

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. 5, No. 10

March 10, 1967

In this issue

	<u>Page</u>
Johnson Again Escalates His War	249
In Response to Barbara Beidler	251
"Rectification Campaign" Curbs "Cultural Revolution" -- by Joseph Hansen	252
Hugo Blanco Case:	
March in London for Hugo Blanco -- by C. Van Gelderen	255
Argentine Meat Packers Local Appeals for Hugo Blanco	255
An Appeal for Hugo Blanco from Detroit -- by Neil Bronson	256
"If We Would Prevent More Vietnams..." -- Sidney Lens	256
Chicago Latin-American Group Solidarizes with Hugo Blanco	257
Illinois CP Expresses Solidarity with Hugo Blanco	257
Interview with Juana Pereyra on Hugo Blanco and Tupac Amaru Cases	258
Swiss March Hails American Opponents to War in Vietnam	259
The Case of Chou Yang -- by George Novack	260
The Meaning of the Shanghai Events -- by Pierre Frank	263
Ho Chi Minh, Nguyen Huu Tho Mourn Death of A.J. Muste	266
Johnson Opens Campaign to Correct Image Trouble	266
Another Blow to the Warren Report -- by Arthur Maglin	267
Guerrilla Resurgence Alarms Philippine Government	268
Venezuelan Guerrilla Fighters Reject CP Policy -- by Guillermo Bonilla	269
"La Era de la Revolución Permanente"	270
Asturian Miners End "Sit-In"	270
Bosch Admits U.S. Is Running Dominican Republic	271
The Tightening Grip of U.S. Imperialism in Guyana	272

JOHNSON AGAIN ESCALATES HIS WAR

In his February 13 message to Pope Paul VI, President Ho Chi Minh stated the terms for a settlement of the conflict in Vietnam as follows: "The U.S. imperialists must put an end to their aggression in Vietnam, end unconditionally and definitively the bombing and all other acts of war against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, withdraw from South Vietnam all American and satellite troops, recognize the South Vietnam National Liberation Front and let the Vietnamese people themselves settle their own affairs."

Hanoi's representative in Paris, Mai Van Bo, explained February 22 that Ho Chi Minh had merely repeated the four conditions required to bring peace and that the opening of peace talks was another matter. On this, the government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam had made an important concession, Mai Van Bo declared. He again called attention to the declaration made by Foreign Minister Nguyen Duy Trinh to the Australian correspondent Wilfred Burchett in late January that talks would be possible if the bombing were to stop.

Previously Hanoi's position had been that if the Johnson administration stopped the bombing unconditionally, then this new fact would be studied. If Washington next took the step of proposing to negotiate, this too would be studied.

The concession made by Hanoi was evidently at the bottom of the recent flurry of speculation about the possibility of "negotiations." It was this concession, apparently, which Kosygin brought to Prime Minister Wilson in the hope that the British government would utilize its "special relations" with Johnson to persuade him to seize the opening.

Johnson's reply was given February 27 when U.S. planes began sowing mines in the rivers of north Vietnam. And at a press conference the same day, Johnson said he had ordered three new kinds of military action. These included mining the rivers, naval shelling of Vietnamese positions and long-range artillery fire into north Vietnam.

This "far-reaching" (the term used by Johnson) intensification of the war set off a storm of protest in the U.S. and throughout the world. The denunciations hinged, in general, on the obvious hypocrisy of the Johnson administration in claiming to be seeking peace talks in which all that was required from Hanoi was the "slightest signal" in this direction to bring a halt to the bombing. More than a slight signal had been given -- with the result that now Johnson was praising the bombing because it tied down as many as 500,000 persons in north Vietnam to repair the continual damage inflicted on the country!

Premier Pham Van Dong told a French reporter March 1 that Johnson had torpedoed the hope for talks by again escalating the war. The U.S. aggressors, he said, "are continuing their escalations, thus defying public opinion and the universal conscience of the peoples." He added that life had again con-

firmed the validity of the four-point position of his government. Nguyen Van Tien, speaking for the Central Committee of the National Liberation Front, said that no choice was left but to "struggle until final victory." "We appeal to all our friends to help us even more."

As to why Johnson had decided to expand the war once more, when it appeared that Hanoi was prepared to go along with the recommendations of people like Kosygin and Wilson, the mystery appeared most impenetrable to those who place the highest hopes in the line of "peaceful coexistence"; i.e., collaborating with the imperialists and appealing to them to listen to reason.

From the very beginning, Washington has moved ahead in Vietnam cautiously testing the ground for resistance. If either Moscow or Peking or the two of them together should engage in a serious countermove, then the Washington strategists were prepared to call a halt and even back down. But no countermove has been forthcoming up to now.

Instead, the conflict between Moscow and Peking has grown sharper. Washington reads this as a success. Mao's rejection of a united front with the Soviet Union is taken as a signal that it is safe to proceed. Finally, the "cultural revolution" in China is obviously not considered by Washington to represent a new upsurge of the world revolution. Instead it is judged to be evidence of unexpected weakness and disarray. The Johnson gang



PHAM VAN DONG

no doubt view the disruptive factionalism in China as a victory for the policy of escalating the war -- a victory for the line of the war hawks. In any case it is taken as confirmation of the view that Peking is for the present incapable of mounting a serious countermove. Hence the conclusion that Johnson can get away with a still bigger war.

The biggest single unknown is the American people. Their impatience with Johnson's war on the Asian mainland is mounting. A great historic responsibility now lies with the antiwar movement in converting this feeling into the form of effective action.

IN RESPONSE TO BARBARA BEIDLER

A poem by 12-year-old Barbara Beidler, "Afterthoughts on Napalm Drop on Jungle Villages Near Haiphong," was so irritating to the Pentagon that it took reprisals against the Sunday School magazine Venture which published it. [See World Outlook February 24, p.206.] In north Vietnam, the poem met with a different response. The well-known Vietnamese poet Huy Can, who is vice-president of the Committee for Child Welfare and vice-minister of Culture of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, was so moved that he replied with a poem. The following is a free translation into English offered by the Vietnam News Agency, published in Rangoon:

Truth Blazes Even in Little Children's Hearts

Dedicated to Barbara Beidler,
12-year-old American school girl.

Little Barbara,
Across the Ocean,
Your skin a different colour,
But you clearly hear,
The screams,
Of children near Haiphong,
Burnt to death by U.S. bombs,
Scraps of their clothing flying in the sky.

You are just twelve years old,
But you speak up the conscience,
Of mankind shocked,
By each rain of bombs.

America, America,
Do you hear the screams
Of thousands of children,
Charred by the golden fire?
Golden fire of napalm,
Golden fire of dollars,
Like a putrefying cancer,
That burns and eats away both flesh and blood,
Like the pus of a gangrene,
That corrupts the bones and marrow,
Sticks to the body of America,
Creeping into her blood and soul.

America, do you feel,
Your flesh and skin,
And your conscience burnt,
To death by American bombs?

Little Barbara,
Your poem kindles a fire,
That scorches ghosts and devils,
They are confused, panic-stricken.
They ban your poem,
But how can they ban,
The truth that blazes,
Even in little children's hearts!

February 18, 1967

Huy Can

"RECTIFICATION CAMPAIGN" CURBS "CULTURAL REVOLUTION"

By Joseph Hansen

A new phase has opened in the "cultural revolution" in China. After utilizing the army to take over authority in certain areas or to play the role of arbiter among the contending factions, including diverse tendencies within the Maoist group itself, the Mao-Lin Piao group is now trying to mitigate the most damaging consequences.

The "rectification campaign," now in full swing, aims at curbing, restraining and subduing the forces set in motion by Mao's appeals to the masses. These forces, were they to be permitted free play, would end in a powerful mass upsurge that would shatter all sectors of the bureaucracy and initiate a political revolution that would put the establishment of a soviet form of government on the agenda.

Before examining the "rectification campaign," it should be clearly understood how important the army has become in the struggle over political power.

The army has evidently been groomed by the Mao-Lin Piao faction for this new role for some time. In retrospect this seems to have been the main significance of some of the staff changes in past years and such measures as the abolition of ranks and other shifts away from the army model set up by Stalin and maintained by his heirs in the Soviet Union. In the current crisis, a long, detailed editorial in the January 1 issue of the Liberation Army Daily, outlining the "general principle" for Chinese army work in 1967, signaled the latest turn although it was little noted abroad at the time.

Heavy stress was placed in the editorial on the need to "firmly apply the spirit of the Eleventh Plenary Session of the Eighth Party Central Committee." This was the meeting last August which issued the Sixteen Points and other documents giving great fanfare to the "cultural revolution." The army, declares the editorial, is to "actively participate in and defend the great proletarian cultural revolution." In the list of specific points for army work, the "great proletarian cultural revolution" is placed first. "This is the foundation for the whole year's work." The army is told: "Chairman Mao teaches us to concern ourselves with the affairs of the state and to carry the great proletarian cultural revolution through to the end."

This could, of course, be interpreted to refer only to the ideological level. But Mao had already issued his appeals to the ranks to "take power" and the struggle was assuming a tense and even violent tone in some areas such as Shanghai. The aim of the editorial was propagandistic preparation for something more concrete.

On January 14 the Liberation Army Daily carried another editorial. Its theme, like the editorial two weeks before, was to carry the cultural revolution through to the end. There were some important additions, however. It was reported that "Our great leader Chairman Mao himself...has called on the party, the government, the army and the people throughout the country to learn from the experience of the Shanghai revolutionary rebel groups, to join together in action and defeat the new counter-attacks of the bourgeois reactionary line so that the great proletarian cultural revolution will advance along the proletarian revolutionary line represented by Chairman Mao. Chairman Mao's great call has pushed the great proletarian cultural revolution into a new stage."

