

a labor press service

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

50¢

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. 26

July 14, 1967

From the Bolivian Underground

Meaning of New Guerrilla Front



Fourth International:

On the Middle East Conflict

Los Angeles Test of "Spirit of Glassboro"

Nguyen Cao Ky "Steps Down"

Russell Urges Ban on Use of Napalm

Execute Thousands in Guatemala

Interview:

Chen Pi-lan on "Cultural Revolution"

Reba Hansen, Business Manager,

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

New York, N.Y. 10010

WORLD OUTLOOK specializes in weekly political analysis and interpretation of events for labor, socialist, colonial independence and Negro freedom publications. Signed articles represent the views of the authors, which may not necessarily coincide with those of WORLD OUTLOOK. Unsigned material expresses, insofar as editorial opinion may appear, the standpoint of revolutionary Marxism. To subscribe for 26 issues send \$7.50 or £2/15s. or 37.50 francs to: Reba Hansen, Business Manager, P. O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station, New York, N. Y. 10010.

From the Bolivian Underground

THE MEANING OF THE NEW GUERRILLA FRONT

[The following material has been passed on to World Outlook from the Bolivian underground. It consists principally of a declaration written by Hugo González Moscoso, one of the main leaders, along with Guillermo Lora, of the Bolivian Trotskyist movement who have both been exiled in remote jungle camps by the Barrientos regime.

[The declaration, now being circulated in Bolivia, appears to have been written before González was seized by the secret political police and was evidently drawn up as the text of an official party statement. It was approved, it should be noted, by the Political Bureau of the POR. The statement is preceded by an introduction signed by the La Paz Regional Committee of the POR.

[The importance of the declaration and the fact that it is being circulated clandestinely will, of course, be apparent to everyone familiar with the political situation in Bolivia.]

* * *

INTRODUCTION

Comrade Workers:

The bourgeois-democratic method of struggling to win power and obtain the great fruits of socialism cannot achieve the triumph of the proletariat. This method serves only to justify the existence of an oppressive regime with the title, "legally constituted."

The emergence of the Nancahuazú guerrillas has totally changed the country's current political situation.

How could the proletariat and the people of Bolivia liberate themselves if they continued today to confine their methods of struggle to the channels which the bourgeoisie established to safeguard its own social order? To put it precisely, in order to achieve the victory of the Bolivian proletariat and popular masses, to destroy the regime which serves the interests of the monopolies and finance

capital, and to create a new social order more in harmony with the needs of the day, it is necessary to adopt a more advanced method of struggle, a method by which the proletariat and people of Bolivia can win political power. And the best method to this end is armed struggle in the form of guerrilla warfare.

The Partido Obrero Revolucionario [POR -- Revolutionary Workers party, the Bolivian section of the Fourth International] was the first to indicate this method of struggle to the masses.

Today, the revolutionary struggle of the Bolivian working masses is expressed in the guerrilla activity of the brave fighters of Nancahuazú. Today, the guerrillas are emerging as the leadership of a nation oppressed by imperialism, as those who most authentically represent the masses and their needs.

The guerrilla struggle has begun! And with it has begun the final battle which will smash the pro-imperialist regime in Bolivia. The task of the revolutionaries is to sharpen this struggle, to defend it, and extend it valiantly without vacillation or fear.

The guerrillas are our most resolute class brothers; they are fighting for us, for the entire people. However, there are many who do not understand their cause or their objectives. The dictatorial military government is mounting a full-scale campaign of slander against the revolutionary patriots of Nancahuazú. Imperialism, for its part, wants to present a distorted view of the guerrilla struggle to international public opinion.

To set the record straight, the La Paz Regional Committee of the POR puts in your hands, comrade worker, peasant, high-school student, university student, employee, intellectual, this work on the guerrillas and their objectives by the party's general secretary, Comrade Hugo González Moscoso.

La Paz, May 1967

ALL THE PEOPLE TO THE SIDE OF THE GUERRILLAS

We wholeheartedly salute the guerrillas of Nancahuazú! In the midst of the demoralization of the vacillators and the opportunism of the parasites, and when the military repression, after filling the concentration camps in the eastern jungles, has outlawed the POR and the

PCB [Partido Comunista de Bolivia], the appearance of the guerrillas in the south-east of the country is the proper response to the crimes of the "gorilla" dictators. The guerrillas are a trumpet call to battle and a light on the path the Bolivian masses must follow to shake off the yoke

of their oppressors and exploiters.

