

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Vol. 3, No. 21

May 28, 1965

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

In this issue

Page

Johnson Sinks Deeper into the Morass	2
"Virtual Civil War" in Bolivia	4
The Crisis in Bolivia	5
Did Luigi Longo Plot to Take over Bolivia?	6
"Workers Militia Take Over the Mines"	11
Bolivian Political Parties Condemn Dictatorial Move	11
The "Center Left" Demagoguery of General Barrientos	13
Atrocity Scenes Removed from South Vietnam War Film	14
Belgian Social Democrats Suffer Major Defeat	15
Brussels Solidarity March for Vietnamese and Dominicans	16
Pro-Cuba Meeting in Amsterdam	18
Guerrilla Struggle Continues in Angola	18
Venezuela Guerrilla Fighters Battle Encirclement	
-- by Daniel Chirinos	19
Nigerian Witch-Hunt Case Thrown Out of Court	21
Okinawans Worried over War in Vietnam	22
Campaign in Japan to Make War Legal	22
"Teach-ins" Embarrass Johnson Administration	
-- by Evelyn Sell	23
Soviet Historians Demand More Facts	27
Revolutionary-Minded Students in Poland	29
Okinawa Seamen Reject U.S. Request	30
Ceylon Compensates Oil Companies	30
Documents:	
Declaration of Pablo Grouping	31
Pablo Announces His Break with the Fourth International	33

SUMMER SCHEDULE

Starting with June, World Outlook will begin its reduced summer schedule. This will mean less frequent appearance but will not affect your subscription which will be extended accordingly.

JOHNSON SINKS DEEPER INTO THE MORASS

Johnson has succeeded in converting the truce in Santo Domingo into a "stabilized crisis." This is the comforting word from the State Department.

Meanwhile, Saigon sources have confirmed the report that during June some 25,000 additional U.S. troops are to be landed in Vietnam as Johnson escalates the "consolidated impasse" there closer toward a Korean-size conflict and the thin border line of nuclear war.

In Santo Domingo, efforts were being made to bring down the curtain on the blood-splashed scene. But reports continued to appear in the European press of arrests mounting into the thousands and summary executions as the generals backed by Johnson sought to consolidate their positions as puppets of the military colossus that had brought the Big Stick down.

The image offered by the United States in Santo Domingo was not one to grace the pages of American history. A description by Marcel Niedergang in the May 22 Paris daily Le Monde of a press conference held in Santo Domingo by one of Johnson's close advisers will illustrate the image that is sinking into world consciousness:

"Thursday evening [May 20] we had the painful spectacle of a Subsecretary of State, a close collaborator of Mr. Johnson, plunged into the deepest embarrassment. Nervous, pale, his jaws set, Mr. Cyrus Vance faced the journalists. In a voice that was dry at first, he categorically denied the news published in some North American papers concerning specific cases of collusion between the American troops and the forces of the junta.

"'It is false,' Mr. Vance said, 'that General Imbert's forces crossed the American lines, false that our troops aided these forces either directly or indirectly. We only gave them two generators and two helicopters. False that our helicopters participated in the fighting. Our helicopters were only used to transport people of the two camps for negotiations. It is false that the Marines widened the international zone and false that our troops fired on the forces of Colonel Caamaño north of the corridor.'

After this energetic and unequivocal statement, the American journalists passed to the counteroffensive. With but few exceptions, the special correspondents of the American papers are serious, scrupulously honest and competent. To them a spade is a spade and American neutrality in the conflict is a lie. Once again they patiently explained to the seething Subsecretary of State that they had proofs -- films or photos -- of specific cases of direct intervention or collusion. Standing at the side of Mr. Vance, small,

pale, wearing large tortoise-shell glasses, General Palmer, commander in chief of the American forces, looked imploringly at the Secretary of State, who was becoming more and more irritated. 'I don't know,' the general said in a weak voice. 'Perhaps I'm not up to date.'

"How can you talk about neutrality when the corridor held by the Marines cuts the poor areas in two, letting General Imbert calmly clean up the north before attacking the south?" asked one of them. Finally Mr. Vance ended the conference. 'It's only a matter of isolated incidents. Our troops have official instructions.'

Among the bits of evidence offered by Niedergang in this same dispatch proving American collusion with the counterrevolutionary generals is the following:

Many fighters were in the industrial quarter where General Imbert moved house to house with tanks to crush the rebellion. There was seemingly no escape since the area was sealed off by American troops, counterrevolutionary troops and the Isabela and Ozama rivers. It was then discovered that some of the armed civilians were escaping the encirclement by crawling through four-foot storm sewers passing under the "American" corridor. When the Americans discovered this they sealed up the entrances with barbed wire.

Johnson's belief in the capacity of the Great Lie to cover up his virtual annexation of the Dominican Republic to the Great Society appeared to be unshaken despite the world-wide anger and condemnation. As a token of the island's new status, he sent seventy-five FBI [Federal Bureau of Investigation -- America's secret political police] agents to Santo Domingo, according to press reports. It was not clear whether they were to make "security checks" on candidates for the government that Johnson is democratically selecting according to his personal whims or whether they were to make security checks on Central Intelligence Agents operating in Santo Domingo.

The reverberations of the U.S. invasion of the Dominican Republic continued to mount in Latin America. What began as protest demonstrations in Colombia grew into a significant challenge to the dictatorial government. In Brazil unrest appeared to be rising again to the surface and dictator Castelo Branco was discovering fresh "Communist plots" on all sides. In Argentina there were rumblings throughout the country. In Guatemala a vice-minister was assassinated. And in Bolivia the country stood at the verge of civil war.

The U.S. occupation of Santo Domingo seemed to have touched off a chain reaction. Whether this would lead to a major political explosion remained to be seen but smoke was rising among many powder kegs.

"VIRTUAL CIVIL WAR" IN BOLIVIA

"Virtual civil war," was the succinct label Col. Oscar Quiroga, spokesman of Bolivia's military junta, put on the situation there May 24. "Growing insurrection," was the phrase used by United Press International in a La Paz dispatch the same day.

General René Barrientos Ortuño appeared to have staked his regime on the deployment of the armed forces against the entire union movement in Bolivia and especially its main bulwark, the organized miners. The would-be strong man ordered the armed forces to occupy or encircle the principal mining centers. In some places they were reported to have succeeded in seizing certain mines. In others the miners were said to have put up a successful resistance, using the armed militia to defend their positions.

Guerrilla warfare loomed as armed miners in some areas moved toward mountain retreats.

Barrientos demanded "unconditional surrender" from the miners and used planes to strafe and bomb their positions. Casualties were reported to be high.

On May 25 a truce was reached between the military junta and the miners. It included the withdrawal of the armed forces from the mining areas by May 29. In return the workers were to end their general strike May 26. The truce was negotiated by Gen. Alfredo Ovando Candia, another member of the junta. But it was not clear what his motives were.

According to foreign diplomats in La Paz the truce may be just a tactical move on the part of the junta to gain time. "There were other indications, however," said Henry Raymond, special correspondent of the New York Times, "to suggest that the army had been forced to yield in the face of yesterday's sudden insurrection in the capital's industrial section."

The efforts of the military junta to work the same "Communist plot" angle used by the Johnson administration in Santo Domingo were intensified. After "discovering" a vast international conspiracy allegedly involving Juan Lechín Oquendo and requiring his exile [see page 6 for details], the junta carried out a raid on Communist party headquarters in La Paz. They padlocked the place and claimed that they had discovered "documents" proving that the Communists were involved in a "conspiracy to assassinate" Barrientos...

The military junta was reported May 26 to be pleading with the State Department to sell "arms" to them. This could escalate later into a plea to send U.S. Marines to mop up Bolivia the way they mopped up the Dominican Republic.

THE CRISIS IN BOLIVIA

La Paz, Bolivia

MAY 16 -- Yesterday Juan Lechín Oquendo, the trade-union leader and head of the PRIN [Partido Revolucionario de Izquierda Nacionalista] was seized and exiled to Paraguay. As a result, a general strike has been called and a demonstration is scheduled for tomorrow.

The new crisis began, however, four days earlier when the seven main trade unions in Bolivia signed a joint agreement to engage in a common struggle for an increase in wages. The answer of the military junta to this was a decision to resort to force.

The junta offered the school teachers some increases in hope of breaking the union front and then seized Lechín with the idea of precipitating the miners into an isolated struggle in defense of Lechín.

However, this afternoon the COB [Central Obrera Boliviana] held meetings with the leaderships of the national confederations of workers and the result was the call for a general strike. The decision was to act in behalf of Lechín but to also press for the wage demands at the same time. The struggle for Lechín is in reality a struggle for trade-union rights and liberties which were violated by the arrest of Lechín.

The junta's scheme of dividing the working class and isolating the miners did not succeed. In fact the country as a whole is close to insurrection.

The military government is being pressured by the Yankee embassy to settle accounts with the workers movement in order to then initiate stringent economic measures. These would probably begin with denationalization of the mines and their ultimate conversion into private property, possibly through mixed companies if they were not handed over directly.

In the wake of Santo Domingo, the military junta has abdicated power, handing it over to the North American ambassador Henderson.

The morale of the masses is high. On May Day they were out in force with a demonstration here of some 20,000 workers.

Upon the invasion of Santo Domingo, the COB called a meeting of trade-union leaders to decide what to do. Forty leaders were invited, but they widened the basis of the gathering and 2,000 turned out. They organized a demonstration which met with police violence.

Since gaining power last November, the position of the military junta has deteriorated with increasing rapidity. Among other things it has been undergoing an internal crisis.

