

a labor press service

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

PARIS OFFICE: Pierre Frank, 21 rue d'Aboukir, Paris 2, France

NEW YORK OFFICE: World Outlook, P. O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station, New York, N.Y. 10010

Vol. 4, No. 23

July 15, 1966

In this issue

	<u>Page</u>
"Black Power" -- A Giant Step Forward	1
Memo for a Coming War Criminal Trial	4
Johnson's Calculations in Bombing Hanoi and Haiphong -- by Dick Roberts	5
The Protests in Germany and Japan	10
The International Outlook from Peking -- by George Novack	11
Hekmatdjou and Kharvi Win Stay of Sentence	14
The Communist Chinese Students	15
Built-in Obsolescence of Johnson Administration Lies	16
Coup d'Etat Topples Illia Regime	17
A Bonapartist Junta in Argentina	18
Waseda Students End Strike Action	19
Barrientos "Elected" in Bolivia	20
Three U.S. Soldiers Denounce War in Vietnam	23
In Tribute to Fabricio Ojeda -- by Miguel Fuente	24
Review:	
Inside Story of Healy's Conference	26
Secret CIA Channel between Manila and Djakarta	27
Documents:	
Note on Three Communiqués	28
Communiqué of the MR-13 Movement	30
Communiqué of the Mexican Posadist Group	33
Communiqué of the Mexican Trotskyists	36

"BLACK POWER" -- A GIANT STEP FORWARD

The Meredith March in Mississippi came to an end June 26 with what was for Jackson, the capital of the state, a giant rally of some 15,000 singing, shouting demonstrators. This successful conclusion to the march that began June 6, when the lone James Meredith was ambushed, turned out, however, to be but a curtain

Reba Hansen, Business Manager,

P. O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station,

New York, N.Y. 10010

raiser for a new development of enormous importance in the American political scene.

All the organizations primarily involved in the Negro struggle for civil rights and equality had rushed contingents, including some of their most prominent leaders, to resume the march begun by Meredith. During the long days walking in the sun, they discussed the major issues facing their movement, particularly the acute problem of ways and means to achieve their goals. The constant harassment of the marchers by local police and white racists lent special point and urgency to the discussion. Daily television coverage brought the debate into the homes of Americans from coast to coast.

The end result was the explosive spread of a new slogan -- black power.

The concept is relatively simple. It involves (1) the right to self-defense against the physical assaults of the racists; (2) the necessity for the Negro people to assert their potential political strength under their own leadership; (3) the necessity to exercise this strength independently of the two-party system and, if need be, against it.

The concept involves a rupture with the "nonviolent" Gandhist prescription (although it does not mean advocacy of violence). It signifies breaking the political strings held by white liberals who have been a major source of financial support for the traditional organizations (it does not mean rejection of white participation in the struggle or "racism in reverse"). It offers a sharp challenge to the Democratic party (while still far from organization of an independent political formation on a nationwide scale). It places a huge question mark over trying to legislate meaningful reforms into the present system (without as yet posing the need to turn to revolutionary methods and a revolutionary program).

One of its most significant aspects is its opposition to the war in Vietnam. It notes the hypocrisy of purportedly exporting democracy to Vietnam while democracy is still nonexistent in the South; and of sending troops across the Pacific under pretense of defending the democratic rights of the south Vietnamese when the Johnson administration does not even offer federal protection for Negroes inside the United States. It stresses in particular the crime of sending Negroes to fight against the colored peoples of Asia.

The spread of the slogan of black power is occurring at breathtaking speed even by American standards. It had already come to the fore in the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee in May with the defeat of John Lewis as chairman and the election of Stokely Carmichael. It was the key issue at the twenty-third annual convention of the Congress of Racial Equality which opened July 1 in Baltimore. And it was the key issue at the fifty-seventh annual convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People which opened July 5 in Los Angeles. The CORE adopted

the slogan amid very militant speeches. The conservative middle-class leadership of the NAACP rejected it amid dire forecasts that it meant "black death." (The decline in membership of the NAACP, however, would seem to indicate that the Roy Wilkins leadership may wither on the vine if it continues to stay out of touch with the current mood among the Negro masses.)

The high command of the Democratic party has mobilized as if it were facing a fresh focal center of colonial revolt. Senator Robert F. Kennedy opened the attack June 30 with a statement that the slogan of black power "could be damaging not only to the civil rights movement but to the country."

Kennedy went further: "But it also indicates a split within the Negro leadership and I think it also demonstrates that there is a militant group of Negroes who are not anxious to work with the white community to try to find answers to these problems."

The Democratic party leaders are mounting their attack along the lines indicated by Kennedy. They are charging that black power is racism in reverse and that it signifies a "go it alone" philosophy and rejection of help from whites concerned about civil liberties and Negro equality.

Johnson sent no one less than Vice-President Hubert Humphrey to press this line at the NAACP convention. In a speech July 6 this liberal Democrat who has made a spectacle of himself belly-crawling before Johnson in hope of again being named vice-president in 1968, said: "And we must reject calls for racism, whether they come from a throat that is white or one that is black."

With such demagogic arguments (and also the use of financial contributions), the Democrats are trying to bolster the most conservative wing of the civil-rights movement, split it down the middle and isolate such militant leaders as Stokely Carmichael, Floyd B. McKissick and Mrs. Fannie Lou Hamer who have shot overnight into national prominence and who are threatening to displace the old, well-housebroken leadership who enjoy being patted on the head by the liberal Democrats.

The Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. is writhing in the middle. He is doing some mighty powerful preaching in behalf of "nonviolence." At the same time he realizes that this no longer goes over. On July 8 he announced that he is considering organizing a wave of civil disobedience demonstrations. "We'll use something that avoids violence, but becomes militant and extreme enough to disrupt the flow of a city."

He seemed to have in mind such things as masses of people lying down on a highway to stop traffic, or sit-down demonstrations by unemployed workers at city halls. He admitted that only a few months ago he felt that such actions should be used sparingly, if at all.

His remarks clearly revealed the pressures he is feeling. "When they [public officials] drain the steam out of the nonviolent movement and give no concessions, they are planting the seeds for a Watts-like situation....They have mastered that art in the North. They'll let you march all summer and not give you one thing."

King cited the case of Chicago's Mayor Richard J. Daley, who promises to end the slums but who does nothing concrete. "He's just trying to stay ahead of us just enough to take the steam out of the movement. But he fails to understand that if gains are not made and made in a hurry through responsible civil rights organizations, it will open the door to militant groups to gain a foothold -- and those that have tried to be responsible will be driven to more irresponsible deeds and words."

He complained that "Industry is playing games with us. Even a long-standing ally like labor tolerates building trades unions that won't allow Negroes in them."

If Negroes had made genuine rather than "superficial" progress, he said, there would not be a black power movement or a danger of violence by Negroes. "But now people have to understand that the choice is no longer between nice little meetings or nonviolence. It is between militant nonviolence and riots."

King's dilemma is a measure of the shift that has occurred in the thinking of the Negro people. He is already being left behind and the movement begun by the martyred Malcolm X has suddenly taken a giant step forward. This can now greatly alter the American political scene, opening up new perspectives that will have inevitable international repercussions, particularly in connection with such imperialist operations as the war in Vietnam.

MEMO FOR A COMING WAR CRIMINAL TRIAL

The bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong June 29 was decided on personally by President Johnson in dictatorial fashion. In a speech the following day that reached a level of cynicism rare even for him, he sought to face down the universal condemnation voiced throughout the world.

Johnson claimed he was fighting the concept that "might makes right" and that he was given a mandate in the 1964 election to wage war on north Vietnam. Others can advise or criticize, "But there is only one that was chosen by the American people to decide."

Johnson won the election not because he said he could put over Goldwater's warmongering program better than Goldwater. Just the opposite. He said, for instance, that "we are not going North and we are not going South" and that he "knew of no plans that have been made" to escalate the war in Vietnam.

JOHNSON'S CALCULATIONS IN BOMBING HANOI AND HAIPHONG

By Dick Roberts

The official reason why the Johnson administration began heavy bombing of the oil-storage depots in Hanoi and Haiphong June 20 is that "infiltration" by north Vietnamese troops into south Vietnam had greatly increased in recent weeks. This position was maintained by Defense Secretary Robert McNamara in a press conference held the day the bombings began.

McNamara contended that "enemy truck movement to South Vietnam has doubled during the first five months of 1966, compared to the same period in 1965" and the "rate of infiltration [is] about 4,500 a month."

Even at face value, these figures are not very convincing. The 4,500 figure is not new. McNamara gave it at least twice earlier this year: first, at the culmination of the "peace offensive" in January when Johnson ordered renewed bombing of north Vietnam; and, second, in his Chamber of Commerce speech May 2, when he promised the huge increases in U.S. troop commitments which have subsequently been sent to Vietnam.

As to doubling the rate of truck movements, it need only be commented, comparing the same periods, that U.S. troop commitment had increased almost tenfold; that the bombing of south Vietnam had increased five times; and that the bombing of north Vietnam had tripled -- before the oil-storage depot attacks.

Very few observers, if any, have accepted McNamara's contention that the main or even an important determinant of the June 29 decision was increased north Vietnamese troop movements. But the question of what really lay behind Washington's drastic escalation of the war is one that is of paramount interest to most people, and not just to war critics alone.

A glance at the leading American newspapers shows that concern about Johnson's decision is deep-going even among those who generally support the war. The New York Times and the Wall Street Journal, for example, devoted considerable attention to the bombing decision -- and the conclusion about its causes that these two newspapers came up with is quite different from the one McNamara gave in his press conference.

In the first place, it was widely noted that the bombing of Haiphong and Hanoi marked a turning point in Washington's tactics that goes far beyond the initial steps of destroying these oil-storage tanks. The New York Times treated this question in its main editorial July 3:

"The policies now being followed were those advocated in essence, by Senator Goldwater in the 1964 campaign and criticized

at that time by Mr. Johnson. The once strong emphasis on negotiations has faded. It appears illogical to escalate the war, as the United States is doing steadily, and still expect the North Vietnamese and Vietcong to 'negotiate.'

"Another change that now requires notice," the New York Times continued, "is the shift in emphasis from a war whose main objective was the containment of Communist China to a war aimed almost exclusively at the military defeat of North Vietnam and the Vietcong."

"There is an obvious calculation that Peking will not move, just as there has been all along a belief that Moscow would not fight for Hanoi. President Johnson now seems assured that the war can be fought and won exclusively in South and North Vietnam..."

According to the New York Times, therefore, the bombings marked a shift to the all-out war concept long advocated by the Pentagon and supported by Barry Goldwater in the 1964 elections -- a concept that leaves little room for a negotiated settlement short of surrender.