The guerrilla movement is not a mad adventure and still less a mechanical and artificial transposition of the Cuban guerrilla experience. While there is no doubt that the victorious armed struggle of the Sierra Maestra, which buried the revisionism of the partisans of a "modus vivendi" with imperialism and "peaceful roads to socialism," was one of the most valuable lessons of the Cuban revolution, the guerrilla movement has emerged in Bolivia as the natural culmination of the country's internal political process.

The armed struggle is not alien to the Bolivian people; to the contrary, it represents the conclusion which the people have drawn from the present objective reality.

Bolivian history records those climactic moments in which these masses have risen in arms to break their oppressive chains. The guerrilla movement of the War of Independence, of the Padillas, Juana Azurduy, the Lanzas, the Mendez Mutiny, the Thesis of Pulacayo with its Armed Committees, the Ninth of April [the revolutionary nationalist uprising of 1952 which put Paz Estenssoro in power] with its armed trade-union militia make up the historical legacy belonging to the guerrillas of Nancahuazú.

Symbolically, the geographic scene of their activity is the same as that in which Juana Azurduy and Manuel Asencio Padilla waged a victorious guerrilla war against the Spanish royal armies in the second decade of the past century.

The experiences of the last fifteen years have forced the Bolivian people to return to this historical tradition. The Nancahuazú guerrillas thus express the people's general inclinations and are their most authentic spokesmen.

The resolve to turn to armed struggle ripened by a slow process in the consciousness of the workers and the people. These last fifteen years are witness to how the workers, the peasants, the intellectuals, the workers and peoples parties, in sum, the entire Bolivian people, have fought to improve their living conditions, to deliver the country from dependency and backwardness.

Numerous working-class, peasant, and student congresses have petitioned and formulated plans and programs. Moreover, the mobilized masses have lent their support and their force to one bourgeois leadership after the other in the hope that they would use their power to realize their desires and aspirations for progress. But the masses were always cheated. The social, economic, and political conquests gained at the cost of sac-

rifices, at the moment of truth, turned into nothing more than pompous, lyrical declarations.

The agrarian reform did not improve the lives of the peasant masses who remain poverty-stricken with the lowest per capita annual income in Latin America. The nationalization of the mines, by way of a peculiar desire to create a "strong bourgeoisie" in Bolivia, served to enrich a caste.

Instead of national independence, finance capital returned to take over the oil and the gold. Imperialist agents infiltrated every institution, from the cabinet on down -- the army, education, and all administrative and economic activities in the country. Hundreds of spies from the so-called Peace Corps, and military, banking, agricultural, mining, and cultural commissions hold sway throughout the length and breadth of the land.

When the masses, realizing how they had been defrauded, became restless and demanded thoroughgoing solutions and a complete change in their way of life, their flatterers became their hangmen; and the workers' every petition and mobilization was answered with open repression. But the jailing of the workers' leaders, the imprisoning of the Trotskyist and Communist leaders, did not end the economic crisis; it did not make unemployment disappear; it did not feed the people.

This aggravated crisis brought the military to power. A military government came to the fore to crush the people. And its inability to solve the problems of the workers and of the nation led it to massacre the miners in the Siglo Veinte Mine, to bomb and machine-gun Milluni and the heights of La Paz, to confiscate trade-union property and to decertify the unions.

Instead of giving the people more bread, the military government cut wages and salaries. But -- in return for reducing the people's food ration -- the military raised their own salaries by more than three hundred percent.

With the military dictatorship, imperialist oppression became more acute. As a consequence, the last vestiges of freedom and democracy disappeared for the masses and their partisans. But, far from containing the economic crisis, the capitulation to imperialism, the destruction of the unions, unemployment, and finally the "outlawing" of the POR and the PCB only accentuated it. The military government with its terroristic methods cannot resolve even the least of these problems; and chaos and bankruptcy continue to mount.

The Guerrilla Movement Is the Way to Save Bolivia

The guerrillas have come to the fore to put an end to this situation and to open up a new road, the true road, to progress for the country.

The normal, legal methods of struggle have become ineffective in the face of military terror. Present conditions have made armed struggle in the form of guerrilla warfare a necessity. The military dictatorship has barred all democratic roads and forced the emergence of guerrilla warfare. This is the incontrovertible truth of the matter.