The generals renounced being candidates for the presidency and elections were set for next October 30. But a crisis among the bourgeois parties led imperialism to reconsider this step. The elections were suspended indefinitely and it was decided to resort to open repression. This was the only weapon they had left.

This may prove to have been a very bad mistake. Instead of ending the bourgeois crisis, it can give a big impulse to revolutionary struggle. Judging from recent experience, the ranks of the army will not prove to be a reliable instrument.

The vanguard is now trying to organize the resistance to the repression in such a way that when it is over there will be no repetition of the situation of last November 4 when the masses brought down Paz Estenssoro only to leave an opening for establishment of a military junta.

DID LUIGI LONGO PLOT TO TAKE OVER BOLIVIA?

Bolivia's well-known political and trade-union leader Juan Lechín Oquendo was seized and exiled to Paraguay under extraordinary charges. "The Government Military Junta," reads the official statement issued May 15 by Minister of State Oscar Quiroga Teran, "has knowledge of a vast subversive plan, of international character, planned and financed for some months by Communist leaders of world renown, in combination with the Bolivian-Chilean citizen Juan Lechín Oquendo, a conspiracy which reached its 'climax' with the formation of the inter-union front, violating the good faith of the workers; the announcement of a general strike and the constant incitements to subversion broadcast by Communist radio stations and agents of extremism."

Specifically, the military junta charged Lechín with holding an identity card in Chile under the name of Juan Latorre, of being in "permanent" contact with the "high Italian Communist leader Luigi Longo [sic], whose instructions he was following in carrying out a vast conspiratorial plan" also allegedly involving Federico Escobar, the well-known miners' leader and member of the Bolivian Communist party.

As to why its charges against Lechín were not brought to court, the junta said it could not do so because of "the imminence of the subversive coup d'état, whose gradual development was being

systematically unfolded, misleading our working class which under guise of wage or union demands was being utilized for the sinister aims of international Communism."

Thus as an "elementary preventive" measure to safeguard the "social peace and the tranquility of all the citizens" the military junta had to exile Juan Lechín "or Juan Latorre."

Besides this, Juan Lechín had been consistently "misleading" the Bolivian masses for "30 years," leading them into "economic bankruptcy and social anarchy."

It is thus up to Juan Lechín "from outside the country," to "clear up the enigma of his double and illegitimate nationality."

Friends of Lechín stated that there was no "enigma" about the Chilean identity card. Lechín got it during a period of exile in Chile in order to be able to travel about the country freely. It is ridiculous to accuse a former vice-president of Bolivia and one of its most prominent figures of being a "Chilean."

The "evidence" offered by the government on Lechín's alleged participation in an international "conspiracy" with Luigi Longo has all the earmarks of a very crude frame-up. Photostats of three letters in "code" were given to the press. The letters are handwritten or rather hand drawn in strange symbols that might have been taken from manuals on Gregg and Pitman shorthand, suitably varied by childish pictograms and occasional letters from the Roman alphabet. But the Bolivian DIC [Dirección Investigación Criminal] was up to the challenge and managed to decode the subversive letters which had come into its hands. The texts as published in the May 16 issue of the Catholic daily Presencia are as follows [the English translations are by World Outlook]:

First Letter

Italia 5 de marzo de 1965.

Camarada Lechín:

Doy respuesta a su atenta de fecha 24 de febrero, he tomado nota de todo lo que en ella me dice: hasta el día 24 del presente tendrá usted en su poder el dinero que solicita; ójala que con esto pueda hacer algo efectivo por la causa.

Según opinión de los camaradas que nos dirigen, en Bolivia ha sido nulo el movimiento que usted dirige; nos cuesta mucho dinero para nada efectivo.

Ojala camarada que trate usted de encaminar su política para

bien de nuestro Partido que en esa se encuentra en estado lamentable.

Lo saluda atentamente.

Fdo Luigui Longo [sic].

Translation

Italy March 5, 1965.

Comrade Lechín:

I am replying to your letter of February 24, I have noted everything you tell me in it: by the twenty-fourth of this month you will get the money you ask for; I hope that you can do something effective for the cause with this.

In the opinion of the comrades directing us, the movement you are directing in Bolivia has accomplished nothing; it is costing us a lot of money for nothing effective.

I hope comrade that you will try to get things going for the good of our Party which in this respect is in a sorry state.

Yours cordially.

Signed Luigui Longo.

Second Letter

Italia 9 de marzo de 1965.

Camarada Lechín:

Tal vez le cause extrañeza el recibir nuevamenta comunicación mía y lo hago porque se ha presentado el siguiente problema:

Recibí una carta del camarada Federico Escobar en la que me comunica que usted no le entregó el dinero a dicho dirigente. Escobar indicó ser muy urgente para entregar a los mineros y así obtener de ellos una colaboración más efectiva, según indica todos ellos se alistarán para la revuelta siempre que se les dé dinero para sus más urgentes necesidades. No sé cómo explicar camarada, esta negligencia suya, siendo que de esta superioridad recibió usted la orden; subsane usted a la brevedad posible esta falta que lo perjudicaría demasiado en su trayectoria política, entregue a Escobar el dinero para no entorpecer la revolución en marcha.

Una vez recibida la ayuda procedan de inmediato.

Fdo. Luigui Longo [sic].

Translation

Italy March 9, 1965

Comrade Lechin:

Perhaps it will surprise you to receive another communication from me and I am doing it because the following problem has been presented:

I received a letter from Comrade Federico Escobar in which he tells me that you did not deliver the money to the said leader. Escobar indicates that it is very urgent to deliver to the miners and thus obtain from them more effective collaboration, according to what he indicates all of them are ready for revolt whenever they are given money for their most urgent necessities. I don't know how to explain this negligence of yours, comrade, since you received orders from higher up; correct as soon as possible this fault which would be too damaging to your political trajectory, deliver the money to Escobar in order not to slow down the revolution underway.

Once the aid is received, proceed immediately.

Signed. Luigui Longo.

Third Letter

Roma 19 de marzo de 1965.

Camarada Lechin:

Doy respuesta a su atenta carta y me complace demasiado que sus negociaciones estén bien adelantadas. Como le prometí el día 24 tendrá usted el dinero; además celebro mucho que hasta ese día habrá en esa, grandes novedades que cambiarán radicalmente el gobierno de su país, de ser cierto esto ya sabe que contará con nuestra incondicional ayuda.

No olvide usted entregar al camarada Escobar el dinero que le indique. Trate usted de aleccionar a toda le gente de las minas y los campos para el momento dado. Le envié 25.000.-dólares que creo serán suficientes para esta oportunidad.

Esperando sus gratas noticias lo saluda atentamente.

Fdo. Luigui Longo [sic].

Translation

Rome March 19, 1965.

Comrade Lechin:

I am replying to your letter at hand and I am very pleased that the negotiations have proceeded well. As I promised, you will have the money on the twenty-fourth; in addition I am very happy that following that date there will be great happenings that will radically change the government of your country, to be certain of this you already know that you can count on our unconditional support.

Don't forget to deliver to Comrade Escobar the money which I indicated. Try to alert all the people of the mines and the fields on the time set. I sent you 25,000 dollars which I believe will be sufficient for the occasion.

Waiting for pleasant news, yours cordially.

Signed Luigui Longo.

In releasing the texts of the letters, the military junta forgot to specify in what language they were originally written -- the Italian used by Luigi Longo, the Spanish used by Juan Lechin, or something more exotic like the Russian used by Kosygin or the Chinese of Mao Tse-tung. It is thus difficult to determine exactly how much credit to give the military junta for cracking the code.

Of course the originals may have been supplied in English by the Central Intelligence Agency, in which case the military junta is to be congratulated only for its skill in providing a Spanish translation and a cryptogram in perfect gibberish.

As for the content of the letters, this reveals a level of imagination that is even lower than that of Stalin's GPU in the notorious Moscow frame-up trials. The money which the absent-minded Lechin could never seem to remember to get to Escobar is particularly intriguing. You would think Luigi Longo would give up using such an undependable messenger and send the money directly to Escobar. Instead he sends another \$25,000 to the inefficient Lechin and spells it out in a letter. There's nothing like Communist persistence, stupidity and ineffectiveness to help the secret political police of a military junta like the one in Bolivia. It is to be hoped that only the letters and not the dollars fell into their hands. They're already getting more than enough dollars directly from Washington.

And how did Luigi Longo send the money to Lechin? Did he enclose it in one of his letters in the form of crisp one-dollar bills? Finally, was it the sight of these American dollars, as the diabolical Luigi Longo plotted, that really inspired the Bolivian miners to defend themselves arms in hand against the American-armed troops sent by the American-backed military junta to occupy the mines?

"WORKERS MILITIA TAKE OVER THE MINES"

The reaction of the Bolivian working class to the seizure and exile of Juan Lechín Oquendo can be judged from the main headline in the May 16 issue of the Catholic daily Presencia: "Workers Militia Take Over the Mines" [Las minas en poder de milicias obreras].

The account reads as follows:

"The political events in La Paz led to the armed mobilization of the militia in the mine districts, the main center of Catavi-Siglo XX being taken under their control.

"According to the radio stations in these centers the Catavi union, in an eight-point communiqué, warned the Armed Forces 'not to continue their provocation because the union of the miners, peasants and middle class, will bring them down to a defeat worse than that suffered by Victor Paz.'

"The armed control of this center was established in order to avoid -- according to the communiqué -- any surprise move by the 'gorillas in the service of Yankee imperialism.'