In the army itself, it was reported, there was need for a cultural revolution and this should be conducted "with particular firmness." "Not a trace of vacillation can be permitted under the pretext of special conditions of the army." It was explained that "The presence of revisionists in the army would be especially dangerous." And to facilitate this work, the Military Commission had reorganized the All-Army Cultural Revolution Group "and a new one has come into being." The new committee was a result of "the struggle in our army between the two lines..."

On January 17 Hsinhua reported that meetings and discussions were being held in many different units throughout China and the response was most encouraging. The army men were taking pledges "to stand squarely behind the proletarian revolutionaries in their struggle to crush economism, capture the bastions in which counter-revolutionary revisionism has entrenched itself and establish new revolutionary order."

This campaign swelled in volume, reaching a high pitch in a January 25 editorial in the Liberation Army Daily. A handful of "bourgeois representatives," it was claimed, had "wormed their way into the party," had "usurped the power of leadership in some places and departments, practised the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, and tried in every way to pull socialist China to capitalism."

The editorial proclaimed: "It is entirely justified for the proletarian revolutionary rebels to rise and seize power from them..." In this struggle, the army "must firmly stand on the side of the proletarian revolutionary line represented by Chairman Mao... We must follow Chairman Mao's teaching and enthusiastically, unequivocally and wholeheartedly support the proletarian revolutionary rebels in rising to seize power. Even though they may be just a minority temporarily, we must support them without the slightest hesitation." (Emphasis added.)

"...it is not possible for the People's Liberation Army to refrain from intervening," the editorial continued. Citing Mao's rather famous aphorism, it spelled things out still more plainly:

"'Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun.' The political power of the proletariat seized by the People's Army with the gun has to be defended by the People's Army with the gun, too. Active reactionaries and counter-revolutionary organisations sabotaging the great proletarian cultural revolution must be resolutely suppressed and the dictatorship of the proletariat practised over them."

On January 26 a number of Hsinhua dispatches from Peking reported the active involvement of troops in various cities acting under a "new call" issued by Mao himself. We have been unable to locate the text of this call in the official English-language material. Hsinhua described it in a January 28 Peking dispatch as "the latest call of Chairman Mao Tse-tung"; and it quoted "leading members" of the army in Shansi as saying at a rally: "Chairman Mao's latest instruction is a general mobilisation order to the entire army and people of China."

The Tokyo newspaper Asahi reported February 4 that its Peking correspondent had read wall bulletins issued by the Committee of the Military Academy of the Cultural Revolution, according to which Mao Tse-tung had appealed to the army to intervene. The bulletins reported that he had made a long political declaration January 27 before the party's Military Commission. The wall bulletins reported a few highlights of the speech:

"When the Cultural Revolution began, the army did not participate in the movement but was morally involved in it. The struggle between the two lines is now very sharp and the army has been led to intervene in it. Since it has joined the movement, it must resolutely support the left elements.

"Many old leaders do not understand the Cultural Revolution. For the most part they are living in their past glory but they must throw themselves into the movement and reform themselves. They must win a new glory, not vacillating and remaining on the side of the left. Under the direction of the latter they can carry out good work.

"With regard to the seizure of power, articles in our newspapers dwell on the necessity of seizing power from those who followed or supported the bourgeois road. It is necessary to take power and only then discuss the question of where those who held it stood. A definitive judgment can be made concerning them only in the final phase of the movement. On taking power it is necessary to get in touch with the State Council in order to obtain its approval."

The latter sentence would indicate that Mao already had in mind the subsequent phase of "rectification." This explains the glaring contradiction between the proclamation, "It is entirely justified for the proletarian revolutionary rebels to rise and seize power," and the stricture, "On taking power it is necessary to get in touch with the State Council in order to obtain its approval."

If Mao went into the question of how the State Council was to determine which groups should receive the official stamp of approval, it was not indicated in the account. The question of program and the programmatic differences distinguishing the various tendencies is one of the more obscure aspects of the "cultural revolution."

For some weeks, the army, in combination with the "revolutionary rebels," did its work in ousting, suppressing, disciplining or intimidating officials thought to be in league with or in sympathy with the faction supposed to be in opposition to "Mao's thought." Too little information is available, however, to determine the extent, the depth and the final outcome of the struggle in many areas. It is also difficult to say to what degree the army itself proved to be uncertain or internally divided.

The signal for the "rectification" campaign came in a lengthy editorial in Red Flag (issue No. 3, reported January 31). The tip-off came in the admonition to the "revolutionary rebels" that "Everyone, in the course of the struggle to seize power and after coming to power, has to undergo new tests." The hope was expressed that the "revolutionary path breakers" would pass these tests, "mature politically," always be loyal to the

proletariat and Chairman Mao and not "just flash across the stage of history."

Most interesting of all was the warning on handling "leading cadres" who have a long record in the party. "To oppose, exclude and overthrow all indiscriminately runs counter to the class viewpoint of Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung's thought....Cadres who have made errors should be treated correctly and should not be overthrown indiscriminately."

The signal had apparently been awaited. A Hsinhua dispatch February 1 reported nationwide acclaim. For instance: "In Peking, representatives of the Workers' Revolutionary Rebel Headquarters and thirty odd other revolutionary mass organisations were holding a conference when the editorial was announced over the radio. Bubbling over with enthusiasm they called it a great victory for Mao Tse-tung's thought...They immediately issued an 'urgent message' to all revolutionary rebels in the capital..." In Tientsin the leading nucleus of the "revolutionary rebels...held a meeting to consider how to deal with leading party cadres." There was unanimous agreement that many of them "belonged to the proletariat," it was agreed to work with them "side by side" and "let them take part in the leadership..."

Within ten days the formula had become sloganized into the "three-way combination" composed of "representatives of genuine proletarian revolutionaries of revolutionary mass organisations, representatives of the Chinese People's Liberation Army...and revolutionary leading cadres in the party and government organisations." The army, of course, constitutes the "firm and staunch cornerstone" of the combination.

Another theme that soon received increasing prominence was to "strengthen the sense of organisation and discipline; oppose disregard of organisational discipline and ultra-democracy."

In a summary of reference material for studying a reprint of Mao's article, "On Correcting Mistaken Ideas in the Party," the editors of the Liberation Army Daily said on February 13: "The purpose of the great proletarian cultural revolution is, in the final analysis, to promote Mao Tse-tung's thought effectively."

Still another note was sounded February 15 when the People's Daily reprinted an article written by the Tsingtao Revolutionary Rebel Committee, a much-extolled model group. The article raised a problem. What to do about those revolutionary rebels who broadcast "the nonsense that cadres are nonrevolutionaries and that all leading cadres are guilty of suppressing the revolution"?

Here is the answer: "The main yardstick for judging whether or not a person is a revolutionary, is the degree of his support for Chairman Mao, for Mao Tse-tung's thought and for Chairman Mao's revolutionary line."

In Shansi, another model for the country to follow, the army found it necessary to intervene in an educational way. "...there were some among the revolutionary rebels," reports a February 18 Hsinhua dispatch, "who failed to act strictly according to Chairman Mao's policy concerning cadres. They were suspicious of anybody in authority and therefore prevented the revolutionary leading cadres from playing their role."

The several-times purged Shanghai Wen Hui Pao went even further in an editorial that was reprinted in the February 20 People's Daily. "The mass of government cadres, especially leading cadres, are more experienced in struggle and have greater political maturity and organizational ability. If they rise up and rebel, the revolutionary rebels should welcome them enthusiastically and give them active support."

And on February 20 Hsinhua reported that the Tsingtao City Revolutionary Rebel Committee "recently held a meeting to launch a rectification campaign..." This campaign is to be "among the revolutionary rebel organisations in the city." These, "after they had achieved some successes and successes" showed "signs of conceit and self-satisfaction and the erroneous ideas of the 'small group' mentality...especially among a number of their leading members."

The new turn was made official in the usual way -- an extensive editorial, "Cadres Must Be Treated Correctly," in Red Flag. Hsinhua provided a translation of the full text of this important editorial in a February 23 Peking dispatch.

The treatment of the leading cadres is now presented as a "key question." While it is true that a "handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists" did usurp power "in some places or some departments," still "it must also be soberly recognized that most of the cadres are good..." Moreover, in view of how few revisionists there really are, it would be "very dangerous if the scope of the attack were erroneously expanded and the spearhead of the struggle were directed against the broad section of cadres."

[To be continued.]

MARCH IN LONDON FOR HUGO BLANCO

By C. Van Gelderen

Under the auspices of the newly formed Committee for Solidarity with the Victims of Repression in Peru, about 100 Londoners took part in a march to the Peruvian embassy on Sunday, February 19. Marchers carried banners demanding the release of Hugo Blanco, imprisoned leader of the Peruvian peasants, now threatened with the death penalty; an amnesty for all political prisoners in Peru; and an end to the police and military oppression of the labour movement in that country.

The march was preceded by a well-attended meeting at Marble Arch with Bill Molloy, Labour MP for Ealing North, as the main speaker. His fiery Welsh oratory drew a vivid picture of the servile conditions under which the peasants of Peru were living and toiling. He described the achievements of Hugo Blanco and his comrades in organising the peasants and how this won for them the hatred of the feudal ruling class. It was because Hugo Blanco taught the people to fight for themselves that he was now in prison and the prosecution was demanding the death penalty.

The marchers, with their banners, attracted a good deal of attention. Casual passers-by wanted to know "Who is Hugo Blanco?" Some joined the march as it proceeded along Park Lane and Knightsbridge to the embassy in Sloane Street. Signatures were readily obtained for a petition to be handed in to the ambassador and to be sent to the president of Peru.

