

# 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. 31

October 14, 1966

In this issue

Page

Johnson Prepares his "Peace" Conference	1
Mao's Gift to the Opportunists in the Kremlin	
-- by George Novack	5
Kim Il Sung Appeals for Increased Aid to North Vietnam	7
Luis Turcios Killed in Auto Crash	8
Maoist Headquarters Fire-Bombed in New York	9
Group Accused of Smuggling Arms to Guatemalan Guerrillas	10
London Demonstrators Support Vietnamese Fighters	
-- by Antonio Farien	11
Walloon Workers Party Supports Hugo Blanco	12
Stormy Internal Conflicts in China -- II	
-- by Livio Maitan	13
Hugo Blanco Defiant Throughout Trial	22
Documents:	
Manifesto: Toward a Free Revolutionary Art	23
Bertrand Russell's Appeal to Negro Soldiers in Vietnam	27
Deutscher Answers a Critic on Vietnam War Crimes Tribunal	28
On Modzelewski's and Kuron's "Open Letter"	
-- by Pierre Frank	31

## JOHNSON PREPARES HIS "PEACE" CONFERENCE

As Johnson continued to dish out his syrupy propaganda about how he just loves peace, the Washington warmakers methodically went ahead with their preparations for a new big step in the escalation of American aggression in Vietnam.

Hanson W. Baldwin, the well-known military expert of the New York Times revealed October 4 that about 75,000 more U.S. ground troops have been scheduled to be sent to Vietnam by next spring. In addition there will be "several thousand more marines... along with more Air Force squadrons and more Navy personnel."

Reba Hansen, Business Manager,

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

New York, N.Y. 10010

According to Baldwin, "This augmentation will bring the total United States military strength on land in Vietnam to 400,000 to 425,000 in the coming year."

Other ominous steps were being taken. A meeting of the top American military command was scheduled in Hawaii. The conference, to be held at the headquarters of Admiral U.S. Grant Sharp, Commander in Chief, Pacific, will include officers from his own staff, from the staff of General William C. Westmoreland, the U.S. commander in Vietnam, and from the Pentagon.

Also present at the meeting will be Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara. He flew to Saigon October 8 for a six-day survey of the situation there. After talking with Westmoreland and Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, McNamara will fly directly to Honolulu for the discussion on the next moves in escalating Johnson's war against the Vietnamese people.

Upon returning to Washington, McNamara will brief Johnson on his trip and the Honolulu confab, after which the president of the U.S. will take off for a "peace" meeting in the Philippines with an assortment of puppets and representatives of satellite powers involved in the war in Vietnam.

In a well-timed coordinating move, former President Eisenhower repeated his intimation in a September 19 television interview that the U.S. should be prepared to use nuclear weapons. At a news conference October 3 in Washington, Eisenhower was asked specifically if he would preclude the use of atomic weapons.

"I would not automatically preclude anything," said the former president. "When you appeal to force to carry out the policies of America abroad there is no court above you."

In relation to Southeast Asia, Eisenhower said that he did not know what restrictions the present administration may have placed on itself in the use of nuclear weapons. He then continued:

"I would just say this -- I would do anything that would bring the war to an honorable and successful conclusion as rapidly as I could."

Eisenhower's suggestion caused fright in many circles. Three senators -- John O. Pastore, Democrat; Gale W. McGee, another Democrat; and Jacob K. Javits, a Republican -- expressed concern and urged Johnson to avoid getting into a situation in Vietnam that would require nuclear weapons.

Pastore declared: "I implore Lyndon B. Johnson, the President; I implore Robert S. McNamara, the Secretary of Defense; I implore Dean Rusk, the Secretary of State, and I implore the joint chiefs of staff not to maneuver the United States in Vietnam into a position where we have to use nuclear or thermonuclear weapons."

"If we do, all I can say is God help us, God help us."

The New York Times likewise expressed worry over the course being taken by the Johnson administration. The powerful newspaper said editorially October 7:

"Can the United States steadily escalate the war in Vietnam, prepare for a still bigger war next year, and at the same time bring about peace negotiations with Hanoi? Peace offers with one hand; killing, burning, defoliating, destroying, bombing with the other. The result, surely, is to cancel out each other's effectiveness."

The Times, which is against further escalation of the war but also against an American withdrawal from Vietnam, agreed with Johnson's propaganda about only "fighting a limited war with 'limited force.'" But this is in effect, saying, continued the editors, "I won't kill you, but I'm going to beat you within an inch of your life, after which I hope you will come and join some of us around a table to talk peace."

Another warning voice was that of Foy D. Kohler, the U.S. ambassador to the Soviet Union. He stated in Washington October 4 that in his opinion an American blockade would be "a dangerous step" involving the risk of a military confrontation with the Soviet Union.

If an American move were made to block Soviet ships from reaching north Vietnam, he said, the Soviet Union would react firmly. The Soviet government could not be expected to "fold in," as it did during the Cuban missile crisis of 1962. Moscow would likely contest the legality of an American blockade while at the same time attempting to continue sending supplies to Hanoi by sea.

If a different move were made, such as widespread bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong, this, too, would create a "serious crisis" for the Soviet Union since it would mean casualties among Soviet technicians now present in the two cities.

Meanwhile others were joining in the cries of the war hawks for steps of a more definitive nature in escalating the conflict in Vietnam.

General Curtis E. LeMay, former Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force, came out for "drastic surgery." American policy in Vietnam at present, he argued, is to "limit casualties" and conduct an "immaculate war." "This fictional doctrine of immaculate war helped lose Suez to the British in 1956. To a certain extent we are practicing immaculate war in Vietnam by our policy not to bomb valuable targets in North Vietnam where civilians might be hurt." If the current devices and fiendish methods are "immaculate" it can be imagined what LeMay's dirty war would resemble.

LeMay proposes to "progressively bomb command and control centers, airfields, electrical-power installations, factories,

major supply-storage areas, irrigation systems, principal transportation centers and harbor facilities at Haiphong." The bombing of irrigation systems would include dikes and dams that would mean the drowning of hundreds of thousands of people.

"The only way to win a war is to escalate it in one way or another above what the enemy can take," this professional butcher of human beings continued in his copyrighted article in the October 10 U.S. News & World Report. "This, of course, is the way we brought Japan to terms in 1945."

LeMay is quite ready to "fight a large war if necessary." The risk must be faced, he says. "We must not let ourselves be subdued by Red China's threats and blusters. If we are not prepared to escalate, that is, apply more power, then we are not prepared to win and we should get out." He thinks the risks are exaggerated. "Moreover, Red China is undergoing a political upheaval. She reacted with surprising mildness toward our bombing of oil targets."

LeMay likewise looks impatiently at the Pentagon's stockpile of nuclear weapons. "Have we forgotten that Mao became conciliatory at Panmunjom in 1953 because President Eisenhower let him know via Prime Minister Nehru of India that we were considering the employment of nuclear weapons against Red China? This was a message that got through."

"Since that time," continues the influential militarist, "we have managed to scare ourselves into a catatonic state of paralysis over the mere thought of nuclear weapons."

A war with China holds no terrors for this atomaniac. If the bombing is stepped up, he argues, "is there any chance that Communist China will do more than scream at us?"

"On the outside chance that this calculated risk fails, then we must be prepared to fight Red China with a will to win. But we need never invade with our own land forces. Air, naval and logistic support to Chiang Kai-shek on Formosa and Gen. Chung Hee Park in South Korea should provide more than enough force to bring an unstable Red China to her knees."

In the same issue of U.S. News & World Report in which this warmongering piece was printed, the screeches of another war hawk were recorded. General Chiang Ching-kuo, the son of the dictator who was run off the mainland seventeen years ago, called for war on his own country. "In order to solve the Vietnam problem and to safeguard U.S. security and prestige in Asia," said this hereditary puppet, "it is imperative that the Chinese Communists be destroyed. And this is the best time for us to deal them a fatal blow."

As Johnson prepared to take off for the Philippines, the chorus could be said to be performing nicely in bringing out the appropriate themes of his projected "peace" conference.

MAO'S GIFT TO THE OPPORTUNISTS IN THE KREMLIN

By George Novack

On October 1 the Chinese celebrated the seventeenth year of their liberating revolution. It has brought them such a heap of benefits that they have no reason to sigh for any blessings of "the good old days" before 1949. Friends of China in the rest of the world likewise rejoice at the progress made under extreme handicaps since the conquest of power and salute the resolve of its people to rebuff any assault upon their country and its revolutionary achievements.

However, Premier Chou En-lai and Defense Minister Lin Piao were not completely credible when they declared in their anniversary speeches that everything was going fine for the regime both at home and abroad. Most of the two million young Red Guards who paraded for four hours before the party hierarchy in Peking may have believed that this was so. But, even though they could not voice their views on this occasion, the critics of Mao's line in the party, the government and the army nursed doubts about the official glowing appraisal. Among them were the deposed associates of Peng Chen, the former mayor of Peking and purged Politburo member, who had been the keynote speaker at National Day celebrations in recent years.

There were other absentees. If the marchers scrutinized the foreign faces at the fete, they could have noticed that this was the first anniversary of the revolution celebrated without the participation of any party or government delegation from Communist countries in Europe and Asia. Moreover, the Soviet bloc diplomats ostentatiously walked off the reviewing stand in protest against Lin Piao's charges that the Kremlin was plotting with Washington over Vietnam.

The defense chief declared: "Imperialism headed by the United States, and modern revisionism, with the leadership of the Communist party of the Soviet Union at its center, are colluding and actively plotting peace-talk swindles for the purpose of stamping out the raging flames of the Vietnamese people's national revolutionary war against United States aggression."

Even conceding that the Soviet policy-makers may be pressuring Hanoi and cautiously angling behind the scenes for a deal with Washington over Vietnam, one can envisage a leadership trained in the Leninist school taking an altogether different tack under present circumstances when U.S. imperialism is on the offensive in Southeast Asia and its military machine is heading toward China's frontiers.

Lin Piao asserted: "Our national defense has never been so strong." This may be so, although the methods of the rampaging "proletarian cultural revolution" are unlikely to have cemented

genuine unity in the party or heightened the morale of the masses in face of the war danger.