"Catavi-Siglo XX, Llallagua and Uncía are controlled by Communist leaders. In their proclamation they bitterly censured Barrientos Ortuño, calling him a traitor to his country. They accused him of trying to drag the country into a second Dominican Republic.

"It is reported that all the entrances to the mine are under guard. Agents of the DIC [Dirección Investigación Criminal] in Llallagua were ordered to leave town. Housewives were told to stock up on provisions in anticipation of further developments.

"According to the various radio broadcasts, the situation in the mines is grave."

BOLIVIAN POLITICAL PARTIES CONDEMN DICTATORIAL MOVE

Most political parties in Bolivia strongly condemned the seizure and exiling of Juan Lechín Oquendo, holding that it constituted a dangerous precedent and a blow at the civil liberties guaranteed by the constitution.

As reported by the Catholic daily Presencia [May 16], Remo Di Natale, head of the Partido Democrato-Cristiano, said that "the seizure of Juan Lechín as main leader of the COB [Central Obrera Boliviana] and head of the PRIN [Partido Revolucionario de Izquierda

Nacionalista] constitutes an arbitrary act in violation of all the principles of civilized society."

"Even graver is the fact," continued Di Natale, "that Señor Lechín was deported from the country. This constitutes a tremendous blow against the country's constitution. The authors of such blows are responsible for the sudden worsening of the difficult political situation which the Bolivian people are undergoing.

"This is no time for our rulers to indulge in the luxury of starting persecution. I wish to appeal to them for a return to reason and I want to issue a warning that the people have firmly decided to establish in this country a democratic regime that respects human dignity."

Gustavo Stumpf Belmote, chairman of the Consejo Directivo Nacional of the Falange Socialista Boliviana [FSB], a right-wing formation, held that the seizure and exiling of Juan Lechín was an outrage and that it was also a violation of trade-union rights and of the rights and guarantees belonging to every citizen, especially the heads of political parties.

He stated that the FSB "protested this attitude which indicates a dangerous contempt for the norms of peaceful society and reveals a grave attempt to do away with the rights of citizens, dragging the country into conditions of violence."

The Unión Popular Demócrata Cristiana likewise protested the detention of Juan Lechín, calling it "arbitrary." In a statement the party said that "Señor Lechín, as a person and as a union leader, cannot be made the object of a political seizure because he enjoys the freedom bestowed by our laws and the rights which represent a conquest of the working class. It is lamentable that the Military Junta has taken the road of arbitrariness, disregarding the most elementary legal principles."

The Partido Revolucionario Auténtico energetically protested the seizure of Lechín and indicated its worry over the "unnecessary aggravation" of Bolivia's social problems, stating that the "error" of the military junta, which constitutes a violation of constitutional guarantees, must be corrected, otherwise "the Armed Forces will take on the responsibility of governing the country as a dictatorship that cannot serve to correct the evils from which the country suffers at present. Instead, they are running the risk of destroying the army as an institution, thus adding grave additional damage to what has already been inherited from the deposed regime [of Paz Estenssoro]."

These protests come from bourgeois and petty-bourgeois circles in Bolivia.

THE "CENTER LEFT" DEMAGOGY OF GENERAL BARRIENTOS

[The following article on the political demagogy of the head of the military junta in Bolivia has been translated from the May 1 issue of Lucha Obrera, organ of the Partido Obrero Revolucionario, Bolivian section of the Fourth International. It is of interest as background material to the present upheaval in the small republic.]

* * *

The Military Junta has declared its policy to be center left, and has called for the formation of a Front of center-left political parties that could back the presidential candidacy of General Barrientos.

The call for a Front mobilized all the opportunists, who hastened to likewise call themselves center leftists. From the revived PIR [Partido de la Izquierda Revolucionaria] to the mine bosses' Unión Republicana of Mr. Hertzog, passing by way of the party of the management of the enterprises directed by Crespo, all of them appear as center-leftists, seeking in this way to hook on to generals and to gain the Palacio de Gobierno along with them in the next election.

It is clear from this that the Military Junta as well as the reactionary parties are labeling themselves "center leftists" in order to confuse and delude the people. Conscious of their unpopularity, the rightist parties are putting on a mask that can appear attractive, the better to peddle their contraband political merchandise.

But besides the presence of these parties, what shows up the famous "center left" as a trap is its political content. In his speech adopting this position, General Barrientos outlined a rightist program and an anti-Communist, antilabor policy in the service of imperialism.

From its first steps, the "center left" label thus appeared as an expression of the counterrevolution, despite the efforts some of the opportunists made to make it more presentable with progressive adjectives.

It is clear then that the worst reaction and the most squalid opportunist groups have baptized themselves center leftists. But even if this were not so, the so-called center-left position would only be a return to the bourgeois-democratic revolution or national revolution exhausted by the MNR [Movimiento Nacionalista Revolucionario] in power.

After the experience with MNRism in Bolivia, Peronism in

in Argentina, the latest experience with Belaunde in Peru, there is no longer any point to talking about the bourgeois democratic revolution. The bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie have demonstrated their absolute incapacity to carry out a program to develop the country and to raise the living standards of the masses. The MNR began by placing itself in a center-left position, between the old rosca [mine owners] and the Marxist tendencies. It even called itself anti-imperialist. But it ended prostrate at the feet of the Yankee boss and it re-established relations with the men of the old rosca.

The so-called center left, with or without Barrientos, would be nothing but a continuation of the MNR, of its plans and methods. The workers cannot let themselves again become mired down in this position which has been cancelled out and rejected by historic events.

In Bolivia, it must be repeated, there is no room for half-way positions. The struggle will be defined by the extreme poles of national politics, fascist counterrevolution or proletarian revolution. No group or tendency that tries to take a middle road will gain political strength; it will be liquidated in short order. Every centrist tendency, in practice, at the present moment, only sows confusion and helps the rightist positions.

The workers and their vanguard are duty bound to energetically combat the center-left positions, because they are an obstacle to the struggle of the working class in assuring its leadership in the political process. The centrists try to impede the proletariat from assuming the role of leader of the nation and from turning the revolution toward socialism.

In face of the radicalization of the working class and its constant politicalization, imperialism and the extreme right foster the center left precisely in order to divert it away from the main issues, draining away its forces.

But not only must we combat this bourgeois deviation fostered among the workers by the PRIN [Partido Revolucionario de Izquierda Nacionalista] and the PCB [Partido Comunista Boliviana]; we must struggle to guarantee the leading role of the working class, boldly posing the slogan of a workers and peasants government as the only viable alternative in the present situation.

ATROCITY SCENES REMOVED FROM SOUTH VIETNAM WAR FILM

The Nippon Television Network decided May 13 to purge a documentary series on south Vietnamese victories. Scenes showed the U.S. puppet troops carrying such trophies as severed heads. There was a wide outcry that the series was "too gruesome," and members of parliament demanded it be modified.

BELGIAN SOCIAL DEMOCRATS SUFFER MAJOR DEFEAT

Brussels

MAY 24 -- The Social Christian (Catholic) and Social Democratic parties constituting Belgium's coalition government suffered a major defeat in yesterday's general election. The final figures on the popular vote are not yet available, but in the Chamber of Deputies, which has 212 seats, the Catholics fell from 96 to 77 seats and the Social Democrats from 84 to 64. For the Social Democrats this was the heaviest defeat in their 72 years of participation in parliamentary activity.

The main gainers in the election were the Party for Liberty and Progress (Liberals) which increased its seats from 20 to 48 and the Volksunie (Flemish nationalists) which won 12 seats as compared with 5 in the 1961 election. Both are rightist bourgeois parties.

The clear-cut shift to the right registered by the over-all election results is ascribable primarily to the policy of capitulation followed by the reformist leaders in their coalition with the Catholic party. Following the great general strike of 1960-61, the Social Democratic party in the spring 1961 elections recorded the highest vote in its history. This mandate to push forward along the road of socialism was betrayed by the Social Democratic leaders. They joined in a bourgeois coalition government with the Catholics. This could only disorient and demoralize the working class, at least the less politically mature sectors. The bourgeois opposition parties capitalized on the situation by advancing a clever demagogic platform that promised everything to everybody. The demagoguery proved successful at the polls. As always, the opportunism of the leaders of the working class paved the way for a defeat.

In a general swing to the right, in which the Social Democracy loses seats, the parties to the left also generally suffer. However, this did not occur on May 23 due to the fact that among the most conscious layers of the Belgian working class there was a shift to the left.

As a result, the Communist party increased its number of seats in the Chamber of Deputies from 5 to 6 and gained two seats in the Senate. The new left socialist party, which has been in existence only a few months, won two seats in the Chamber of Deputies, one in Liège and one in Brussels. A third seat in the south (province of Hainaut) was missed by a few thousand votes. The winner there was Robert Moreau, former assistant national secretary of the Belgian Federation of Labor, who ran on a Walloon nationalist platform.

The vote for the parties of the left is estimated to be nearly double the 1961 figure but they failed to win proportionate

parliamentary representation due to division among their forces.

The pro-Peking Communists in Brussels refused to join the electoral bloc of the pro-Moscow Communists and the new left socialist party. This prevented the bloc from getting a second member of parliament in the Belgian capital. In Antwerp the Communist party won an estimated 19,000 votes and Camille Huysmans 15,000. But the 34,000 votes gained no seat. Had all the groupings of the left joined in an electoral bloc, they would have won 10 or 11 seats as compared to the 8 that were actually chalked up.