When trade unions are being broken and unionized workers massacred, when union leaders and revolutionary militants are being jailed and persecuted, and when the workers' every petition or action is met with armed force or jail, that means that there is no room for legal and democratic methods of struggle.

It is the military dictatorship which has put itself outside the law and forced the people to take up arms. The military government alone, the lackey of imperialism, is responsible for the guerrilla war!

The masses have learned from their daily experience that armed rebellion is now necessary to oust the military dictatorship, to break the yoke of imperialism, and then to create a state of the workers and the people. The people have seen clearly the inability of the bourgeoisie and imperialism to promote development. The meetings of ministers [of the American states], the OAS [Organization of American States], the ECLA [Economic Commission for Latin America], the summit meetings of the [Western Hemisphere] presidents, the Alliance for Progress, all the different kinds of economic plans, have failed disastrously and become nothing more than smokescreens to hide the dramatic and agonizing reality in Latin America and in Bolivia.

All these bodies have been studying the Bolivian crisis for twenty years. There is no lack of plans, programs, inquiries, etc. Bolivia has been studied from every angle, but the imperialists and their lackeys have never found a remedy for its backwardness.

The reason for this is quite simple -- the only cure for the ills of Bolivia, its backwardness, dependence, and poverty is socialism; and this medicine is poison to the Yankee exploiters and their national bourgeois counterparts.

It is natural, then, for the people to have lost confidence in the plans of the imperialists and the semicolonial

bourgeoisies and in their organizations and bodies. After long experience, no one can hope any longer that the exploiters will change and become sensitive to the needs of those they exploit; the most the exploiters can do is cover themselves with empty, demagogic verbiage.

Barrientos speaks of developing a dialogue with the people; but for him development is capitulation to imperialism and his dialogue is directed to the oligarchies and the agents of imperialism. He speaks of concord and peace among Bolivians but at the same time he persecutes, jails, and slaughters the people. We saw the dialogue Barrientos is offering when the army moved into the Siglo Veinte, and the peace he offers is the peace of the grave, as it was for the construction worker Adrian Arce and the POR miner leader César Lora, who was murdered by a pistol shot in the head.

We have seen it also in the peace of the prisons, of San Pedro, Puerto Rico, Huaragoys, Pekín, Madidi, Ixiamas, Ulla Ulla, where the revolutionary opponents of his antinational and antiproletarian regime are confined; and in the outlawing of the POR and the PCB. The entire Bolivian people condemn and reject such dialogues and such a peace!

The Guerrillas Are Sons of the People

It is through this conviction that the people, the great majority making up the nation, have come to the belief that armed struggle -- guerrilla war -- is the true way and that it is the solution to this situation here and now. The guerrilla movement thus has issued from the needs of the people itself and from out of the depths of the people.

The most resolute and valiant sons of the Bolivian people are fighting in the mountains of Nancahuazú -- the miners who were driven from the mines and condemned to starve; the factory and construction workers who saw their wages cut and their rights abolished; the peasants who in their humble huts waited in vain for progress and saw the agrarian reform become a cruel farce; the young unemployed professionals who chose to sacrifice themselves for the fatherland rather than emigrate; the students whose hopes have been frustrated by the crisis and by unemployment.

These sons of Bolivia, the sons of miners, factory workers, peasants, and professionals, are called "foreign mercenaries" by the military dictatorship. We reject this insult to the patriotic sons of the people! It is the Yankee spies, fauned on in every government office from the palace down, who are the mercenaries.

Barrientos' gorillas have whipped up a full-scale sensation around three journalists,* but they keep their mouths shut about the arrival of Yankee military officers and FBI agents. The foreign mercenaries are the Argentine, U.S. and Brazilian military officers who, in complete violation of national sovereignty, have, in fact, replaced the inept Military High Command and the government itself! The mercenaries are those who trail behind their imperialist master and have converted Bolivia into a jail for Bolivians.

What Are the Guerrillas Fighting For?

The objectives which the guerrillas seek are clear and require no special explanation. Issuing from out of the people itself, they seek to put an end to the regime characterized by social injustice, absence of democratic freedoms and guarantees, and imperialist oppression of the nation.