One thing, however, is sure. Whatever the state of the national defense, the international defense of the People's Republic of China and the Vietnamese revolution has grown weaker.

The responsibility for this disunity falls in no small measure upon the Chinese Communist leaders themselves. By demanding that every other Communist government, regardless of its situation, categorically line up with them against Moscow on penalty of being stigmatized as accomplices of the revisionists, and by insisting they would never sit at the same conference table with the men in the Kremlin, the Maoists have succeeded in alienating one workers state after another over the past two years until they now stand almost alone in the Communist and colonial world.

Their isolation could be countered if they modified their factional frenzy and made a turnabout in their attitude. Defense Minister Lin Piao could have taken a step in that direction by declaring in his keynote speech from the high balcony of the Gate of Heavenly Peace that Peking was ready and willing to support the suggestions of the Communist parties from Cuba to Japan for collaboration against American military escalation and would sit down anywhere with the Kremlin leaders to discuss the most effective moves to deter further U.S. aggression, defend Vietnam and ward off the threat of armed attack upon China. Regrettably, there was no sign of any such shift on Peking's part in its conflict with Moscow.

This unreasoning intransigence is harmful to the antiwar movement, the interests of the world working class, the colonial revolution and China itself. But the crowning irony is that these divisive tactics have frustrated rather than facilitated the very purpose set by the Maoists themselves in their feud with the Khrushchevists. They reiterate that they are bent on conducting the fight against the revisionists to the end and defeating them. The fact is that, instead of weakening the influence of the Moscow revisionists, Mao's line has served to strengthen them far beyond all expectations while dealing heavy blows to his own international standing.

Could this be more dramatically indicated than by the deliberate absence of all official Communist delegations from the participants in the October 1 celebrations this year? Even the north Korean Communist regime, among others, has felt it necessary to openly move away, and the former partner-in-arms in the Korean war has gone so far as to castigate the Chinese Communists as "traitors to the revolution."

Mao's conduct has done more to burnish the tarnished reputation of the Khrushchevists than any other single factor. Their credit has been rehabilitated, not through any improvement in Moscow's policies, but through the faults and defaults of their

adversary in Peking.

Just as Stalin's adventurist and opportunist zigzags in foreign affairs and his misdeeds at home poured grist into the mills of the discredited Social Democracy and enabled their parties to refurbish their reputations at the expense of the Communists, so Mao's false policies have been the greatest gift that could have been handed to Stalin's successors at the head of the Soviet bureaucracy. Brezhnev, Kosygin and their followers are making the most of Mao's blindness and blunders to retrieve some of their lost prestige.

Here again we have a living exhibition of how unrestrained sectarianism feeds the worst opportunism. That in itself warrants severe censure of Peking's continuing course in its foreign relations.

#### KIM IL SUNG APPEALS FOR INCREASED AID TO NORTH VIETNAM

The North Korean Communist party has criticized Peking for putting pressure on Cuba in the course of the Sino-Soviet dispute. Furthermore, according to an October 5 Associated Press dispatch from Tokyo, the North Korean party attacked Russian "modern revisionism" and proclaimed that "each Communist party must uphold the principle of independency."

These comments were contained in a strong appeal by party chairman Kim Il Sung to all countries in the Sino-Soviet bloc to send volunteers to Vietnam. Chairman Kim's appeal thus paralleled the position that has been taken by Fidel Castro since March 15, 1965, when the Cuban leader stated that his country favored sending arms and men to Vietnam, whatever the risks entailed.

According to the Associated Press, "Kim did not just offer to send volunteers, he argued that they should be sent. Kim painted a bleak picture of differences in the Communist world and said that they could not be settled now. He lambasted Moscow and Peking equally in possibly one of the bluntest public pronouncements by a Communist leader in recent years."

"We deem it necessary," Kim stated, "for all the Socialist countries, first of all, to dispatch international volunteers to assist the fighting people of Vietnam. This will be the first step toward realization of joint action against imperialism....When definite conditions are created, the fraternal parties may hold a conference and discuss the question of anti-imperialist joint action in a concrete way."

"Earlier," according to the account, Kim said "that the U.S. was expanding the Vietnam war and 'bringing in troops of their subordinate countries and puppets.' Because of this, he said, every Communist country 'should dispatch volunteers to Vietnam. This is

the internationalist duty of the Socialist countries to the brotherly Vietnamese people.'

"Most of his report was devoted to differences among the Communist countries....He decried Moscow's overtures to Yugoslavia...." Kim rejected Peking's claim that it had taken over world Communist leadership under Mao Tse-tung, saying: "It is impossible that any one country becomes the 'center of world revolution.'"

#### LUIS TURCIOS KILLED IN AUTO CRASH

Luis Augusto Turcios Lima, head of the Rebel Armed Forces [FAR] of Guatemala, was killed in an auto crash October 2, according to a communiqué issued by his organization. The car driven by the 24-year-old guerrilla leader presumably hit an object on the highway outside of Guatemala City, overturned, and burst into flames. Another occupant of the car, Silia Yvonne Flores Letona, 18, died shortly after reaching the hospital. Another passenger, an unidentified young woman, survived with minor burns and bruises.

The FAR announced that Luis Turcios' command would be taken over by his lieutenant César Montes, who is 23.

At the funeral, held the following day, some 1,500 mourners turned out to pay homage to Turcios and Miss Flores, who was reportedly also a member of the guerrilla group. The turnout was a remarkable demonstration in view of the repressive atmosphere in Guatemala and the ruthless way in which the government has murdered partisans and sympathizers of the guerrilla movement. A price of \$25,000 had been put on Turcios' head by the Guatemalan authorities. Suspicion was expressed in various quarters that foul play was involved in the auto crash in which Turcios met death.

Turcios, who was born November 23, 1941, gained international prominence as a co-leader with Marco Antonio Yon Sosa of the November 13 Movement [MR-13]. Both of them had been officers in the Guatemalan army and had received "counter insurgency" training under auspices of the Pentagon.

Two years ago, Turcios split from the MR-13 charging that it had been "infiltrated by Trotskyists." (They were actually followers of J. Posadas, an ultraleftist who parades as a "Trotskyist.") Although he developed fraternal ties with the leadership of the Guatemalan Communist party, Turcios stood to the left of that organization. He was a particular admirer of Che Guevara and a strong advocate of the Second Declaration of Havana. At the Tricontinental Conference last January, he was singled out for special attention and praised by Fidel Castro in the same speech in which Castro leveled an unwarranted attack against the Trotskyist movement.

Last April, the MR-13 expelled the followers of Posadas for



misappropriation of funds. Recently it was reported that Yon Sosa and Luis Turcios had opened discussions on the possibility of uniting their forces. How the death of Turcios will affect this progressive step is not known.

At the Tricontinental Conference, in an attack against imperialism and its neocolonialist game, Turcios said: "But revolutionary war, the war of the people, has already begun and even though we know that we shall have to undergo suffering, death and destruction for a long time, we are resolved not to halt until the people take power in their hands."

The fighting spirit embodied in these words will undoubtedly continue to animate the Guatemalan guerrillas who stood shoulder to shoulder with Turcios in the struggle to free their country from the grip of imperialism and to take it onto the road to socialism.

#### MAOIST CP HEADQUARTERS FIRE-BOMBED IN NEW YORK

The Eastern headquarters of the Communist Party U.S.A.-Marxist-Leninist, the American Maoist organization, was fire-bombed October 8. Opened only two weeks previously, the meeting place suffered damages estimated at \$1,500 to \$2,000. Besides the breakage of the storefront glass windows, Chinese, Albanian and Vietnamese literature was damaged.

According to Michael I. Laski, national party spokesman and general secretary of the group, three men broke the glass front at about 3 a.m. The noise awoke Earl Johnson, who had been sleeping in a rear room. Johnson ran out of the rear door to alert Laski and another party member, Easton Simmons.

When the three returned, several small fires were burning on the floor and along the bookshelves.

As they sought to put out the fires, a bottle filled with gasoline was thrown through the window from a moving automobile.

The assault followed a similar attack on the national headquarters of the Socialist Workers party only the week before. [See World Outlook October 7.] In the fire-bombing of the SWP; Judy White, the New York gubernatorial candidate of the Trotskyist organization, called attention to a definite pattern that had appeared.

She noted the bomb assaults against the national headquarters of the Communist pro-Moscow Communist party, the national headquarters of the W.E.B. Dubois Clubs, and the headquarters of the Vietnam Day Committee in Berkeley -- all since last April. These organizations oppose American involvement in the civil war in Vietnam.

"Possibly a single right-wing or fascist-type organization is responsible for all these outrages," she said. "The commandos evidently hope by violent means like this to intimidate organizations that oppose the war in Vietnam."

Laski told the press that he thought the fire was started in the Maoist headquarters because the party had urged Negroes last week to arm themselves "as the only effective means to struggle tit-for-tat with the Ku Klux Klan." The finger of suspicion pointed, he said, to "states-rights groups."

He said that his organization intended to stick tough. "We will not be pushed out of here by racists. This will not intimidate us. In fact, it reaffirms our convictions."

If necessary, he told the press, the plate-glass windows will be replaced by plywood "backed with steel."

#### GROUP ACCUSED OF SMUGGLING ARMS TO GUATEMALAN GUERRILLAS

Four Guatemalans and six Mexicans are under arrest in Mexico City, according to the September 27 Ultimas Noticias, on charges of running arms for the purpose of overthrowing the Guatemalan government.

The smuggled arms were made in the U.S., Czechoslovakia and Mexico, it was alleged.

According to the Mexican police, the head of the group was Victor Hugo Martínez Pantaleón. He had been "commissioned by the guerrillas" in Guatemala and when arrested was carrying US\$4,030.

Martínez was captured in the railway station after leaving a shipment there that contained a number of machineguns and 9,000 cartridges.

After arresting Martínez, the police picked up three other Guatemalans: Amado Domínguez Flores, Odilia Martínez Mena de González and María Luisa Robles Secaira.

The six Mexicans were Leopoldo Constantino Pérez, Juan Constantino Pérez, Eduardo Zepeda Regalado, Oscar Julio Orduña Sancho, Raúl Rodríguez Nava and Rafael Soriano Mayoral.

The police said that others were involved and that a search is being made for them.