With two members of parliament in their first election try, the new left socialist party registered an encouraging success. The highest votes were recorded in the working-class strongholds of the "red belt" around Liège. This was the only area in the country where the gains of the Communist party and the new left socialist party came close to equaling the losses suffered by the Social Democrats. In these districts they received 20% of the vote; in one case, 29%.

The left socialist member of parliament from Liège is Professor François Perin of the Parti des Travailleurs Wallons, the less radical and more nationalist wing of the new party. In Brussels the member of parliament is Pierre Le Grève of the Union de la Gauche Socialiste and chairman of the Brussels Teachers union. A well-known figure in the extreme left of the Brussels labor movement, he was the initiator of the Belgian Committee to Aid the Algerian Revolution. He became a target of the terrorists in the service of French colonialism and received a bomb in the mail. Fortunately his wife was suspicious of the package inasmuch as a Liège teacher, participating with Le Grève in similar help for the Algerian revolution, had been killed a few days earlier by a bomb when he opened a package sent him through the mail.

BRUSSELS SOLIDARITY MARCH FOR VIETNAMESE AND DOMINICANS

On May 15 some 1,500 people marched in Brussels behind banners strongly condemning the U.S. imperialist aggression against the peoples of Vietnam and Santo Domingo and supporting the right of the workers and peasants in both countries to determine their own fate.

It was the largest demonstration yet staged in Belgium against American imperialism since Johnson first ordered the bombing of north Vietnam.

Many organizations participated in the demonstration but the key force was the Union de la Gauche Socialiste, the new left social-

ist party.

The demonstration was deliberately limited in order to assure slogans explicitly condemning the U.S. aggression and openly supporting the revolutions in Vietnam and Santo Domingo. Banners of the South Vietnam National Front of Liberation and Youth Movement of Santo Domingo were carried by the marchers. Less radical parties and trade unions refused to participate in the demonstration unless the slogans were scaled down to a call for "negotiations" and for "peace" in Vietnam.

The pro-Moscow Communist party was inclined to give in to this line of argument which would have transformed the demonstration from an act of solidarity with the colonial revolution into a hollow gesture that could have even served the diplomatic aims of U.S. imperialism.

Under the pressure of the left socialists, the CP gave up the attempt and agreed to the more radical slogans proposed by the organizers of the demonstration.

When groups of participants showed up with posters calling for "Peace in Vietnam," stewards of the organizing committee talked with them and succeeded in convincing them to give up the equivocal formulation. As the demonstration marched through the main streets of the Belgian capital, the radical character of the demonstration stood out very well.

The May 15 demonstration was a remarkable achievement in practical united-front politics among the radical tendencies. Only a few weeks before, the sectarian attitude of the pro-Peking Communist party had caused a serious rift. [See World Outlook April 30.] The leaders of that party deliberately broke up the preparations for a united march on April 24, with the aim of excluding the numerically much stronger pro-Moscow Communist party. As a result of their "go it alone" decision, only some 250 people marched in that demonstration.

In retaliation, the pro-Moscow Communist party sought to exclude the pro-Peking Communist party from the May 15 demonstration. But the left socialists strongly opposed any attempts to bar any organization or participant who accepted the central slogans of the demonstration. As a result of this principled stand, both Communist parties finally agreed, although somewhat grudgingly, to participate in the same demonstration, and about 150 pro-Peking Communists marched behind their own banners.

This appears to be the first time in Western Europe that a united front in action has brought together all the radical tendencies despite the bitterness of the dispute between the pro-Moscow

and pro-Peking Communist parties.

Le Peuple, the daily paper of the reformist Social Democratic party, commented sneeringly that the Khrushchevists and Maoists had marched together -- while insulting each other -- under the leadership of the "Trotskyists."

The taunt missed its mark, however. In radical circles in Belgium it is considered a big step forward to have succeeded in organizing a common action with correct slogans. And if the label for this is "Trotskyist" so be it!

PRO-CUBA MEETING IN AMSTERDAM

Amsterdam

Some 200 socialists, students and left-wing militants turned out May 14 to hear Ernest Mandel, editor of the Belgian left socialist weekly La Gauche, discuss the Cuban Revolution. The meeting was sponsored by the Dutch "Cuba Information Committee." It was the largest yet held in Holland on this topic.

Mandel called special attention to new progressive developments that have recently occurred in Cuba, particularly the stress placed by Fidel Castro in his January 1, 1965, speech on the need to fight the danger of bureaucracy in Cuba, the election of workers councils, and Cuba's independent stand in the Sino-Soviet conflict.

This was the twentieth meeting addressed by Mandel since he visited Cuba a year ago. He has lectured in Belgium, Germany and Holland.

GUERRILLA STRUGGLE CONTINUES IN ANGOLA

The Revolutionary Government of Angola in Exile [GRAE] reported from Algiers May 21 that a number of successes have been registered by the National Liberation Army of Angola [ALNA] in engagements with the Portuguese repressive forces.

Between Mucari and Cangandala the ALNA destroyed two vehicles of the occupation army with mortar fire, killing the fifteen occupants. Important documents were captured.

In the Dembos, close to Ucu, the freedom fighters ambushed some Portuguese troops, killing eight. The ALNA suffered five dead.

Near the Cuango river, an ALNA group which had just received reinforcements from across the border were attacked. Four of them were killed. As they made good their retreat, they killed two Portuguese troops.

At Serra Bamba the freedom fighters killed a group of "OPV" (a terrorist organization used by the colonialist authorities) who were "protecting" a large coffee plantation, the "Fasenda Marilia." Seven were killed; the rest fled; and the ALNA now controls the plantation.

In Cabinda, between Yema and Tando-Zinze, four Portuguese soldiers were killed during a violent skirmish with the ALNA. Some modern weapons were secured as a result.

Finally between Capulo and Ambriz, the ALNA fought "naval" Portuguese forces. Four members of the ALNA lost their lives. On the other side eleven were killed, including three officers, Anacleto Pires, Carvalho Machado and Faustino Reis.

VENEZUELA GUERRILLA FIGHTERS BATTLE ENCIRCLEMENT

By Daniel Chirinos

[The following article has been translated from the April 5 issue of the Venezuelan underground publication Tribuna Popular. The original title is "Derrotar el Cerco" (To Defeat the Encirclement).]

* * *

A new military-police offensive is under way in the guerrilla zones of Falcón, Para, Trujillo-Portuguesa and Monagas-Sucre. Thousands of troops and police are participating in the punitive operation. The government's aim is clear -- to attack the guerrilla detachments with the objective of undermining their base of social support, isolating and then destroying them. They have failed more than once in their aims. Their biggest defeat occurred at the end of 1964 in "Operation Extermination."

The political crisis is now deeper and the attrition of the government's standing is more pronounced. Today better political and military conditions exist to defeat the new encirclement initiated by the government forces. But to accomplish this certain requisites are an absolute necessity.

The first condition is the mobility and audacity of the guerrilla detachments in eluding the encirclement and in striking at the

government forces.

The second condition is the semimilitary support of the masses located in the peripheral zone of the encirclement -- sabotage, sheltering the fighters, etc.

The third condition is the mobilization of public opinion to restrain the criminal hand of the attacking forces, to paralyze their reprisals and their murderous order to take no prisoners, shooting whoever falls into their power as they did with Soto Rojas, Trino Barrios and other brave guerrilla fighters.

The fourth condition is that the freedom movement does everything in its power to convince the country that it is time to put into effect a policy different from that of the Betancourtists and to seek the means to unite the immense majority of Venezuelans who want a government of democratic and nationalist peace.

The fifth condition is to convince officers and soldiers that nothing is to be gained in this war against the freedom movement. The peace message of the freedom movement must be brought to the detachments and to the mass of officers and soldiers. What interests are they defending? Why are they on the side of murderers like Carlos Andrés Pérez? Why should they risk their lives and energy to maintain an inept government, to defend a government that decrees measures against the people and fosters an antinational management favoring the big North American monopolies? In the National Armed Forces there are sectors receptive to the reasoning of the freedom movement and it is necessary to reach them directly and indirectly.

The sixth condition is a big publicity campaign over the outrages committed by the government, the guerrilla method of self-defense, the successes of our heroic combatants in their operations and resistance.

The guerrilla movement is the most militant part of fighting Venezuela. The guerrilla movement advances the development of the political crisis, stimulates the rest of the popular movement by its presence and its actions, offers realistic hope to the broad toiling masses, is a people in arms against the official violence enthroned in Miraflores that follows the dictates of the Betancourtist camarilla and the "gorillas" who block all roads to a dialogue and peace.

The guerrilla movement is no obstacle in the road to peace, while it is one of the main walls blocking the objectives of the dirty politicians who seek to perpetuate the rule of the native and foreign oligarchical minority groups. The guerrilla movement, as part of Venezuela in arms, is conscious of its role in the present over-all struggle of the people for independence and democracy.

Solidarity with the guerrilla movement must be placed on the agenda to help it defeat the new and criminal encirclement launched against the populations surrounding the guerrilla zones. Those who say that the government is compelled to occupy these zones should be reminded that the government is obliged above all to guarantee peace. And this can be achieved only by respecting democratic freedoms, liberating the prisoners, legalizing the PCV [Venezuelan Communist party] and the MIR [Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionaria], and passing measures in favor of the poor in our country. These are the political conditions that must be established in order to restore peace among Venezuelans. It will not be gained by means of criminal military encirclements.

The answer to the military-police mobilization must be support for the guerrilla fighters and a struggle for a government that will end the recourse to violence and establish nationalist and democratic premises.