And, according to the Times, the bombings showed that for the time being, at least, Washington is confident that neither the Soviet Union nor China will enter the war; and it is this "calculation" that is the main reason why Johnson made the bombing decision at this time.

The two conclusions set forth by the New York Times about Washington's policy were corroborated by members of the newspaper's staff who attended various "high-level" press briefings in Washington during the week the bombing began, or who were privy to other inside sources. Arthur Krock, the Times' senior correspondent in Washington, devoted a column to the subject June 29.

Krock addressed himself to the question of why President Johnson had chosen to reveal the bombing intentions in a press conference June 18, ten days before they actually took place [see World Outlook July 1]. "Was the President's purpose...to prepare the American people and those of friendly nations for the attack, thereby softening the impact of the policy change?" Krock asked, or, "was the purpose also, or only, to assure Moscow and Peking in advance that the attack on the facilities did not represent a change of policy to unlimited war?" (Emphasis added.)

Krock inclined toward the second answer. "The mere ritual denunciation of the attack by the Soviet Union," he pointed out, "suggests that if this was the objective of the caveat it was comprehended and accepted."

The opinion that Johnson had made the early statement in order to warn the American people and their allies could be rejected, Krock believed, because the reasons for the policy shift of bombing Hanoi and Haiphong were known long beforehand both to leading

Democrats and Republicans and to Washington's main allies abroad.

"There is another speculative assignment here for its timing," Krock then added. "This is that the internal troubles of the Peking Government have removed any risk there may ever have been of a military response." (Emphasis added.)

To other Washington journalists, the importance of the Chinese and Soviet responses, the internal fighting between them, and the wave of purges in China, were not speculative matters in determining Johnson's move.

Wall Street Journal staff reporter Philip Geyelin reported June 30, "Much more than practical military need was involved in the decision, which has been the subject of intense deliberation for weeks.... To the experts, Hanoi looks to be increasingly isolated from its big Red patrons, Russia and Communist China, as these two concentrate increasingly on their own quarrel and the Chinese are convulsed by purges and internal strains."

New York Times Washington correspondent Max Frankel, who possibly attended the same briefing as Geyelin, spelled out the influence of Moscow and Peking's response (or lack of it) in greater detail. "Strains between the Communist nations and a great political upheaval in Communist China," Frankel reported in the May 30 New York Times, "have encouraged the Administration to intensify its pressure."

"Far from uniting in support for a Communist ally," Frankel continues, "Moscow and Peking have been quarrelling more and more about which is to blame for North Vietnam's unhappy predicament and for the ineffectiveness of Soviet and Chinese help."

And it is not only the polemical exchanges between Moscow and Peking which are carefully watched in Washington: "The Soviet Union has taken pains all along to emphasize that it is supplying only 'defensive' weapons to North Vietnam. These have not proved an effective deterrent to American air assaults." (Emphasis added.)

"More effective for a time," Frankel then explained, "was the memory of Chinese intervention in the Korean war 16 years ago. In deference to the huge Chinese Army, Washington has repeatedly disavowed any desire to conquer or destroy North Vietnam. To prove its point, it has long spared Hanoi and Haiphong, has tried to stay away from civilian targets and from Chinese frontier areas, and had only gradually expanded the pattern of attack toward the two main cities.

"The fear of Chinese intervention has abated here in recent months," Frankel concluded, "as Peking has apparently toned down its ambiguously worded threats of last year and has spoken more and more of the need for the North Vietnamese to stand on their own feet." (Emphasis added.)

But Washington can never be absolutely certain that the Soviet and Chinese leaders will refrain from defending north Vietnam indefinitely. Each step of the U.S. escalation serves as a further test of Moscow and Peking's resolve. Besides being a significant step towards greater destruction of north Vietnamese material resources, the present bombing attack was also -- and perhaps mainly -- a test of Soviet and Chinese policy.

Three large air bases capable of landing jet fighters are known to be in the vicinity of Hanoi and Haiphong. "North Vietnam's first reaction to the raids today," Frankel continued in the June 30 analysis, "was viewed here as relatively restrained. Some officials had believed that the best of its Soviet and Chinese-built air force had been committed to the defense of Hanoi. The absence of a serious challenge was taken as a sign that Hanoi feels itself isolated and unsure of more aid..."

Washington's "calculation" which lay behind the decision to bomb Haiphong and Hanoi, therefore, had two sides to it: One was the decision that the Soviet and Chinese leadership would not respond; the other was the decision that this failure to respond would set the stage for a sweeping escalation of the war against Vietnam.

It was clearly the second side of the reasoning which led the New York Times to the conclusion cited earlier that a new stage of the war had been opened. The bombings of oil-storage depots are only a preliminary step. Once begun, the Pentagon's plan is to continue escalation until -- stopped.

New York Times reporter William Beecher reported the Pentagon's viewpoint as of the first day of bombing, June 29: "Even as black smoke rose over Hanoi and Haiphong after today's air strikes on petroleum installations," Beecher wrote, "top military men at the Pentagon were looking toward further escalation of the war effort." (New York Times, June 30.)

Beecher listed the following immediate steps on the Pentagon's agenda:

"Closing of the harbor at Haiphong. It is estimated that two-thirds of North Vietnam's imports, including 95 percent of its oil, pass through Haiphong..."

"Destruction of the three largest jet airfields in the Hanoi-Haiphong area. Most of North Vietnam's 70 MIG fighters and 12 IL-28 bombers are based on those fields..."

"Bombing of power plants and industrial installations. High on the list would be the Thainguyen steel plant, about 35 miles north of Hanoi..."

Beecher also took note of the reason why Johnson had not bombed Hanoi earlier, and what the implications of the present move

were: "For months," he stated, "the Joint Chiefs of Staff pressed for such assaults.... Their arguments were resisted, however, because of the danger that striking at the heartland of North Vietnam might cause Communist China to enter the war in a bigger way, might force the Soviet Union to step up its material support to Hanoi, and might injure the United States' reputation throughout the world if substantial numbers of civilians were killed in the bombing.

"Now that President Johnson has decided to run those risks....," Beecher continued, "some key Pentagon planners feel that, in time, they may be permitted to attack other major military targets in the formerly off-limits areas."

Therefore all eyes in Washington were on the response: Would Moscow finally alter its policy of "ritual denunciation" and de facto "peaceful coexistence" with the West? Would Peking cease its ultrarevolutionary sounding harangues against Moscow, bid for a united front against Johnson and actually come to Hanoi's support? Those were the major questions in the Pentagon war room, and the answers were duly registered.

New York Times correspondent Peter Grose wired the Soviet response from Moscow. "About 20 petitions of protest were handed in yesterday and today at the United States Embassy," Grose reported July 1. "The petitions, all similar in wording, were brought by small delegations. There were no threats of large-scale demonstrations, the [U.S.] official said."

Grose continued, "To most observers, the initial Soviet reaction to the Hanoi-Haiphong bombings has been guarded and reserved -- about the minimum required by the long-standing Soviet policy of giving the Vietnamese Communists full political support while remaining aloof from anything approaching military engagements." (Emphasis added.)

Grose also observed in passing, "Enthusiastic offers of volunteers to fight beside the North Vietnamese, heard in public meetings in months past, have not been reported now."

Washington was not as confident about Peking's reply. No official assessment was made until Hanoi and Haiphong had been pounded with bombs four more days. When hundreds of tons of bombs had produced only one note from Peking, however, Washington was jubilant. The story made the front page.

"Peking's carefully worded reaction to the bombings of Hanoi and Haiphong," Max Frankel wrote in the July 6 New York Times, "has reinforced the Administration's calculation that China will not directly intervene in the war at this stage."

"That calculation," Frankel continued, "was supported by nearly all of President Johnson's principal advisers before he ordered the attacks." Even the gloomiest Pentagon planners were

pleased with the results, Frankel reported: "Those who most feared a Chinese military involvement last year and those who opposed the resumption of bombings last February, find little reason to challenge that judgment now."

And Frankel comes to the crux of the matter: "Far from using tougher language, the Chinese were found here to have held back even from the language they used in the spring of 1965...This was the reaction predicted throughout the top levels of the United States Government. In fact, one of the major purposes of the intensified bombing was to demonstrate to Hanoi that it must stand essentially alone against increasing American pressure." (Emphasis added.)

THE PROTESTS IN GERMANY AND JAPAN

The shocked protests that swept the world over Johnson's decision to bomb Hanoi and Haiphong were especially significant in two countries -- Germany and Japan.

In Munich, 600 demonstrators appeared at the U.S. consulate, shouting, "Johnson, murderer!"

A similar demonstration occurred in Stuttgart. One of the placards depicted American planes loaded with bombs marked, "Made in Germany."

Clashes with police and reactionaries flared up in both cities. In Hamburg, where a crowd of 500 tried to break into the U.S. consulate, the police used fire hoses and clubs.

In Japan, Johnson's popularity could be gauged by the fact that when Secretary Dean Rusk landed July 4 at Kyoto, 4,500 police were on hand to protect him from the crowds and help sneak him along back roads into town. Some 1,600 police were deployed around Rusk's hotel to keep the stone throwers out of range. Apparently the head of the U.S. State Department is a light sleeper and wakes at the sound of breaking glass.

On June 30, the Japan Postal Workers Union sent a cable to Johnson protesting the bombings at Hanoi and Haiphong. The annual convention of the 243,000-member union adopted the message the following day at its opening session. The message expressed fear that the bombing of Hanoi may lead to a third world war. It urged the U.S. government to immediately suspend bombing, to withdraw its troops, and recognize the self-determination of the Vietnamese people.

The General Council of Trade Unions of Japan (Sohyo) issued a similar protest and announced that it was calling on all affiliated unions to hold workshop rallies immediately and to organize protest actions on a nationwide scale.

THE INTERNATIONAL OUTLOOK FROM PEKING

By George Novack

The snags encountered by Premier Chou En-lai during his eight-day visit to Bucharest in June, which resulted in a rift with the Rumanian leaders, underscore the deepening isolation of China at a time when it is menaced by U.S. military aggression and most in need of solidarity and support from the other Communist states.

The extent of this isolation can be measured by contrasting Peking's present international situation with its bright outlook when Khrushchev fell in October 1964.

With the deposing of the first secretary and chairman of the Council of Ministers it looked as though Peking had gained a smashing victory over its archopponent and was on the way to attaining most of its principal objectives in the Sino-Soviet dispute. Peking had demanded Khrushchev's political head; it had been chopped off. The leader of the Russian revisionists had apparently been repudiated as well as removed.

On that very day the Chinese exploded their first nuclear bomb, a remarkable feat considering the Russian withdrawal of nuclear, military and economic aid in 1961.

These two events dramatically demonstrated how high Peking's star had risen while Moscow's prestige had fallen.