Bill Molloy and Mrs. Harold Laski led the deputation but there was no one in the embassy to receive it. Bill Molloy, in a short address, explained that, rather than simply push the petition through the letter box, he would personally arrange a definite meeting with the ambassador to present it formally.

ARGENTINE MEAT PACKERS LOCAL APPEALS FOR HUGO BLANCO

[The following appeal in behalf of Hugo Blanco was sent by the Armour and Swift Berisso local of the Workers and Employees Union of the Meat Industry (Obreros y Empleados de la Industria de la Carne) in Argentina. This was the local in which Hugo Blanco became known as an outstanding activist before he returned to Peru to undertake organizational work among the peasants. Although many new members of the local never met Hugo Blanco, they feel solidarity with him as a comrade in the class struggle.

[The letter was published in the February 27 issue of the Buenos Aires weekly La Verdad. The translation is by World Outlook.]

* * *

Berisso, February 2, 1967

To His Excellency Señor Presidente
of the Republic of Peru
Arquitect Fernando Belaúnde Terry

After duly weighing the matter, the Sindicato de Obreros y Empleados de la Carne "Armour-Swift" of Berisso, Republic of Argentina, appeals to you to intercede with your powers of office in behalf of our fellow worker Hugo Blanco, who was part of our working class in the Republic of Argentina, and who has been condemned in your country to the death penalty.* It is not our intention in making this petition for clemency in behalf of Comrade Blanco to interfere in the affairs of a sister nation; we are doing it as Christians and in accordance with the noblest of human feelings.

We leave aside completely the circumstances or reasons which might have led to this situation, since we hold that everyone, whether an individual or a people, must solve their own problems.

Because of all this we are sure that the appeals for clemency being sent you will

* The letter is in error on this point. A decision has not yet been handed down by the Supreme Council of Military Justice in either Hugo Blanco's appeal against the harshness of the 25-year sentence or the prosecution's demand that it be superseded by the death penalty. -- W.O.]

be heard.

Thanking you in advance for the attention you may extend to our appeal, we utilize the opportunity to reiterate our respect.

Abel Jaca
Organizational Secretary

Estanislao Kowalczuk
Interunion Secretary

AN APPEAL FOR HUGO BLANCO FROM DETROIT

By Neil Bronson

Detroit

Some 125 students and Detroit residents attended a meeting here February 23 which went on record demanding the end of the death threat against Peruvian peasant leader Hugo Blanco and his release from prison.

Sponsored by the Wayne State University Artists' Society and the U.S. Committee for Justice for Latin American Political Prisoners, the benefit was to include readings by new poets from Latin America; a talk by Young Socialist Alliance member Jan Garrett on the revolutionary activity, arrest and trial of Blanco; and a showing of a film on the Venezuelan guerrilla movement.

Because of weather conditions, Argentine poets Oscar Mascotta and Halma Perry, and Peruvian poet Leandro Katz, who had been scheduled, were unable to get to Detroit. Local poet Allen Van Newkirk, of the Artists' Society, read excerpts from the work of Javier Heraud, a young guerrilla fighter killed in Peru a few years ago.

Garrett outlined Hugo Blanco's experiences in Argentina and in Peru, and described the development of the peasant union movement organized by Blanco; he discussed the illegal character of the military trial of the young leader and the impressive international campaign to save Blanco's life.

He read the moving letters of Hector Bejar and Jacqueline Lobatón, Peruvian militants involved in the campaign for Hugo's life, about the encouraging effect of the international defense.

The meeting unanimously decided to address an appeal to Fernando Belaúnde Terry, the president of Peru, in behalf of Hugo Blanco. The text of the appeal was as follows:

"We, 125 members of the Wayne State University community in Detroit, Michigan, meeting tonight in support of peasant leader Hugo Blanco, demand the removal of the death threat against him. Freedom for Hugo Blanco!"

A copy of the message was sent to Hugo Blanco's attorney, Dr. Alfredo Battilana.

A Peruvian student now studying law in the U.S., who had known Hugo in his early youth, attended the meeting and afterwards gave his hearty thanks for the Detroit solidarity meeting.

The meeting received favorable advance publicity in the college press. The Fifth Estate carried a background story on the case and published a drawing of Hugo Blanco.

"IF WE WOULD PREVENT MORE VIETNAMS ..." -- SIDNEY LENS

[The following statement by Sidney Lens, the well-known union official and writer, was sent to a meeting held in solidarity with Hugo Blanco at the Friday Night Socialist Forum in Chicago February 24.]

* * *

The crime for which Hugo Blanco has been imprisoned is that he fought to win land for landless peasants, he fought to retrieve plots that were stolen from the poor Indians in the first place.

In our topsy-turvy world this struggle for social justice is adjudged a crime, but

the robbery and exploitation by the landlord classes of Peru, aided and abetted by the American State Department, is considered "responsible" behavior. Despite all the Alliance for Progress talk of social reform and despite President Belaúnde's talk of land reform everyone knows that this is empty rhetoric.

Hugo Blanco tried to make that empty rhetoric a reality for the injured and oppressed. Far from being a criminal he has associated himself with Man's noblest ideals. I salute him and I condemn the men who have imprisoned him as the true criminals.

Peru may seem a long way off to most of us, but it is a shorter distance from Chicago to Lima than from Chicago to Saigon; and the struggle of the peasant in Peru is not much different from the struggle of the peasant in Vietnam. In both cases the myopia of American policy leads the common man, in self-defense, to take extreme measures. Hugo Blanco in Peru was an expression of that sense of desperation, just as was the resistance of the poor peasant in Vietnam to Diem, Kahn and now Ky.

If we would prevent more Vietnams it is incumbent that we defend the native leaders like Hugo Blanco who have already sacrificed so much for the cause of the common man. Blanco's incarceration is a blow to progress; his release would be an important step towards freedom and liberation for the common man not only in Peru but everywhere.

CHICAGO LATIN-AMERICAN GROUP SOLIDARIZES WITH HUGO BLANCO

[The following message from John Rossen of the Circuito Latino de Cines was sent to a meeting held in support of Hugo Blanco at the Friday Night Socialist Forum in Chicago February 24.]

* * *

Dear Friends,

The progressive Latin-Americans with whom I am in touch support fully the campaign of solidarity with Hugo Blanco, the imprisoned fighter for the rights of Peruvian peasants.

They realize fully that the fight to defend and to free Hugo Blanco is closely related to their own struggles against discrimination, for the independence of Puerto Rico and for an end to U.S. imperialist domination and exploitation of all the peoples of the hemisphere.

They are prepared to cooperate fully in any campaigns to publicize the case of Hugo Blanco and to win his release.

On their behalf I enclose a modest contribution toward the campaign.

Sincerely,
John Rossen

ILLINOIS CP EXPRESSES SOLIDARITY WITH HUGO BLANCO

[The following letter to Mary Henderson was sent by Jack Kling, state secretary of the Communist party of Illinois, to be read at a meeting held in solidarity with Hugo Blanco at the Friday Night Socialist Forum in Chicago February 24.]

* * *

Dear Miss Henderson:

Your letter to James West, inviting him as a speaker at a meeting being held on Friday, Feb. 24th, to protest the imprisonment of Hugo Blanco, leader of the Peruvian Peasant Union, was turned over to me to be answered.

We are really very sorry to have to inform you that because Mr. West has another commitment, he will be unable to attend this meeting. We are also sorry that at this writing we are unable to get a speaker to replace Mr. West.

However, in behalf of James West and of the Communist Party of Illinois, we join with you to protest the shameful imprisonment of Hugo Blanco.

The continued imprisonment for the past three years of Hugo Blanco and his co-workers represents not only a blow to the heroic Peruvian Peasant Union and to the heroic peoples of Peru who are struggling for democracy, freedom and independence, but also a blow for all democratic and freedom-loving people the world over.

Americans must raise their voices in solidarity with the peoples of Latin America and South America, in condemning the continued imprisonment of Hugo Blanco and his co-workers.

Sincerely yours,

Jack Kling

State Secy. Communist Party of Ill.

INTERVIEW WITH JUANA PEREYRA ON HUGO BLANCO AND TUPAC AMARU CASES

[While in Montevideo, Uruguay, last December in connection with the campaign to win the release of Hugo Blanco, Juana Pereyra was asked to grant an interview to the weekly newspaper Epoca about her husband, Daniel Pereyra, who has been held in prison in Lima, Peru, since 1962. He and a number of his comrades belonging to the "Tupac Amaru" group, were charged with holding up a bank to obtain funds for guerrilla activities; but their trial did not open until last August, only to be postponed because of its relationship with the Hugo Blanco trial being staged then in Tacna. (See World Outlook September 9, 1966, p.11.)

[In an editorial note, Epoca states that the prosecution is demanding a seven-year sentence for Daniel Pereyra. An Argentine Trotskyist, "who has nothing to do with the Posadas sector," Pereyra was not seeking money for himself, declares the editor. The Tupac Amaru group were trying to get funds to help the peasants in the Cuzco area, who were fighting for their freedom under the leadership of Hugo Blanco.

[Juana Pereyra's account of this case as well as Hugo Blanco's case appeared in the December 17, 1966, issue of Epoca. The translation is by World Outlook.]

* * *

Pereyra and his comrades have been prisoners in "El Sexto," in Lima, for five years. The judges do everything to present them as "common criminals." However, in a book on the guerrilla fighters published by the Ministry of War itself, Pereyra is described as an Argentine Trotskyist militant, proofs are cited of his activities as a member of the metal workers union and his running for office in Avellaneda as a candidate of the Partido Socialista Revolucionario Nacional. When the police arrested him, they held him completely incommunicado for fifty-five days and submitted him to brutal torture.

At present it is possible to visit him. But his situation, so far as his trial is concerned, has not changed.

When the prosecution demanded the death penalty for Hugo Blanco, Pereyra and his comrades conducted a hunger strike demanding that his life be spared.

