

THE MILITANT

Editor: JOSEPH HANSEN

Published weekly, except during July and August when published bi-weekly, by The Militant Publishing Ass'n., 116 University Pl., New York 3, N.Y. Phone CH 2-3410. Second-class postage paid at New York, N.Y. Subscription: \$3 a year; Canada, \$3.00. Single copies by contribution. Do not necessarily represent the Militant's views. These are expressed in editorials.

Vol. 27 - No. 37

345

Monday, October 21, 1963

Kennedy Administration Seeks 'Democratic' Latin Dictators

Suspicion that the Kennedy administration intends to recognize the military usurpers in the Dominican Republic and Honduras, without what liberals consider a "decent" interval of mourning for the "democratic" regimes they overthrow, has stirred a protest in the Senate.

Senator Wayne Morse (D-Ore.) has introduced an amendment to the foreign-aid bill barring Alliance for Progress funds to Latin-American regimes which have taken power by coups this year. It would also cover future military overthrows — except in Cuba and Haiti.

Morse's amendment would apply only to "Alliance for Progress" aid. The White House would not be hampered in giving funds and supplies to the military dictatorships under such programs as export-import bank loans, general economic-support aid, excess agricultural commodities and military aid.

Cuban Premier Fidel Castro has aptly described U.S. diplomatic policy as one of withholding recognition of military regimes for a matter of days or weeks and then seizing upon a promise of "elections" by the militarists as the pretext for according recognition.

In an Oct. 6 policy statement, Edwin McChesney Martin, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, indicated that is precisely the policy, with a few beguiling frills, the White House intends to follow.

Martin warned against being too unfriendly toward the Latin-American militarists. "We must use our leverage to keep these new regimes as liberal and considerate of the welfare of the people as possible," he said. "In addition, we must support and strengthen the civilian components against military influence and press for new elections as soon as possible. . . ."

This, he claims, is what U.S. policy achieved in Argentina and Peru, where the military produced what he calls "two of the most progressive regimes either country has ever had," and in Guatemala and Ecuador, where he claims the military has announced "reform programs of substantial significance."

Martin's statement was followed the next day by a State Department briefing of reporters. It was explained that instead of being dismayed by the recent military coups in Latin America, one should realize that this in its own way was a measure of the success of the Alliance for Progress. These new military regimes, State Department spokesmen asserted, were more enlightened and progressive than old-time Latin-American dictatorships.

Martin's statement and the briefing provoked something of an uproar — they were just a bit too raw. Morse declared that Martin was laying down a "smokescreen" for recognition of, and aid to, the dictatorships which had just taken over in the Dominican Republic and Honduras.

Queried about the State Department line at his Oct. 6 press conference, President Kennedy talked out of both sides of his mouth. He defended Martin's statement. He also claimed it represented no departure from previous U.S. policy which he defined as one of abhorrence of military dictatorships.

The White House intends to follow the same line toward Latin American dictators as it does toward the Diem dictatorship. Its only concern is to dress them up with a few "democratic" frills. Sometimes for the imperialists even that is quite a problem — as a Vietnam shows.

Kennedy and Automation

The elimination of jobs through automation and other technological changes is helping maintain a permanent army of about five million unemployed workers. Instead of benefiting man, automation — in the hands of big business — is breeding misery and poverty.

One of the most effective immediate solution would be to reduce the work week without any cut in take-home pay. This would create new jobs for those displaced by the automated machines. Militants in the unions have popularized this under the slogan of 30-for-40, i.e., a 30-hour week at 40 hours' pay. The trade-union leadership have given lip service to the idea of some reduction in the work week.

When President Kennedy on his recent "non-political" speaking tour said in Whiskeytown, Calif., that national parks were needed for the increased leisure that would come when people worked fewer hours per week, the naive thought he had given up his long-standing opposition to the shorter work week.

Queried about this back in Washington, Kennedy protested, "Not Not!" At Whiskeytown he had been talking about the dim, distant future. In other words — pie in the sky. Right now, Kennedy repeated, the 40-hour week had to prevail to keep U.S. business "competitive." As for those workers thrown on the scrap heap by the automated machines, Kennedy had nothing to say about them.

THE MOSCOW-PEKING CONFLICT

Differing National Interests Come to Fore

By Tom Kerry

Chinese opposition to the nuclear test-ban treaty has brought into focus the underlying cause of the widening rift between Peking and Moscow. What emerges from the welter of charges and counter-charges is the deepening conflict of national interest which lies at the root of the ideological political disputes over a whole series of controversial questions.

This is most clearly disclosed in the heated exchange over the nuclear-test-ban treaty. The Chinese charge that the Soviet leaders view the test-ban treaty as the first step in a process of accommodation with American imperialism, in which the colonial liberation movement and the world struggle for socialism are to be offered up as sacrificial lambs.

"The real aim of the Soviet leaders," the Chinese charge, "is to compromise with the United States in order to seek monetary ease and to maintain a monopoly of nuclear weapons and lord it over in the socialist camp." (Hsin-hua, Aug. 15.)