The guerrilla struggle takes its inspiration from the aspirations of the people and the workers, from all of the demands of the miners, students, and teachers which up to now have met only with a violent and negative response from the military dictatorship.

Conduct of the Military Dictatorship

The response of the gorillas to the presence of guerrillas in Nancahuazú has been the same as their previous response to the petitions of the workers: terrorism, deception, and lies. Far from giving any thought to the social and economic causes of the guerrilla activity, the military clique lashed out violently against the people.

In the cities and in the mines, dozens of trade-union leaders and revolutionaries have been arrested. The concentration camps in the eastern jungles are full of POR, PCB, and PRIN [Partido Revolucionario de Izquierda Nacionalista, the left split-off from the former ruling Movimiento Nacionalista Revolucionario] members and leaders, of miner and student leaders.

In the countryside, the bureaucratic henchmen of the dictatorship have unleashed a reign of terror and already many peasants have fallen victim to it.

In the guerrilla zone, the Yankee, Argentinian, and Brazilian officers are displaying criminal ferocity against a handful of Bolivian patriots; 3,000 infantrymen, heavy artillery, fighter

planes and bombers, parashoot troops, the DIC [Dirección Investigación Criminal, the secret political police] and the National Guard with trained dogs have been thrown against the guerrillas.

Daily, the woods, plains and settlements are being furiously and indiscriminately bombed and machine-gunned. Napalm, provided by American aid, is being dumped on farmers, small ranchers, and humble peasants. The villages of Camiri, Lagunillas, Muyupampa, and Monteaudo are living in anguish as a result of the attitude taken by the military bullies.

Day after day, presumed guerrilla supporters are taken prisoner, many of whom "commit suicide" after horrible torture.

This sort of behavior on the part of the Yankee, Argentinian, and Brazilian mercenaries, as well as the Bolivian traitors, stands in contrast to the humane conduct of the guerrillas, who call for surrender first and fire only in self-defense, and who treat their prisoners well and set them free after giving them medical treatment.

Thus, the casualties which occur in the guerrilla zone are the sole responsibility of the military dictatorship and its gorilla mercenaries.

It Is Our Duty to Support the Guerrillas

The guerrillas' cause is the cause of every Bolivian. The guerrillas are nothing more than the fighting arm of the people, their weapon to curb those who starve the masses, to check the murderers of Arce and Lora, the butchers of Siglo Veinte, Milluni, the heights of La Paz, the mass murderers of 1965, those responsible for Bolivia's backwardness and want, as well as for the wage cuts -- and those who are selling their country and delivering it over to the voracious appetite of imperialism.

The guerrillas represent every Bolivian, every sector of the population, because their struggle is all Bolivia's struggle.

But the people's support must be organized and coordinated. The greatest help we can give to the guerrillas is to advance the struggles of the urban masses, the masses of the miners, the masses of the workers in general, as well as the masses of students and peasants, for their own demands.

Onward with the struggle to regain possession of the mines! Onward with the struggle for a general increase in wages! Onward with the struggle of the teachers,

* Régis Debray, George Andrew Roth and Carlos Alberto Fructuoso. -- W.O.

university and high-school students, and the peasants! Onward with the struggle for democratic rights and for the release of the prisoners! The guerrillas are supporting the people's struggle arms in hand! Mobilize against the military dictatorship and the gorilla mercenaries!

All revolutionaries must unite to strengthen the powerful Left Front. The underground committees and armed militia must reappear in the unions; and the most audacious union leaders must be brought to the fore.

In this mighty process, the trade unions must be reorganized, from the rank-and-file level to the leadership of the COB [Central Obrera Boliviana, the Bolivian trade-union federation], bringing forward elements whose stature is equal to the level of the armed struggle begun by the guerrillas. The masses must start from the level to which their gains and their experiences of the most recent years have brought them.

The Guerrillas Will Triumph

The people are invincible and the guerrillas, who constitute the armed ex-

pression of the people, will triumph. The weaknesses of imperialism and the puppet government are apparent; already signs of crisis and demoralization are appearing in the Military High Command, the officers and the ranks. The hybrid cabinet of Barrientos, the Bolivian Cao Ky, is tottering. Nothing but the pressure of the American embassy has prevented the army and the government from cracking before now. A section of the army has called for Barrientos' resignation and demands an exclusively military cabinet.