Mrs. Pereyra explained Hugo Blanco's struggle, how he organized the Federación de Campesinos in the valley of La Convención and Iares with the aim of obtaining a genuine agrarian reform. In these zones, he built schools, health centers, impelled respect for the peasants who were being treated like slaves by the "gamonales" (Peruvian landlords), and organized an armed defense for the peasantry.

When Hugo Blanco was arrested, they kept him locked up in the Arequipa prison, holding him completely incommunicado. They did not allow anyone to visit him. They kept him isolated from the other prisoners and for three years they did not permit him to have books or newspapers. During this time he went on ten hunger strikes in protest against the conditions inflicted on him.

Three and a half years after his arrest, they began his trial, holding it in neither Arequipa nor Cuzco as was required legally. They held the trial in the most distant town in Peru -- Tacna.

The trial, Mrs. Pereyra explained firmly, was illegal. First, because the Tribunal acted as both prosecution and judge. Second, they denied the prisoners the right to call witnesses. In addition, they maneuvered to deprive Hugo Blanco of the attorney he designated and to substitute one named by the police. This oligarchical measure was defeated, inasmuch as Blanco's attorney, after much effort, succeeded in having his name put on the list of lawyers in the locality and thus being able to practice in Tacna.

During the trial, the people in Tacna expressed their solidarity with Hugo Blanco and his comrades. They turned the tables in the courtroom of the Tribunal and the trial they sought to hold for Blanco became in reality a trial of the reaction.

All the peasants, when it came their turn, acknowledged Hugo Blanco as their leader. "Thanks to Hugo Blanco we learned what it is to eat"; "we learned that we were human beings."

The prosecution demanded twenty-five years in prison. The consulting judge advised the death penalty. The prisoner was sentenced to twenty-five years.

Hugo Blanco, who had refused to recognize the Tribunal due to its representing the oligarchy and therefore lacking the right to judge a representative of the people, responded to the threat of a death penalty by saying it should be carried out by the Tribunal and "not the police, who are part of the people." At the end of the trial, he turned to the crowd filling the hall and said: "The people of Tacna and Peru have absolved me. Land or death! We will win!" The crowd expressed their feelings by shouting back: "Freedom for Hugo Blanco. Land or death! We will win!"

In accordance with Peruvian military justice, every trial is passed on to the Supreme Council of Military Justice. There the prosecution demanded that the death penalty be applied, alleging premeditated murder.

In the face of this demand, a movement arose in Peru for the release of Hugo Blanco and against the death penalty.

First of all the political prisoners went on a hunger strike in El Sexto, El Frontón, San Quintín and the Guardia Republicana. The peasants found guilty at the same time as he was, asked that they too be given the death sentence if it was applied to Hugo Blanco.

The entire left in the country rallied behind the Committee for the Defense of Human Rights which is battling to save Hugo Blanco's life. The committee organized a meeting in the Plaza San Martín in Lima at which more than 20,000 persons turned out. Representatives of the Peruvian peasants, workers and students spoke.

The movement headed by Hugo Blanco urges the organization of defense committees throughout Latin America. It is confident that one will be organized in Uruguay, too. Petitions in behalf of Hugo Blanco have been sent to the Supreme Council of Military Justice from the most distant parts of the world: Cuba, the United States, Belgium, Mexico, France, Argentina, the CGT in Italy, Japan, Iran, the USSR.

The voice of the people is different from that of the "Tribunal." Their voice is the voice of the future.

SWISS MARCH HAILS AMERICAN OPPONENTS TO WAR IN VIETNAM

Zurich

Anger over the U.S. role in Vietnam continues to mount in Switzerland. On February 4 this city saw the biggest demonstration yet staged, some 1,200 responding to the appeal of the sponsoring group, an ad hoc committee composed of youths of various political tendencies.

A contingent of about 300 Spanish workers participated in the march. Two well-known trade-union leaders spoke.

A proposed letter to be sent to the U.S. ambassador was read at the meeting. The letter condemned the "brutal intervention of the leading Western power in the internal affairs of the Vietnamese people" and expressed "heartfelt solidarity with the American opposition."

The letter met with enthusiastic approval.

An Example of Maoist Double-Dealing

THE CASE OF CHOU YANG

By George Novack

The first issue of the journal Red Flag for 1967 carried an article by Yao Wen-yuan entitled "On the Counterrevolutionary Double-Dealer Chou Yang." Its full text was reproduced in three installments in the January 9-10-12 Hong Kong edition of the daily bulletin published by the Hsinhua News Agency.

Chou Yang is well known to anyone who has followed the intellectual and cultural activities of Chinese Communism. He was a deputy director of the propaganda department of the Central Committee of the Chinese CP, a vice-minister of culture, vice-chairman of the Federation of Literary and Art Circles and of the Chinese Writers Union. In 1956 he became an alternate member of the Central Committee.

For over twenty years Chou performed the same services for Mao Tse-tung in the fields of literature, art and philosophy as Zhdanov did for Stalin. He transmitted and interpreted Mao's directives on cultural policy and saw that they were stringently enforced. He was quoted as an authority alongside Mao himself. He has been one of the principal exponents of the official line in the Sino-Soviet dispute.

Suddenly in the summer of 1966 Chou, who had purged the ranks of China's writers and intellectuals in one campaign after another, himself became a victim of the "great proletarian cultural revolution." He was branded as "the big red umbrella covering all monsters." Since then he has been foremost among the villains whose influence had to be eradicated in literary and cultural circles. A wall poster put up in Peking February 26 named him as one of the "leaders who have followed an anti-revolutionary, revisionist literary line."

The New Year's article in Red Flag purported to be a detailed exposure of Chou's maneuvers and misdeeds. According to the prefatory note in Hsinhua, it "traces his counterrevolutionary activities over the previous sixteen years against the party, against socialism and against Mao Tse-tung's thought in the field of literature and art."

The indictment begins by stigmatizing Chou Yang as "typical of counterrevolutionary double-dealers. He consistently played double-dealing tricks to cover up his counterrevolutionary political features, tampered with history, slipped through, waved 'red flags' to oppose the red flag and carried out a variety of criminal activities."

The propaganda campaign directed against Chou depicts the struggles in the field of literature and art since the Liberation, and even before, in a simple, clear-cut fashion. Here is how it is summed up at the end of Red Flag's review. "We can see clearly the acute struggle between the two lines. One is Mao Tse-tung's line on literature and art, a red line. It is Comrade Mao Tse-tung who has personally led every major struggle, pushed the cultural revolution forward step by step and, after long preparations, started the great proletarian cultural revolution which is a stormy general onslaught against the bourgeoisie in which hundreds of millions of people are taking part and in which the old lair of Chou Yang and company has been smashed.

"The other is a black line, the antiparty, antisocialist bourgeois line on literature and art. The ringleader of this black line is precisely Chou Yang. Behind Chou Yang was the counterrevolutionary clique which plotted to usurp the leadership of the party, the army and the government and which was crushed recently."

This counterposing of two irreconcilable lines certainly "tampers with history." It thoroughly misrepresents what actually happened in the cultural policies pursued by the Chinese CP over the past thirty years by reversing Chou's role and his real relations with Mao.

Merle Goldman of the East Asian Research Center at Harvard University documents the perversion of facts in a piece on "The Fall of Chou Yang" which appeared in the July-September issue of The China Quarterly. The information he presents illustrates how crassly Mao's faction falsifies history in the one-sided polemics characteristic of the ongoing political conflict. This poses the question: if the truth can be so twisted in regard to Chou Yang, what credence can be given to charges against others of Mao's opponents which cannot be so readily checked by reference to the available record?

The China Quarterly article should be read together with the attack in Red Flag. Here are some instructive excerpts from them.

Goldman writes that "in the seventh issue of Red Flag, the party theoretical journal, published on July 1, Chou Yang was accused for the first time: 'For 24 years Chou Yang and company have consistently refused to carry out Comrade Mao Tse-tung's line on literature and art and stubbornly adhered to the bourgeois revisionist black line on literature and art.' But in reality, Chou Yang had been the most ardent advocate of Mao's cultural line since the Yen-an days when he declared, 'I put forth every effort to make myself an interpreter, propagandist, and practitioner of Mao Tse-tung's cultural ideas and policies.' At no time had he failed to live up to these words."

The first big deviation attributed to Chou goes back thirty years to 1936. He is accused of dissolving the party's front organization, the League of Left-wing Writers, and setting up in its stead the United Association of Chinese Writers, which sought to bring together writers of different political persuasions. This action was taken in accord with the turn made by the Comintern in 1935 toward the Popular Front. At the same time, in the United States for example, the John Reed Clubs were disbanded in favor of the broader League of American Writers.

In forming the new organization Chou Yang was carrying out both Comintern and party directives. The Chinese CP was then urging the Kuomintang and other parties to stop the war against it and join together against the Japanese. It was ready to suspend the class struggle for that purpose. This conciliatory move was opposed by the noted writer, Lu Hsun, and his followers who set up their own organization, the Chinese Literary Workers, along more leftist lines.

Until the cultural revolution, the official literary histories interpreted Chou's course as in accord with the party position and Lu Hsun's as a departure from it. Now, in its efforts to show that Mao never deviated from the path of class struggle, Peking contends that Chou disobeyed party orders while Lu Hsun conformed to them.

The next falsification concerns Mao's Yen-an "Talks on Art and Literature." Here is Goldman's explanation. "As with the controversy over 'Literature of National Defence,' the regime has similarly rewritten the events surrounding the presentation of Mao's 'Talks on Art and Literature.' In the summer of 1966, the regime declared that the Talks were delivered as a rebuke to the cultural line represented by Chou Yang during the united front. The Talks, given in May 1942, were used in the summer of 1966 as one of the weapons to overthrow Chou Yang. They were reprinted with great fanfare in the major newspapers and journals. Discussions on them were convened throughout the country.