As is customary in the Mexican press, which generally acts like a house organ for the government and the police department, no statements by the defendants were published.

LONDON DEMONSTRATORS SUPPORT VIETNAMESE FIGHTERS

By Antonio Farién

London

The Vietnam Solidarity Campaign held a demonstration in London September 28 on the eve of the Labour party's annual conference, to protest British complicity in the Vietnam war. The demonstration was in solidarity with the forces inside the Labour party who are in opposition to Wilson on Vietnam.

Many of the slogans were directed at Wilson and his cabinet. The demonstrators shouted, "Stop British Complicity!" "Out with Wilson!" "American Troops in Vietnam -- Out!" Hundreds of flags of the National Liberation Front were carried.

Some 800 to 1,000 people participated. Every major left political tendency was represented. They marched from the Victoria Embankment to Transport House in Smith Square, the Labour party headquarters, where Pat Jordan, secretary of the Campaign, delivered the following letter to Len Williams, the secretary of the party:

"Ever-growing numbers of British people are becoming disgusted with the policy of the present Labour Government in supporting the American Johnson administration in its war of aggression in Vietnam. So far, only a small proportion of the population realise the extent of British involvement and complicity and we consider it our duty to make certain facts known to the British public so they can pass judgement on the Government. The British people have been horrified by the many stories and photographs which have appeared in the British press illustrating the atrocities perpetrated by Marshall Ky's forces. We intend to make known to the British people that British officers are actively engaged in training these self-same forces in the art of jungle 'counter insurgency' warfare in Malaya. We are going to make known to the British people the extent of British involvement in Thailand in protecting and helping to build American bases from which a very high proportion of the raids on North Vietnam take place. Many other incidents of British physical involvement in the war can be given, not to speak of the spineless parroting of American arguments about the war which emanates from British Government sources. Moreover, the economic consequences of the British Government's foreign policy are leading to sackings, unemployment and a lower standard of living for the British people.

"The present Labour leadership have, by their Vietnam policy, betrayed the principles upon which the Labour Party was formed. What would Keir Hardie, George Lansbury and other Labour pioneers make of all this? Even Ramsay MacDonald -- who went to prison for his pacifist beliefs -- would have rejected these policies. But Mr. Wilson and his team (many of whom have forgotten everything they said and stood for in their Aldermaston days) are not the

Labour Party. Another aspect of the Labour Party is shown in the huge number of resolutions on Vietnam down for discussion at next week's Labour Party annual conference. The overwhelming majority of these resolutions are highly critical of the present policy of the Government. We pledge our solidarity with those in the Labour Party who are fighting -- often in the face of expulsion threats to reverse Labour Party policy. These are the people who represent the true traditions of the Labour Party and we wish them every success."

Following the protest march, more than 500 of the demonstrators went to Central Hall to a meeting sponsored by the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation in order to launch the "International War Crimes Tribunal" campaign in Britain.

The main speakers included Setsuru Tsurushima (Japan), Ernest Tate (Vietnam Solidarity Campaign), Tariq-Ali (Pakistan) and Ralph Schoenman (secretary of the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation). They explained the purpose and goals of the War Crimes Tribunal.

The speakers criticized the Wilson government not only for bowing to Johnson but for actually fronting for American imperialism. Britain's active role, such as training "counter insurgency" forces in Malaya and building air bases to be used by the U.S. in carrying out bombing missions, was denounced.

The keynote of the meeting was solidarity with the Vietnamese people in their struggle against American aggression.

#### WALLOON WORKERS PARTY SUPPORTS HUGO BLANCO

In an article presenting the background of Hugo Blanco's activities as the leader of the tumultuous peasant movement in Peru in 1961-63, the Belgian socialist weekly La Gauche [the Left] reported October 1 that the Parti Wallon des Travailleurs [Walloon Workers party] had issued a statement calling for the immediate release of the revolutionist, who was then facing trial after being held for more than three years in prison.

Blanco was later condemned to 25 years in prison, to be served in the notorious dungeon of El Frontón, for his courageous efforts in organizing the peasants.

The action was taken by the Central Committee of the PWT at a meeting held in Namur September 4 when news was received of the imminence of the long-delayed court-martial of the popular figure.

The PWT demand was signed by the following members of the Central Committee: C. Alsteen, R. Cujas, A. Dams, G. Dobbeleer, J. Dessart, F. Gauthier, L. Goire, M. Lambert, F. Legros, R. Nicolas, R. Raes, L. Stas, M. Slangen, G. Trigaut and H. Vaume.

STORMY INTERNAL CONFLICTS IN CHINA -- II

By Livio Maitan

[Continued from last week.]

Why This Campaign Now?

The principal themes of the present round of polemics and denunciations, as we have seen, go back into the past. Why then was the campaign set in motion at this stage, beginning last November when a Shanghai newspaper opened fire on the unfortunate Wu Han?

A number of factors of various kinds appear to have been involved. The ruling group probably felt that critical elements and oppositionists (or persons presumed to be such) were in positions of too great importance and were waiting for an occasion to settle accounts. Specific events on which we as yet have no information may have pushed them into opening their offensive out of fear of a turn less favorable to them or in reply to the moves of the others. (It is possible that a crisis was developing in the Political Bureau, two members of which -- Peng Chen and Lu Ting-yi -- had been eliminated.) (40)

No special emphasis is put on international questions in the official documents, but there is no doubt that the events of the second half of 1965 and the beginning of 1966 constituted a heavy liability for the Maoist leadership. Oppositionists might have taken advantage of it and there is every reason to believe that very sharp debates broke out over this question, including the highest levels. The imperialist escalation in Vietnam was also very likely a subject of conflict, particularly in relation to the problem of China's attitude toward the Soviet Union. This is a factor that might well have determined the Mao group to take the initiative in order to avoid being taken by surprise and to keep the situation well in hand.

It is also possible that the leadership team wanted to take timely precautions, bearing in mind certain eventualities which they would strive to meet absolutely united and with completely firm positions. The most tragic eventuality might be a test of strength with the United States, including a military confrontation (hence the necessity for firm control over the army). Another might be problems arising in an acute way from economic developments. At present, the economic situation is not especially

---

(40) It was said in a long article in Red Flag June 11 that the attack on the "monsters" had the aim of removing the "time-bomb" in which these adversaries of the party had put their hopes. (See HNA, June 12, p. 10, and also HNA, July 21, p. 6.)

tense and nothing indicates that it is at the bottom of the conflicts of recent months.(41) But 1966 marks the beginning of the third plan and tensions are bound to occur in carrying out the plan whether things go well or whether there are serious failures. Hence the possibility, in the not distant future, of some offensive mounted by critical elements who might resume themes currently on the order of the day in the USSR and in the peoples democracies; in particular, themes which the Maoists consider utterly pernicious. It is possible, therefore, that they wanted to strike down the potentially dangerous "revisionists" here and now.

The international press has strongly inclined to interpret the crisis as an episode in the struggle over the succession. Aside from the sensationalist element and the arbitrary hypotheses concerning Mao's health, the problem is actually posed in more general terms than the possible replacement of the chairman. For a whole series of well-known reasons, the Chinese leadership is among the oldest in the workers states and Communist parties; and the need for alternative leaders will become more and more pressing. It is perhaps with this problem in mind that the old leadership wished to clean out any critical or doubtful elements and launch a thoroughgoing campaign reaffirming the universal validity of its concepts and methods, symbolized by Mao's thought. In other words they may have been preoccupied with the problem of assuring the continuity of the leadership in a period of difficulties for the country. It is possible that the events which occurred in the Soviet Union after Stalin's death is a subject of reflection for Mao.

Insofar as it is possible to judge from fragmentary reports, no promotion of new, younger elements has occurred on the highest level. But it appears that Lin Piao, the least aged of the old guard, now occupies the number two spot. Do they hope that he will be in the best position to play a role in solving the problem of continuity of leadership when the older ones are no longer able to maintain their positions?(42)

---

(41)According to the China Association of London -- which is composed of British firms dealing with China -- industry in 1965 progressed by 20% (19.9% in 1964). Difficulties developed in agriculture, with a drop in the production of cereals (the production of tractors is also running into difficulties); but agriculture as a whole is reported to have progressed by 5%.

(42) Liu Shao-chi, Chou En-lai, Lin Piao and Teng Hsiao-ping were mentioned in the People's Daily (HNA July 1, p. 6) on the anniversary of the Chinese Communist party, which cited statements they had made. But Lin Piao alone was cited in many documents as the faithful interpreter of Mao's thought

With regard to Lin Piao, it should be remembered that for reasons of health he was absent from the political scene for long stretches. He became Minister of Defense in 1959 after Peng Teh-huai was ousted.

## Style and Specific Features of the Chinese Bureaucracy

During the recent crisis, as on previous occasions, a certain "style," characteristic of the Mao leadership could be noted. The immediate aim of an operation appears limited and incidental, and during the first phase they advance cautiously as if they were feeling out the ground. Then they mount a feverish campaign with a rising tempo, bringing enormous propaganda means to bear. What remains to be seen is whether this time, too, a moderating rectification will later be brought in to restore the overall equilibrium.

The methods used in recent months are reminiscent of the methods and formulas of other Chinese campaigns against critical elements and oppositionists as well as being in the old Stalinist tradition. The frenzied glorification of Mao, the use of amalgams, the absurdity of certain accusations, the denunciation of previously forgotten "misdeeds" of the past to discredit those under accusation(43), mobilizations from the top down and bureaucratically orchestrated demonstrations of support, multiple pressure on partisans abroad to lend uncritical support to the campaigns -- there are so many well-known elements present that we need not characterize them again.(44)

At the same time, all this confirms the revolutionary Marxist characterization of the Chinese leadership as bureaucratic in nature and brings into sharp relief the persistence of the pernicious effects of its Stalinist education. Still, this-time too the existence of specific methods and concepts cannot be ignored.

First of all, at least up to now, the campaign underway has not been accompanied by police repression or the physical liquidation of those under fire. For the time being, not even the expul-

---

(43)The accusations brought against Wu Han were particularly absurd. "He was personally groomed by the reactionary politician Hu Shih and consistently worshipped the U.S. and was pro-Chiang Kai-shek and anti-Communist." (HNA, June 12, p. 11.)