This crisis, suppressed today, will soon ripen and explode. The guerrilla war and mass struggle will shatter every barrier and apparatus of repression, and at last Bolivia will be free and find the path of development which will lead it to the creation of a new workers society without exploiters.

Political Bureau of the POR
Bolivian Section of the
Fourth International

May 1967

BOLIVIAN STUDENTS DECLARE UNIVERSITY "FREE TERRITORY"

The proclamation of the tin miners at Oruro and Huanuni, stating that the region constitutes "free territory," was answered by dictator Barrientos in his customary manner. He sent in troops. Shooting began June 24 and unofficial figures put the toll at 21 dead and 70 wounded.

On June 26 the miners at the Catavi and Siglo Veinte mines downed tools. The workers at the San José, Huanuni and Potosí mines held meetings to decide what action they would take.

The occupation of the mines does not seem to have succeeded in "pacifying" the Bolivian people. On June 29 the students at Santa Clara held an animated meeting that ended with them declaring their university "free territory."

During the meeting they demanded the withdrawal of the troops from the mining centers, an end to the state of siege, and an increase in the miners' wages which were slashed by Barrientos.

They also demanded that Barrientos and his minister of government Arguedas hand in their resignations.

The students then organized a street demonstration in which they made speeches and distributed leaflets calling

for a struggle to overthrow the government. They marched to the local headquarters of the Partido Revolucionario Auténtico but were met by police who broke up the demonstration through the use of tear gas and fire hoses.

The military regime appeared to be coming rattled by these events. On July 4 the Onganía government in Argentina leaked to the press that it had turned down "for the time being" a request from Barrientos for Argentinian troops to be used against the guerrillas who have been operating in southeast Bolivia. The news that Barrientos was seeking foreign troops to bolster his regime created a sensation in Latin America. It showed how shaky the general himself estimates his regime to be.

As an excuse for appealing for foreign troops, Barrientos is alleging that Che Guevara is the leader of the guerrilla front. The July 5 New York Times said that Barrientos had "resurrected" the "legend" of Che Guevara being in Bolivia. The Paris daily Le Monde has reported that Régis Debray's lawyer was the first to put the report into circulation.

Whatever the facts, Barrientos can be congratulated for providing a beautiful example of the terror the very name of Che Guevara strikes in the heart of a typical Latin-American dictator.

FIRST BALANCE SHEET OF THE MIDDLE-EAST CONFLICT

[The following is the text of a resolution on the Middle-East conflict adopted June 28 by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International, the world party of socialist revolution founded by Leon Trotsky.]

* * *

(1) The crisis in the Middle East has served to demonstrate once again the explosive nature of the world situation. While imperialism pursued its criminal war in Vietnam, a limited war broke out in another epicenter where international contradictions converge, bearing with it the danger of becoming transformed into a major conflict. At the same time, other epicenters in other parts of the world are rumbling, particularly in Latin America where the potential for an explosion is building up day by day.

For the past twenty years the Middle East has been kept in turmoil by an almost uninterrupted succession of domestic and international crises. At bottom this is due, whether directly or indirectly, to the presence of imperialism, which is exploiting the enormous resources of this region and seeking to maintain its position at any price. The Arab masses, in return, bled by the foreign exploiters and the indigenous ruling classes and layers, linking up with the historic wave of the colonial revolution, have mobilized in impetuous movements that have already brought about important changes in the traditional structures despite the limitations and contradictions featuring the leaderships in the forefront at various stages.

It is in this context that the existence and the role of the State of Israel must be considered. Set up by Zionism and imperialism at the expense of the Palestinian Arabs, this creation exploited the sentiments and aspirations of broad layers of Jews, the victims of the barbarous anti-Semitic persecution which raged repeatedly in the so-called civilized countries of Europe.

In view of its social and political structure, the origin and ideology of its ruling groups, its international ties, the State of Israel inevitably introduced an element of permanent antagonism in the Middle East. Imperialism has profited from this, exploiting the resulting weakening of the Arab movement and the possibility of propagandizing ideological themes that might have an impact on wide sectors of world opinion. At the same time, the question of Israel provided a channel for the reactionary Arab ruling classes in diverting the hate of the masses who were beginning to rebel against

the exploitation of which they were victim.

In the glaring light cast by the events of 1956, all possibility of doubt was removed as to the actual role of the State of Israel, the ally of French and British imperialism in their adventure to regain the Suez Canal after it was nationalized by the progressive Egyptian government.