"Yet, these same Talks were republished with similar fanfare in 1958 for the opposite purpose. They were used as a weapon to overthrow Chou Yang's enemies Ting Ling, Hsiao Chun and Ai Ch'ing who had supported Lu Hsun, not Chou Yang, in the conflicts of the 1930's. Originally, the Talks had been presented by Mao to chastise these writers for continuing Lu Hsun's critical tradition in Yen-an. It was by refuting the views of these associates of Lu Hsun, not the views of Chou Yang, that Mao laid the foundation for the party's policy toward writers and intellectuals. In the cheng feng movement that accompanied the presentation of the Talks, Chou Yang played an important role in denouncing these writers and imposing Mao's literary doctrine not only on intellectuals in Yen-an, but also on intellectuals in the non-Communist areas, particularly in Chung-king.

"Chou Yang would not have been one of the leaders in this drive if the Talks had been directed against him. In fact, it was his active role in pursuing this campaign that led to his ascendancy over others in carrying out the party's thought reform movement."

Chou is found guilty by Red Flag of hailing bourgeois intellectuals on June 30, 1949 as "one of the leading forces of the revolution." But he did so in conformity with the CP line. After the occupation of Peking Mao proclaimed that in the new China there was a constructive role to be played by "the petty bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie."

The Red Flag article concentrates on tracking down Chou's "conspiratorial activities" over the past sixteen years. He is made out to be an exceedingly cunning maneuverer who succeeded in "slipping through four major struggles" by retreating each time he was in danger and feigning agreement with the party and Mao's thought. However, his rascality has finally been fully exposed in the present struggle when he was "cut to the quick by the sharp sword of the great proletarian cultural revolution."

The first of these struggles took place in 1951 around the film "Life of Wu Hsun."

After Mao criticized it as an utterly abominable counterrevolutionary production which eulogized the landlords and their flunkys, Chou Yang feigned self-criticism "but secretly acted in defiance, seeking an opportunity to counterattack."

That chance came in 1954, according to Red Flag, when "following Stalin's death, the adverse trend of modern revisionism began to run wild" in China's literary and art circles. "The revisionist clique headed by Chou Yang" had to be called to order at that time by Mao for "lauding the bourgeois 'authorities' and repressing the emerging Marxist forces." Again, Chou "hastily concocted a sham self-criticism with the hope of slipping through unscathed."

The substance of Chou's crimes can be gauged from the following odd accusation. "In November 1955 Chou Yang wrote an essay entitled 'In Memory of Leaves of Grass and Don Quixote.' At that time China's rural areas were experiencing a great socialist upsurge. Comrade Mao Tse-tung called on literary and art workers to go to the countryside to take part in the fiery struggles of the masses and to write in volume about 'thousands and tens of thousands' of heroes.

"Chou Yang, in direct contravention of this, chose that moment wildly to advocate the 'lofty ethical principles' of Don Quixote, that is, bourgeois ethical principles; and his praise of the nineteenth century American bourgeois poet Walt Whitman was fulsome, urging writers to emulate Whitman as an 'example' of 'taking part in struggles.'

"Was this not open opposition to Mao Tse-tung's thought?" the writer asks. "Was this not a fierce counterattack on the world-shaking socialist revolution of the 600 million workers and peasants? Was this not encouragement to the bourgeoisie in towns and villages and right opportunists within the party firmly to resist socialist transformation and persist in taking the capitalist road?"

If praise of Cervantes or Whitman can be construed as "a fierce counterattack" on the socialist revolution, then many celebrated Marxists, starting with Marx, will have to be enrolled among the counterrevolutionaries.

"In the same way that Chou Yang was held responsible for the moderation of the united front, he was blamed for the intellectual ferment and criticisms of the party that occurred during the Hundred Flowers period," writes Goldman. "Here again, he was attacked for faithfully implementing Mao's policy. In an effort to show that it never encouraged far-ranging debate on academic subjects nor tolerated criticism, the party declared in 1966 that the Hundred Flowers policy had been introduced to oppose liberalization, not to encourage it, as Chou Yang had done. Similarly, it asserted that instead of intensifying the class struggle, Chou Yang had diluted class struggle during the Hundred Flowers period."

Chou is most vehemently denounced by Red Flag for his role in the relaxation of the intellectual and political atmosphere which followed the reverses of the Great Leap Forward and preceded the current drive against any signs of nonconformism. He is accused of fostering tendencies which led to the creation of "many Petöfi clubs of all sizes."

The Petöfi Club was the association of dissident Communist writers and intellectuals in Budapest which became the rallying center for the voicing of grievances against the Rakosi regime in the months before the outbreak of the Hungarian revolt in 1956. Although Chou was merely following out the party line, the more tolerant attitude toward intellectuals between 1961 and 1964 may have inadvertently afforded some cover for similar nuclei of dissidents who were regarded as a threat by Mao and his men. Red Flag gives no details on this point. It is content to conclude with the injunction that "we must now smash all their 'Petöfi clubs' and destroy their underground kingdoms! We must take over, thoroughly take over, the leadership of all literary and art organizations from the hands of the bourgeoisie!"

Goldman points out that Chou has become the scapegoat for the party's inability to drive all intellectuals into line and make them kowtow before Mao's thought. He believes that Chou may have been marked for disgrace, not because he resisted Mao's line for thirty years, but rather because he resisted the intrusion of Defense Minister Lin Piao and the General Political Department of the People's Liberation Army into his bureaucratic domain.

"The showdown between the Propaganda Department and Lin Piao occurred in the spring of 1966," he says. "In the past when Chou Yang clashed with other groups like those of Hu Feng and Ting Ling for power in the cultural sphere, Mao sided with Chou Yang. In this struggle between the faction to which Chou Yang belonged and Lin Piao, Mao obviously sided with Lin. The Liberation Army Daily editorial of April 18, 1966,

'Hold High the Great Red Banner of Mao's Thinking,' presented the same cultural line that Chou had helped to make literary dogma. It called for art that was more ideal than life, the creation of heroic characters, the reflection of revolutionary optimism, and the combination of revolutionary realism and revolutionary romanticism.

"But, whereas in the past Chou Yang and his group had imposed these doctrines, the Liberation Army Daily served notice that henceforth it would be Lin and his followers who would set the line in the cultural realm." In any case, the Army has since taken the cultural organizations under its wing.

Chou's downfall casts a lurid light on the recesses of Mao's regime. According to its main slogan, the cultural revolution aims to do away with "old customs and habits." If we may judge from Chou's treatment, it has certainly not broken with the old Stalinist custom of falsifying the past for purposes of factional warfare. Here, at least, anything goes.

Chou Yang is being execrated for "his double-dealing tricks." There are, as has been indicated, no lack of such tricks involved in his case. But, on the record, it is Mao and the men still in his service who are guilty of them.

THE MEANING OF THE SHANGHAI EVENTS

By Pierre Frank

[The following article has been translated by World Outlook from the February issue of La Quatrième Internationale published in Paris by the Parti Communiste Internationaliste, French section of the Fourth International.]

* * *

In our October 1966 issue we said with regard to the "great cultural revolution" in China that "unexpected turns," "surprises," were still possible and that in reaching certain conclusions, we kept an open mind. At the time it had been suggested to the Red Guards that they go backhome, the demonstrations, it appeared, would not resume until spring. But the Red Guards did not disperse, mass demonstrations occurred and the scope of things broadened extraordinarily.

For many reasons it is difficult, most certainly, to find one's way in all this. All the Chinese who make public pronouncements -- even when they argue among themselves and violently denounce each other -- invoke "Mao's thought." Others, among the accused, are not permitted to speak; moreover, if they could speak, it is probable that they too would invoke "Mao's thought." This "thought," the "little red book," is a kind of talisman which everyone claims to abide by. We are offered a ritualistic formula, without much content, after which each one introduces his own program. The situation is not clarified by the fact that the foreign correspondents relay official news that has been manipulated by Mao's men, send reports about bulletins consisting of propaganda in which the truth is butchered by everyone and in which the declarations are often interpreted literally without understanding the nuances of the language so that more than ever the saying traduttore traditore [translators are traitors] is seen to be true.

It should be emphasized in connection with this that the Stalinist press -- l'Humanité seeks to hold first place in this -- vies with the bourgeois journals in scandalmongering and refraining from any attempt to understand or help others understand what is happening in China, presenting the facts and the dispatches in the most extravagant way to serve the grossest of factional aims.

Mao Was in a Minority in the Central Committee

We said that the "cultural revolution" was in the first place the expression of a big factional struggle with the leadership of the Chinese party and state. All the serious information not only confirms this as the point of departure but enables us to likewise say that Mao found himself and probably still finds himself in a minority in the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist party.

The January 25 Le Monde reproduced an article by a Yugoslav journalist which appeared in the Far Eastern Economic Review of Hong Kong giving many details that must correspond rather closely to the reality. According to other reports that have reached us, Mao did not have with him more than about a quarter of the members of the Central

Committee. In addition, the declarations and the appeals of the Maoists themselves against the "tiny handful" that took the road to the "restoration of capitalism," indicate implicitly and at times explicitly that this "tiny handful" holds the majority in many leading bodies.

A second point is likewise now certain; namely, that there are not just two but various factions and subfactions in conflict with each other. The Maoist documents call for making distinctions, for condemning some and not condemning others who made honest mistakes, etc. In addition, more than nuances are apparent in the utterances of Chou En-lai, Mao's wife and others.

On the other hand it is not known how long it has been that Mao was no longer actually at the helm of the party, what measures he opposed and what measures he advocated. The lineaments of the factions and their programs are not known, even approximately. We doubt that the masses and even the militants in China are better off than we are in trying to thread this labyrinth.