(44)It is necessary to point out one aspect of the present campaign which is probably aimed at exploiting backward concepts and outlooks still surviving in some layers of the population. On the one hand, the oppositionists are depicted as demonic beings and are commonly characterized as "monsters" and "evil spirits." On the other hand, a veritable power of exorcism is attributed to the name and thought of Mao: "When there is any mention of Mao Tse-tung's ideas, they [the oppositionists] get upset, start swearing and cursing, and even get quite hysterical, just like the imperialists and Khrushchov revisionists." (HNA, July 1, p. 6.) "Tsai Lien-hsing said that in the twenty years since his locomotive was named Mao Tse-tung, it had not a single accident, because 'we are equipped with Mao Tse-tung's thought.'" (HNA, July 4, p. 12.)

sion of the leaders and intellectuals, who are the targets of very serious accusations, has been announced. Furthermore, the climate of ideological terrorism has not eliminated the paternalistic tone and it must not be forgotten either that the recent cultural-political discussions developed rather freely with statements by those attacked as well as by those who spoke in their defense being published in the press. One should note, however, that the self-criticisms made up to this point have been regarded as incomplete and unsatisfactory by the ruling group.(45)

As for the political content, I will not return to what we have already said a number of times, particularly with regard to the economic policy and line of the Chinese CP in agriculture, which does not seem to have been rectified in the present crisis.(46) Nonetheless attention should be called to a real leitmotiv that constantly turns up even in the documents of recent months and which it would be a mistake to underestimate -- the reaffirmation of equalitarian concepts. It is expressed in many forms, from the proclamation of certain norms to the denunciation of the dangers of degeneration inherent in differentiations in the level of the standard of living and social conditions, in the constant reference to the necessity of not separating oneself from the masses and of living with them, to the extolling of cadres ready to share all the difficulties facing the masses and impervious to the temptation of privileges.(47)

---

(45)It is well-known that certain celebrated "deviationists" of the thirties, who are always cited as negative examples, far from having suffered the fate of their counterparts in the Soviet CP or the other CP's, are still in the party, and in some cases are members of the Central Committee. (This is the case, for example, with Li Li-san and Wang Ming.) This has not prevented them from using different criteria against other oppositionists, in particular the Trotskyists who have suffered and are still suffering repression.

It must also be noted that at the same time intellectuals are attacked as supporters of the bourgeoisie, the ruling group takes care to reassure its bourgeois fellow travelers as to its intentions toward them. (See HNA, June 12, pp. 9-10.)

(46)On this question, see the resolution on the Sino-Soviet conflict adopted at the Reunification Congress of the Fourth International. Section II, part "b."

(47)Passages have already been cited from recent documents dealing with this question, in particular some from the article on the direction of enterprises (see HNA, April 4) and the relevant article (HNA, April 2) cited in footnote 35. Again, it should be noted that the report of Hsiao Hua to the conference on political work in the army said, among other things: "While carrying out the mass line consistently in the three spheres, we should resolutely prevent cadres from becoming 'special' and help them to overcome any such tendency; the cadres should always be solicitous of the



This does not mean that there are actually no social differentiations and bureaucratic privileges in Chinese society. But the inequalities, according to all the serious observers, are much more limited than they were in the Soviet Union in the time of Stalin (and than they are in the Soviet Union today). In any case, the choice of an ideological theme which is constantly advanced cannot be considered as pure and simple deception -- all the more so since propaganda along these lines is not without its repercussions on the outlook and activities of a whole series of cadres and, in the last analysis, on the attitude of the masses themselves. It will be remembered that Stalin, contrariwise, sought to give theoretical justification to inequality, denouncing any resistance to the growing differentiations as "petty bourgeois"; and that Stalin praised, among other things, the displays of Stakhanovism, a phenomenon which has no real counterpart in the Chinese experience.

### Political and Social Tensions and the Perspectives

Beyond the crisis of the most recent months, in what fields and what forms are tensions likely to develop in People's China?

An answer is not easily found, since many of the elements necessary for a judgment are lacking; but nonetheless some hypotheses can be advanced on possible perspectives.

I will not return to the international context, which has unquestionably influenced the Chinese developments. But it should be noted that it is precisely in this field, which represented a strong point for the Chinese bureaucracy in recent years(48), that

---

masses and be at one with them. Our cadres must behave like ordinary labourers and ordinary soldiers..." (HNA, January 25, p. 8.) See also the April 30 speech by Chou En-lai (HNA, May 2). In an article on the work of the functionaries in Yen-an, we read: "These functionaries receive pay according to the actual amount and quality of field work they do, as is the case with all the ordinary peasants, from whom they are indistinguishable." (HNA, May 23, p. 6.) The press also published extracts from the diary of a soldier famous for his heroic actions, where we read the following for the date of December 31, 1964: "Labour, especially physical labour, is the best road for the revolutionization of our youth. It enables us to reject non-proletarian ideology and develop proletarian ideology." (HNA, June 9, p. 17.) On June 30, the press extolled a young peasant cadre with leadership responsibilities who lived among the peasants, on their level, and who arrived at the local headquarters of the sector under his direction in a bus, dressed modestly and with a small suitcase. (HNA, July 1, p. 11.)

(48) The perspective of international successes to relieve the situation had a real basis in fact. At the same time, the measures taken by Khrushchev against China, along with the constant threats of

the most serious frictions could develop in the near future. The truth is that after a period of successes in the diplomatic field as well as the international Communist movement, the Chinese suffered extremely serious setbacks which have already had repercussions within the party and leading bodies and which will have still more in the future. If no substantial change intervenes, the attitude toward the war in Vietnam will in particular induce differences and conflicts because the entire world will have noted that solemn declarations are not followed up by concrete measures. The problem of the need for a united front agreement with the Soviet Union against American imperialism and for the defense of the Vietnamese revolution, cannot be eluded indefinitely with the help of more and more virulent denunciations of the misdeeds of the Moscow leaders.

The methods adopted in the conflict within the Communist movement and in relations with the revolutionary movements of the colonial countries also threatens to create disillusionment and crises. Attitudes which are sectarian in the extreme may lead to even greater isolation; and the support of opportunist leaderships and orientations can only lead to impasses or to new grave defeats. The total lack of critical analysis of some very important experiences like the one in Indonesia, contributes, in addition to sowing confusion and demoralization and even to facilitating the maneuvers of the Soviet leaders. Lastly, the efforts of the Chinese to have at their disposal absolutely loyal groups or "parties," ready to repeat everything they say, will only result in artificial creations and a kind of inverse selection among party cadres and members who turn toward China out of revulsion against the rightist opportunism of the pro-Soviet parties.(49)

To touch briefly on the internal problems, China will have to confront difficulties in the industrial sector similar to those experienced by the Soviet Union, particularly when it has achieved sustained growth rates and attained higher productive levels. When this comes, the problems and debates which the ruling group has been seeking to eliminate will inevitably arise again. With regard to agriculture, despite the excesses of the years of the "great leap forward," there are no dramatic tensions in the Chinese countryside comparable to the tensions that have existed in the Soviet countryside for twenty years. Relations between the state and the peasants in particular are quite different; and acute problems over the prices of products which the peasants deliver to the state do not

---

imperialism, facilitated a certain rallying around the party and its ruling group.

(49) In the long run, the lessons of the Indonesian experience cannot be ignored; and the balance sheet of groups like the one led by Grippa [in Belgium] and those existing in the Latin-American countries must also be drawn. Furthermore, the Chinese will reflect on their break with the Cubans to which they contributed by their sectarianism and their inadmissible methods of pressure.

exist.(50)

However, difficulties and contradictions are developing and will continue to develop because of the relatively weak rate of growth and the lack of the industrial products needed by the countryside. Hence the possibility, despite everything, that the tendency of the peasants to become increasingly disinterested in collective labor -- the efficiency of which is reduced by the lack of certain material prerequisites -- and to become more and more exclusively interested in their little plots and individual trade will become manifest and grow deeper in China, too. In this area, the leading group must move, and continue to move, with extreme caution, if they want to avoid compromising their relationship with the peasant masses in spite of the, be it repeated, absence of the negative factors which have operated in the USSR or in the people's democracies of Europe.

The so-called "self-reliance" line, which had its legitimate side as a defense against the practices of the Soviet bureaucracy and as an exposure of certain Khrushchevist theses, will inevitably manifest its limitations. The Chinese economy will not be able to develop in a balanced and harmonious way and with the necessary high rates of growth if it is not integrated into the larger context of a community of collectivist states.

New tensions will undoubtedly arise in the cultural field. Past experience has demonstrated that conflicts and debates cannot be suppressed despite all the measures resorted to by the party and state bureaucracy. In science, a prolonged imposition of the present methods, symbolized by the polyvalence of Mao's thought, can only lead to increasing stagnation. In art and literature, rebellion is inevitable against the neo-Zhdanovists who in practice seek to reduce artists to being propagandists of the official line. It is above all among the new generations in China, too, that recruits will be made for the vanguard in future assaults on the seemingly triumphant bureaucratic concepts and practices.(51)

---

(50)On this problem, which merits detailed study, see Charles Bettelheim's remarks in La Construction du Socialisme en Chine, Paris, Maspero, 1965, particularly pp. 87-88. An interesting article among the many published in the Chinese press was reproduced in HNA, February 19, p. 12. Information along the lines of that provided by Bettelheim concerning deliveries to the state was given by Joan Robinson in a private conversation after her return from China.

(51)Such a prognosis seems all the clearer since the glorification of Mao's thought concerns in reality only affirmations on completely general methodological criteria, directions on norms of work, and "moral" exhortations -- these are not sufficient for anyone. It must not be forgotten either that concepts of the Zhdanov type at a given moment provoke reactions even in some of the layers of the bureaucracy which sense the danger to the system of paralysis and ossification.

It must be added that sooner or later, if it is not reversed by the intervention of other factors, the tendency toward social stratification and the crystallization of privileged conditions will become accentuated likewise in Chinese society, which is still characterized by an insufficient development of the productive forces and therefore an inability to effectively satisfy expanding needs. Propaganda favoring equalitarian concepts, measures like those requiring work among the worker and peasant masses, or abolition of ranks in the army can only prove utterly inadequate in the best of circumstances. The most positive aspect objectively could be to foster antibureaucratic feelings among the masses and to stimulate their resistance to possibly deeper social differentiations.