Own 'Deterrent'

The Chinese insist upon their right to develop their own nuclear "deterrent." They reject the contention of the Soviet spokesmen that such a goal is possessed by the Soviet Union as a reliable means of their [China's] defense. To accept this reasoning, they contend, would convert China into a Soviet satellite completely subordinate to the power politics of the Kremlin.

"In fighting imperialist aggression and defending its security," they insist, "every socialist country has to rely in the first place on its own defence capability, and then — and only then — on assistance from fraternal countries and the peoples of the world. For the Soviet government to describe all the socialist countries as depending on the nuclear weapons of the Soviet Union for their survival is," they add, "to strike an out-and-out great-power chauvinistic note and to fly in the face of facts."

The central "fact" which the Chinese underscore is the conspiracy of the two major nuclear powers, the Soviet Union and the United States, to prevent China from developing its own nuclear arsenal. While the U.S. provides its allies with nuclear warheads, post Polaris missile-firing submarines in Japan, establishes rocket bases in Europe, Africa and Asia, the Soviets have refused to make available to China the nuclear know-how that would oblige the need to resort to atomospheric testing.

Aimed at Them

The Chinese, therefore, with good reason see the partial nuclear test-ban as being aimed directly at them. As if to confirm their worst suspicions, there appeared recently in the American press an "inspired" article spelling out in detail: "The Real Meaning of the Test Ban." (Saturday Evening Post, Sept. 28.)

Stewart Alsop, Washington editor of the widely circulated weekly magazine, with a direct pipeline to the White House, writes with bloodcurdling cynicism of the lengths to which the Kennedy administration is prepared to go to prevent China from becoming a nuclear power.

"The Chinese Communists," Alsop declares, "who have raged against the test-ban agreement as a 'plot to 'manacle' China by denying it nuclear weapons, have understood the real meaning of the test-ban better than the senators who opposed it. For the fact is that the President and his inner circle of advisers have agreed in principle that China must be prevented, by whatever means, from becoming a nuclear power. The

approach" which could be adopted.

"Experiments in using the U-2 for special-use weapons carrying," says Alsop, "were conducted as long ago as 1956. The Soviets have not provided the Chinese with the SA-2 missile which can shoot down the U-2. And," he stily adds, "atomic plants are dangerous places after all — because of an accident, a British plant, Windscale One, had to be abandoned and buried in concrete in 1957. Accidents do happen." (My emphasis) And, to assure us that this does not exhaust the repertoire of our imaginative "sterilizers," Alsop adds: "There are other oblique approaches."

"To quiet any misgivings, Alsop comforts us with the assurance that Khrushchev shares with Kennedy and his chief advisers, the view that under no circumstances can the Chinese be permitted to become a nuclear power. Khrushchev, he points out, "has called the Chinese 'maniacs' for wanting a war which would create hundreds of millions of corpses," and in which "the living will envy the dead."

What this means, he adds, "in the view of top American officials is that the United States can take whatever measures may be necessary to deny the 'maniacs' the power to start a nuclear war, without risking war with the Soviet Union."

Self-aid

By falsely smearing the Chinese as "madmen" advocating nuclear war as a solution to the problems of humanity, the Soviet leaders aid in creating an atmosphere which the real warmonger cabal in Washington finds favorable for setting in motion another exercise in nuclear brinkmanship.

Small wonder that the Chinese arrive at the conclusion that "the tripartite treaty once again shows that the Soviet leaders seek only to preserve themselves and would leave other people to sink or swim. They have repeatedly said that so long as they themselves survive and develop the people of the world will be saved."

"The fact is," they add, "they are selling out the fundamental interests of the peoples of the world in order to seek their own momentary ease. All countries and peoples subjected to oppression and aggression are now engaged in earth-shaking struggles against imperialism and old and new colonialism headed by the United States and for their own independence and freedom. Yet the Soviet leaders, of one mind with U.S. imperialism, have collaborated with it in a fraud and want the peoples of the world to believe that the U.S. imperialists are 'peace fighters,' thus jolting their fighting will and undermining the cause of world peace."

Will Require Force

This "sterilization," observes Alsop, "will ultimately require force — the policy-makers have no illusions on this score. But it will not require very much force . . . in the words of one expert." Alsop adds, "the operation would be no more serious than a tonallectomy."

Just a minor surgical operation! "Thanks to the U-2, and to other secret devices," Alsop assures us, "the intelligence community knows precisely where the two main Chinese atomic plants are. Such plants are highly vulnerable to even a single high-explosive bomb."

Thus, the "nuclear sterilization" of China, Alsop informs us, is "technically an easy problem — the job could be done with a few rather small bangs." As an alternative to a Pentagon "tonallectomy" there is the more "oblique

WORLD OUTLOOK

A Labor Press Service

News and political analysis of special interest to militant unionists, socialist, colonial revolutionaries, opponents of nuclear war and supporters of civil rights and the Negro struggle for freedom.

Features magazine-length articles on topics of prime world interest such as the current Peking-Moscow conflict, the shift in relations between the USA and USSR, underground struggles in Spain, the Portuguese colonies, Latin America, etc.

Students of world affairs will find it of great assistance in working out the deeper meaning of events.

Compiled weekly from the vantage point of Paris.

For 26 issues send \$7.50 to:

PIERRE FRANK

21 RUE D'ABOUKIR, PARIS 2, FRANCE