Mao and his associates doubtless awaited signs of willingness on the part of Brezhnev and Kosygin to grant substantial concessions to their viewpoint. This expectation was reasonable since Peking had amassed broad backing from a variety of other Communist governments and parties, not so much for its policies as for its tactics in the Sino-Soviet dispute.

For months Moscow had been pressing for an international conference of Communist parties which would repudiate Peking's positions, condemn its intransigence, and virtually excommunicate it from the Communist community. Peking opposed the convening of such a conference as unwarranted and divisive and insisted that it be indefinitely postponed.

After dumping Khrushchev, his successors did attempt to mollify the Chinese by making small overtures and suspending open polemics. Although they did not alter the policy of peaceful coexistence in any essential respect, they did have to beat a retreat at the 19-party meeting in Moscow in March 1965. So many of the participants, from the Italians to the Cubans, objected for diverse reasons to any bans against the Chinese that the Kremlin was forced to abandon the projected type of international conference.

Despite the absence of the Chinese and their closest allies, this rebuff to the Soviet leaders was a gain for Peking. The communiqué that came out of the March meeting did not comply with any of the Kremlin's key demands, among them a proposal that dogmatism, not opportunism, be recognized as "the main danger" in deviating from the correct line. This would have meant shifting the center of attack from Yugoslavia, the target in 1960, to Peking.

It can now be seen that this marked the high tide of Chinese influence in the Communist world between the outbreak of the Sino-Soviet dispute at the beginning of the 1960's and today.

* * *

The turn took place soon after the March 1965 meeting, beginning with the demonstrations of Chinese and Vietnamese students before the U.S. embassy in Moscow which was broken up by police and soldiers. This incident was staged by the Chinese embassy on orders from Peking in protest against the Kremlin's behind-the-scenes negotiations on Vietnam with Washington. This action, however justified by the sluggish Russian reaction to Johnson's bombing of north Vietnam, was widely construed as a provocation and a deliberate widening of the breach between the two powers when greater solidarity was in order.

This feeling was confirmed when the Chinese followed up with vehement accusations that Moscow's guiding line was "Khrushchevism without Khrushchev" and that his successors were conspiring with Washington to sell out north Vietnam and the National Liberation Front.

Since that time relations between Moscow and Peking have steadily deteriorated until today they stand farther apart than ever with no prospect of reconciliation short of direct American assault upon China's territory.

Meanwhile Peking has suffered an almost uninterrupted series of setbacks in the colonial countries. These began with the postponement of the Asian-African Conference scheduled for Algiers in June 1965 after Ben Bella's overturn by Boumedienne. Peking received two black marks by its indecent haste in recognizing the new military regime and then by the nullification of the conference which it was eagerly promoting with a view to barring Soviet participation.

The interventions of the Chinese in various of the newly independent African countries have not met with much success, in part because of the reverses of the revolutionary struggles on that continent highlighted by the suppression of the Congo rebels with the aid of U.S.-Belgian-South African mercenaries. Chinese representatives have been expelled from several countries (Burundi, Kenya). By the end of 1965 Peking's influence in Africa had been largely reduced to the Congo Republic and Tanzania.

The most dramatic blow came at the end of February 1966 when Nkrumah was overthrown while on his way to Peking.

In Latin America, pro-Peking splitoffs have been organized from the Communist parties in Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Mexico. Many guerrilla fighters are inspired by the example of the Chinese Revolution, adhere to its ideas of colonial struggle, and look hopefully toward Peking for material aid. But it cannot be said that the Chinese have made sizeable headway at Moscow's expense. Castroism remains the predominant influence within the revolutionary left in Latin America.

In the past year and a half, Peking's influence in Asia has lessened, not only among its states, but also among its Communist parties. China won no laurels by its abortive mobilization during the India-Pakistan conflict. It has seen both north Korea and north Vietnam turn from sympathy to neutrality in the Sino-Soviet dispute and attend the twenty-third congress of the Soviet Communist party in defiance of Peking's boycott.

Even the Japanese Communist party, irritated by Peking's obstinacy in rejecting united action of the Communist countries against U.S. military escalation in Southeast Asia, is becoming alienated. Its daily newspaper has stopped publishing the broadcast schedules of the Peking, Hanoi and Pyongyang radio stations.

The military coup in Indonesia last October was the severest setback for Communist China on both the diplomatic and party levels. The keystone of Chinese policy in Asia against Washington and Moscow was the close alliance with Sukarno. The shunting aside of the Indonesian head of state and the reorientation of the generals toward the imperialist powers have shattered this strategy and shifted the relation of forces in that part of the world to Peking's disadvantage. Peking is left with no strong and reliable partners in the Afro-Asian bloc.

The bloody crushing of the Communist party of Indonesia, the largest outside China and the Soviet Union, was a double blow. Though formally neutral, the PKI was actually one of China's firmest allies in the tussle with Moscow. It was also held up as a prize example of the success of Peking's line in "the third world." The repercussions of its total annihilation, so completely unanticipated by everyone from Djakarta to Peking and Moscow, are still resounding throughout the Communist world as well as within the Chinese Communist party.

After this came Castro's attacks upon Peking and closer alignment with Moscow. From the inception of the debate Havana was tacitly sympathetic with the Chinese positions on the colonial revolution and unbending opposition to U.S. imperialism. However, Peking's sectarian attitude in dealing with the neutrals in the Sino-Soviet conflict, coupled with Cuba's inescapable economic and military dependence upon the Soviet Union, have nullified this sympathy.

For a time, neutralist Rumania sought to play the role of honest broker between Moscow and Peking. Now the schism produced by Chou's visit, either through the Chinese premier's intention to make a public denunciation of Moscow or through opposing any concession to U.S. imperialism in the Vietnam war, has left Peking virtually alone.

Its only remaining staunch supporters are Albania in Europe and an assortment of smaller Communist parties, ranging from Burma, New Zealand and Australia to the Grippa group in Belgium. China can count on only half-hearted backing from north Vietnam and north Korea against Moscow. This is not much to boast of after five years of bitter ideological struggle.

The prospect of improved trade and diplomatic ties with Japan and other capitalist governments does not compensate for these accumulated losses on the world arena.

China's growing isolation within the Communist bloc is all the more troubling in face of the tightening of U.S. encirclement and the relentless edging of its military machine toward Chinese territory, now grimly emphasized by the bombing of the oil installations at Hanoi and Haiphong and the repeated reports from Washington that more is to come.

Even a fissureless monolith would tend to crack under such stresses. A realistic view of China's worsened international situation must be one of the principal generators of dissension at the top of the Chinese Communist party and the government.

Prominent spokesmen in Peking have dismissed the reverses as unimportant and asserted that such temporary setbacks are inevitable on the road to complete victory. Such official optimism cannot quash all doubts.

Some influential voices must be raising such questions as: how did we land in this plight within a year and a half after Khrushchev's downfall? Can there be some flaws in Mao's omniscience? What must be done to turn the adverse tide and break out of our isolation? Isn't a new course necessary?

Such "dangerous thoughts" of critics in high circles may very well have been major precipitants of the regime's ongoing purge and its stiffening of thought control over the whole range of China's intellectual and political life.

HEKMATDJOU AND KHARVI WIN STAY OF SENTENCE

An order to stay the execution of Parviz Hekmatdjou and Ali Kharvi has been issued by the shah, according to a July 6 dispatch from Teheran. The shah may now commute their death penalties to life imprisonment. Demands to release the two political prisoners should be sent to the shah and Iranian consulates.

THE COMMUNIST CHINESE STUDENTS

From a Correspondent in Tokyo

I read George Novack's article "The Internal Struggle in Peking" [World Outlook, June 3]. It is very good. We must acutely realize the explosively high pressure of 700,000,000 people densely jammed within one frontier confronting physical and ideological problems unsolved by the Chinese Communist leaders.

The impact of developments there surpasses our imagination. The great Chinese Revolution which inspired the world with such hope is turning into a horror to millions of people, just as Stalin's betrayals disgusted so many and led them into terrible frustration. We must acutely realize this danger.

Last summer one of my sons, a freshman at a Tokyo university, helped organize a tour in which 130 university students went to China. They were welcomed by the young people and university students there with such enthusiasm that they were completely overwhelmed. Their encounters were spontaneous and passionate, even though they were organized under official auspices.

In brief meetings the young people became so friendly that many, almost all, on both sides embraced each other and parted with tears, though few could speak each other's language.

The Chinese youth welcomed them with dances and other entertainment and the moment the program was finished they rushed to their young guests and embraced them. My son and others afterwards admitted that they felt their own atomized existence in Japan all the more keenly. They were embarrassed to realize that when the Chinese youth would repay the visit to their school in Japan in response to their invitation, they would not be able to accord a welcome such as they received in China.

My son was much impressed by an old Japanese folksong rendered so beautifully by a Chinese group. He felt its beauty for the first time, he said.

Upon their return, the Japanese student delegation compiled a booklet giving their impressions which, however naive, can by that very fact be more trusted in certain respects than those of better-known, more sophisticated people.

I learned through them that the Chinese students at the leading universities, together with other young men and women, are still in a more or less revolutionary frame of mind. They yearn for something great and true with a common aspiration. They number by the millions, by the tens of millions, in the cities.

In his article Novack quoted Victor Zorza's words comparing the present situation in Peking with the crisis in the Soviet

leadership a few months before Stalin's death. That may be true so far as the gravity of the conflict in the leadership is concerned.

But in regard to these tens of millions of young people it rather resembles to some extent the situation in 1927 before Stalin's suppression of the Left Opposition. These intellectuals and young people are not indifferent. They are strikingly bright, burning with intense curiosity and revolutionary zeal.

Their fiery, nonindividualistic rebel spirit makes them different from students in capitalist countries and perhaps also from Soviet Russia. They still live in a pre-Stalin era. They study Lenin's works as well as Mao's, even though all the documents of the Comintern are not at their disposal.

The writings of the figures now accused of counterrevolution are sharply critical of the present leaders. None of the accused, except for the old Kuo Mo-jo, has yet recanted.

Behind this surprising militancy of the adults is the resistance of these young men and women. If the grown-ups can become so critical, then the dissidence of these young people with bright intelligence must be unbearably acute.

We should not forget the existence of many victims of the "Great Leap Forward" and other affairs. Each of these has involved thousands of young men. (Many Trotskyists who were arrested in 1949 and later also remain in prison.)

We know of one prison alone in the suburbs of Peking where hundreds of youthful political prisoners have been doing heavy labor for many years, resolutely refusing release on the condition of recanting. They are not Trotskyists, at least they do not call themselves such. Many Chinese youth and students know of their existence and resistance.