All these tensions existing within the frame of the internal dialectics of a society in transition and not within the frame of a struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, will wind up sooner or later in conflicts and ruptures between the bureaucracy and the masses, between a leadership, which despite everything remains the expression of a privileged layer, and revolutionary tendencies struggling for a socialist democracy. How long it will take for this to happen is another question to which no answer can be given at present.

In fact, the ties between the bureaucratic Maoist leadership and the masses are still solid. This leadership is, in the eyes of the peasants and the workers, the same that led the revolutionary struggle against the regime of the landlords, the comprador bourgeoisie and the agents of imperialism. Furthermore, whatever the bureaucratic abuses, whatever the rigidity of a system where the party apparatus dominates by imposing its methods and its solutions, the comparison which counts, among the peasant masses in particular, is with their former status. And in comparison with the former regime, the progress made is gigantic. Not only has the standard of living for the masses undergone real improvement (and the Indian tragedy shows what this means concretely for countries starting from an extremely low level), but the peasants can also discuss day-to-day problems of their work and make their opinion felt. They perceive the gap existing between the party and state cadres with whom they deal now, and with whom they often share their lives and their problems, and the representatives of the former regime whose attitudes symbolized a regime of unutterable exploitation and oppression. It is easy to see that for masses coming from such a past what has been gained counts much more than the lack of genuine proletarian democracy and the fact that it is impossible for them to actually exercise decisive voice in the major problems posed in China.

The tensions which we have just indicated will develop clearly, therefore, first of all in relatively limited sectors and layers, both of intellectuals and vanguard workers, who through their own experiences, will grasp the concrete significance of a struggle for democratic management of the enterprises and against the bureaucratic grip.

It is not by chance that the ruling old guard do not conceal their concern over possible conflicts with the representatives of the new generations. For a long time, they have stressed this theme which was present in Mao's famous speech on contradictions among the people and which has turned up more and more frequently in recent months. The old guard seem to understand quite clearly why the youth may hold some surprises in store. The youth learn the documents by rote; they did not experience the former regime; and they have not passed through the crucible of revolutionary war; they do not have the ideological education and training of the old cadres. They might be vulnerable to the seduction of "revisionism," to individualist aspirations, to the desire to become specialists setting themselves above others, to making money, etc. Imperialism itself might attract the rising generations. (52)

Beyond all the vague moralizing and a certain nostalgia for the struggles of the past which seems to emerge at times, the basic fact is that the point of departure for the youth is a situation created by the revolution, which they take for granted; and thus they can put themselves immediately within the frame of the dialectics of the new society in which they were born and grew up. In other words, the comparison that interests them is not so much between the present situation and a dead past, as between the present regime with all its limitations, contradictions and absurdities, and the undeveloped potentialities of the collectivist structures that issued from the revolution. This holds all the truer since the youth now have the possibility of seeing other experiments on a world scale and thus of developing a more critical outlook than the preceding generations. These tendencies cannot be stifled by compulsory teaching of Mao's works in the schools or by frenetic campaigns on the subject of the so-called cultural revolution.

July 24, 1966

---

(52) On the problem of the youth and the education of succeeding generations, see in particular the report by Hu Ke-shi, member of the Secretariat of the Young Communists at a meeting of the Central Committee on May 5 (HNA, May 6); an article in the People's Daily of June 5 ("Proletarian Revolutionaries or Bourgeois Royalists?") where, among other things, it is said: "In the last analysis the struggle between the two lines and the two roads of socialism and capitalism in the field of education is a question of whether the younger generation will grow up to become successors to the proletarian cause or successors to the bourgeois cause." (HNA, June 6, p. 7.) See also the article already cited several times, published in HNA, June 12, which accuses the oppositionists of seeking to win the youth (p. 6); and the article in the People's Daily of June 18 on the cultural revolution, which includes the following key passage: "The transformation of the educational system in the final analysis affects the question of what sort of successors we shall produce, the question of whether we shall pass on Mao Tse-tung's thought from generation to generation, the question of whether our party and

country will change colour." (See HNA, June 19, p. 3, also HNA June 20, p. 4.)

Another manifestation of the official attitude toward the youth is that in all the edifying anecdotes published in the press, the exemplary young cadres constantly consult with their elders. (See, for example, HNA, June 30, p. 18 and July 1, p. 11.)

#### HUGO BLANCO -- DEFIANT THROUGHOUT TRIAL

[The following is a translation of an article, "The Alternative of the Bearded Ones," which appeared in the September 11-23 Caretas, a Lima biweekly.]

\* \* \*

In Tacna the chapter called Hugo Blanco has been closed. The military tribunal, disregarding the petition of the Auditor, Colonel Jesus Fernández, calling for the death penalty, sentenced the leader to 25 years in prison, to be served in El Frontón. Blanco, who had been detained for three years following the disintegration of the guerrilla movement which he commanded in Cuzco, admitted having organized the assault at Pucyura and the ambush at Mesacancha. In the two skirmishes, three civil guards were killed.

The Tacna trial, in which Blanco, his lieutenant Pedro Candela and others exhibited continual defiance -- each session ended with the cry of "Tierra o Muerte, Venceremos!" [Land or Death, we will win!] -- and at times something like impudence, was closely followed by the national and foreign press. The ex-student, who returned from Argentina a Trotskyist, enjoyed publicity out of all proportions from the time he entered the valley of La Convención. The campaign conducted particularly by "La Prensa," as well as a public relations organization that was the envy of the other leftists, contributed to his notoriety in Peru and abroad. In the very scene of his operations, the conditions he found greatly helped him. Proof of this is that a youth who organized a union converted himself within a few months into a supposed "Fidel Castro of Peru."

Twenty-five years -- and 160,000 soles in civil damages to be paid by all those found guilty -- ended the bloody chapter of Hugo Blanco. The announcement that the sentence is being appealed will not alter this fact. The only thing that could alter it would be tragic blindness, a stubborn lack of understanding among those who confuse the closing of a chapter with the ending of the problem in general. As if after Hugo Blanco there had not occurred the much more serious outbreaks of the MIR guerrillas!

No, the threat of violence will not disappear until the tremendous social problems of Peruvian agriculture are eliminated.

MANIFESTO: TOWARD A FREE REVOLUTIONARY ART

[The recent death of André Breton, the leading spokesman of the surrealist movement, reminded many of his appreciation of Trotsky's views on art and literature. As we noted last week in World Outlook, André Breton came to Mexico in 1938 to visit Trotsky and Diego Rivera, the great painter and muralist. The three world figures discussed the relation of art and politics, and particularly the baneful influence of Stalinism in this field, over a period of several weeks. The upshot of the discussion was a manifesto which André Breton and Diego Rivera issued over their signatures. Trotsky fully supported the manifesto and participated in the final editing of the manuscript.

[This interesting document is not easily available today. We have therefore thought it a good occasion to reprint it.

[The authors, it will be noted, called for the formation of an International Federation of Independent Revolutionary Art. The initiative received some support at the time but was cut short by the outbreak of World War II. One of the authors, Diego Rivera, also made his peace with the Stalin regime.

[The translation below was made by Dwight Macdonald and was printed in the fall 1938 issue of Partisan Review.]

\* \* \*

We can say without exaggeration that never has civilization been menaced so seriously as today. The Vandals, with instruments which were barbarous, and so comparatively ineffective, blotted out the culture of antiquity in one corner of Europe. But today we see world civilization, united in its historic destiny, reeling under the blows of reactionary forces armed with the entire arsenal of modern technology. We are by no means thinking only of the world war that draws near. Even in times of "peace," the position of art and science has become absolutely intolerable.

Insofar as it originates with an individual, insofar as it brings into play subjective talents to create something which brings about an objective enriching of culture, any philosophical, sociological, scientific or artistic discovery seems to be the fruit of a precious chance, that is to say, the manifestation, more or less spontaneous, of necessity. Such creations cannot be slighted, whether from the standpoint of general knowledge (which interprets the existing world), or of revolutionary knowledge (which, the better to change the world, requires an exact analysis of the laws which govern its movement). Specifically, we cannot remain indifferent to the intellectual conditions under which creative activity take place, nor should we fail to pay all respect to those particular laws which govern intellectual creation.

In the contemporary world we must recognize the ever more widespread destruction of those conditions under which intellectual creation is possible. From this follows of necessity an increasingly manifest degradation not only to the work of art but also of the specifically "artistic" personality. The regime of Hitler, now that it has rid Germany of all those artists whose work expressed the slightest sympathy for liberty, however superficial, has reduced those who still consent to take up pen or brush to the status of domestic servants of the regime, whose task it is to glorify it on order, according to the worst possible esthetic conventions. If reports may be believed, it is the same in the Soviet Union, where Thermidorean reaction is now reaching its climax.

It goes without saying that we do not identify ourselves with the currently fashionable catchword: "Neither fascism nor communism!" a shibboleth which suits the temperament of the Philistine, conservative and frightened, clinging to the tattered remnants of the "democratic" past. True art, which is not content to play variations on ready-made models but rather insists on expressing the inner needs of man and of mankind in its time -- true art is unable not to be revolutionary, not to aspire to a complete and radical reconstruction of society. This it must do, were it only to deliver intellectual creation from the chains which bind it, and to allow all mankind to raise itself to those heights which only isolated geniuses have achieved in the past. We recognize that only the social revolution can sweep clear the path for a new culture. If, however, we reject all solidarity with the bureaucracy now in control of the Soviet Union, it is precisely because, in our eyes, it represents not communism but its most treacherous and dangerous enemy.

The totalitarian regime of the U.S.S.R., working through the so-called "cultural" organizations it controls in other countries, has spread over the entire world a deep twilight hostile to every sort of spiritual value. A twilight of filth and blood in which, disguised as intellectuals and artists, those men steep themselves who have made of servility a career, of lying for pay a custom, and of the palliation of crime a course of pleasure. The official art of Stalinism mirrors with a blatancy unexampled in history their efforts to put a good face on their mercenary profession.