NIGERIAN WITCH-HUNT CASE THROWN OUT OF COURT

Lagos

Leftists here are celebrating another court victory following the recent release of Dr. Victor Allen.* The case involved Celestine Bassoong who was charged with being a member of the UPC [Union des Populations du Cameroun], Ataturk Ananaba, the first secretary of the Nigerian Labour party, and Eskor Toyo. They were charged with running an unlawful society (the UPC) for the sole aim of overthrowing the government of Cameroun.

When the case came up, the public expected that as evidence of the plot the police would at least refer to bombs, rifles and similar equipment. There was much laughter when the exhibits turned out to be ordinary ink, starch, soap and other household equipment plus two or three letters.

The magistrate decided that the police had failed to prove the case they had alleged and that even if Celestine Bassoong was a member of the UPC it was natural for him to receive mail and to possess documents of the party.

The case was thus thrown out of court.

*Dr. Allen was ordered released April 15. His fellow defendants, Jonas Abam, Olushegun Adebayo and Sidi Khayam were scheduled to be released May 27. They were convicted November 10 along with Dr. Allen on charges of subversion and sentenced to one year in prison at hard labor.

OKINAWANS WORRIED OVER WAR IN VIETNAM

The movement of the Okinawans for the return of the Ryukyu islands to Japan is taking an antiwar trend. The reason is the use of these islands, seized by the U.S. as a prize of World War II, in staging military aggression against Vietnam.

Since the U.S. began bombing north Vietnam three months ago, the people of Okinawa have been "gripped by mounting fear...that they may be involved in war again," reports the May 19 Japan Times.

The Okinawan Council against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs has filed a protest with U.S. authorities against the training of south Vietnamese soldiers in the Ryukyus.

According to the Japan Times, "the antiwar trend, it seems, is taking root deeper among the islanders and is being organized by various return-the-islands groups."

Among such groups is the All-Okinawa Military Workers Union which has 8,500 members out of 38,000 Okinawan base workers. Putting up a battle for the safety of Okinawans working at the U.S. base, the union is "refusing to co-operate in war activities."

On May 17 the Okinawan legislature began deliberations on a resolution brought in by the opposition against Okinawan involvement in the war in Vietnam.

CAMPAIGN IN JAPAN TO MAKE WAR LEGAL

A move is on foot in Japan to change the constitution so as to make it legal for the country to engage in another war.

The drive is being mounted by the Liberal-Democratic party's "Constitution Research Council." It has prepared a booklet which argues the need for the amendments.

Three objectives are listed by the modernizers who hold that the constitution imposed on Japan after the defeat in World War II has become antiquated.

Under Article 9 Japan renounced war once and for all. This does not fit the prevalent international situation, the "new think" group contend. They hold that the article should be deleted and one inserted about "peace maintenance, national defense and military actions."

Article 41 provides that the Diet is the highest institution

of government power. This should be deleted and replaced by something putting the administrative, legislative and judicial powers on an equal plane. The change would, of course, facilitate elevating the Mikado to his former divine role.

The third point is that the constitution is too broad about safeguarding human rights. These should be restricted, the modernizers contend, "when national interests are involved." Obligations of citizens should be listed such as "abiding by the law," "loyalty to the state," "duty to national defense," and "duty to observe state secrets."

"TEACH-INS" EMBARRASS JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION

By Evelyn Sell

The rapid and spectacular growth of the university "teach-in" is evidence of the unpopularity of the Johnson administration's policies in south Vietnam. On March 24 more than 3,000 students and scores of faculty members engaged in the first teach-in at the University of Michigan. In an all-night, twelve-hour series of lectures, discussions, meetings and outdoor rallies, the students and professors explored the shameful history of American intervention in south-east Asia. Encouraged by the success of this first venture, the professors organized the Inter-University Committee for a Public Hearing on Vietnam and succeeded in establishing 150 chapters on campuses across the nation. Some 50 universities held teach-ins similar to the original one.

On May 15 the Inter-University Committee sponsored a national teach-in in Washington, D.C. Supporters and speakers included some of the most distinguished names in the academic community: David Riesman, famed Harvard sociologist; Dr. Benjamin Spock, author of child-rearing books; Hans J. Morgenthau, of the University of Chicago and a leading American writer on international relations; Robert M. Hutchins, former president of the University of Chicago and presently with the center for Study of Democratic Institutions; Isaac Deutscher, internationally famous author-lecturer.

More than 100 campuses in 35 states participated in the Washington teach-in through radio and television hook-ups. About 5,000 professors and students from all over the country participated directly in the Washington meeting and another 100,000 gathered in the local meetings across the country. Add to this number, hundreds of thousands more Americans who learned of the teach-in through radio news broadcasts, special television shows and front-page stories in local newspapers.

The national teach-in was significant both for its strength in rallying behind its vigorous opponents of United States actions in southeast Asia and for its weaknesses in failing to link its well-documented, well-presented denunciations of American foreign policy with an equally clear-cut program of action.

When compared with the almost total lack of organized opposition to governmental crimes in Vietnam, the national teach-in stands out as a healthy and needed step forward. However, when compared with the April 18 march on Washington of 20,000 students demanding immediate withdrawal of United States troops, the appeal for immediate negotiations in Vietnam voiced by most of the scholars gathered in Washington marked a more equivocal stand.

Even the administration supporters participating in the teach-in debates called for negotiations!

The anti-administration professors could only differentiate themselves in their call for negotiations with "the Viet Cong" [Front of National Liberation] and official recognition of "Red China." Johnson's hypocritical speeches calling for negotiations and his brief cessation of air strikes against the north seemed to have convinced some of his critics that he was paying heed to their demands. Some professors at the Wayne State University teach-in, for example, stated they were for withdrawal but it was an unacceptable demand to Johnson; negotiations were acceptable -- so it was smarter to ask for what could be gotten than to ask for what was really needed! (When you play the game in accordance with capitalist rules, you're sure to lose.)

Although the professors at the Washington teach-in traced and criticized United States policies in southeast Asia as a whole, they barely touched on the matter of American troops being rushed into the Dominican Republic. Student groups were quick to respond to the events in the Caribbean. On May 5 hundreds of students from the University of California marched on the local draft board, presented the board co-ordinator with a black coffin and stated this was done as a "symbolic protest" against "the invasion of the Dominican Republic." Forty of the students publicly burned their draft cards during this demonstration. The professors in Washington stuck very closely to their assigned topic; they barely mentioned the new outrages committed by the United States government in the Caribbean.

Despite its shortcomings, the national teach-in movement has been a terrible embarrassment for the Johnson administration. A month after the first teach-in of March 24, the State Department announced plans for "an educational campaign" to counter criticisms from students and professors. The Detroit Free Press reported, "Informed sources disclosed that officials feel an immediate counter-offensive is needed because of evidence that student demonstrations and professional 'teach-ins' are misleading Communist policy makers

about America's determination in Vietnam." The educational counter-offensive didn't silence the demonstrations and after the national teach-in of May 15 the Detroit Free Press carried another article entitled "Campus Criticism Irks U.S. Envoys."

"According to the U.S. diplomats," the article stated, "the Reds (i.e., 'Communists in Hanoi and Peking') anticipate a collapse of support within the United States for the government's Vietnam policies much the same way that French public opinion aroused itself against its government before and following the fall of Dien Bien Phu...The debate in the United States -- such as it is -- has provided the Reds with fresh hope. And it is this that makes the American diplomats' work so frustrating and difficult."

On April 23 Secretary of State Dean Rusk denounced the campus protests against U.S. policies in Vietnam. Rusk said, "I continue to hear and see nonsense about the nature of the struggle there. I sometimes wonder at the gullibility of educated men and the stubborn disregard of plain facts by men who are supposed to be helping our young to learn -- especially to learn how to think."

The day before the national teach-in, George Meany, president of the mammoth American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, sharply castigated academic opponents of President Johnson's foreign policy. Meany used the same argument often heard from the military brass hats and the State Department policy makers: the American public doesn't know what is going on in Vietnam and therefore is incapable of judging the situation in an intelligent fashion, only those who hold the true inside information are competent to dictate foreign policy. One of the strongest virtues of the teach-in movement is its insistence that the public should know what is going on in Vietnam.

Eric Wolf, University of Michigan anthropologist and one of the original organizers of the teach-in, stated that he and his associates reject "the assumption that we are incompetent to make a judgment because we do not have access to the immediate confidential intelligence available to high officials."

George Kahin, professor of government and director of the Southeast Asia Program at Cornell University, declared during his speech at the national teach-in, "When the American public faces the prospect of war, it has the right to full and honest answers." He questioned the Johnson administration's readiness to supply those answers.

Prof. Kahin's remarks were particularly discomfoting to the administration because he was to be the principal debater against McGeorge Bundy, special assistant to President Johnson for national security affairs. Bundy sent a last minute note withdrawing from the confrontation. Eric Wolf explained, "We were particularly inter-

ested to have Mr. Bundy not only because he is one of the top policy makers, but also because his position in public affairs resulted from the status he earned among his colleagues in the academic community." It was later revealed that Bundy was unable to attend the teach-in because he had flown to the Dominican Republic for a top-level meeting. However, the administration sent no one to replace their spokesman. Many students and faculty members felt that Bundy's absence and the lack of any comparable substitute proved that the administration was unable to defend its policies. Many were angered at the government and Bundy's arrogance at cancelling out at the last minute.

Speaking for fellow faculty members who participated in a two-day teach-in at the University of Wisconsin, Dr. William Williams, professor of history, stated that his colleagues and he "are concerned with the crisis in representative government involved in the Administration's policy of secrecy, its persistent refusal to engage in candid open debate with its critics, and its regular disregard of facts which undercut its own rationalizations."