BUILT-IN OBSOLESCENCE OF JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION LIES

The high degree of obsolescence built into the lies of the Johnson administration shows how hard it is to beat American technique and know-how. A good example was provided by Under Secretary of State George W. Ball on a nationwide televised program June 26.

Said Ball: "There is no decision on the part of the United States Government to bomb Haiphong or to bomb the installations in Haiphong-Hanoi."

Johnson's lieutenant said that similar statements had been made before but he was repeating it "because of the amount of discussion there has been in the press on this subject." Hanoi and Haiphong were bombed just three days later.

COUP D'ETAT TOPPLES ILLIA REGIME

On June 28 a three-man military junta ousted the civilian government of President Arturo U. Illia in Argentina. The junta, consisting of commander in chief of the army, Lieut. Gen. Pascual Angel Pistarini, Admiral of the Fleet Benigno Ignacio Varela and the air force chief, Brig. Gen. Adolfo Teodoro Alvarez, selected a retired army commander, Lieut. Gen. Juan Carlos Ongania to serve as provisional president of the country.

The coup was not unexpected. Rumors that it was impending had mounted in recent weeks. As long ago as March, La Verdad, the weekly newspaper of the Partido Revolucionario de los Trabajadores [Workers Revolutionary party], in a close analysis of the political situation, came to the conclusion that a coup "is possible, although we do not believe it is the most probable variant." [See World Outlook May 20.] In the following weeks, La Verdad, opposing the reactionary moves, noted the rising danger.

While the Argentine coup d'état is different from the Brazilian coup of 1964 in a number of respects, the military men who undertook it clearly drew inspiration from Branco's seizure of power, particularly Johnson's role in that reactionary event.

Juan de Onis, special correspondent of the New York Times, noted this in a dispatch from Rio de Janeiro the day of the coup:

"But the military movement that really stirred the thinking of the Argentine armed forces was the Brazilian coup that toppled President João Goulart in April, 1964.

"Brazil's example -- of a regime that has adopted strong powers to reorganize the public administration, to fight inflation through increased taxes and control of wages and to banish political opposition -- has had a strong impact on the Argentine military.

"The fact that the United States has given moral support and generous material backing to the Brazilian Government of President Humberto Castelo Branco, the former Army Chief of Staff, has been cited in Argentina by supporters of the military as indication that United States opposition to a coup in Argentina was 'window dressing.'"

As Minister of Economics, the junta appointed Nestor Salimei. A manufacturer of vegetable oil, he is a director of several big banks and insurance companies. He directly represents the business and industrial leaders behind the coup d'état. These circles, according to H.J. Maidenberg, Buenos Aires correspondent of the New York Times, were "generally highly pleased" with the coup.

The price of the peso went up and the Buenos Aires stock exchange had its best rise in more than a year.

The junta announced that it would "legislate" laws and that the president they appointed would exercise the powers granted by the constitution to Congress.

They dissolved all political parties, the supreme court and Congress.

The New York Times predicted editorially June 29 that "The junta will no doubt now try the impossible task of crushing Peronism." While this appears to be a basic aim of the junta, they were proceeding cautiously, perhaps hoping to deepen the already existing divisions in the Peronist movement or at least to avoid frightening it into closing ranks and advancing a militant, independent political program.

On June 30 the junta staged nationwide raids on Communist party headquarters. Thirty arrests were made. The police chief in Misiones Province announced July 6 that 70 "Communists" had been arrested in his jurisdiction. He declared that they may have been trying to get into contact with "the notorious Che Guevara."

The junta also organized arrests of Jewish shopkeepers on July 1. It was learned July 3 that six directors of a Jewish-led credit-union cooperative had also been arrested. Twelve more were arrested July 4.

The shopkeepers were released July 4, the credit officials the following day. The police gave no explanation for either the arrests or the releases. Certain figures of the Illia regime, including Illia's brother Ricardo, were also arrested and then released.

A BONAPARTIST JUNTA IN ARGENTINA

Buenos Aires

The new regime is Bonapartist in character. Its aim essentially is to serve as an arbiter in the disputes between sectors of the Argentine bourgeoisie, between the industrial bourgeoisie and the landlord-cattleman interests, between the lower and middle sectors of the bourgeoisie and the oligarchical circles at the top.

The coup d'état is a consequence in addition of the labor movement's retreat since 1959. In this respect, the coup has a preventive aim, but not in an immediate sense. Thus it differs from the coup d'état in Brazil in April 1964 which was organized in direct response to the immediate threat of a popular and working-class mobilization.

Le Monde's analysis is mistaken in concluding that it closely parallels the Brazilian coup d'état. The Argentine coup is Bonapartist and not semifascist, a rightist Bonapartism but not semifascism.

The view of revolutionary Marxists here is that this is probably the last chance the bourgeoisie will have to establish a stable bourgeois government. After this regime, the situation can become openly prerevolutionary.

The prospects of the new government are not very bright. It is almost certain to run into squabbles among the armed forces themselves at an early date. There are cleavage lines running between the navy and the army. Moreover the various sectors of the bourgeoisie will be compelled to find expression through groupings in the armed forces inasmuch as political parties have been banned.

If these differences, which are inherent in the present situation, should develop, as they most likely will before long, the sole present base of the regime will be broken; i.e., the discipline and unity of the military will be shattered. Something like this happened in the coup d'état of 1955.

The trade-union leaderships are up to their necks in the filth of class collaboration. The leadership of the CGT [Confederación General del Trabajo], which has been honeymooning with the Stalinists, went along with the shift in power. They issued public declarations granting a certain degree of political confidence in the new government.

The Stalinists, who in turn were honeymooning with the previous bourgeois government, have been reticent. Along with the Trotskyists they will be the first targets to be singled out by the reactionaries. However, the Stalinists are not converting their reticence into a plan of struggle. On the contrary, they are placing complete faith in the CGT leadership, which will possibly support the military regime.

Perón and the Peronist leadership also appear to have decided on a policy of watchful waiting with signs of a favorable attitude toward the new government.

The junta's method of operation appears to be quite different from anything experienced up to now. They are proceeding cautiously and slowly. They appear to be trying to avoid provoking resistance. However their economic and social plans leave no room for the least doubt. They intend to shift the burden of the economic crisis onto the backs of the workers, increasing productivity by putting a greater squeeze on them.

June 29, 1966

WASEDA STUDENTS END STRIKE ACTION

On June 24 students at Tokyo's big Waseda University called off a five-month strike against a hike in tuition and for greater autonomy in student affairs. They won some concessions, including changes in administration, but not their main grievance concerning tuition.

BARRIENTOS "ELECTED" IN BOLIVIA

[Lieut. Gen. René Barrientos Ortuño easily won the electoral contest which the military junta in Bolivia decided to stage July 3. According to the figures released by the junta on July 6 before the count was complete, Barrientos was credited with 455,729 votes out of a total of 745,299 cast. Charges of fraud were sent to the Organization of American States. The OAS, which is a creature of the U.S. State Department, will probably file them in the wastebasket.

[The article below, written on the eve of the election, indicates that the electoral show put on by Barrientos and his American advisers will have but little effect on the acuteness of the country's political crisis.]

* * *

La Paz

In the electoral campaign, the opposition has been very active, hinging its platform on the demand for a general amnesty. The military junta felt compelled to concede this, but imposed a number of limitations. Thus the atmosphere of repression remains unbroken in Bolivia.

Due to the persecution of political and trade-union leaders, intervention in the internal affairs of the unions, prosecution of political opponents as criminals, etc., the prospect of elections failed to arouse any enthusiasm among the people. Despite intensive campaigning in the press and over the radio, the military junta and the National Electoral Court have met with poor response. The books closed June 3 with 1,198,000 registered voters. The registration in 1964 was 1,700,000. It is estimated that at least thirty percent of those eligible failed to register.

Not all the political parties are participating in the July 3 elections. Many of them are calling for a boycott, others advocate casting blank ballots.

Barrientos is the candidate of the FRB [Frente de la Revolución Boliviana]. This is composed of the MPC [Movimiento Popular Cristiano], a party organized by the military junta; the PRA [Partido Revolucionario Auténtico], which split from the MNR [Movimiento Nacionalista Revolucionario] shortly before the downfall of Paz Estenssoro; the PSD [Partido Social Demócrata], a grouping of the oligarchy founded by Robert Arce, former manager of the Patiño Mines Co.; and the PIR [Partido Izquierda Revolucionaria], which claims to be Marxist and which was the first vehicle of Stalinism in Bolivia. This contradictory conglomeration was put together with a combination of blackmail and handouts; and is designed to pass as a civilian base for the candidacy of the military figure, Barrientos. They are discredited organizations without the least following among the masses.

Up to the middle of May, the FRB was the only organization participating in the elections. By granting them a handful of seats as deputies and senators, the military junta gained the participation of the AID [Alianza Institucionalista Democrática], which is composed of the Partido Liberal, the pro tin-company ex-President Enrique Hertzog's Unión Republicana, and the wing of the MNR headed by Víctor Andrade, a friend of the Yankees who served as ambassador to Washington under the former government.

The electoral Court denied the wing of the MNR headed by Víctor Paz Estenssoro and Hernán Siles Zuazo a place on the ballot, certifying Andrade who has an understanding with the military and the Yankees but who lacks any popular support. It also certified the FLIN [Frente de Liberación Nacional], which is a front organization for the pro-Moscow Communist party, and the FSB [Falange Socialista Boliviana].

It is common public knowledge that these parties have an understanding with the military involving seats in parliament and large sums of money. The pro-Moscow Communist party is accused of seeking to serve as an agency of the government within the labor movement.

The political parties boycotting the election include the MNR headed by Paz Estenssoro and Siles Zuazo, the united POR [Partido Obrero Revolucionario] headed by Hugo González Moscoso and Guillermo Lora; the PDC [Partido Demócrata Cristiano] led by Remo Di Natali; the pro-Peking Partido Comunista Boliviana; the PRIN [Partido Revolucionaria de la Izquierda Nacional] headed by Lechín; the Grupo Espartaco, an old split-off from the MNR which claims to be Marxist. All of these parties, with the exception of the PDC belong to the CODEP [Consejo Democrático del Pueblo], a kind of leftist front. The boycott called for by these parties is being observed by the working-class and popular organizations. The thirteenth congress of the mine workers decided to boycott the elections as did the Federacion de Trabajadores en Harina [Flour Workers Federation], the COB [Central Obrera Boliviana] and the oppositional peasant organizations.

