putting an end to U.S. imperialist aggression against Viet Nam and forcing the United States to withdraw all its armed forces from Viet Nam. Together with the Vietnamese people, we firmly oppose the U.S. imperialists' 'peaceful negotiations' plot, and firmly oppose all despicable collusion with the U.S. imperialists to betray the fundamental interests of the Vietnamese people."

The resolution reaffirmed the position that "aggression by the U.S. imperialists against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam means aggression against China."

"The Chinese people will absolutely not stand idly by without lending a helping hand. In accordance with the requests of the Vietnamese people and with the needs of the joint struggle against U.S. imperialist aggression, the Chinese people have done and will continue to do their utmost to assist the Vietnamese people to defeat the U.S. aggressors completely."

The Standing Committee called for a number of actions, including making "full preparations to send our own people to fight together with the Vietnamese people and drive out the U.S. aggressors in the event that U.S. imperialism continues to escalate its war of aggression and the Vietnamese people need them."

The extreme caution displayed in formulating this statement

has been singled out for comment in the Western press. The Johnson administration has even interpreted the cautiousness as indicating that the statement is mere verbiage and that the war can safely be escalated still further without provoking an effective defensive reaction.

But the caution in this formulation is understandable. The clear threat exists that Johnson will order hydrogen bombs dropped on China's nuclear reactors. Perhaps he is even seeking a "pretext" such as Goldwater has prayed for. Most likely China, as yet, lacks the military means to offer effective defense against a nuclear attack. In fact, the People's Republic of China, faced with the rapid buildup by the Pentagon of what amounts to a major military beachhead on the continent of Asia, is herself in need of military guarantees.

Defense of the Soviet Union at Stake

Thus attention inevitably centers on the Soviet Union. But the bureaucratic ruling caste there, despite the considerable concessions granted the workers under "de-Stalinization," has not changed essentially since Stalin's time. After almost three months of Johnson's "measured escalation," Khrushchev's heirs still appear to be hoping for a last-minute miracle that would open the road for a deal with the White House at the expense of the Vietnamese revolution.

The eagerness of the Kosygin-Brezhnev team to escape from the imperialist pressure through a deal at someone else's expense is clearly one of the essential premises in the Pentagon's calculations. The White House is moving rapidly to take advantage of what it considers to be an "opening" provided by the Sino-Soviet dispute and the replacement of Khrushchev by weak figures of an interim regime.

However, Khrushchev's heirs can scarcely persist indefinitely in such a self-defeating course any more than their teacher and master Stalin could in face of the aggression of German imperialism. At a certain point, the defense of the Soviet Union, even from the circumscribed outlook of the bureaucratic caste, will require action. Besides, they are under stiffer pressures than those felt by Stalin. In addition to the pressure from China and the other workers states, there is pressure from the Soviet people of weightier kind than could be mounted on the eve of World War II.

While he was in Paris, undoubtedly discussing the possibility with de Gaulle of utilizing a proposed conference on Cambodia as an opening wedge for "negotiations" over Vietnam, Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko was reported to have said that "the Soviet leaders have reached the point where their reserve on the Vietnam affair is becoming seriously damaging to their personal position in their own

country as well as the Socialist world as a whole." (In Le Nouvel Observateur, April 29.)

The heads of the Chinese bureaucracy, however, have failed to exert the most effective possible pressure on the Kremlin. They have not spoken out clearly about China's defense needs in facing the monstrous threat of nuclear war. They have not publicly asked Moscow for defensive weapons against the fleet of long-range bombers, capable of carrying nuclear weapons, already assembled by the United States in Vietnam. They have not publicly asked Moscow for allocation of nuclear "deterrents" to "dissuade" the military strategists of American imperialism from launching a nuclear assault. They have not publicly asked Moscow to reaffirm the Sino-Soviet military treaty, or to announce that any nuclear attack on China will be considered equivalent to an assault on the USSR that will at once get a corresponding answer.

Instead they have resumed their attack on the "revisionism" of Khrushchev's heirs -- as if this needed any fresh demonstration! They insist on "return" to the "1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement," and the necessity for Khrushchev's heirs to "publicly and solemnly admit before the Communists and the people of the world" a whole series of errors and crimes such as Khrushchev's "revisionism, great-power chauvinism and splittism."

The Chinese also demand that the Kremlin publicly admit that the "revisionist line and programme adopted at the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the C.P.S.U. presided over by Khrushchev are wrong." But besides advancing the revisionism begun by Stalin, Khrushchev also exposed some of Stalin's crimes and started the process of "de-Stalinization" which the Soviet people hailed with universal relief after the nightmare years of the "cult of the personality." The continued defense of Stalin by the Chinese undermines whatever appeal the demand to "publicly admit" revisionism might have among the Soviet people.