The repugnance which this shameful negation of the principles of art inspires in the artistic world -- a negation which even slave states have never dared carry so far -- should give rise to an active, uncompromising condemnation. The opposition of writers and artists is one of the forces which can usefully contribute to the discrediting and overthrow of regimes which are destroying, along with the right of the proletariat to aspire to a better world, every sentiment of nobility and even of human dignity.

The communist revolution is not afraid of art. It realizes that the role of the artist in a decadent capitalist society is determined by the conflict between the individual and various social forms which are hostile to him. This fact alone, insofar as



he is conscious of it, makes the artist the natural ally of revolution. The process of sublimation, which here comes into play, and which psychoanalysis has analyzed, tries to restore the broken equilibrium between the integral "ego" and the outside elements which it rejects. This restoration works to the advantage of the "ideal of self," which marshals against the unbearable present reality all those powers of the interior world, of the "self," which are common to all men and which are constantly flowering and developing. The need for emancipation felt by the individual spirit has only to follow its natural course to be led to mingle its stream with this primeval necessity: the need for the emancipation of man.

The conception of the writer's function which the young Marx worked out is worth recalling. "The writer," he declared, "naturally must make money in order to live and write, but he should not under any circumstances live and write in order to make money... The writer by no means looks on his works as a means. It is an end in itself and so little a means in the eyes of himself and of others that if necessary he sacrifices his existence to the existence of his work... The first condition of the freedom of the press is that it is not a business activity." It is more than ever fitting to use this statement against those who would regiment intellectual activity in the direction of ends foreign to itself, and prescribe, in the guise of so-called "reasons of State," the themes of art. The free choice of these themes and the absence of all restrictions on the range of his explorations -- these are possessions which the artist has a right to claim as inalienable. In the realm of artistic creation, the imagination must escape from all constraint and must, under no pretext, allow itself to be placed under bonds. To those who would urge us, whether for today or for tomorrow, to consent that art should submit to a discipline which we hold to be radically incompatible with its nature, we give a flat refusal, and we repeat our deliberate intention of standing by the formula: complete freedom for art.

We recognize, of course, that the revolutionary State has the right to defend itself against the counter-attack of the bourgeoisie, even when this drapes itself in the flag of science or art. But there is an abyss between these enforced and temporary measures of revolutionary self-defense and the pretension to lay commands on intellectual creation. If, for the better development of the forces of material production, the revolution must build a socialist regime with centralized control, to develop intellectual creation an anarchist regime of individual liberty should from the first be established. No authority, no dictation, not the least trace of orders from above! Only on a base of friendly cooperation, without the constraint from outside, will it be possible for scholars and artists to carry out their tasks, which will be more far-reaching than ever before in history.

It should be clear by now that in defending freedom of thought we have no intention of justifying political indifference, and that it is far from our wish to revive a so-called "pure" art which generally serves the extremely impure ends of reaction. No,

our conception of the role of art is too high to refuse it an influence on the fate of society. We believe that the supreme task of art in our epoch is to take part actively and consciously in the preparation of the revolution. But the artist cannot serve the struggle for freedom unless he subjectively assimilates its social content, unless he feels in his very nerves its meaning and drama and freely seeks to give his own inner world incarnation in his art.

In the present period of the death agony of capitalism, democratic as well as fascist, the artist sees himself threatened with the loss of his right to live and continue working. He sees all avenues of communication choked with the debris of capitalist collapse. Only naturally, he turns to the Stalinist organizations, which hold out the possibility of escaping from his isolation. But if he is to avoid complete demoralization, he cannot remain there, because of the impossibility of delivering his own message and the degrading servility which these organizations exact from him in exchange for certain material advantages. He must understand that his place is elsewhere, not among those who betray the cause of the revolution and of mankind, but among those who with unshaken fidelity bear witness to this revolution, among those who, for this reason, are alone able to bring it to fruition, and along with it the ultimate free expression of all forms of human genius

The aim of this appeal is to find a common ground on which may be reunited all revolutionary writers and artists, the better to serve the revolution by their art and to defend the liberty of that art itself against the usurpers of the revolution. We believe that esthetic, philosophical and political tendencies of the most varied sort can find here a common ground. Marxists can march here hand in hand with anarchists, provided both parties uncompromisingly reject the reactionary police-patrol spirit represented by Joseph Stalin and by his henchman, Garcia Oliver.\*

We know very well that thousands on thousands of isolated thinkers and artists are today scattered throughout the world, their voices drowned out by the loud choruses of well-disciplined liars. Hundreds of small local magazines are trying to gather youthful

---

\*Juan García Oliver, a top leader of the Spanish Anarchist movement. The Spanish Anarchists, like the Anarchist movement generally, were opposed in principle to supporting governments of any kind. During the Spanish Civil War, however, they violated their own principles and supported the bourgeois democratic government, even accepting posts in it. They argued, like the Stalinists, that this class-collaborationist policy was required in order to defeat Franco. As in the case of the Stalinists, "support" included approving and actively engaging in repressive moves against revolutionary actions undertaken by the working class. This course played into the hands of the fascists and doomed the Spanish revolution to a defeat from which it has not yet recovered. -- W.O.

forces about them, seeking new paths and not subsidies. Every progressive tendency in art is destroyed by fascism as "degenerate." Every free creation is called "fascist" by the Stalinists. Independent revolutionary art must now gather its forces for the struggle against reactionary persecution. It must proclaim aloud its right to exist. Such a union of forces is the aim of the International Federation of Independent Revolutionary Art which we believe it is now necessary to form.

We by no means insist on every idea put forth in this manifesto, which we ourselves consider only a first step in the new direction. We urge every friend and defender of art, who cannot but realize the necessity for this appeal, to make himself heard at once. We address the same appeal to all those publications of the left-wing which are ready to participate in the creation of the International Federation and to consider its task and its methods of action.

When a preliminary international contact has been established through the press and by correspondence, we will proceed to the organization of local and national congresses on a modest scale. The final step will be the assembling of a world congress which will officially mark the foundation of the International Federation.

Our aims:

The independence of art -- for the revolution;

The revolution -- for the complete liberation of art!

André Breton  
Diego Rivera

BERTRAND RUSSELL'S APPEAL TO NEGRO SOLDIERS IN VIETNAM

[The following "Message from Bertrand Russell to American Negro soldiers in Vietnam," dated September 19, was released to the press in London.]

\* \* \*

I address myself to you, American Negro soldiers, because you are engaged in a war so unjust and cruel, against an Asian people who wish only to live better and be left alone. Today in the United States the brutality which the Vietnamese experience at the hands of the American army is experienced by American Negroes, whether in the North or South of the United States.

You may know that I have established an international War Crimes Tribunal, which has been set up to examine and condemn the

terrible crimes committed against the people of Vietnam. Gas, chemicals, jelly-gasoline, acids, lazy dogs, torture and mutilation of prisoners -- all these horrors are being committed by American soldiers in Vietnam, on orders from Washington. At the same time, in Harlem, Watts, Chicago, Detroit, Atlanta and in Mississippi, American Negroes are tortured and killed. Humiliation and brutality are imposed on Negro children and families across the United States.

It is clear that the same Government and the same power structure which commits these acts against Negro citizens of the United States is directing acts of cruelty against the Vietnamese. I think you know from your own experience in Vietnam that the people of Vietnam suffer the way oppressed American Negroes suffer in the United States. I think you know also that the oppressor is the same in each case.

I appeal to you, American Negro soldiers, to think where your real struggle lies. Is it in Vietnam, or is it in defence of your own people against oppression inside the United States? Refuse to fight this dirty war any longer. Come forward with evidence of the crimes of Johnson and the U.S. Government in Vietnam. I have already appealed to American soldiers in general to do this, but I am addressing this particular appeal to you personally, as Negroes, because the American Negro is made to suffer more than any other group, both in the United States and in Vietnam.

You know that 30 percent of the U.S. army in Vietnam consists of American Negroes. You are used to fight the dirty wars of the Johnson Government not only because the U.S. Government assigns to its Negro population the dirtiest and the most dangerous jobs, but because the Johnson Government fears courageous and alert Negro men in the United States, who will defend their people against racism, poverty, police brutality and death. Militant Negro organisations are supporting our War Crimes Tribunal in the United States and condemning the war in Vietnam. This is because the struggle against the war in Vietnam and the struggle for the rights of American Negroes is the same struggle against the same enemy.

I extend to you my greetings and my warm feelings, and I know you will respond to the appeal of your people in the United States and your brothers who are the Vietnamese people themselves.

#### DEUTSCHER ANSWERS A CRITIC ON VIETNAM WAR CRIMES TRIBUNAL

[In its issue of September 29, the London Times published a letter to the editor from Robert Conquest concerning the International War Crimes Tribunal initiated by Bertrand Russell to investigate the atrocities being perpetrated by American imperialism in Vietnam. This was answered by Isaac Deutscher, his letter being published in the October 1 issue of the Times. The text of the two letters follows.]

From Mr. Robert Conquest

Sir, -- Most people will have formed their own opinions about the probable standards of judiciousness of Lord Russell's "tribunal". But either way, he must not rely (September 21), when it comes to the supposed precedent of the Nuremberg Trial, on Justice Jackson's unexceptionable general remarks, but on what that court actually did.

Though the judges included men with greater judicial experience than Lord Russell's current selection, they cannot be seriously thought to have acted in accordance with Jackson's claim that war crimes were being dealt with regardless of who committed them. One of the accusations was of responsibility for the Katyn massacre -- which, indeed, figured as the leading charge in the category of murder of prisoners of war.

The court dealt with this in a most superficial fashion, hearing half a dozen unsubstantial Russians and Germans, when it was public knowledge that witnesses including former allied prisoners of war, neutral medical men, Polish underground leaders and others would have clearly implicated the Russians. Katyn was not directly referred to in the verdict, but nor were the defendants cleared of this particular charge.

This singularly unjudicial behaviour was surely linked to political compromise. (The Soviet judge, it may be remarked, had appeared on the bench at the notorious Zinoviev Trial; and he is named by the Soviet General Gorbatov, in his memoirs, as sentencing him to 15 years in a labour camp at a 29-minute session at which the General testified that the evidence was based on torture.)

Whatever the good intentions of the western judges, the court's conduct over Katyn may perhaps serve as a warning to less august bodies that political bias and political calculation are not readily excluded.