The reasons given for the boycott are as follows:

(1) Absence of guarantees in a climate of terror and persecution of the opposition, particularly the left; continuation of the Ley de Seguridad del Estado [State Security Law] which prohibits any trade-union activity and political opposition and under which political and trade-union leaders have been subjected to criminal trials and imprisonment; absence of the right of assembly, since any meeting of the left is broken up and tear-gassed; absence of freedom of the press, since journalists who report the news truthfully are beaten up and newspapers that print anything against the government are punished, as happened to the newspaperman Sánchez who was beaten up and the evening Jornada whose offices were broken into and tear-gassed, and the trade-union radio stations that were attacked, smashed and then padlocked.

(2) Existence of a powerful apparatus to put over the military candidate, an apparatus that uses government planes and vehicles and government money, including funds to buy a helicopter, which mobilizes state functionaries, compelling them to participate actively under threat of losing their jobs, and which organizes armed bands to intimidate the population. The POR and the PDC have demanded investigation of the sources of money used by the candidate, but their demands have been met with silence.

(3) The open intervention of all the military, police and administrative authorities in behalf of the military candidate. They are the only ones who enjoy civil liberties.

(4) The open intervention of the North American embassy, a Yankee colonel supervising Barrientos' electoral campaign.

In view of this situation, the election is only a farce and a fraud aimed at legalizing the military dictatorship.

The parties of the Marxist left, the POR and the pro-Peking PCB, point in addition to the bourgeois parliamentary crisis that is at the bottom of the indifference and lack of confidence of the masses in the elections. The electoral law does not grant the working-class districts parliamentary representation and the peasant vote is a mere fiction due to the intervention of the army and the bureaucracy. In practice the peasants do not vote, the authorities simply load the ballot boxes with their votes. A parliament formed in this way can be only completely servile as it was in the days of the MNR. It cannot serve even as a tribune for revolutionists still less as a means for discussing and resolving the problems of the nation and the workers.

The parties of the right who are boycotting the election call their campaign "democratic resistance"; those of the left call theirs "militant, fighting abstention."

Their slogans are not to vote; or, where voting is obligatory, to cast a blank or invalid ballot.

The president of the National Electoral Court, Mario Rolón Anaya, estimated that around 800,000 would vote July 3; that is, less than fifty percent of those on the lists in 1964 and about two-thirds of those registered this year. This serves as a gauge of the extent of abstention. Out of the 800,000, however, there will be a big percentage of blank, invalid or spoiled ballots. All this indicates the overwhelming opposition in Bolivia to the military.

If Rolón's estimate proves correct, and one adds the 500,000 unregistered citizens to his estimate of 400,000 registered voters who will fail to turn out, this means that about 900,000 will have rejected participating in the elections, aside from those who cast blank ballots.

As can be seen, under present circumstances, the elections

do not have a popular basis of support. The insurrectional way out, posed by the POR and the pro-Peking PCB, is gaining ground as the only road. On the eve of the elections a question mark still stood over them and there were persistent rumors that one of the military factions was considering another coup d'état.

June 20, 1966

THREE U.S. SOLDIERS DENOUNCE WAR IN VIETNAM

Three privates in the U.S. army, on furlough in New York, told a press conference June 30 that they would refuse to board a troop transport on which they were scheduled to leave for Vietnam. Pvt. Dennis Mora, 25, read from a prepared statement: "We have made our decision. We will not be part of this unjust, immoral and illegal war. We want no part of a war of extermination. We oppose the criminal waste of American lives and resources. We refuse to go to Vietnam."

Pfc. James A. Johnson, 20, a Negro, said: "Many brave, loyal black American soldiers who fight and die for their country are hated, despised and cruelly treated in many sections of this country. The Negro in Vietnam is being called upon to defend freedom which in many parts of this country does not exist for him. Just as the Negroes are fighting for absolute freedom and self-determination in the United States, so it is with the Vietnamese in their struggle against the Americans."

Pvt. David A. Samas said, "America has no role in Vietnam except that of instigator and conqueror. Are we fighting the Fascists, the Communists, or are we killing little brown peasants who in turn are fighting for their freedom?"

The action of the three created a nationwide sensation, being given extensive coverage on television and the radio as well as in the major newspapers.

The first reaction of the Johnson administration was voiced by Frank A. Bartimo, the Pentagon's assistant general counsel. He said July 2 that the men had exercised their right of free speech and had not -- as yet -- violated military discipline.

The three were scheduled to address a meeting under the auspices of the Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee at the Community Church in Manhattan July 7. Just before the meeting, they together with a fourth soldier Pvt. Joel Turtel, 22, were arrested by plainclothesmen, and hustled in handcuffs to Fort Dix, New Jersey.

The entire audience of some 500 at the Community Church responded by marching in a body to Times Square where they staged a protest demonstration.

IN TRIBUTE TO FABRICIO OJEDA

By Miguel Fuente

"I seek, through revolutionary action, the solution to all our great problems and the achievement of a new life for the people, different from the precarious existence they have experienced for a century and a half in an unjust republic.... We take up arms with faith and optimism, as one who has found his fatherland of the future. We take up arms against violence, against repression, against torture, against graft and corruption. We take up arms against the depravities and the betrayals.... We are fighting so that the dawn of liberty and justice can light up the horizon of our country."

These were the words which Fabricio Ojeda, member of the Chamber of Deputies of the Venezuelan Congress, addressed to his colleagues in an open letter on June 5, 1962.

On June 17 of this year he was captured by the SIFA [Servicio de Inteligencia de las Fuerzas Armadas -- Intelligence Service of the Armed Forces] and assassinated within four days.

Torture and assassination of political prisoners in the style of Batista has been common practice under the Betancourt-Leoni agencies of repression since 1963. But the blatant way in which Fabricio Ojeda was murdered testifies to the intensification of the armed struggle of the Venezuelan people, to the desperation of the U.S. lackeys running Venezuela, and to the Hitler-like measures fostered by the U.S. government in a useless attempt to hold back the revolutionary determination of the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America.

Who was Fabricio Ojeda?

Born in Boconó, in the state of Trujillo, thirty-seven years ago, Fabricio served as a schoolteacher for some years in the state of Zulia. Later he worked as a reporter on various Caracas dailies.

During the dictatorship of Marcos Pérez Jiménez (who was awarded the Order of Merit, the highest award that can be given to a foreigner by the U.S. government), Fabricio was a reporter for El Nacional, Caracas' number one daily which at the time had a left-of-center orientation. His assignment was to cover the Presidential Palace. He happened at the same time to be president of the clandestine "Junta Patriótica" which was to act as the coordinating center for the overthrow of the dictatorship on January 23, 1958.

In the elections that followed, Fabricio won a seat to the Chamber of Deputies as a candidate of the URD [Unión Republicana Democrática -- Republican Democratic Union].

By the spring of 1962, the FALN [Fuerzas Armadas de Liberación Nacional -- Armed Forces of National Liberation] were in process of consolidation. When the uprisings of Carúpano and Puerto Cabello took place, Fabricio decided that the only way to obtain national liberation from U.S. imperialism was through armed struggle against both the foreign oppressor and its "national" representatives.

Fabricio joined the guerrilla forces. On October 12, 1962, he was taken prisoner after an encounter with government troops. At his trial, the prosecution demanded eighteen years imprisonment for him. On September 17, 1963, along with other revolutionists being held in the Trujillo state prison, he made a spectacular escape and rejoined the guerrillas.

He was given the rank of comandante and placed in charge of the "José Antonio Paez" front which operates in the states of Trujillo, Barinas, Lara and Portuguesa.

When he was captured June 17, Fabricio was president of the General Command of the FLN [Frente de Liberación Nacional -- National Liberation Front] and the FALN.

Minister of Defense Florencio Gómez announced June 21 that Fabricio Ojeda had committed suicide that day by hanging himself in his cell. The government's cover story for his death while in the hands of the notorious SIFA was so flimsy that protests and demands for a thorough investigation came from all quarters. Even the reactionary daily La Esfera said that the circumstances of Ojeda's death "creates a delicate problem for the government."

The students at the University of Caracas did not stop with simply voicing protests. They held demonstrations which spread to many points in the city, including the "23 de Enero" working-class district. On June 22, two policemen on Los Ilustres Avenue were cut down by machinegun fire from a passing car. The next day a police patrol car was hit by a hand grenade and automatic rifle fire. Sporadic shooting occurred in various parts of the capital. Protest leaflets were scattered throughout the city and the slogan, "Comandante Fabricio, your death will be avenged," was painted on walls.

Meanwhile, in the "José Antonio Paez" front, four government soldiers were ambushed and killed by guerrillas.

The pressure on the government has been such that it felt forced to release eight leaders of the Transport Workers union who had been held for several days following a strike protesting the sudden firing of 140 workers on government projects.

Upon announcing the "suicide," the government barred newsmen from the headquarters of the SIFA where the body was being held. Fabricio's brother reported that he had seen Fabricio two days before and that he was in good spirits. After identifying the body, he reported seeing marks on Fabricio's chest. The results of the

autopsy were not made public.

In an apparent move to appease public suspicions, Attorney General Antonio Salcedo Lozada announced that a "thorough investigation" of the death would be made.

Revolutionists throughout Latin America will see in Fabricio Ojeda a figure who typified their own political course since the Cuban Revolution. His exemplary record and martyrdom will produce thousands of new "Fabricios" in Venezuela. The imperialists and their indigenous agents think they can stop the revolutionary movement by murdering its best representatives. They do not understand that the sacrifice made by these revolutionists will bring countless new recruits into the ranks of those who are determined to achieve the complete social and economic liberation of Latin America.

Review

INSIDE STORY OF HEALY'S CONFERENCE

HEALY "RECONSTRUCTS" THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL -- DOCUMENTS AND COMMENTS BY PARTICIPANTS IN A FIASCO. With a preface by Joseph Hansen. Socialist Workers Party, 873 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10003. 40 pp. 35 cents.

This pamphlet contains documentary material of particular interest to partisans of the Fourth International and to revolutionary socialists concerned about the good name of Trotskyism in Britain. It provides an inside picture of what went on at an international conference organized by Gerry Healy of the Socialist Labour League last April with the avowed aim of "reconstructing" the Fourth International.

The conference, which had been ballyhooed by Healy's weekly publication The Newsletter for some time as a coming major event in the revolutionary-socialist movement, ended in a complete fiasco. Of the three main participating tendencies, one was kicked out and another walked out, leaving only Healy and his group.

The pamphlet includes letters written by representatives of the Spartacist tendency, who attended the conference as observers and who saw their leading spokesman James Robertson hustled out of the gathering; a letter by Healy trying to justify the dictatorial way he ran things; an exchange of letters between James Robertson and Tim Wohlforth after the conference; and an article by the Voix Ouvrière group recounting the abysmal political level of the gathering and why they as invited guests and participants were faced with no choice but to walk out.

In a preface to these illuminating documents, Joseph Hansen indicates the background to the pretentious conference and why it was that the participants -- to their own complete surprise -- found themselves at loggerheads despite the common views that had brought them together in the same room. Hansen analyzes in detail the organizational procedures followed by Healy in expelling Robertson and shows how grossly the norms of democratic centralism were violated.