These remarks and the reactions voiced during the many teach-ins reveal a deep-going loss of confidence in the government's ability to cope with the global problems now facing mankind. When the people of a country feel that their ruling class can no longer handle the reins of power, explosive social forces are brought much closer to bursting. The teach-ins have given clear indication of this loss of confidence in the political and military leaders of the United States and have encouraged people to speak out more forthrightly on their opposition to the war-provoking activities of the administration.

The sponsors of the national teach-in plan to keep their organization intact. They will try again to arrange a confrontation with Bundy. They will help arrange local campus discussions of foreign affairs (preferably with public officials), supply information and literature and conduct periodic national teach-ins patterned on the May 15 meeting. Some of the sponsors want to continue the Inter-University Committee as a permanent forum for discussion where both points of view could be aired while other sponsors urged the committee to engage in direct political action.

If the committee can be diverted into sterile debates with administration lackeys, its force and vigor and social function will dissipate completely. If it links itself up with the more militant student movement against American imperialism, it can add social weight and the luster of academic prestige to the struggle against the bi-partisan foreign policy of Johnson, Goldwater & Co. Regardless of its future, the Inter-University Committee has succeeded in focusing national and international attention on the deep repugnance of the American people to the escalation of the war in Vietnam and it has forced the administration to pay some heed to the growing

clamor for a cessation of hostilities in southeast Asia.

The administration's disregard for the demands of the American people -- expressed so overwhelmingly in the vote against Goldwaterism in the 1964 election -- and its persistent arrogance towards the well-being of the people of the United States and the world shows clearly that scholarly debates are not enough. Careful research and an intelligent presentation of the facts and the problems involved are helpful and serve a useful purpose but as the founders of the United States said so aptly in the Declaration of Independence:

"That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends (Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness), it is the Right of the People to alter or abolish it; and to institute a new Government..."

Most Americans have had to memorize the Declaration of Independence during their school years. The words ring loud and clear across the years.

SOVIET HISTORIANS DEMAND MORE FACTS

The Economist of May 15 calls attention to a document published in the April issue of the Polish emigré monthly Kultura reporting a debate June 17-18, 1964, at the Historical Institute of the Soviet Academy of Sciences.

The document is of interest for what it reveals about the intellectual ferment in the Soviet Union.

The discussion at the Institute was about the draft text of the ninth volume of the History of the USSR, covering the years from 1933 to 1941.

On the prison camps, A. P. Korushev argued that the official history should at least tell how much concentration camp labor was used in pre-war Soviet projects. He also wanted to know if the Stalin-Hitler pact contained secret clauses. If so they should be revealed. Also the lessons of the Finnish war should be discussed.

Another speaker criticized the lack of explanation for the development of repressive measures and the use of torture to obtain "confessions." The draft did not name enough of Stalin's victims.

Another speaker said that the breakdown of democracy in the Soviet Union was due to Stalin and not to Hitler and that the "cult" period should be analyzed.

Professor Genkin took the opposite view, holding that the speakers were too critical. The tendency to omit Stalin in recent publications was unwise, she held. Her argument that the Soviet archives are no longer inaccessible led to a sharp exchange and queries as to what sections are open.

Another speaker wanted details about Soviet involvement in the Spanish civil war, illumination of the personality of Nikolayev, who was charged with assassinating Kirov, and the names of the men who led the campaign against the historian Pokrovsky.

A.V. Snegov created a sensation when he conceded that the 1930s were a contradictory period in the Soviet Union, marked by both progress and regression. The half-truths in the draft volume were better, he held, than the flat lies of previous Soviet historians, but it should contain more factual material. When he asked whether it had been unavoidable to shoot Zinoviev and Kamenev as traitors, somebody in the hall answered "no."

"Mr. Snegov went on to argue that the psychological puzzle of Stalin must be solved and an answer given to the question: what did he do for Russia? Stalin's provocative policy towards minority peoples should also be discussed. In general, he urged, Soviet historians must stop repeating stalinist formulas about rightists, leftists and trotskyists; nothing had harmed the reputation of socialism more than Stalin's behaviour in the 1930s. He asked whether the murder in Moscow of the leading Polish communists had been really necessary; or had it been a precious gift for Hitler? He wondered why the book praised the partition of Poland between the Germans and the Russians in 1939. What had this really done to facilitate the defence of Russia?"

Points made by other speakers included the argument that Soviet historians must stop depicting everything in crude black and white; that the volume did not explain the repressions; that it should contain more about rural living conditions; that the book was too superficial; that a more penetrating analysis is needed of Stalin's personality as has been done with Ivan the Terrible and Peter the Great. "A young lecturer also wanted it to be explained why many people have still not been rehabilitated, though the charges made against them have been largely discredited."

One of the drafters of the book, a woman, pleaded that no serious study had been possible until after the first attacks on the "personality cult." Until then one could only write about the exceptionally good or bad.

"We still tend to act that way," she continued. "We are still, in this respect, under Stalin's influence. Have we managed to produce a balanced opinion of a personality, including its good and bad features? (cries from the hall of 'no'). And yet nobody is

either God or devil. This cannot last. We cannot write that way. We must write in such a way that we need not burn with shame in ten years' time."

She appears to have argued, however, that as much truth about the Moscow frame-up trials had been revealed in the book as "could or should be said now."

In concluding, the chairman said that the main truth was that in Stalin's time the Soviet Union went on building socialism.

REVOLUTIONARY-MINDED STUDENTS IN POLAND

In an article about the censorship in Poland and the attitude of various oppositional currents to it, Michel Tatu, writing in the May 26 Paris daily Le Monde, tells about a tendency that appears to have gained access to "Trotskyist" material and to have incorporated it in its views. The pertinent paragraphs are as follows:

"Among those abiding by the censorship, even if its actions are contested, we remain within the legal domain. A small number of persons in Poland have chosen a more radical road by publishing or seeking to publish clandestinely -- generally abroad -- writings that have no other way of 'getting by.' A rather well-known writer, Jan Nepomucène Miller, was recently arrested for having sent a manuscript to an English magazine. Released after several hours of detention, he found himself, in principle, facing trial....

"Two recent affairs were characteristic in this respect. In the spring of 1964 a young Communist of 27, Karol Modzelewski, the son of a Communist of the old guard who was the first minister of foreign affairs in People's Poland, was expelled from the committee of the party in the University of Warsaw for having read and approved the manifesto of the 'thirty-four.' But the young university student did not stop there. With several other Marxist students, including Jacek Kuron, the son of another old Communist, Modzelewski drew up a 'revolutionary Communist' program, in which the guiding idea was a radical criticism of the 'bureaucratic dictatorship' put in power in Poland and elsewhere by the traditional Communist parties.

"Largely inspired by the New Class analysis of Djilas and by the criticisms levelled by Trotsky against the Stalinist system, the platform of these 'neo-Marxists' sought to put together a bit of everything that had been said or expressed against the bureaucratic deformation of Marxist doctrine. It was a question of struggling for respect for freedoms and against the single party, but at the same time to go beyond the imperfect bourgeois democracy in order to gain a 'genuine workers democracy,' established on the basis of

genuine workers councils which would take away from the bureaucratic machine the property which it had in reality usurped (the example of the Yugoslav workers councils was considered to be tainted with 'technocracy').

"There is no need to say that these authors spoke against the 'reactionary' role of the Polish clergy and for a return to proletarian internationalism, borrowing some arguments from the Chinese on this. All these theories, which despite their at times utopian character, seem to have found a certain audience among the young intellectuals of the 'second Communist generation,' were developed last autumn by Modzelewski and Kuron in a 128-page manifesto, which only a few privileged people know about, among them Mr. Gomulka himself...Because the police, turning up 'in time,' hastened to confiscate the dangerous manuscript and put the authors behind bars. Seven conspirators were implicated in the affair, but, as is frequent in Poland, were all released after several hours of detention. According to the latest report, the trial involving subversion, which was doubtful in the first place, will not take place."

OKINAWA SEAMEN REJECT U.S. REQUEST

A U.S. request to man an LST (landing ship, tank) going to south Vietnam from Naha was turned down by the All-Okinawa U.S. Forces Workers Union (Zengunro) May 14. The U.S. demanded 20 seamen within an hour. The union met at once and turned down the request stating that putting their men on the U.S. military craft would run counter to the Okinawan people's aspiration for peace and that it was impossible for the Japanese to make a decision on such an important matter in an hour.

CEYLON COMPENSATES OIL COMPANIES

Shell, Caltex and Esso, the oil monopolists whose holdings were taken over by the Ceylonese government under Mrs. Bandaranaike, have agreed to accept a settlement on their claims offered to them by the new Dudley Senanayake government.

It was announced in Colombo May 11 that the pay off would be 55,000,000 rupees [about \$11,200,000].

With this dispute settled to the satisfaction of the oil companies it was expected that U.S. imperialism would resume sending handouts to the Ceylonese government. These were cut off when the oil installations were nationalized.

DECLARATION OF PABLO GROUPING

[The following is a translation of a statement by the Pablo grouping published in the May issue of Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme. The original title is "Declaration."]

* * *

The entire international Communist movement today is passing through a profound crisis.

This was caused by the necessity of readapting to a reality that is more complex and dynamic than ever, in constant, extra-swift evolution.

Theory runs the permanent risk of lagging behind in relation to life, to reality.

It is not only the official Communist movement educated in Stalinism that is seeing the bankruptcy of dogmatic, vulgar schemas, to which the Soviet bureaucracy reduced the flexibility, the richness of the critical thought of revolutionary Marxism.