Incidentally the Katyn case, though it is now universally believed to have been a N.K.V.D. operation, has never been properly tried by an impartial tribunal. Perhaps Lord Russell's group might wish to catch up on this backlog before proceeding to later investigations.

Yours faithfully,

R. CONQUEST.

\* \* \*

From Mr. Isaac Deutscher

Sir, -- What is Mr. R. Conquest's purpose in dragging the Katyn affair into his argument (September 29) against Lord Russell on the war in Vietnam? If he merely wanted to say that that dark

affair has never been investigated by any impartial body and that the Nuremberg Tribunal administered justice in a manner calculated to suit the immediate convenience of the victors of the Second World War, I, for one, would agree.

All this does not alter the fact that the defendants at the Nuremberg Trials were guilty of unprecedented and unparalleled crimes against humanity. The tragedy was that not a Germany risen in revolt against Nazism pronounced judgment over them, but that representatives of foreign powers, entangled in their inter-allied diplomacy, had to do it.

However, two -- or a thousand -- wrongs do not make a right; and to speak of Katyn and the inconsistencies of the Nuremberg Trial in reply to protests against the American war in Vietnam is worse than irrelevant. The war in Vietnam, the sufferings it causes and the dangers it casts upon the world, have not yet receded into the past; they are part of the present and overshadow the future. Lord Russell is surely right in reminding the American Administration which wages the war in Vietnam of the solemn pledge about war crimes given by American representatives at Nuremberg.

As Lord Russell has explained in these columns, the Tribunal which has been convened on his initiative, to consider prima facie evidence about American war crimes in Vietnam, is to be a Commission of Inquiry, claiming no official status for itself. It will perhaps resemble far less the Nuremberg Tribunal than the Commission of Inquiry which nearly 30 years ago sat in judgment over Stalin's great purges, under the chairmanship of another famous philosopher -- John Dewey. The question of the "judicial experience" of "Lord Russell's Tribunal" need not disturb Mr. Conquest, for the Tribunal benefits from the services of several lawyers, quite as eminent as any of the Nuremberg lawyers, and completely independent.

I am one of those who, responding to Lord Russell's appeal, have joined the Tribunal, because I feel that Lord Russell and his associates speak in this matter for the conscience of our age. Having in the course of the past two years addressed, in the United States, huge audiences, inter alia tens or perhaps hundreds of thousands of students, eager to protest against American intervention in Vietnam, I have no doubt that the activity of our Tribunal will meet with a wide and sensitive response on both sides of the Atlantic and, of course, in many countries of Asia and Africa. But I am appalled by the passivity and apathy of the Labour movement over so crucial and fateful an issue.

Yours faithfully,

ISAAC DEUTSCHER.

ON MODZELEWSKI'S AND KURON'S "OPEN LETTER"

By Pierre Frank

[Two political trials in Poland during the past year attracted international attention. The one involved two youths, Karol Modzelewski and Jacek Kuron; the other, three members of the prewar generation, Ludwik Hass, Romuald Smiech and Kazimierz Badowski. Hass is a Trotskyist, who openly proclaimed his convictions even after seventeen years in Stalin's labor camps. Where Modzelewski and Kuron stood has remained more obscure. It was known that they had been condemned for circulating an "Open Letter" to members of the Communist party, but it was difficult to determine the trustworthiness of the various reports concerning its content.

[Recently the French Trotskyist movement received a copy of the "Open Letter" in the form in which it was circulated among the members of the University of Warsaw sections of the Polish Communist party and the Young Socialists. The document was clearly of such interest and importance that the French Trotskyists decided to make it available in a French translation to the workers movement in France.

[While the translation into French was being prepared, the Polish emigré group associated with the magazine Kultura, which has very dubious ties, printed a copy of the document in Polish. It is not known how they obtained it. From certain small discrepancies in the text, it would appear that it is not one of the original documents, but one that has been reproduced, undergoing slight modifications in the process. Could this copy have come from sources interested in casting political discredit on Modzelewski and Kuron? The two prisoners, under the conditions of their incarceration, may not even know that Kultura printed the document. They had previously refused to make a copy available to the emigré magazine.

[The French translation is now available in a mimeographed edition of 100 pages. To get a copy, send \$1 or the equivalent in francs to Perspective Mondiale, 21 rue d'Aboukir, Paris 2, France.

[Below we are offering an English translation of Pierre Frank's introduction to the French edition of the "Open Letter." This provides an estimate of the document from the Trotskyist point of view.]

\* \* \*

In July 1965 and again in January 1966 Warsaw was the scene of two trials which foreign correspondents linked together, due to the similarity of political views among the defendants, although the Polish courts did not bring out any organizational connections between them. In the first trial, the defendants were two university youths, Karol Modzelewski and Jacek Kuron. Modzelewski was the son

of a Communist leader, now dead, who served as the first Minister of Foreign Affairs when the People's Republic of Poland was established. Karol Modzelewski was one of the leaders of the youth at the University of Warsaw in October 1956. Later he was a leading participant in a discussion circle at the university where he openly expressed opinions critical of the policies of the party and the government. Kuron was likewise the son of an old Communist cadre. Modzelewski was sentenced to three and a half years in prison, Kuron to three years.

The defendants in the second trial, Ludwik Hass, Romuald Smiech and Kazimierz Badowsky, belonged to the prewar generation. The latter two, professors of history and of political economy at the universities of Warsaw and Cracow, were sentenced to three years in prison, as was Ludwik Hass. Before the second world war, Hass belonged to the Polish Trotskyist organization. When the Soviet troops entered Poland in 1939, he was arrested and deported, spending the next seventeen years in the Soviet labor camps. According to other prisoners who knew him, he conducted himself very courageously. Upon returning to Poland, he publicly announced that he was a Trotskyist. He was active in a circle of intellectuals where he was noted for his exceptional contributions. He worked in the history section of the Central Committee of the Polish trade unions.

Thus the men who were condemned always took public positions, publicly voiced the opinions for which they were imprisoned, although it would have been perfectly in order for them to work in an underground way. The government's subsequent attitude is proof enough of this, if justification is still needed. Since they took public positions not on passing questions but on the most general problems facing Polish society it was logical to suppose that they had made notes. A search of Modzelewski's home in November 1964 by the police brought to light an uncompleted study of 128 mimeographed pages. The existence of this document resulted in the expulsion of Modzelewski and Kuron from the party and from the youth organization, although the document was not made available to the bodies engaged in their expulsion.

Modzelewski and Kuron were released but felt that they were being watched and that they would be arrested again, this time for a longer period. They wrote an "Open Letter" to those called on to ratify the expulsions. In it they set down the opinions which they had advanced publicly. This document began to circulate clandestinely. Last spring, the organ of the Polish bourgeois emigration Kultura complained that Modzelewski and Kuron, under the influence of Marxist "dogmatism," had refused to let the "Open Letter" be sent to them. But this August, Kultura published the "Open Letter" as a pamphlet. It is doubtful that the authors of the document had changed their views concerning Kultura in the meantime. In any case, we are publishing the "Open Letter." The Polish text that reached us bore certain differences, generally small ones, from the one published by Kultura.



Modzelewski's and Kuron's "Open Letter" was written at the beginning of 1965. Its exceptional interest cannot fail to impress everyone who reads it. To begin with it is the first revolutionary Marxist document to appear in any workers state since the physical annihilation of the Left Opposition and the assassination of Trotsky. This alone suffices to give the document great historic interest. But it reveals, in addition, the very high level of Marxist culture of its authors and their capacity to undertake a rigorous analysis of Polish society and to formulate, under the difficult conditions under which they lived, a valid program for a genuine revolutionary party of the Polish working class.

On the basis of official statistics, they draw a faithful picture of the living conditions of the workers, the peasants, technicians, etc., since the establishment of the new Poland. It is not necessary in this introduction to dwell on this very important part of the document. We will mention only that the authors strongly underline the fact that the stabilization that came rather soon after the Polish October of 1956 was made possible by economic reserves accumulated in preceding years, that the effect of the modifications secured through the October 1956 movement has now worn off and that new reforms will have little efficacy. On this point, their conclusions coincide with those reached by the Fourth International in drawing up a balance sheet of the "de-Stalinization" following the twenty-third congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The authors of the "Open Letter" show the power of their thought not only in their analysis of the situation since the establishment of the new Poland but also in their formulation of a program that would enable the working class to lead Polish society out of the crisis in which it has been landed by bureaucratic management and toward socialism. This program offers not only measures for the immediate improvement of living conditions for the workers and measures to end the stagnation in agriculture. It likewise offers an entire solidly reasoned section dealing with the structure of the country that condemns without reservation any retreat in a rightist direction and places complete confidence in the working class -- calling for the formation of Workers Councils and a Central Council of workers delegates, election and recall of delegates, plurality of parties (specified as political groups recognized by the working class), independence of the unions from the state, recognition of the right to strike, education of the workers on general economic problems, suppression of the political police, suppression of the standing army, arming of the working class. The program also offers a section on foreign policy that denounces the nationalism of the bureaucracy and expresses unyielding confidence in the potentialities of genuine proletarian internationalism in assuring solidarity with respect to every working-class movement directed against imperialism or against a ruling bureaucracy.

Modzelewski and Kuron present this program for an antibureaucratic proletarian revolution which they conceive as part of the

revolutionary struggle for socialism on a world scale. The program as a whole is reminiscent in concept and often even in its formulations of the program of political revolution outlined for the USSR by Trotsky in The Revolution Betrayed.

The power of the thinking shown in this document cannot be stressed too much. Modzelewski and Kuron do not hesitate to make an acute criticism of the policies followed by those whom they call the "October left." By this they refer to those elements (to whom they belonged) who, in October 1956, in the movement that brought Gomulka to power, instinctively sought the restoration of workers democracy. They accuse the left of that time of failing to formulate a clear program and of failing to differentiate themselves from the liberal currents in the bureaucracy. Having participated in the October 1956 movement with the legitimate hopes of young Communists and having seen that movement then disintegrate, they developed their reflections with admirable consistency, expressing them without concern for their personal fate.