An Appeal to the Masses Against the Party

Nevertheless, in all this confusion some very important events have occurred. We noted from the beginning that the Mao faction had appealed to the masses to mobilize, first of all the school-age youth assembled in the Red Guards. During January the Mao faction appealed to the workers in the plants, and now, it appears, to the army and to the peasants. This warrants some comments.

First of all, such appeals show that those who thought more or less that the whole business was designed as a diversion from internal difficulties were mistaken. That bureaucratic factions could resort to this, going against their natural inclinations as bureaucrats, can be explained only by the intensity of the crisis tearing apart a leadership that is now the oldest in any Communist party, and this, close to twenty years after seizing power. It is to be noted that the post-Stalinists, and, of course l'Humanité in the first place, denounce as unforgivable this crime of appealing to the masses against the party! According to Stalin's successors, the masses can be appealed to only to enthusiastically ratify the decisions taken at the very top, particularly after the settling of accounts among the bureaucrats.

It goes without saying that we do not at all approve the slanders picturing the differences as being between partisans and opponents of the "reestablishment of capitalism, instead of as they really are. It likewise goes without saying that we condemn the violence, the brutality, the disgraceful actions, but we cannot at all condemn an appeal to the masses against a bureaucratized party and apparatus, even if this appeal originates from a wing of the bureaucracy. We condemn all the less the appeals that resulted in consequences of the greatest importance. We already noted the possibility that certain appeals of the Maoists along the lines of equalitarian demands, even if they were demagogic, would not fail to have consequences. This is what occurred.

The Shanghai Events

The first appeals and the first demonstrations were addressed to the youth in the schools and universities. The results could only be relatively minimum. They marched by the millions, waving the little red book of Mao's thought. These aphorisms, more often moral than genuinely political, could in these circles, aside from noisy demonstrations, give rise only to abstract theorizing. But when appeals are directed to the workers, as soon as they begin moving, they give their action a substantial content.

The Shanghai events, even on the basis of the limited information at our disposal, are of considerable significance in this respect. First of all, it should be recalled that Mao went to Shanghai last year and that it was from there where he has the firmest support in the party institutions and other bodies that he left to try to regain the leadership in Peking and the Central Committee.

The Shanghai workers responded to the appeals to support the "cultural revolution." But how? They demanded wage increases, they occupied lodgings, without doubt better than the ones in which they had been living. They sent delegations to Peking, demanding that the trips be paid like those of the Red Guards. In certain plants they elected committees.

More occurred. The situation brought about an open division in the Shanghai leadership, that is, among the Maoists. Some of them joined the workers; others resisted, forming groups of "revolutionary rebels," invoking against the workers' demands inspired by equalitarian tendencies the phrases against "economism," for "politics in command," against "material stimulants," etc. A social difference openly emerged between a current

that lined up with the workers and one dominated by bureaucratic concerns.

Things didn't stop there. In fact, for four or five days, the headquarters of the Mao faction in Peking said nothing. And it was only after some time, which in view of the events was extremely long that they came out in favor of the "rebels" and proceeded to alter the leadership in Shanghai, particularly in the newspaper which in November 1965 had launched the "cultural revolution" by attacking the leaders in Peking. Likewise to be noted is the caution with which the Mao faction operated under the circumstances. They condemned "people who want to go too far," who "camouflage themselves behind Mao's thought," the "left opportunists," the "left extremists"; it was indicated that "not all were to be condemned," since they had been "hoodwinked by the enemy," etc. The Mao leadership also stated, and this was particularly significant, that the concessions and the strikes were to be condemned and that only the Central Committee could decide in the question of wage increases.

The contradictions in Mao's positions could not have been expressed more revealingly. To beat down the majority in the Central Committee, he turned to the masses. But when the workers went into action, taking seriously the declamations that had been made in order to gain a mass base in the factional struggle, he told them: "That's far enough!" And he referred them to the Central Committee where he is battling against the majority.

An explanation for this obviously cannot be found in the red book of Mao's thoughts. What had appeared were the limits of the Mao faction, limits resulting from its bureaucratic character.

The Bureaucracy and the Proletariat

Once again the events in China are notable, among other things, for their turns, their ups and downs, their surprises, and it is necessary to be cautious about drawing definitive conclusions too quickly, particularly with regard to episodes in the struggle going on within the bureaucracy. The attitude of Mao, who took the initiative in starting this struggle within the bureaucracy, who conducted it with extraordinary intensity, only to suddenly back down in face of certain consequences resulting from his appeals, speaks eloquently enough. But the Shanghai events must not be considered as a mere incident.

Shanghai is the biggest industrial center in the whole mainland of Asia, and it was there, more than forty years ago, that the Chinese revolution began. It was probably not by chance that Mao turned to this city first in appealing to revolutionary feelings. Without doubt he wanted to use the workers for his own ends; but, at least for a few days, he lost control of the Shanghai workers. This was a historic event that will not be without a sequel. The struggle that is being waged in China under the name of the "great cultural revolution" has considerably weakened the apparatus, the entire apparatus (party, unions, army, police, etc.). This permitted the proletariat in Shanghai, and, it seems in other big industrial centers in the Northeast, to intervene as an autonomous social force. Even if this lasted only a few days, even if Mao or a different faction of the bureaucracy regains control over the workers due to the fact that no organized political force exists capable of clearly and powerfully expressing proletarian aspirations and guiding the working class, it is no less true that a new element has appeared, and that the former "order" can never be reinstated. Neither the forms nor the rates can be predicted -- it would be difficult to do this even in China and still more so at a distance -- but the gigantic significance of this event stands out in the jumble of reports now coming out of China.

This event answers those who, like the pro-Yugoslav magazine Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme, see only a repetition of Stalinism in China, and those like the Socialist Labour League in England, who after not having written a single line on China for over a year, suddenly called for all-out support to the Red Guards, labelling those who offer a critical analysis, "White Guards."

In the Soviet Union, beginning with 1923 and on up to the war, we witnessed a virtually uninterrupted growth of the bureaucracy. It exterminated the revolutionary Marxist vanguard and all the Communist wings of the Bolshevik party, including the right wing, and transformed the party into a mere political instrument of the bureaucracy. This growth occurred against a background of apathy, of passivity in the working class. In China, we are at present witnessing such deep-going rents in the apparatus, extending into the highest circles, that the working class feels able to begin intervening as an autonomous force. This stands in complete contrast to the process of Stalinization that occurred in the Soviet Union in its time; but it is still too early to see a political revolution in this.

We leave aside in this article various questions which the events in China could not help but raise. What effect, for example, will they have on the economic situation, either in industry or agriculture, particularly if the struggle extends into the countryside? And above all, what will be the consequences in the field of aid to the Vietnamese fighters? There is almost a total lack of the facts needed to offer an answer.

Chinese society has its own dynamism with a potential of considerable power. Our first duty is to try to understand what is happening and to combat the odious anti-Chinese campaigns that seek to exploit the current difficulties either to the advantage of imperialism or the Soviet bureaucracy. It is likewise requisite to seek to politically help the vanguard elements that have begun to appear. It is necessary, too -- and this by far is the field where the most can be done to help the progression of the permanent revolution in China -- to organize the maximum support for the Vietnamese revolution. A victory in Vietnam would bring relief to China on the level of military defense where the cost runs very high, adding to the enormous difficulties China is now experiencing.

February 1, 1967

HO CHI MINH, NGUYEN HUU THO MOURN DEATH OF A.J.MUSTE

In a message sent February 14 to the Committee for Nonviolent Action, whose headquarters is in New York, President Ho Chi Minh mourned the death of A.J. Muste, a leading figure in the antiwar movement in the United States who did much to help bring together antagonistic radical political tendencies into a nonexclusive united front committed to active struggle for the immediate withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam.

"I am deeply grieved to learn the demise of Abraham J. Muste, an outstanding fighter of the peace and democratic movement in the U.S.A. and the world, a loyal and valiant friend of the Vietnamese people," said Ho Chi Minh. "I wish to convey to your committee and through it to the bereaved family my deepest sympathy and condolences."

Nguyen Huu Tho, president of the Presidium of the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation, sent a similar message:

"Our people and the people of the world will bear in mind with deep gratitude the noble contributions of Reverend Abraham J. Muste to the struggle against the brutal war of aggression waged by the U.S. government in Vietnam and to the building of the enjoyable friendship between the people of our two countries."

JOHNSON OPENS CAMPAIGN TO CORRECT IMAGE TROUBLE

To judge by his landslide vote in 1964, Johnson was the most popular candidate in the history of the United States. Since then, however, the polls have registered an almost steady decline in his rating with the public. Many think that this is due to his betraying his campaign promises, escalating the war in Vietnam and letting inflation cut deeply into family budgets. Others point to his widening credibility gap. The top strategists of the Democratic party, however, believe something else is involved.

Thus the U.S. News & World Report said February 27 in its weekly "Newsgram" on page 26:

"Democrats seem to be convinced that next year's election will be close.

"Vietnam war, if it still goes on, will be a serious complication. The President's trouble in getting across the image he would like to create on television is another thing. Voters seemingly don't warm up to Mr. Johnson."

On page 31 in its feature "Washington Whispers," the same magazine revealed the heroic measures Johnson is taking to fix things up with the voters:

"The President is wearing glasses with specially treated lenses when he appears on television and has given up contact lens. Mr. Johnson, too, is found to be wearing more carefully tailored suits as he sets about establishing a 'new' image."

ANOTHER BLOW TO THE WARREN REPORT

By Arthur Maglin

Events in New Orleans have cut another deep wedge in public confidence in the Johnson administration's official version of the Kennedy assassination embodied in the report of the Warren Commission. Everything began on February 18 when the district attorney of New Orleans said that he had been conducting an investigation into the Kennedy case and expected to make arrests in the near future.