The Socialist Labour League, under Healy's leadership, has long been notorious in the British labor movement for its lack of democracy. However, it was difficult for revolutionary socialists abroad to judge how much the rumors and reports might be colored by factionalism.

This material settles the question. "The facts reported by the Robertson delegation," as Hansen observes, "are different from anything yet revealed since they come from people who were pathetically loyal to Healy and who could scarcely believe their eyes as they witnessed what was happening. Their report of how Healy expelled Robertson, backed as it is by Healy's own boasts and admissions, is utterly convincing."

In contrast to the fiasco of Healy's conference, Hansen calls attention to the progress of the Fourth International since its Reunification Congress in 1963. Last December it held another world congress, marking a new step forward.

While the international Trotskyist movement continues to advance, the few groups like the one headed by Healy, which refused to abide by the rules of democratic centralism, have moved further away from the basic principles and practices of Trotskyism. The result, in the form of political and organizational degeneration, is to be seen in such revealing documents as those that have been made available in this pamphlet.

SECRET CIA CHANNEL BETWEEN MANILA AND DJAKARTA

Activities of the CIA have become a subject of inquiry in the Philippines, according to Lorenzo J. Cruz, writing in the April 26 issue of The Asia Magazine. When Justice Secretary José Yulo disclosed that several government officials were on the payroll of the CIA, it was asked if they should not be charged with treason. Foreign Secretary Narciso Ramos admitted that when normal communications with Djakarta broke down recently, "the Philippine government used the CIA's secret channel to Djakarta to communicate with the Philippine embassy in that city." Aside from indicating the extensiveness of the CIA's web, this scandal raised the question of the CIA's knowledge of "confidential national documents -- if not outright secrets." Cruz does not mention it, but the revelation also again raised the matter of the CIA's role in the mysterious events that set off the blood purge in Indonesia last October.

NOTE ON THREE COMMUNIQUES

Three communiqués have been translated and published below by World Outlook, all of them dealing with a matter of considerable interest to the revolutionary movement in Latin America and elsewhere inasmuch as it concerns a guerrilla front and a sectarian group which were the subject of extensive remarks by Fidel Castro last January and the occasion for an unjustified attack by him against Trotskyism.

The full text of Castro's speech was published in the February 11 issue of World Outlook. In subsequent issues extensive documentation was provided on the repercussions touched off by his attack. These included such items as a reply by the editors of Monthly Review, an "Open Letter" by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International, an attempted rebuttal by Blas Roca, and a reply to this by Joseph Hansen.

The guerrilla movement cited by Castro was the MR-13 of Guatemala headed by Marco Antonio Yon Sosa; the sectarians involved in the Guatemalan situation and alleged to be "Trotskyists" were followers of J. Posadas, who usurped the name of the Fourth International.

Yon Sosa has now broken with this group. The circumstances of the break are indicated in the three documents below -- an official communiqué issued by the MR-13, an official reply by the Mexican Posadists and an official clarification by the Mexican Trotskyists.

World Outlook reserves comment for the moment to the following:

(1) Judging from its communiqué, the MR-13 leadership does not yet understand the true nature of the Posadist group, but still believes them to be genuine Trotskyists and genuine representatives of the Fourth International. This is no doubt due to the isolation of these guerrilla forces.

(2) The Khrushchevists (and no doubt forces much to the right of them, particularly in Mexico) will seek to utilize Yon Sosa's break with the Posadists to grind their own factional ax. This was immediately indicated by the fact that in Mexico the Communist party engaged in massive distributions of the MR-13 communiqué. The break lends itself to factional use by the Khrushchevists, however, only because of the fraud that the Posadist group represents Trotskyism, a fraud which these sectarians help maintain by their own fraudulent claim to being "the Fourth International." In this respect the "reply" of the Mexican Posadists to Yon Sosa plays completely into the hands of the heirs and continuators of Stalinism.

(3) There is a minor error in the communiqué of the Mexican Trotskyists. They state that Posadas and his group were expelled

from the Fourth International because of their "sectarian and adventurously positions." Inside the Fourth International, Posadas and his faction advocated sectarian and possibly adventurously views but were not expelled because of that. So long as they abided by majority decision they retained full right to maintain their views and to advocate them inside the movement in accordance with the rules of democratic centralism. However, Posadas finally broke these rules. He publicly proclaimed that an emergency congress had been called and that this congress had "reorganized" the Fourth International, deposing the former leadership and vesting all authority in him and his Latin-American Bureau. He even went so far as to reproduce the official publications of the Fourth International, taking their titles and faking them down to the very type face. It was because of this that the Fourth International "expelled" him.

(4) On the organizational level, Posadas acted just as arbitrarily with the MR-13 leadership as he had with the leadership of the Fourth International. He usurped authority. This occurred in connection with both the handling of MR-13 funds and the functioning of the Political Bureau of the MR-13. Both instances are reminiscent of the abominations typical of the Comintern in the days of Stalin, denounced innumerable times by the world Trotskyist movement as examples of the worst bureaucratic practices. Insofar as the abstract principle advanced by the Posadists in their "reply" is concerned, it is true that the international revolutionary-socialist movement must be financed by its adherents, but it is completely impermissible to do this without their knowledge and consent. In this area, the revolutionary movement has no recourse but to rely on the level of consciousness of its members. Anything else means political suicide.

This applies a thousandfold to other organizations -- trade unions, civil-rights bodies, cooperatives, and other groupings with avowedly limited aims -- in which revolutionists are granted positions of responsibility. To divert funds, or to manipulate the organization, no matter how laudable the professed aim, is a betrayal of trust. How many promising organizations have been wrecked by such practices! This was one of the most bitter fruits of Stalinism.

(5) The Posadist communiqué refers to the Guatemalan FAR [Fuerzas Armadas Rebeldes]. These guerrillas are headed by Luis A. Turcios Lima, who split from the MR-13, alleging the influence of the "Trotskyists" (Posadists) as his reason. Turcios is influenced, it would seem by the PGT (Guatemalan Labor party -- the Communist party), but it would be a mistake to assume that he is dominated by it or by its tendency to adhere to the line of "peaceful coexistence." Turcios enjoys strong backing from the Fidelista current and was given great prominence at the Tricontinental Conference in Havana last January. It may be that Yon Sosa's break with the Posadist group is not unconnected with moves to unite the two guerrilla groups. Objectively this would be a favorable development if it occurs on the basis of a program of socialist revolution, whatever

tactical adjustments may be required concretely in Guatemala. Should "peaceful coexistence" become the axis of unification this would be a disastrous setback. In that case, however, much more would be involved than the fate of the Guatemalan revolution. It would be a sign of a big turn to the right by the Fidelista leadership. There has been no decisive evidence of such a turn yet. In fact, the positions taken by the Cuban leaders in the main at the Tricontinental Conference and subsequently indicates the contrary.

COMMUNIQUE OF THE MR-13 MOVEMENT

[The following is a translation of the full text of a communiqué issued by the Movimiento Revolucionario 13 de Noviembre, the Guatemalan guerrilla movement headed by Marco Antonio Yon Sosa. It appeared in No. 20 of Voz Campesina, a supplement to Revolución Socialista, organ of the "Alejandro De León" guerrilla front.]

* * *

From the National Leadership of the Movimiento Revolucionario 13 de Noviembre to the masses of Guatemala, the Americas and the entire world:

THE MR-13 EXPELS THREE MILITANTS, MEMBERS OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL (TROTSKYIST) FOR DISLOYALTY AND SURREPTITIOUS DIVERSION OF FUNDS.

THE FIRST PEOPLE'S REVOLUTIONARY COURT OF THE MR-13, consisting of the Political Bureau, representatives of the guerrillas, Chiefs of the Militia and Presidents of the Peasant Committees, met in one of the camp sites of the ALEJANDRO DE LEON GUERRILLA FRONT on the date of April 29 and 30, 1966, to consider acts committed by three members of the Fourth International, who were active militants of the MR-13.

The trial was characterized by the freedom, serenity, equanimity and impartiality of the members of the Court throughout the session and by the objectivity with which they judged the facts. The three defendants made full use of their right to defend themselves and the Court examined the proofs on which the accusation was based, free from pressure and emotional influences.

After the President of the Court, Comandante Marco Antonio Yon Sosa, opened the trial, comrade Ernesto -- on behalf of the National Leadership -- proceeded to present the facts with the objective of fully illuminating the problem, so as to make it possible to judge its exact dimensions.

From the explanations and the speeches, especially the replies by the defendants (the main parts of which were recorded

on tape), the following facts were fully established during the trial: (a) that in the month of November 1965, the MR-13 carried out the collection of forced levies on the bourgeoisie, an operation that produced some thousands of quetzales [one quetzal = \$1] to be utilized to cover expenses incurred in the struggle to take power and in the development of the Socialist Revolution in Guatemala; (b) nevertheless, this entire sum of money was divided between the Fourth International and the MR-13, without previously consulting or getting approval from either the National Leadership of the Party or Comandante Marco Antonio Yon Sosa; (c) that this division of the money was organized and carried out by the militants Francisco Amado Granados (ex-member of the PB) and members of the Fourth International whose pseudonyms are: Tury, EVARISTO, TOMAS and ROBERTO; (d) that this distribution was the culmination of a plan which had been conceived and decided on by the International Secretariat (IS) of the Fourth International almost a year ago, a plan which the members under trial today were ready to carry out. Those named, upon integrating themselves into the struggle in Guatemala, took advantage of the confidence that had been placed in them because of the way they had preoccupied themselves with advancing the Socialist Revolution in our country. This, along with their political abilities, brought them to membership in the PB, with the exception of Tury who in his visit to Guatemala usurped this position.

Due to circumstances connected with their activities in the Party, at the time the trial was held only EVARISTO, TOMAS and ROBERTO were present.

The only one who knew about the diversion of funds was compañero Ernesto, who was opposed from the beginning to the plan. Because of this he was isolated, first separated from tasks involving the Leadership and then persuaded to go abroad under pretext of getting medical treatment, finally trying to tie him down with a petty-bourgeois perspective and thus taking him away from the revolutionary struggle and the party. At the beginning of the year compañero Ernesto rejoined the armed struggle in the "ALEJANDRO DE LEON," GUERRILLA FRONT, an occasion which he utilized to take up with Comandante Yon Sosa everything that had happened. The real leadership of the Movement was called together to be advised of the facts; this culminated with the setting up of the PEOPLE'S COURT. During the proceedings of the trial, two other instances of funds being diverted with the same aims were uncovered. Although less was involved, this, too, was fully proved.