A correct appreciation of the recent events and the attitude which the revolutionary movement ought to adopt cannot be gained without understanding the essential facts about the class nature of the countries involved in the crisis and the international meaning of their respective actions. The fundamental feature of the June 1967 conflict was the confrontation between a capitalist state with very specific sociological and ideological traits, integrated in the imperialist system on a regional and world scale, and an ensemble of countries of colonial and semicolonial structure, in which the most dynamic element was represented by states that had at different stages adopted spectacular anti-imperialist measures.

The imperialist forces, welded into an international united front that included even the dregs of traditional anti-Semitism, utilized the occasion to deliver a blow to the Arab states, particularly Egypt and Syria, in order to force back the freedom movement and postpone the settling of accounts in certain crucial instances. The camouflage for this was propaganda designed to obscure the primary significance of the conflict.

Washington in particular also found it useful in diverting attention from the war in Vietnam, the most recent phases of which had profoundly moved world opinion and touched off unprecedented demonstrations in the European capitalist countries and the United States. A certain success in this was registered -- not only did divisions occur in the pro-Vietnam movement, but new attacks against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam failed to provoke the countering response that would normally have followed; and in a whole series of countries a very dangerous hysteria was to be noted in which fear over the fate of Israel merged with the revengeful mood of former colonialists against the peoples engaged in the colonial revolution.

In this context it is the duty of the Fourth International to state its attitude with complete frankness -- we stand on the side of the Arab masses and the Arab countries against the Zionist state

of Israel and its imperialist partners and masters.

(2) Analysis of the events shows unquestionably that the Tel Aviv government took the initiative in opening fire, thereby assuring itself probably a decisive advantage on the military level. But even before the outbreak of hostilities, several episodes indicated that Israel was getting ready to strike at her neighbors. Various factors contributed in this direction -- growing economic difficulties, the gradual consolidation in Syria of a government in the vanguard of the progressive Arab movement, the pressure and concern of the oil companies who became more and more worried about maintaining their positions.

It is likewise probable that the ruling circles in Tel Aviv felt that the international context was definitely more favorable than in 1956 and they could count on the Soviet Union not intervening directly in the conflict in any way.

The problem arises, however, of explaining why Nasser, for his part, accepted the perspective of a test of force under the given conditions and consequently undertook measures, including those dealing with the Strait of Tiran which on the face of it involved the risk of a military confrontation.

The hypothesis that at bottom it was due to pressure exercised by the Soviet Union with the aim of engaging the United States on a new front in order to establish a basis for overall negotiations has not been confirmed by the events. In the diplomatic phase following the cease-fire, the USSR did seek to place all the problems on the table; but it is clear that the outcome of the conflict in the Middle East weakened the position of the USSR, and, in addition, in view of the fact that they had no intention of becoming directly engaged, the Soviet leaders could have had no doubts about this even if they did not foresee such a quick conclusion. Nasser himself in announcing his resignation revealed that Moscow, while sounding the alarm at the beginning over the threat to Syria, intervened later in the direction of "moderation."

In addition, it can be gathered from the official Nasserite explanations, aside from their apologetic character, that the Arab leaders, particularly the Egyptians, were under no delusion, essentially, in their estimate of the Israeli reaction (no one could seriously envisage the possibility of Tel Aviv swallowing the blow struck at Aqaba without replying) or in their interpretation of the attitude of the USSR (it was difficult to believe that Moscow, which had not become directly engaged in

Vietnam, would do so in the Middle East under less favorable conditions).

It was particularly in their estimate of the relationship of forces on the military level that the Nasserite group made a very grave error. In counting on the way the army and the air force had been strengthened and in underestimating the forces of the enemy (and likewise, no doubt, the negative consequences of the engagement in Yemen), the Nasserites thought they could reverse the situations of 1948 and 1956, or at least sustain a prolonged war which, accompanied by guerrilla struggle and a people's war in certain zones, would effectively constitute a major danger for Israel. A test of a few days duration was sufficient to show how mistaken these calculations were.

(3) The immediate causes of the Arab defeat were thus rooted in a false estimate of the relationship of forces and, fundamentally, in a military inferiority that was expressed, among other things, by the technical errors indicated by Nasser himself. No one can point to any crisis in the relations between the regime and the masses that might have flared during the conflict and provoked the disintegration of the army. No source has adduced the least evidence of this kind; and the masses, in addition, displayed their support to Nasser at the most crucial moment.