On February 21 Senator Russell B. Long of Louisiana said that he was convinced that District Attorney James Garrison of New Orleans has "some information the Warren Commission didn't have" about a possible conspiracy to assassinate President Kennedy. Long told an informal news conference that he had discussed the possibility of a conspiracy with Garrison on a plane trip last October.

On February 22 David W. Ferrie, a former airlines pilot who figured in District Attorney James Garrison's assassination inquiry, was found dead in his bed. The coroner decided that the death was from natural causes, but Garrison thinks it was probably a suicide because of the existence of what appears to be a suicide note near Ferrie's body.

According to the February 23 New York Times, Ferrie had recently complained that Garrison had him "pegged as the get-away pilot in an elaborate plot to kill Kennedy."

At a February 22 news conference Garrison said:

"The apparent suicide of David Ferrie ends the life of a man who, in my judgment, was one of history's most important individuals. Evidence developed by our office had long since confirmed that he was involved in events culminating in the assassination of President Kennedy."

On February 23 Garrison was reported to have said, "I have no reason to believe that Lee Harvey Oswald killed anyone in Dallas. This is my personal feeling." Garrison did not elaborate on this theme.

The February 23 New York World Journal Tribune carried the following report from Pensacola, Florida:

"Authorities are investigating the death of a Florida man two years ago at the request of his brother who said he wanted a fresh probe because of the current investigation in New Orleans of the Kennedy assassination.

"The brother, Earl Killam, said the dead man, Thomas Henry Killam, told him he fled Dallas in December 1963, because he was being harassed by 'agents.' Killam said his brother didn't specify whether the agents were federal, state or some other type.

"'I'm a dead man,' Killam quoted his brother as saying. 'I've run as far as I'm going to run.'"

"Wanda Killam, the dead man's wife, reached yesterday in Dallas by the Pensacola News-Journal, said her husband had been questioned several times about the assassination by federal agents. [Wanda Killam had been employed for several years as a hostess in a night club in Dallas owned by Jack Ruby.]

"Killam died beside a broken shop window on a Pensacola street March 19, 1964. His throat had been slashed."

The February 23 New York Times reported:

"Earl Killam asked the [Pensacola] solicitor today [February 22] to exhume his brother's body to find out more about the death, which the police listed as an apparent suicide. 'Did you ever hear of a man committing suicide by jumping through a plate glass window?' the brother asked."

On February 26 the New York Times reported:

"The death this week of a former airline pilot left District Attorney Jim Garrison, who says he has detected a 'conspiracy' that culminated in the assassination of President Kennedy, with an investigation centered almost entirely on Cuban refugees.

"This was learned here from a source within Mr. Garrison's office and bolstered by what is known publicly about the 'witnesses' Mr. Garrison and his staff are seeking.

"The District Attorney's investigators are combing Cuban refugee communities in the United States, and especially Miami. They are searching for persons who can shed light on what Mr. Garrison thinks was a plot to kill Premier Fidel Castro of Cuba that turned into a plot to assassinate President Kennedy."

A bit further on the story continues:

"The District Attorney believes, according to one of his investigators, that Oswald might have distributed the [pro-Castro] literature in an effort to win the confidence of the Cuban Government and gain permission to enter that country.

"Once in Cuba, Mr. Garrison's theory goes, Oswald would have become the 'trigger man' in the plot to assassinate Premier Castro.

"However, when Oswald was denied permission to enter Cuba, the theory continues, the anti-Castro 'conspirators' decided next to use him to assassinate President Kennedy as a way of punishing him for his 'failure to follow up the Bay of Pigs invasion with a second military effort.'"

New developments in the assassination case are now continually being reported. Their effect is the further eroding of public confidence in the Johnson administration and the agencies of the federal government and the further widening of the so-called "credibility gap" created by the continual new exposures of governmental deception in such instances as the United States' Vietnam war policy and the underhanded and anti-democratic operations of the CIA.

GUERRILLA RESURGENCE ALARMS PHILIPPINE GOVERNMENT

[The following has been reproduced from the February 15 issue of Laging Una, published in Los Angeles, California.]

* * *

Alarm of the Philippine government at the resurgence of the Huk movement was translated Feb. 14 into well-publicized offers of large cash bounties for the capture, dead or alive, of the top two rebel leaders. A reward of \$25,000 was posted for secretary general Pedro Taruc and \$20,000 for Faustino del Mundo, known in the rebel ranks as Commander Sumulong.

The offer of rewards was announced by the new defense secretary, Gen. Ernesto S. Mata, who was appointed to that post by President Marcos Jan. 23. Marcos had kept the defense portfolio for a year following his election to the presidency. Mata had been chief of staff of the armed forces.

Huk resurgence is a fact, and an alarming fact, according to Brig. Gen. Rafael M. Ileteo, commander of the Philippine Constabulary in Zone 1, which includes most of the area of central Luzon, long-time stronghold of the Huks.

Ileteo made the revelation Jan. 28 in a briefing session for the PC chief, Brig. Gen. Manuel T. Yan, at Camp Olivas, Pampanga. He said that of the 16 provinces in his jurisdiction, four are under virtual Huk control.

He identified the four provinces as Pampanga, Tarlac, Nueva Ecija and Bulacan. At the same time, he asserted the Huks had extended their operations to the provinces of Bataan and Isabela.

As an illustration of Huk influence, Ileteo said: "No politician in Pampanga can run for an elective position without first consulting or actually getting the blessing of the Huks."

In a speech Jan. 14, President Marcos demanded that the Huks surrender. "Otherwise," he said, "I must continue the angry dialogue of guns."

[A rise in guerrilla activities in the Philippines was first noted last fall. See World Outlook October 7, 1966, p. 31.]

VENEZUELAN GUERRILLA FIGHTERS REJECT CP POLICY

By Guillermo Bonilla

The Mexican weekly magazine Sucesos recently published [December 10, 17, 24, 31, 1966, and January 7, 1967] a series of articles on the background, present status and program of the revolutionary guerrillas in Venezuela. The articles are based on a lengthy interview which the editor of Sucesos, Mario Menéndez Rodríguez held with the top guerrilla leaders in their hideouts in the mountains of Iracara in the state of Falcón.

One of the main points of interest in the series is that the Communist party of Venezuela is charged with betraying, blackmailing and sabotaging the guerrilla struggle. The Communist party leaders are pictured as having supported the formation of guerrilla fronts initially, not as part of a program of actual revolutionary warfare, but as a card to be played in the Venezuelan political arena. Their aim, it is held, was to utilize the guerrillas to harass the army and frighten the oligarchy, blackmailing them into granting political concessions and getting into position for a military coup d'état that would carry the CP into power.

According to Menéndez, in the initial phase the guerrillas were to follow orders given by the CP bureaucrats in Caracas. Orders came from the city for an attack at such and such a place at such and such a date. Likewise from the city came the orders for a ceasefire and the suspension of harrying actions.

This type of strategy was ineffective and bound to fail; and guerrilla leaders like Comandante Douglas Bravo, who rebelled against it, were deprived of economic supplies, their communications and publicity about their activities cut off, and they were even accused of being traitors to the revolution, adventurers and provocateurs. For three whole years, says the reporter, the guerrilla fighters of the José Leonardo Chirinos front, led by Douglas Bravo, were not supplied with shoes, clothing, food, weapons or medical assistance while they underwent constant harassment as the army sought to encircle them.

Meanwhile, top leaders of the Communist party of Venezuela like Machado, Pompeyo Marquez, Jesús Farias and others, who had been imprisoned, reached an understanding with the Venezuelan government under which they would be released in exchange for stopping the guerrilla war and dismantling the various fronts. The rationale offered for this course was that conditions for guerrilla warfare were absent in Venezuela and that the correct policy was to build a mass party within the legal framework.

The only member of the Central Committee who did not capitulate, who kept alive the idea of armed revolution, was Douglas Bravo. He decided to come down out of the mountains to Caracas to talk to the students and workers and try to reorganize a network of information, publicity and supplies for the guerrillas, who had been cut off from outside help.

According to the account, when the CP leaders heard that Bravo was in Caracas, they immediately launched a "search and destroy" operation. During the ten months he remained in the city, Douglas Bravo was under constant danger of being caught either by the police or by agents of the CP. But they never found him; and once his mission was accomplished, Bravo returned to the mountains where he is now operating as top commander of the Venezuelan guerrillas.

He was later joined by Luben Petkoff, who landed on the coast of Falcón with a group of heavily armed guerrilleros from the island of Margarita. The landing was discovered by government forces the same day it was made and they immediately opened an attack. Despite troops and bombers, after an epic march of many days, hungry, exhausted, and sick, the Petkoff group managed to join the main force under Comandante Bravo.

Since then, things have been different in Venezuela. Bravo and Petkoff lead a large, well armed and experienced guerrilla front in the state of Falcón; and coordinate their activities with those of other minor fronts in different parts of Venezuela.

During November and December, 1966, guerrilla activity rose to such a degree both in the mountains and in Caracas itself, that the Leoni government, which had previously boasted of crushing the guerrilla movement, felt forced to declare a state of siege and close the National University.

The pro-Moscow leaders of the Communist party of Venezuela are said to be furious, as are their Mexican counterparts. Epithets are thrown at Bravo, such as "undisci-

plined," "traitor," "liar," "provocateur" and so on.

However, Douglas Bravo is supported in Havana. Comandante Manuit Comero, who is president of the forces headed by Bravo, the FALN-FLN [Fuerzas Armadas de Liberación Nacional and the Frente de Liberación Nacional], is in Cuba on a mission of information and organization.