The defendants: EVARISTO, TOMAS and ROBERTO did not deny, refute or minimize the essence of the proofs that were presented. They limited themselves to making political explanations which at no time had been brought into the dispute by the Court. They argued that this money was being used in all the sections of the Fourth International and that at no time did they take anything for their personal benefit. They tried to cover up and distort the facts by posing political considerations. Their sectarianism, haughtiness and arrogance prevented them from viewing the reason for the trial

objectively. The trial was the result of the premeditated way in which they arbitrarily and dishonestly disposed of the money of the Guatemalan masses, which the MR-13 administers due to the necessities of the struggle, employing it for tasks leading to the conquest of power, the establishment of a Worker-Peasant government and the construction of socialism in Guatemala. In brief the reason why the defendants were submitted to trial was the disloyal, opportunistic and premeditated way in which, taking advantage of the confidence placed in them by the Party, they utilized our resources. At no time were they accused of diverting funds for their personal benefit; and there was complete clarity about this in the Court. In their defense, no matter how they tried, they could not distort the facts.

The Court, after deciding that the motives which led them to divert funds were mitigating, RESOLVED:

First: TO EXPEL EVARISTO, TOMAS and ROBERTO FROM THE MR-13.

Second: TO BREAK ALL TIES WITH THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL.

Not being in agreement with the sentence of the Court, the defendants appealed, declaring their attachment to the Guatemalan masses. The verdict was unanimously upheld.

THE MR-13 DECLARES before the masses of Guatemala, the Americas and the world, that it is expelling the Trotskyists and breaking all ties with the Fourth International and all its sections because of the opportunistic and disloyal conduct they displayed within the party and REAFFIRMS ITS UNSWERVING DECISION TO CONTINUE ARMED STRUGGLE FOR THE PROGRAM OF THE SOCIALIST REVOLUTION.

IT APPEALS to all the masses of Guatemala, to the workers, peasants, students and poor petty-bourgeoisie to struggle under the leadership of the MR-13 which with its program of Socialist Revolution is bringing the masses together in preparation for the seizure of power. IT APPEALS to the masses of all the Workers States: To the Chinese and Cuban masses and their leaderships to unconditionally support the MR-13 and to distribute its documents. IT APPEALS to the masses of the whole world to crush Imperialism and Capitalism and establish an Anti-imperialist World United Front.

WORKERS, STUDENTS, PEASANTS, ARM YOURSELVES!

Rebel Territory, May 15, 1966

For the National Leadership

Marco Antonio Yon Sosa

Cmdte. General

COMMUNIQUE OF THE MEXICAN POSADIST GROUP

[The following is a translation of the full text of a leaflet distributed in Mexico City by the followers of J. Posadas, who call themselves the Partido Obrero Revolucionario (Trotskista), Sección Mexicana de la Cuarta Internacional.]

* * *

TO THE PROLETARIAT, THE STUDENTS, THE PEASANTRY, THE REVOLUTIONARY
MASSES OF MEXICO

COMMUNIQUE

Comrades:

Yesterday, the twenty-third of June, militants of the Mexican Communist Party profusely distributed Number 20 of "Voz Campesina," the supplement of "Revolución Socialista," organ of the MRL3 of November of Guatemala. The document announces the expulsion of three Trotskyist militants of the MRL3, in whose leadership they were active, and the breaking of ties with the Fourth International on the charge of disloyalty and the surreptitious diversion of funds for Trotskyism. The very fact that militants of the CP, which always combated, sabotaged and fingered the actions of the MRL3 in Guatemala and combated and sabotaged it in Mexico, are the ones distributing this document, is in itself eloquent with regard to the political meaning of the turn taken by the leadership of the MRL3. The rejoicing of the counterrevolutionaries and their action in distributing this document shows in and of itself, both fear of the advance of the MRL3 along the road of revolutionary Marxism, that is, Trotskyism, and fear that the present retreat of the leadership of the MRL3 may not be permanent. With all their might they want to drag it back, widen the breach with Trotskyism, get it to abandon its program, drag it toward peaceful coexistence.

The MRL3, at its Conference in February of this year, accepted the program of the Fourth International, saluted its action, resolved to constitute itself into a party. Since then, as a result of fingering by the Partido Guatemalteco del Trabajo (CP), the FAR, the conciliationist Cuban leadership, combined with actions of the Guatemalan dictatorship and imperialism, its best and most conscious leaders have been assassinated. Among others who fell were Francisco Amado, member of the PB, editor of "Revolucion Socialista" and political leader of the movement; David Aguilar Mora and his companion, Eunice Campirán de Mora, "Chinto," "Ismael" and other Guatemalan or Mexican cadres, Trotskyists or semi-Trotskyists, who were the base of the political leadership of the MRL3. The preparation of the imperialist war, as the Chinese charge, unites the conciliationist bureaucracy, the CP's and the police in a conscious counterrevolutionary labor. The Venezuelan CP expels guerrillas as "adventurers" and ten days later Fabricio Ojeda, who refused to give up and capitulate, to "coexist peacefully," is fingered and

assassinated. The Guatemalan FAR supported Méndez Montenegro in the elections, it "coexisted." In order to stop the action of the MRL3 and its socialist program on the Guatemalan masses and the ranks of the FAR, it was necessary to finger and betray its leadership and throw the Trotskyists out of the MRL3. The anti-Trotskyist campaign of "Sucesos," "El Dia," "Política" goes together with repression by the Mexican police and the CIA and its local agents. The preparation of the war requires blocking the construction of a world revolutionary Marxist leadership, blocking a united front between the Chinese, the consistent revolutionary nationalists and Trotskyism, striking at Trotskyism as the spearhead and motor of this united front. The Soviet bureaucracy, Fidel Castro, the CP's and the imperialist and national capitalist police move in common in this aim. Thus taking advantage of the assassination and imprisonment of the most ardent militants in the political struggle, and of the political formation of the rest of the team of the Guatemalan leadership begun by Yon Sosa, which is insufficient to carry forward the struggle for the socialist program, in which they believe, and to apply the February resolutions to function as a party, the agents of the FAR utilized a comprehension of the struggle that is still nationalist, limited, particularist, and used false pretexts in order to expel the Trotskyist leaders of the MRL3. And they have opened the road to an internal struggle in this movement which can cripple it, disrupt it and cause it to lose the prestige acquired before the masses precisely through its socialist, Trotskyist program and action, but which cannot withdraw from the masses, whatever the course followed by the majority of the MRL3, what they have already acquired: the program of the MRL3, fruit of the conscious action of Trotskyism, which coincides with the experience of the masses themselves, that the revolution must be socialist and must lead to a workers and peasants government, and not one of bourgeois democracy and a government of alliance with the bourgeoisie, as the FAR and the PGT claim.

The accusation of "disloyalty" is false, because Trotskyism supported the MRL3 from the very beginning, when it consisted of six, sabotaged by the CP, alone, without perspectives and suffering demoralization. Because it helped the development of the MRL3 with all its means so that it owes its positions and influence to the raising of the level of its best cadres and the adoption by the movement of the Trotskyist program.

By dint of militants and forces sacrificed at the expense of its own development, by dint of means sent to the MRL3 when Trotskyism was hard-pressed, the Mexican section of the Fourth International helped the MRL3 to advance, because it was thus helping, not Trotskyism, but the Guatemalan revolution, which is part of the world revolution, and not an isolated process. For this Mexican Trotskyist revolutionary militants struggled and died in Guatemala, together with Guatemalan Trotskyists and semi-Trotskyists who struggled and died for what was attacked by those who today publish and distribute this document, the Communist parties and other counterrevolutionaries. The Fourth International was the only movement that publicized and supported the action of the MRL3 and the

only one that organized action to accelerate the triumph of the Guatemalan revolution, accelerating and organizing the triumph of the world socialist revolution. There can be no disloyalty when the MRL3 enjoyed and enjoys every kind of support, political, material and organizational, despite the International's lack of means and when, fundamentally, the action of the International was what permitted the MRL3 to gain its two main strengths: its program, which is Trotskyist, and the support of the world revolution and the best groups and tendencies in each country, when everyone was sabotaging it and is still sabotaging it and the CP's are moving now in its behalf only to bury it.

And there can be no diversion of funds when the document itself proves that a majority of the leadership decided on the disposition of these funds and when these funds were used for the MRL3 and action by the MRL3 in the action of developing the world revolution and the only parties and cadres that are defending it. And when the action itself from which these funds originated was organized and carried out by militants of the Fourth International in the MRL3. Ernesto, a minority within the leadership and its pro-FAR limping wing, the FAR that tried to get the MRL3 to vote for Méndez Montenegro, was not "pulled out" with preconceived aims, as the document says, but simply went over to acting now as a leader acting, with the backing of the PGT, along the line of its opportunism and to get the MRL3 to retreat from its program and objectives, when formerly he could not do this because an entire team existed -- now physically eliminated, by the police or by expulsions from the MRL3 -- which in practice carried almost the whole leadership, because it corresponded with the wishes and socialist orientation of the MRL3 and the Guatemalan and world revolution.

The MRL3's break with the International is transitory. The triumph of the Trotskyist program does not depend on the comprehension of one or another leader, but on the process itself of the revolution which requires it. The honest revolutionaries come to it and action in accordance with this program signifies action together with the only ones who are its consistent defenders and appliers, the parties of the Fourth International. Groups can retreat, some leaders can break themselves, but the revolutionary socialist, Trotskyist process advances and will triumph. The pressures are immense. The very advance of the Chinese, in practice, to Trotskyist positions increases these pressures by increasing the acceleration of the time limit for war. The repression of Trotskyism and the assassination of those opposed to peaceful coexistence will increase. The anti-Trotskyist slanders as well as the assassinations, shows the weakness and the desperation of the two who are doomed -- the bureaucracy of the CP's and capitalism -- over the advance of the world socialist revolution and Trotskyism. Due to lack of experience as a mass revolutionary world party, the advance of the revolutionary tendencies is contradictory, is subject to zigzags, to retreats, even to partial delays. But the world process always unites the front in a forward direction, never backward. And the advance of the MRL3 to the Trotskyist program will not recede because it is an advance of the masses of Guatemala and the world.