This approach evades the concrete question of what to do about the immediate problem created by the military aggression of U.S. imperialism. The Peking leaders ought to publicly and solemnly make a series of concrete proposals about the joint defense of the two giant workers states and the smaller ones like Vietnam and Cuba that are being singled out for the first morsels in the banquet of death prepared by U.S. imperialism.

Fidel Castro was completely correct in criticizing the substitution of "Byzantine" disputes for a united front in action and in declaring, "We must show the imperialists that we are not afraid of them. When you don't resist them, they continue further; but when you resist them, they stop."

The bureaucrats of both Peking and Moscow would do well to

take a few lessons in Havana on how to defend a workers state.

There is some evidence that material aid may now be arriving in Vietnam from Moscow and Peking. Nothing is to be gained from trying to keep this secret. It would be far better to give it maximum publicity. One gain would be to counteract the impression that the aid is insufficient and not of a kind to cause deep hesitation in the Pentagon and to stir the White House into reconsidering its present course toward a nuclear catastrophe.

Mobilization of Revolutionary Opposition

On April 14, Johnson took another big step in escalating the war by initiating "round-the-clock" bombing. This was accompanied by revelations about the use of fiendish new "antipersonnel" weapons in Vietnam, a rifle, for instance, that fires bullets of a velocity such that on impact whole sections of the human body are exploded or torn off.

Vietnam begins to be reminiscent not only of Korea but the Spain that served German and Italian fascism as a proving ground on the eve of World War II. The Pentagon is testing all its latest contrivances for mass butchery on the revolutionary freedom fighters and civilians of Vietnam. The American people in turn are getting a glimpse of some of the "achievements" made possible by the \$50 billion a year or so spent by the Pentagon during the past several decades in preparing for World War III. The sight has sickened them as it has sickened the entire world.

The first reaction internationally to the launching of the war on north Vietnam was a great wave of protest. This appeared, however, to temporarily subside. The masses of the world acted as if they could not really believe that Johnson would persist in his war course in face of the universal disapproval. They even gave the appearance of turning their eyes away from the fearful perspective visible at the end of Johnson's brinkmanship, as if somehow the image could be wiped out by refusing to look at it.

Nonetheless a rather broad spectrum of leaders grasped the danger and spoke up. Mobilization began for a second wave of more effective protest actions. These have flared on all continents and have been growing in volume and seriousness.

One of the most hopeful developments is the appearance of a big opposition movement among students and faculties inside the United States itself. The mobilization of 20,000 demonstrators, mostly students, from all parts of the United States in Washington on April 18 was a tremendous achievement that has had international repercussions, serving to hearten and inspire the opponents of American imperialism throughout the world. The leaders of this demonstration, which was sponsored by the Students for a Democratic

Society, very wisely invited all political tendencies to participate. As a result, the demonstration was an extraordinary success in size, in singleness of sentiment, and in the radical character of the slogans. These hinged on the demand for immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam.

In other countries significant demonstrations have been organized, particularly in connection with antinuclear marches. In London, for instance, it was estimated that about forty per cent of the slogans in the annual Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament march dealt with the war in Vietnam. In Belgium the antinuclear march was extraordinarily successful, more than 25,000 turning out. The slogan "Hands Off Vietnam!" was centrally displayed due to the action of the pro-Chinese Communist party and the left Socialists.

Such demonstrations are an excellent beginning. They must be repeated and extended in the effort to make the madmen in Washington grasp more clearly what the world thinks about their course in Vietnam.

In the imperialist countries, the key problem that faces the vanguard is to link this opposition with the mass organizations of the working class. That is where the "heavy battalions" are to be found. The most energetic work is required to make a breakthrough in organizations under the grip of reactionary bureaucracies, but avenues can be opened to reach the rank and file who view the war in Vietnam with foreboding. Every revolutionary-socialist party should place this problem at the top of its agenda in the struggle to help Vietnam.

Everywhere in the colonial countries the freedom fighters in continuing their own struggle must hold up the magnificent example of the Vietnamese heroes. The Vietnamese are following in the path blazed by the Algerians and Cubans. The best way to help Vietnam is to carry through and complete the revolutions already begun. Give Washington one more Cuba, one more Algeria, another Vietnam!

Get the American Troops Out of Vietnam!

Hands Off the Vietnamese Revolution!

Let the Vietnamese People Decide Their Own Fate!

Forward to the Socialist World of Enduring Peace!