All the other tendencies of the international Communist movement likewise find that they must get rid of much schematic, sectarian or opportunist dross and demonstrate in creative thought combined with consistent action their genuinely revolutionary-Marxist character.

The historic movement known today under the name of the "Fourth International" is not an exception to this rule either.

At a time when the entire international Communist movement is differentiating into ideological tendencies, the Fourth International cannot be identified with one tendency.

For some years already, the revolutionary-Marxist tendency of the Fourth International which we represent, has carried on an ideological fight to reorient this entire movement, historically born in the advanced capitalist countries (Europe, the United States), along the following fundamental lines:

To "de-Europeanize" and to "de-North Americanize" the international organization of the world revolutionary-Marxist current, and to make it genuinely international.

To give priority at the present stage of the World Revolution to work within the Colonial Revolution, and to the process of "de-Stalinization" of the Workers States and the Communist parties. To combine, in the advanced capitalist countries, centrist [entrist?]

work within the workers mass organizations, with open defense of the full program of revolutionary Marxism. These objectives flow from the entirety of the analysis of the international situation and of the dynamics of the World Revolution at its present stage.

The revolutionary-Marxist tendency of the Fourth International is for the free, objective discussion of all the points of view now existing within the Fourth International, including openly, publicly.

Because it is convinced that the crisis through which the world Communist movement is passing will prove wholly salutary on condition that the discussion among tendencies is free and genuinely ideological.

The revolutionary-Marxist tendency of the Fourth International is not inclined to reply to slanderous attacks by factional elements whose obtuseness, in particular toward the Colonial Revolution and "de-Stalinization" is incompatible with the traditions and spirit of the historic movement founded by Leon Trotsky.

They are free to hold, if they like, that they must continue to exist at the margin of the Revolution, absent in practice from the Algerian, African and Colonial Revolution in general, and separated farther than ever, by their attitude, from the elements and currents being born in the Workers States and the Communist parties in process of "de-Stalinization."

They are also free, if they like, to continue "critically supporting" from Paris, from Brussels, from New York, the Chinese bureaucracy, allegedly more "revolutionary" in practice than that of the USSR, while systematically minimizing the aid which the USSR, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Bulgaria, Hungary are granting as Workers States to the colonial movements in Africa, Latin America, Vietnam, the States of Cuba, Algeria, Egypt, Ghana, etc.

They are also free, if they like, to continue supporting Roberto Holden and his "G.R.A.E." against the M.P.L.A., committing the same very grave error which some of them committed in the recent past, supporting the M.N.A. against the F.L.N. and then the G.P.R.A. against the government of Ben Bella.

The revolutionary-Marxist tendency of the Fourth International, which includes a large number of organizations, cadres and militants, will never agree to being identified with such a line, for which it places the entire responsibility on P.Frank, L.Maitan, E.Germain and a few other hardened champions of a dead past without a future.

April 25, 1965

The Revolutionary-Marxist Tendency
of the Fourth International

PABLO ANNOUNCES HIS BREAK WITH THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

[The United Secretariat of the Fourth International issued the following statement May 24 in reply to a "declaration" of "The Revolutionary-Marxist Tendency of the Fourth International" (see p. 31).]

* * *

In the May issue of Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme, the faction headed by M. Pablo published a notice stating its differences with the majority of the Fourth International and its decision to "never agree" to being "identified" with the majority stand. The grouping has chosen this way of informing the Trotskyist movement that it refuses to abide by the majority decisions of the next world congress of the Fourth International, preparations for which have been underway for some months. Thus the document amounts to public announcement of the split toward which Pablo has been moving for the past year and a half.

As justification for his grave decision, Pablo advances the following line of argument:

That an "ideological" crisis is racking the entire international Communist movement due to ossification of theory. That just as the Stalinist movement is afflicted with an undue delay in theory catching up with reality, so is the Trotskyist movement. That just as the Stalinist movement has differentiated into ideological tendencies because of this, so has the Trotskyist movement. And just as it would be wrong to identify Stalinism with a single tendency, so is it wrong to identify Trotskyism with a single tendency. Therefore, the Pablo grouping, despite the smallness of its forces and its incapacity to convince the majority of the Trotskyist movement of the correctness of its views in a free internal discussion, is nevertheless entitled to appear before the world as an autonomous grouping; and, at the same time, speak in the name of the Fourth International.

In addition to the above arguments, Pablo proclaims that he has been fighting for many years to "reorient" the world Trotskyist movement both in theory and in practice. On the theoretical level he has been fighting to have the Fourth International discard much of its theoretical heritage as "dross"; and on the practical level he has been fighting to have it shift the "priority" of its revolutionary-socialist work from the imperialist centers to the colonial areas.

He alleges finally that the Fourth International and its sections and sympathizing parties, due to their failure to accept the novelties he offers in theory and practice, are today standing at

the "margin" of the colonial revolution, are farther than ever from currents in the workers states and Communist parties engendered by "de-Stalinization," are wrong in offering critical support to the Chinese side in the Sino-Soviet dispute, are "minimizing" the aid granted by the USSR and the workers states of Eastern Europe to the colonial revolution, have chosen the "wrong side" in the internal differences among the Angolan freedom fighters, and consequently belong to "a dead past without a future."

This line of argument, based on a rightist deviation and embellished with some rather exaggerated claims, cannot stand the slightest critical examination.

First of all, to represent the Trotskyist movement as not fundamentally different from Stalinism, insofar as the root source of difficulties in theory are concerned, signifies nothing less than throwing overboard the basic theoretical heritage of Trotskyism and substituting in its place alien conceptions that are far from new. The ideology of Stalinism emanates from the parasitic bureaucratic caste in the Soviet Union. Its main aim is not to reflect reality or to serve in changing reality. The ideology of Stalinism is an ideology of apology, the principal objective of which is to cover up and disguise the bureaucracy and to further its special interests. Such crises as occur in Stalinist ideology are symptoms of the economic, social and political contradictions faced by this conservative caste under the pressures of a mounting world revolution and rising domestic proletarian demands on the one hand and counter-revolutionary imperialism on the other. In this way the coming political revolution in the Soviet Union, through which the working class will end the arbitrary rule of the bureaucratic caste and restore the proletarian democracy and revolutionary program of Lenin and Trotsky, casts its shadow ahead.

From his basic position concerning the common source of allegedly similar ideological flaws in both Stalinism and Trotskyism, Pablo derives his conclusion that just as it would be incorrect to consider one tendency in the spectrum extending from Yugoslavia to Albania as speaking for the whole, so in the Trotskyist movement it is incorrect to consider one tendency as speaking for the organization as a whole, even if it is an overwhelming majority. (This does not prevent Pablo, of course, from giving the fraudulent impression in his public faction organ that the views of his tiny minority represent the Fourth International as a whole). Thus, following the thread of Pablo's argument, the majority has no right to submit him to discipline, while he -- as an independent tendency -- does have the right, like any other autonomous formation, to follow and to publicly advocate whatever line he chooses, including palming it off as the line of the Fourth International.

If the Trotskyist movement were to acquiesce in this, it would be reduced to a mere federation of tendencies with clashing

views on some of the most important issues of the day. Any minority, no matter how small or ephemeral, would be entitled to speak with an authority equal to that of the majority. The practical effect, it is obvious, would be to destroy the Fourth International.

But this is not all. The logic of Pablo's argument, if carried to the end, would signify -- not the unification of revolutionists internationally on the basis of a correct program, as is advocated by the Fourth International -- but the complete dispersion of their forces. For instance, why shouldn't a subgrouping in the Pablo faction bring out their own public organ in a still further proliferation of tendencies and multiplication of ideological confusion?

In his own way, Pablo shows his awareness of the need to block the development of the logical consequences of his position, particularly as it affects his own followers. Iron centralism is the rule in any areas which he considers to be his "own." Expulsion forthwith is the punishment for the "crime" of agreeing with the position of the majority of the Fourth International. Pablo's arguments about the need for discarding democratic centralism, at least "at present" -- while he is in a minority -- could scarcely be more cynical and unprincipled.

Obviously it is sophistry to refer to the growing polycentrism of the Communist parties as an excuse for splitting from the Fourth International. The real need in the entire revolutionary movement is to rally to a correct program; thus the real issue is the program of the Fourth International. Isn't that program, hammered out in decades of discussion and tested by great events, a revolutionary Marxist program? Then those who adhere to it are duty bound to abide by democratic centralism in presenting their differences and contributions, or in seeking to win a majority.

We do not deny Pablo's democratic right to proclaim himself an autonomous tendency alongside all the others in the workers movement; but it is fraudulent to do this under the label of the Fourth International, and we have already protested this deception.

As for Pablo's messianic efforts for an unspecified number of years to "reorient" the world Trotskyist movement and to get it to discard an unspecified part of its theoretical heritage as "dross," the following can be said: If we are to believe Pablo, it is based on the view that the Trotskyist movement was "born historically" in Europe and North America and was consequently "deformed" from birth due to the imperialist milieu in which it saw the light of day. For a long time, he says, he has sought to "de-Europeanize" and "de-North Americanize" the world Trotskyist movement, thus overcoming the original deformation. Engaging in crudely apparent demagogy, this European grossly distorts the truth. The Trotskyist movement was born historically in the Soviet Union in 1923 as the direct continuation of Leninism. Its program has always included the basic docu-

ments of the first four congresses of the Third International which place special emphasis on problems of the colonial revolution, on relations with nationalist movements and minority struggles. Its theory of permanent revolution applies with special force to the colonial world. However, if Pablo wished to continue riding this hobbyhorse about overcoming the birth defects of Trotskyism, the movement would not deny him the right so long as he kept his enterprise within the movement itself; i.e., so long as he adhered to the rules of democratic centralism governing all tendencies, groupings and factions who participate loyally in the rich internal life of the Fourth International. The world Trotskyist movement is not monolithic. It includes distinct tendencies not only of varying degrees of political experience and maturity but of different shadings. In fact the Fourth International seeks the adherence of revolutionary-minded tendencies who may have special positions on certain points to which they wish to win the movement but who are willing to abide by democratic centralism, accepting majority rule and unity in action.