This resolution of part of the leadership of the MR13 is a blow against the Guatemalan revolution, but much more a blow against the MR13. Through it the counterrevolutionaries of the CP, the PGT, the FAR, Fidel Castro, have caused great damage to the revolution. But they cannot rejoice much. Greater damage was caused by the extermination of the Bolshevik party, the old Leninist guard, the liquidation of the Third International. Nevertheless, the world revolution and Trotskyism are triumphing and Stalin has been swept into the ashcan of History, where the whole bureaucracy will shortly follow him. The triumph of world socialism is an objective process. The attacks against Trotskyism, like the insults and attacks against the Chinese, cannot hold it back. The Fourth International will continue and is continuing to support the MR13 while it maintains its program. It calls on the revolutionaries of Mexico to repudiate this expulsion which opens the road for the abandonment of the program of the MR13, although its honest leaders want to defend it, because a program requires men to carry it forward, militants of one and the same substance as what they are defending. The Mexican section of the Fourth International calls on all the revolutionary militants to demand freedom for the members of the MR13 and the Guatemalan revolutionaries in prison, the appearance of David Aguilar Mora, Eunice Campirán de Mora, Francisco Amado and other revolutionaries presumably assassinated by the dictatorship. It calls on them to demand freedom for the Mexican and Argentine Trotskyists in prison in Mexico. It calls on them to impose the full right of freedom of tendencies within a United Front and repudiation of the anti-Trotskyist campaign of the Stalinist capitulators, who are helping the bourgeoisie and imperialism in trying to disarm the masses and their revolutionary vanguard.

The Political Bureau of the
Revolutionary Workers Party
(Trotskyist), Mexican Section
of the Fourth International

June 24, 1966

COMMUNIQUE OF THE MEXICAN TROTSKYISTS

[The following is a translation of the full text of a leaflet distributed by the Marxist Workers League, the Mexican section of the Fourth International. The original title of the leaflet is "El MR-13 Desenmascara al Posadismo" (The MR-13 Unmaska Posadism).]

* * *

COMMUNIQUE FROM THE LIGA OBRERA MARXISTA
TO THE REVOLUTIONARY VANGUARD OF MEXICO AND LATIN AMERICA

In a communiqué dated May 15, 1966, the National Leadership of the (Guatemalan) Movimiento Revolucionario 13 de Noviembre made

public the expulsion of three militants accused of disloyalty and the surreptitious diversion of funds. It is stated in the same communiqué that the three who were expelled are Trotskyists and members of the Fourth International.

The LIGA OBRERA MARXISTA, MEXICAN SECTION OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL, specifies:

FIRST: That on the basis of the charges in the communiqué and the reply of the defendants, IT APPROVES THE EXPULSION DECIDED ON BY THE MOVIMIENTO REVOLUCIONARIO 13 DE NOVIEMBRE AND COMMENDS THE DEMOCRATIC WAY IN WHICH THE PEOPLE'S COURT WAS CONDUCTED.

SECOND: It rejects the "political arguments" which the Partido Obrero Revolucionario published in Mexico in reply to the charges.

THIRD: It agrees with the MOVIMIENTO REVOLUCIONARIO 13 DE NOVIEMBRE in characterizing those expelled and the entire group to which they belong as "sectarian, haughty and arrogant."

FOURTH: It strongly denies that the Partido Obrero Revolucionario, or the three who were expelled are Trotskyists or members of the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL.

FIFTH: The Posadist group, to which they belong, was expelled more than three years ago from the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL.

The LIGA OBRERA MARXISTA (LOM), MEXICAN SECTION OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL, feels doubly obliged to solidarize with the MOVIMIENTO REVOLUCIONARIO 13 DE NOVIEMBRE. First because it concerns an organization that represents the exploited Guatemalan masses; and, second, because it was taken in by the adventurous group headed by J. Posadas in the name of Trotskyism.

Posadas and his group were expelled from the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL in 1963 because of their sectarian and adventurous positions. They continued to speak in the name of our world organization after this in the most irresponsible and piratical way.

On the organizational level, Posadism is reduced to subsidized groups of two or three members who publish newspapers all of which print the same absurd articles written by their "chief" Posadas. They are groups without any real links with the masses in their countries, without any serious program and having in common nothing more than being blindly obedient to a mentally sick person and being recipients of the disesteem of the political groups in the few countries in which they are active. Their life depends precisely on the economic aid sent by their center, aid which -- as we now know -- originated in tapping the funds of the MR-13.

On the ideological level, they exist on a few items developed by the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL, smothered in all kinds of ridiculous absurdities that only arouse laughter whether taken singly or as a whole. Nevertheless the question is only too serious. It is

serious in that it succeeded in coming up in the ranks of a movement, the MR-13, which is the vanguard of the Guatemalan masses. And it is tragic in that the vanguard of the Guatemalan movement confused the adventurous Posadas group with the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL.

On the political level, Posadism is sectarianism carried to an absurdity -- provoked from one side by the opportunism of the traditional organizations. In effect, some revolutionary youth who rejected the faulty methods of the CP's and other Stalinist organizations, entered the ranks of Posadism in search of an alternative leadership. The "political" justification for mishandling the funds of the MR-13 is the most recent example of this sectarianism. They argue, basically, that the money was utilized "for the world revolution." In reality the money was utilized to maintain subsidized groups in various countries dedicated to reproducing and distributing the articles of Posadas. In other words, the sectarian Posadists did nothing less than to get the world revolution confounded with these tiny groups.

Sectarianism, under normal conditions, especially when it reaches fantastic, religious extremes, merits no more attention than a few biting sentences. But if this sectarianism takes over real revolutionary leaderships it becomes an actual danger. In Mexico, Argentina, Bolivia, Peru, etc., Posadism is only the butt of jokes among political organizations. In Guatemala it has cost lives. Revolutionaries throughout the world must consider this problem seriously before it becomes of major importance. Our course is to organize the revolutionary vanguard, offering a way out for revolutionaries who correctly despise the faulty leaderships of the CP and other groups allied openly or covertly with the class enemy.

From the historic point of view, Posadism was born with the expulsion of a group that controlled the BLA (Buró Latinoamericano [Latin-American Bureau] of the Fourth International) and which succeeded in dragging along, for a short time, the big majority of the sections of the International in Latin America. Within a few months these sections abandoned the Posadist leadership, reducing it to nothing, and rejoined the ranks of our Party. The process of disintegration of the group was held up precisely because it succeeded in linking up with the leadership of the MR-13, for which it set itself up as spokesman, gaining prestige for itself and above all, economic resources. Immediately newspapers underwritten by this group began to appear in various countries, including Europe, in which they designated themselves as "the Fourth International." The common denominator of these newspapers was that all of them published exactly the same material: articles, declarations, appeals to the masses, etc., signed by J. Posadas. No other name was permitted to appear in these newspapers beside that of the "chief." There are unsigned notes and what Posadas writes. From time to time the name of a certain Luis appears, whom Posadas himself praises, but this is not to be marvelled at in this marvelous religion, since Luis and Posadas are pseudonyms of the same person.

In Mexico everybody knows the Posadists. They were the ones who took the floor at an assembly of the school of economics to predict the Atomic World War amid general laughter. They are the ones who from the platform in an assembly of fifty students or in their newspaper with a circulation of 300 which they distribute in the UNAM [Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México], make pathetic appeals to the masses of the world for a General Revolutionary Strike Against the Nuclear World War. They are the ones who maintain the thesis of "War and Instant Revolution." We know the Posadists for their sectarian postures, for their bemusement by a general slogan that makes them lose touch with reality, that takes them like magic into a world of fanciful dreams. So that they state that "there is now no time for anything, the World War is on us." A striking instance of the unreality of their "Marxist" analyses was provided by the declaration they issued when the Posadists were recently imprisoned in Mexico. They said it "is a proof of the weakness of the bourgeoisie..." Is the arrest of its cadres a sign of the strength of Posadism? Who raised protests? Was there any mobilization, any public meeting...?

An odd group of this kind, lacking a sense of the ridiculous, is difficult to classify politically. To characterize a group with such a strange religion as sectarian or bureaucratic is not much.

This phenomenon must be viewed by revolutionaries as one of the consequences of lack of effective leadership in the revolutionary movement, as a product of the incapacities of the leaderships holding responsibility in the mass organizations of the workers. Concretely, as the other side of the coin of opportunism, likewise carried to an absurdity by the CP's and other working-class leaderships affected by Stalinism. Posadas is the echo, the inverted mirror image of all the big opportunist traitors of the workers movement like Lombardo, Thorez, Togliatti, Khrushchev, etc.

Posadism has been dealt a hard blow by being deprived of the resources of the MR-13. As hard as it received when the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL won back the sections which it controlled in Latin America. But this does not mean that Posadism will disappear. Posadism, like any social phenomenon, will not disappear as long as the causes that engendered it continue to exist -- as long as the revolutionary leadership of the proletariat is not organized on a world scale. Until this is accomplished, Posadism will continue to attract elements who can be counted on for adventurous moves, for infiltration into other organized groups, especially in groups that initiate a struggle without a clear political program and who are easily taken in by the ultraleft demagogy which the sectarians generally employ. So long as the world crisis in proletarian leadership continues, the sectarians throughout the world will be able to sacrifice the lives of revolutionary militants who mistakenly join their ranks out of disappointment with opportunism in general.

The LOM declares that on an international scale, the task of the revolutionaries in struggling against sectarianism (and against its other face, opportunism) is to organize revolutionary Marxist

parties. In Mexico this means organizing the revolutionary party of the workers.

The LOM declares that from any point of view it is unjustifiable to confound Trotskyism with the activities of the Posadist sect. It is as unjustifiable as to hold communism responsible for the betrayals and errors of hundreds of political groups that adopt the most opportunistic positions in the name of Marxism-Leninism.

The LOM protests against the arrest of the Posadists in Mexico and against the torture to which they were subjected. Despite our deep differences with this group, the LOM considers it necessary to state that it opposes bourgeois violence against revolutionary militants, whether or not they are mistaken, whether or not they are sectarian. The LOM registers the same protest against the arrest and torture of the writer Adolfo Gilly.

The LIGA OBRERA MARXISTA urges Mexican revolutionaries to struggle to overcome the crisis in leadership affecting the working class; to overcome the contradiction between the objective conditions of capitalist crisis and the absence of a leadership capable of burying it and constructing a new state, a socialist state. The way to overcome this crisis, a crisis determining the present situation, is to construct a vanguard revolutionary Marxist party.

The LIGA OBRERA MARXISTA declares that the construction of such a party will occur in turn through a process of alliances and fronts among revolutionary groups in order in this way to achieve an effective organizational level in which the revolutionary program can be consistently applied. To overcome the barriers of sectarianism and to promote the formation of an Anti-imperialist and Anticapitalist United Front is a slogan inscribed on the banners of our World Party.

The LIGA OBRERA MARXISTA, MEXICAN SECTION OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL, urges revolutionaries, the youth, the vanguard of the working class to join its ranks. Not to struggle for improvements in the present system, but to bury it. We urge the most conscious sectors of society to participate under the banner of the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL in carrying out the World Socialist Revolution.

WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

CENTRAL COMMITTEE

LIGA OBRERA MARXISTA

MEXICAN SECTION OF THE
FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

July 1, 1966