And it is clear that the entire problem of the fossilized, bureaucratic leaderships of the Communist parties of Latin America, who are discredited in the eyes of the masses, will have to be placed on the agenda for a thoroughgoing discussion.

"LA ERA DE LA REVOLUCION PERMANENTE"

The Spanish edition of The Age of Permanent Revolution: A Trotsky Anthology has just been published in Mexico City by Ediciones Saeta. This is the selection from Leon Trotsky's writings made by George Novack which has won well-deserved recognition for its representativeness and balance in presenting the major contributions and wide-ranging interests of the Russian revolutionary leader. The idea for an anthology of this kind originated with the late C. Wright Mills, who enlisted Novack's aid in working it out.

The Spanish edition includes the introduction by Isaac Deutscher explaining the timeliness of an anthology of the writings of the "persecuted, maligned, and misunderstood" leader who "left a deeper and more lasting mark on the age" than probably any of the other great political figures of our century "with the exception of Lenin."

Besides the complete text of the English edition, including the very useful notes prepared by George Novack, the Spanish contains an additional chapter (No. 16) "For a Socialist United States of Latin America." This consists of extracts from two interviews with the Argentine trade-union leader Mateo Fossa, an extract from Trotsky's defense of Mexico's right to expropriate the imperialist oil holdings, and part of an article which Trotsky had begun at the time he was assassinated -- "Trade Unions in the Epoch of Imperialist Decay." The notes for this chapter were prepared by Profesor César Nicolás Molina Flores, who was also in charge of the translating team. The 383-page paperback book is well printed and includes an index.

The publication of this anthology in Spanish is an event to be celebrated in view of the growing interest throughout Latin America in Leon Trotsky and his contributions. Much of the material will prove to be of the highest interest among revolutionists in their current discussions on problems of theory and politics involving the struggle for national freedom and socialism.

La Era de la Revolución Permanente can be obtained by sending 30 pesos [US\$2.50] to Ediciones Saeta, Apartado Postal 27-509, México 7, D.F., México.

The book can also be obtained through Merit Publishers, 5 East Third St., New York, N.Y., 10003.

ASTURIAN MINERS END "SIT-IN"

Eleven Asturian coal miners, who staged a "sit-in" demonstration in an unused gallery at the 1,000-foot level of the Llamas mine near Mieres, Spain, brought their action to a close February 24. They had stayed underground a full week.

The eleven used this way of protesting their dismissal a year ago for participating in labor disputes. They demanded to be rehired. They said that they would stay in the mine until they had to be taken out on stretchers.

Management closed the mine, alleging that the action of the eleven heightened the danger of an explosion from coal damp.

Some 4,000 coal miners in the region began a sympathy strike February 21. By the time the eleven came out of the mine, this had spread until more than 6,500 miners were involved.

The eleven were immediately arrested and hauled away in ambulances. The authorities said that they would be given a medical examination. Their next place of residence was presumably one of Franco's jails.

BOSCH ADMITS U.S. IS RUNNING DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Juan Bosch, who lost out to Joaquín Balaguer in the elections conducted under the auspices of the Pentagon and State Department in the Dominican Republic June 1, 1966, and who is now staying provisionally in Spain, has become very "pessimistic, bitter, and without any illusions about the chances that democracy will be restored in his country in either the immediate or more distant future," according to Marcel Niedergang, who interviewed him in Madrid. (Le Monde, March 1.)

By running against Balaguer, the candidate favored by Washington, Bosch made it possible for American imperialism to get away with the scandalous fraud that the staged elections were "democratic" although the country had been invaded by an armed force of around 24,000 American troops. Bosch's cooperation with the foreign imperialist army was thus of inestimable service to the Johnson administration, which is now busy welding together the dictatorial machine built by Trujillo that came to pieces under the impact of the April 24, 1965, uprising in Santo Domingo. Realizing that he now stands in the category of a thoroughly squeezed lemon, it is understandable why Bosch is in such a sour mood.

"To define the present situation in the Dominican Republic," Bosch told Niedergang, "a single word is sufficient -- decomposition. Economically, we stand at the brink of catastrophe. The disorganization indirectly provoked by the April 1965 uprising has never been halted. It is continuing. Thousands of workers have been thrown into the streets. Never has misery been so great. Politically there is no government, quite simply because it is not possible to govern today in Santo Domingo."

During the election campaign, which the American Social Democrat Norman Thomas later certified as being in the "democratic" tradition, Juan Bosch was afraid to leave his villa. He remained under constant guard. "After his defeat in the elections," declares Niedergang, "Juan Bosch continued to live under the constant threat of being assassinated. A number of his bodyguards were killed in opposing terrorist commandos of the extreme right. He himself, at the time he left, was able to get to the airport only thanks to multiple precautions and the intervention of friendly diplomats."

Bosch spoke freely of how Balaguer is running the country under the auspices of the Johnson administration: "The terror is permanent. The assassination of former members of the Constitutionalist forces occurs almost daily. It is no secret. The Dominican press reports from day to day the extortion, violence, kidnappings and murders; but the impunity with which the terrorists of the right operate is beyond comprehension. Here are two examples among others: A former Constitutionalist official remained in the hands of the police for a week. He was released in such bad condition that he died the next day from the torture he had undergone. The family filed a complaint, stating that the prisoner had been seen each day in the police headquarters by witnesses. Despite this, the head of the police replied: 'We never saw the fellow.'"

"Maximo Fiallo, a known organizer of ultrarightist commando killers was arrested after repeated complaints. The pilots of the San Isidro base, the former general headquarters of General Wessin y Wessin, protested. He was their 'friend.' The police turned them down. The next morning, a commando group of pilots came to release Maximo Fiallo by force. Nobody said anything. I had occasion at a dinner at the nunciature with President Balaguer to expose these facts and to state that the police had set up 'interrogation centers' in the heart of the city without taking it up with the authorities...But what can be done? There is no government in Santo Domingo..."

Continuing in this vein, Bosch declared that he had never wanted to give the impression that the "democratic game" would be respected in the Dominican Republic, because it isn't. "The real government is not in Santo Domingo; it is in Washington. The real master of my country is the United States. I said that the day the marines landed. I say it again today. From this point of view, nothing has changed."

Should Balaguer display too much independence, he would be assassinated, and the army would put one of its generals in. The U.S. had probably already anticipated this. And wouldn't there be protest? "The United States," said Juan Bosch, "pays absolutely no attention to public opinion. They have only one objective -- to maintain and reinforce the group in the armed forces which they have gained."



JUAN BOSCH

THE TIGHTENING GRIP OF U.S. IMPERIALISM IN GUYANA

Georgetown

The situation in Guyana has continued on the pattern set since the coalition government of the People's National Congress (led by Forbes Burnham) and the United Force assumed office in December 1964. That government, as is well known, depends heavily on U.S. and United Kingdom backing, both for personnel (technicians, Peace Corps, etc.) and finances. The U.S. government has not relaxed at all over the last two years and their penetration continues intensified at every conceivable level.

The local trade unions receive large handouts from the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions* which conducts regular training also. U.S. trade unions finance housing projects for the local trade unions. The U.S. Agency for International Development* has embarked on a programme of training for Guyanese personnel, from heads of departments to clerks in all branches of government service.

The local security officers are being trained in Washington. The prime minister, Forbes Burnham, is advised by an American economist (Davenport). The U.S. government has been applying severe pressure on the Guyana government to join the Organization of American States for obvious reasons. The University of Guyana is completely controlled by the Americans and Canadians.

In consistency with this alignment the Guyana government has been utterly conservative in its policies at home and it has been unearthing all the diehard conservatives previously associated with the colonial power, appointing them to all the important positions in government.

The Americans and the coalition government have been proceeding unimpeded in their course; and as if no opposition existed. The People's Progressive party, which won forty-seven percent of the votes at the last elections, has been pathetically ineffective. Because it lacks both dynamism and a real power position, it has been brushed aside with contempt. The position of the PPP needs serious analysis.

At the moment the PPP is gearing to meet the next elections. Elections are its strong point since its strategy is based on the assumption that with time the East Indian voters will have an absolute majority. That position, as one can see, is also the source of its weakness.

The Africans are vital for a revolutionary undertaking in Guyana, and Burnham is assured of their loyalty, which gives him a far stronger power position than Jagan. Burnham controls effectively the police and army; his party is militarily organised, his party controls the trade unions and most government servants are behind him. Burnham has control of the election machinery and can manipulate it with impunity.

The PPP is very vulnerable and can be crushed physically if the imperialists feel compelled to do so. Organisationally the PPP has been weakened and the "left" in the party is prisoner of the racial situation as well as the compulsion felt by the leadership to regard maintenance of the party machine as the fundamental priority. Jagan is now engulfed in more inner-party conflicts with moderate and openly racist elements in the party. These elements want an accommodation with the Americans and British so as to ensure a regular place in office for the party.

* These names received unsavory mention in the U.S. press at the height of the exposure of Central Intelligence Agency operations in February. Drew Pearson charged that the AFL-CIO has received around \$100,000,000 a year in subsidies from the CIA, most of which is funneled abroad through affiliated bodies. Pearson named in this connection Jay Lovestone and Irving Brown, who handle foreign policy for George Meany, the head of the big U.S. trade-union federation. [See World Outlook March 3, page 242.] On February 22, the New York Times reported that CIA agents, "working under cover of an American labor union, helped organize strikes in British Guiana in 1962 and 1963 against Dr. Cheddi Jagan..." The international affairs department [Public Service International Inter-American Affairs Branch] of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees "was actually run by two intelligence agency aides who operated out of the union's former headquarters in Washington with the knowledge of the union leadership," according to the same report. The whereabouts of one of these two CIA agents is not known at present. The other "is now a provincial adviser for the Agency for International Development in Vietnam."