Pablo has chosen to break with democratic centralism, however, and presumably will now inform the Fourth International more clearly and fully from an outside platform precisely what in its program he considers to be "dross" and in what way the world Trotskyist movement requires "reorientation" -- if he does not lose all interest in the subject.

Pablo's funereal utterances about the Fourth International and its sections and sympathizing parties standing at the "margin" of revolutionary developments, separated from the "de-Stalinization" process, and on the wrong side in the Sino-Soviet dispute, in disputes in Algeria and among the Angolan revolutionists are evidently written for the edification of the bureaucracies he is trying to play up to today. No doubt they will appreciate the way in which he seeks to slander and denigrate the movement with which he was so long associated and perhaps in his own conscience he will find it easier through such means to justify the course he has decided to follow.

The program of the Fourth International calls on revolutionists to integrate themselves in the revolutionary movements or mass organizations of their own countries, whether this be in the colonial world or in the economically advanced countries. The primary aim is to build a revolutionary Marxist party; but it is also an essential way of expressing internationalism. For instance, in the development of the revolution in the Congo, in South Africa, in Vietnam, in Santo Domingo, a revolutionist can play a vital role in Europe or North America in his union or other mass organization in solidarity with comrades in those lands. Contrariwise, comrades in the colonial countries can play an immensely valuable role in advancing the revolutionary movement inside the imperialist countries by

pursuing their own revolutionary struggle at home.

The Fourth International has never permitted its program to remain a mere abstraction. Its members in the colonial countries have a proud record of participation in great struggles in their own lands. In the recent period Peru can be cited where Hugo Blanco has gained renown throughout Latin America as a peasant leader; Bolivia where the Trotskyists constitute a leading tendency in the working class; South Africa where many Trotskyists are now serving long prison sentences because of their role in the political opposition. The list could be extended to many other countries. In the imperialist centers, the Trotskyists have stood in the forefront in organizing actions of solidarity with the colonial revolution. Their role in Western Europe and North America in defending the Algerian and Cuban revolutions from the moment they began offers an inspiring example. As to the idea that revolutionary Marxists should leave their posts in this difficult front of struggle and go to the colonial countries, this is justified where it is a question of volunteers needed to strengthen a military struggle, or of technicians needed during the consolidation of independence and the construction of socialism, but it is a caricature of internationalism to conceive of this as capable of substituting for an indigenous political leadership based on an indigenous revolutionary Marxist party.

The relation of the Trotskyist movement to the process of "de-Stalinization" is not at all as Pablo pictures it. The truth is that the old Stalinist slanders about Trotskyism have fallen away on a world scale. Where the revolutionary currents are running strong, as in Latin America, the Trotskyist movement is being increasingly accepted at its real worth among the vanguard. It counts many former members of the Communist party in its ranks, it has good relations with others and is experiencing less and less difficulty in working with those among whom the hostility of the past still lingers. This new relationship does not extend, of course, to those who have not yet transcended the cult of the personality of Stalin or to bureaucratic elements, whether of the Maoist, Khrushchevist or Titoist variety. Perhaps it is in the latter field that Pablo would very much like to "reorient" the world Trotskyist movement.

In the Sino-Soviet dispute, the Fourth International has critically supported Peking as against Moscow on specific issues. Peking's militancy is more favorable to the development of the world revolution than Moscow's insistence on "peaceful coexistence" (meaning maintenance of the status quo in relation to imperialism and the class struggle). At the same time, the limitations in Peking's position, particularly its efforts to maintain the cult of Stalin, have been severely criticized by the Fourth International. The Trotskyist position in this dispute is independent, and has

drawn fire from both bureaucracies.

As for the differences among the nationalist tendencies in the Angolan freedom movement, the Fourth International bases its position neither on Holden Roberto's leadership as such nor that of his opponents but on determining which tendency is most deeply engaged in actually fighting Portuguese imperialism on the scene. Pablo's analogy with the MNA [Mouvement National Algérien] and the FLN [Front de Libération Nationale] is completely false. The Fourth International gave critical support to the FLN because it was actually fighting in Algeria -- which was not the case with the MNA. And our support to the FLN never implied political confidence in the Algerian leaders of the time like Ferhat Abbas and Belkacem Krim.

Pablo's innuendo about the position of the Fourth International in relation to the Ben Bella government is scarcely worth noting. Members of the Fourth International in Western Europe were persecuted by French imperialism for supporting the Algerian revolution during the most difficult years. Some suffered imprisonment; some were targets of OAS [Organisation de l'Armée Secrète] bombings. Active solidarity with the Algerian revolution was displayed by all tendencies of the Fourth International despite their differences on various questions. Since the victory of the Algerian freedom struggle, the Fourth International has strongly defended the Ben Bella government against all its counterrevolutionary enemies -- and against this government's own weaknesses and lack of a Marxist-Leninist orientation, which are also part of the situation. All this is well known among the Algerian vanguard.

So much for Pablo's attempted justification of his course away from the Fourth International and toward an unspecified milieu.

In 1963 at a Reunification Congress, the world Trotskyist movement, represented by the International Secretariat and the majority of the International Committee, succeeded in healing a breach of ten years' standing on the basis of a principled program, including both the basic tenets of the world Trotskyist movement going back to 1923 and the advances reflecting world developments since then. Only minor groupings (Healy, Lambert, Posadas) refused to join in the Reunification Congress although they were invited to send delegates either as participants or observers. Pablo voted for the reunification and hailed it as a big step forward. It was hoped that a collective leadership, including Pablo, could be established despite the important differences and reservations which he held.

However, Pablo, it is now clear, was not sincere in his support of the reunification. He immediately set about organizing a faction on an international scale. In accordance with the tradition of the Fourth International, which has always led and fostered a highly democratic internal life, full rights were granted to this faction. Pablo's program, however, was such that he was impelled

into increasingly grave violations of discipline. Eventually, as a warning, he and others with him were suspended from the leadership. Instead of changing their course, however, they moved all the more deliberately toward a split, engaging in a kind of factional "brinkmanship" that included repeated predictions over the past year and a half of Pablo's imminent expulsion at the hands of the majority.

The political explanation for Pablo's course is his rightist position on some major points. In the Sino-Soviet dispute the grouping stood somewhere between Tito and Khrushchev until the latter's downfall. Since then they appear to have accepted Kosygin-Brezhnev as a reasonable replacement. This rightist stand led them in the case of Chile to project the possibility of a socialist government coming to power via the electoral road. In Ceylon they envisaged a revolutionary upsurge centering around the Bandaranaike bourgeois coalition government. Their Khrushchevist or Titoist prejudices in the Sino-Soviet conflict led them to go so far during Johnson's escalation of the war in Vietnam as to publicly imply that Peking at least shared in the guilt for the continued crisis. They made the impermissible declaration, for instance, that "China, in going it alone, can contribute to precipitating a world catastrophe."

In the same issue of Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme in which the split declaration appears, Pablo apologizes for the failure of Kosygin-Brezhnev to come at once to the aid of North Vietnam in an effective way when it suffered military assault from American imperialism. Three months after Johnson began the bombing raids, Pablo could still write: "A certain prudence on the part of the Workers States and of the USSR in particular is absolutely necessary under these conditions." This was after the Pentagon had conducted 8,863 individual bombing forays in Vietnam in February, March and April! Pablo adds, as if to indicate his closeness to the Kremlin's theory of peaceful coexistence with imperialism: "It is a question of giving time for all the factors to intervene in order to oblige American imperialism to withdraw, while handling them tactfully in this retreat."

As for the practical consequences of Pablo's rightist position, the faction has cut itself off from the possibility of integration with militant currents that favor the revolutionary road as against "peaceful coexistence" with imperialism. The fact is that without listing other parts of the world, where his followers are but a handful, in Africa, where Pablo claims to have the most strength and influence, the group is outweighed by forces loyal to the Fourth International; and it has practically no African members. To cover up the smallness of his following, Pablo claims "a large number of organizations..." The claim is pure bluff, including such creations on paper as the "African Commission" and "European Commission" of "The Revolutionary-Marxist Tendency."

One of the reasons why the Pablo grouping selected this mom-

ant to issue their splitting declaration was precisely because at the coming world congress, where a political confrontation with them had been placed on the agenda, it was evident they would represent an even smaller proportion of the reunified movement than the ten per cent or so which they obtained at the Reunification Congress two years ago.

While this grouping dwindled, the Fourth International as a whole has been able to register encouraging successes in a number of areas since the Reunification Congress. Recruiting among some sections has been especially heartening as have certain openings which have favored the world Trotskyist movement.

The United Secretariat does not dismiss the members of the Pablo grouping as of no further interest, despite the very unfavorable political direction in which they are moving. They are fundamentally committed to revolutionary socialism. They will, however, make the mistake of their lives if they continue down the course outlined for them by the head of the faction. We hope that they will draw up short and refuse to break with the Fourth International. The fate of similar splits in the past offers some grim lessons as to the perspectives facing a group like this that tries "going it alone."