But the military weakness, in the final analysis, has political roots. At bottom what was involved were the intrinsic limitations and contradictions of a regime which is still based much more on the passive and controlled support of the masses than on their active, democratic mobilization, and which above all has maintained to a large degree the political and administrative structures of the past, featured by extreme bureaucratization and immense corruption. It is these factors, more precisely, which are at the bottom of the ineffectiveness of a military apparatus that despite the efforts of a decade and considerable foreign aid once again proved inadequate when the test came in the field.

The political causes on an international scale are not less important. The Arab countries are deeply divided and this division, behind the facade of a "sacred union," once again operated in favor of the Israelis and the imperialists. Certain countries did not budge, limiting themselves to verbal demonstrations of solidarity, while the united front which Nasser established with Jordan, severely criticized by the Syrians and Algerians, proved completely sterile in practice since it did not serve to distract the concentration of enemy efforts against Egypt or to avoid the immediate collapse of the Jordanian forces.

(Only King Hussein seems, for the time being, to have profited from this pact, succeeding in retaining his throne, which would probably have been impossible without the cover of the alliance with Nasser.)

The refusal of certain countries to prolong the oil blockade after the cease-fire provided further confirmation of the precarious nature of the Arab bloc and signified an additional weakening of the positions of the most progressive governments.

The Arab countries found out, in addition, that the bureaucratic leadership of the USSR, whose acts are determined essentially by its conservative interests and the ramifications of its concept of "peaceful coexistence," is not at all inclined to run risks. In the current situation in the Middle East, the bureaucracy is anxious above all to avoid a direct confrontation with the United States. This anxiety, which led to panic at the crucial moment, induced the Kremlin to associate itself shamefully with the June 7 UN decision which in reality sanctioned the Israeli victory, showing the solemn declarations of the top Moscow figures to be nothing but propaganda.

No matter how the political and diplomatic situation evolves -- and for obvious reasons the progressive Arab states cannot envisage a rupture with Moscow -- the prestige of the USSR has suffered a very grave blow. Class-conscious militants and vanguard layers will be more and more inclined to question the fundamental line of the Soviet leadership and its willingness to reply effectively to imperialism.

Tendencies oriented toward Peking can gain despite the fact that China is in no condition to intervene in a decisive way and the fact that its capacity to act is seriously limited by its policy of rejecting a united front against imperialism a priori.

(4) The war in the Middle East undoubtedly strengthened the State of Israel and enabled imperialism to score some gains. The Arab states emerged from the test with greatly weakened or disorganized armies and with very grave losses. They face the perspective of a long period of difficult military and economic reconstruction.

But in recognizing this fact, it must not be forgotten that in the near and even immediate future, Israel must face some acute problems arising from her expansion and some difficult political situations -- both abroad and at home -- without mentioning the fact that its inhabitants have not ended the nightmare of

another clash with the crushing superiority of forces held by the Arab countries.

As for American imperialism, it will have to pay a high price for the limited success that was gained. Even leaving aside the economic repercussions of the blocking of the Suez Canal and the supply of oil, the imperialists must post against their account the increasingly bitter hate of the Arab masses, who have gained still clearer understanding of the imperialist role and the need for a struggle to the end against it. This factor will have extensive influence on developments in the Middle East.

This is all the more so inasmuch as the military defeat did not involve demoralization and demobilization of the masses up to now. On the contrary, in a series of countries, and Egypt in the first place, the masses responded with a new wave of radicalization which was symbolized by the demonstrations in Cairo in support of Nasser against the forces demanding his departure.

(5) The military defeat did not cut the links between the Nasserite regime and the masses. At the decisive moment, the resigning president was able to count on a mobilization of wide extent in contrast to what happened upon the downfall of other Bonapartist leaders brought down by their adversaries without the masses reacting or reacting very little. It would be an error, however, to underestimate the difficulties in store for the future, including those following a "cooler" appreciation of the consequences of the defeat.

In any case, the revolutionary Arab movement will not fail to seriously ponder the experiences it has undergone. In the phase now opening, the domestic problems of reconstruction in particular will be on the agenda, and in the progressive countries, especially in Egypt and Syria, there will be the danger of a counterattack by the partisans of the former regime.