\* \* \*

This program, in our opinion, was inspired by the same considerations underlying the program of political revolution advanced by Trotsky and the Fourth International for the Soviet Union and comes very close to it. Nevertheless it would not be right to pass by in silence an important theoretical difference between Modzelewski's and Kuron's document on the one hand and the position of Trotsky and the Fourth International on the other. It is well known that the Trotskyist movement has characterized the Soviet Union and the other states having the same social structure as workers states, bureaucratically degenerated or deformed as the case may be, and that they have combatted without quarter any idea suggesting that they are "state capitalist," or a new form of exploitive society in which the bureaucracy is depicted as a "new exploiting class" (Burnham's "managers," Djilas's "new class," etc.). The theory advanced by Modzelewski and Kuron is very specific. The label of exploiting class is generally applied to the bureaucracy in the Soviet Union and the other comparable states; they are not in accord with this. They see a difference between the technicians on the one hand and the central political bureaucracy on the other; and it is only the latter social layer -- a very thin one according to the authors themselves -- which they characterize as a ruling class in the new society where it collectively owns the means of production and management of the state, as they put it. On the basis of this concept, Modzelewski and Kuron distinguish between a bureaucratic social system and a technocratic social system, the model of which, according to them, is provided at present by Yugoslavia. In connection with this, they offer a searching criticism of "workers self-management" of the kind to be seen in Yugoslavia -- lacking democracy on a national scale. Their document presents an illuminating demonstration of the fact that the "self-management" which Liberman and other reformers seek at present in Soviet society, constitutes the program of the technicians who are demanding a higher standard of living and increased privileges in order to

assure a more favorable growth in production.

The difference between Modzelewski's and Kuron's theory and the multiple theories about a new exploiting class lies less in the assertion of a difference between the ruling political bureaucracy and the technicians -- which testifies more to the subtlety of the argument -- than in a fundamental difference: they stand on a completely different class level than most of those who have been fought by Trotsky and the Fourth International. Among almost all the theoreticians of a new class, the revolt against Stalin and the post-Stalinists has ended in denial of the validity of Marxism, in skepticism toward the working class and socialism, in adulation of bourgeois democracy. Denunciation of the crimes of the Kremlin has brought many of them into the wake of Washington. There is absolutely nothing of this in Modzelewski and Kuron. They denounce capitalism, particularly bourgeois democracy. They have confidence in the capacity of the proletariat to accomplish its historic mission. They support Marxism without reserve and strike strong blows to remove the Stalinist encrustation that has disfigured it for so long. That is why we think that the difference between them and the Trotskyist movement is terminological rather than political in nature.

In his polemics on the class nature of the Soviet Union, Trotsky indicated that such cases do arise. We cannot do better than cite what he wrote during the last great controversy which he engaged in immediately after the Hitler-Stalin pact was signed, during the first month of the second world war:

"Let us begin by posing the question of the nature of the Soviet state not on the abstract sociological plane but on the plane of concrete political tasks. Let us concede for the moment that the bureaucracy is a new 'class' and that the present regime in the USSR is a special system of class exploitation. What new political conclusions follow for us from these definitions? The Fourth International long ago recognized the necessity of overthrowing the bureaucracy by means of a revolutionary uprising of the toilers. Nothing else is proposed or can be proposed by those who proclaim the bureaucracy to be an exploiting 'class.' The goal to be attained by the overthrow of the bureaucracy is the reestablishment of the rule of the soviets, expelling from them the present bureaucracy. Nothing different can be proposed or is proposed by the leftist critics. It is the task of the regenerated soviets to collaborate with the world revolution and building of a socialist society. The overthrow of the bureaucracy therefore presupposes the preservation of state property and of planned economy. Herein is the nub of the whole problem.

"Needless to say, the distribution of productive forces among the various branches of economy and generally the entire content of the plan will be drastically changed when this plan is determined by the interests not of the bureaucracy but of the producers themselves. But inasmuch as the question of overthrowing the parasitic oligarchy still remains linked with that of preserving the national-

ized (state) property, we called the future revolution political. Certain of our critics (Ciliga, Bruno and others) want, come what may, to call the future revolution social. Let us grant this definition. What does it alter in essence? To those tasks of the revolution which we have enumerated it adds nothing whatsoever.

"Our critics as a rule take the facts as we long ago established them. They add absolutely nothing essential to the appraisal either of the position of the bureaucracy and the toilers, or of the role of the Kremlin on the international arena. In all these spheres, not only do they fail to challenge our analysis, but on the contrary they base themselves completely upon it and even restrict themselves entirely to it. The sole accusation they bring against us is that we do not draw the necessary 'conclusions.' Upon analysis it turns out, however, that these conclusions are of a purely terminological character. Our critics refuse to call the degenerated workers' state -- a workers' state. They demand that the totalitarian bureaucracy be called a ruling class. The revolution against this bureaucracy they propose to consider not political but social. Were we to make them these terminological concessions, we would place our critics in a very difficult position, inasmuch as they themselves would not know what to do with their purely verbal victory.

"It would therefore be a piece of monstrous nonsense to split with comrades who on the question of the sociological nature of the USSR have an opinion different from ours, insofar as they solidarize with us in regard to the political tasks." ("The USSR in War," September 25, 1939.) [See Leon Trotsky, In Defense of Marxism, Pioneer Publishers, New York. pp. 4-5.]

With Trotsky it was not a matter of abstract speculation, or even of innovation, properly speaking. In the course of the struggle against rising Stalinism in 1926-27, the Left Opposition was made up not only of a bloc between Trotsky's faction and Zinoviev's faction. The faction of so-called democratic centralism (the "Decemists" of V. Smirnov, Sapronov, etc.), who denied that the Soviet state was a workers' state, signed the platform of the Left Opposition submitted at the fifteenth congress. In the case of the young Polish revolutionists, now imprisoned, we must take into account the fact that the bureaucracy in power has deprived them of documentary sources of the history of the Left Opposition and of the possibility of exchanging views on an international level. Thus the nearness of the "Open Letter" to the positions of our movement is infinitely more important to us than the difference in question.

In Trotsky's view, however, agreement on political tasks could not be permitted to shunt aside discussions on theoretical or even terminological differences. In the article cited above, he likewise said:

"But on the other hand, it would be blindness on our part to ignore purely theoretical and even terminological differences, because in the course of further development they may acquire

flesh and blood and lead to diametrically opposite political conclusions."

This introduction is not the place to conduct such a debate; here we will make only a few brief observations. Modzelewski's and Kuron's theoretical generalization is based on a real fact -- the omnipotence of the central political bureaucracy in states like Poland. But this omnipotence does not make it a collective owner. The authors of the "Open Letter" recognize that in these countries there is no market in the means of production (outside of the labor power of the workers), the bureaucracy does not itself buy the means of production which it disposes of as it wishes. It disposes of them -- the term is an excellent one. State property and planning are not sufficient to characterize a society as socialist, but neither do they convert such a restricted group as a central political bureaucracy into the owner of the means of production in a period when, for specific passing reasons, it disposes of them almost without control. In our opinion, Modzelewski and Kuron fall into a confusion similar to that, *mutatis mutandis*, of the theoreticians who present the managers of monopoly capitalism as a class opposed to the stockholders. The management function is dissociated from that of ownership, it is not suppressed. The managers are capitalists quite as much as the stockholders. Analogously the central political bureaucracy cannot be opposed socially to the technicians. In the Soviet Union and in the East European states, it should likewise be noted that the technicians do not call for any profound political overturn, for any social rearrangement; their program calls for an adjustment of the economy to increase their benefits and guarantee their status. From Stalin, the most omnipotent of the "political bureaucrats," to Kosygin, an eminent technician, there has been no break in continuity.

In their document, Modzelewski and Kuron declare that the regime of the central political bureaucracy was "objectively useful" for a certain period when Poland, following the war, began economic construction, but that in less than ten years it became pernicious to the development of the productive forces, the interests of the political bureaucracy being contrary to those of the immense majority of the population. History has never provided an example of a ruling class becoming a brake or an obstacle to the development of the productive forces within a few years. What is involved is a social layer brought to power under exceptional circumstances and exercising because of this an economic and political dictatorship that has no historical legitimacy and whose temporary "utility" is very questionable.

\* \* \*

As we were writing these lines, we learned that Ludwik Hass had been freed at the end of August or beginning of September. But the others are still in prison.

The arrests and sentences were strongly resented among the Polish intellectuals and university youth. Foreign correspondents

in Warsaw have noted this. At Modzelewski's and Kuron's trial, some eminent figures, the physicist Infeld, the philosopher Kolakowski, the critic Slonimski and others served as character witnesses for the defendants.

Outside of Poland, one of the first protests came from the Vietnam Day Committee at the University of California in Berkeley. These youth who stand in the front line of the struggle in the United States against the imperialist aggression in Vietnam sent a protest:

"We the undersigned, who have protested and will continue to protest violations of freedom in our own country, and who are engaged even now in defending the civil liberties of American dissidents such as the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs and others who have come under government attack, are appalled that Polish citizens Hass, Modzelewski, Smiech, Badowski and Kuron have been sentenced to imprisonment for the exercise of political rights which we regard as elementary. We protest this repression of freedom. We demand that the defendants be released and that their political rights, including their rights to distribute literature of protest and organize political opposition, be affirmed."

We quote from a letter of protest sent by Isaac Deutscher April 24 to Gomulka and the Central Committee of the Polish party:

"You have not, as far as I know, jailed and put in chains any of your all too numerous and virulent anti-Communist opponents; and you deserve credit for the moderation with which you treat them. But why do you deny such treatment to your critics on the Left? Hass, Modzelewski and their friends have been brought to the Courtrooms hand-cuffed and under heavy guards. Eye-witness accounts say that they raised their chained fists in the old Communist salute and sang the Internationale. This detail speaks eloquently about their political characters and loyalties. How many of your dignitaries, Wladyslaw Gomulka, would nowadays intone the Internationale of their own free will and choice?"

The political, intellectual and moral courage of these prisoners measures up to the best revolutionary tradition, measures up to those victims of Stalin whom they claim as their own -- the old Polish Communist party formed by Rosa Luxemburg and the Soviet Left Opposition organized by Leon Trotsky. The publication of this pamphlet is for us more than a task of providing political information; it is above all an appeal for international solidarity to help win their freedom.

September 24, 1966