The correct response will not be limited to defending the status quo, to supporting the existing regimes, but must be conducted by working out a political course aimed at surmounting the limitations and contradictions of the present leaderships and regimes and at assuring the complete elimination of the vestiges of imperialist domination and settling accounts with the national bourgeoisies as classes.

A prime necessity is to establish state structures qualitatively different from those of the former regime and capable of really guaranteeing all the democratic rights of the masses, who must

be in position to directly control and manage the property confiscated from the imperialists and the indigenous ruling classes. In other words, objectively the problem is the consistent socialist development of the revolutionary movement in Egypt, in Syria, and also in the countries where the task still remains to sweep aside the most reactionary layers closely linked to imperialism in the defense of their monstrous privileges.

On an international level, the Arab revolutionists must pose the struggle against the State of Israel in correct terms, opposing any chauvinist distortions or manifestations along the line of a "holy war." The State of Israel must be combated because of its Zionist nature and its role as an instrument of imperialism, which is the enemy No. 1. It is necessary to reject any political or propagandistic orientation that reverses the order of things, seeking to justify the struggle against the imperialists essentially because of the aid they provide to Israel.

The perspective of the Arab revolution, in general, can only be that of a very hard and prolonged struggle which will probably take the most diverse forms, ranging from new military conflicts between states to guerrilla actions and a genuine people's war. That is why it is imperative to draw all the lessons of June 1967.

(7) Even if the euphoria of the victory still retards the political and ideological maturing of the Israeli masses, they will come to realize in the final analysis that maintenance of a Zionist state, integrated in the imperialist system, within the framework of an Arab world in full transformation, constitutes a blind alley for them. Even in the near future they will be able to observe that the war did not resolve the economic difficulties and that the consequences of this thrust to the right which the conflict accentuated injures them.

Sooner or later the Arab movement must admit that the problem exists of Jewish masses living in the Middle East and who cannot be denied the elementary rights belonging to every nationality. But a condition for such recognition is that the Jewish masses in Israel do not identify their fate with that of the Zionist state.

The Arab masses have struggled and will legitimately continue to struggle in the future against the Zionist state -- which from the very fact that it is based on the right of unlimited immigration necessarily operates in an expansionist direction at the expense of the Arab population in Palestine and the neighboring regions as has occurred in the past and

as is the case at present.

But the terms of the problem will change radically the day the Jewish masses in Palestine free themselves from Zionism, rejecting it as the doctrine at the heart of their state organization, struggling against their own capitalism -- whatever its specific social and ideological nature -- and joining in the common struggle of the peoples of the Middle East against imperialism. This is the way in which the premises for solidarity and collaboration between the Israeli masses and the Arab peoples can be established.

Within this perspective, which also involves the right of self-determination for the Israeli masses, it is possible to find a solution which will permit coexistence and collaboration between the Arab states, including a Palestinian Arab state, if the interested populations wish to establish it, and the Jewish national community now in Palestine.

For us the present task is not to take up the question of the state structure such a national community would have. For our part we believe that a genuinely independent state would scarcely be viable and that it would thus be preferable to envisage particular forms of autonomy within the framework of a wider state formation which would obviously have an Arab majority. It is clear that this perspective can be realized only as imperialism is driven out of the Middle East, capitalism overturned in the Arab countries and the working-class and peasant masses of this area of the world move jointly toward the construction of socialism.

(8) In the conflict that has continued on the political and diplomatic level since the June 7 cease-fire, the Fourth International reaffirms its solidarity with the Arab countries against the State of Israel. The Fourth International is struggling in particular for the achievement of the following immediate or short-range objectives:

(a) The withdrawal of the Israeli armies to their bases of departure and the reestablishment of the lines of the armistice of 1949.

(b) The immediate return of the refugees to their homes, with full compensation for the damages inflicted on them as victims in the recent war.

(c) An effective solution of the problem of the former refugees, to whom the opportunity must be given of returning to their lands, with compensation for all damages they have suffered; or, if they choose not to return, full compensation for their holdings. The right of the Arabs of Palestine to self-determination must be recognized and translated into

practice.

(d) Effective measures to boycott the imperialist powers. The measures should likewise be applied to governments who oppose them or hesitate to ap-

ply them.

(e) Complete solidarity of the workers states on the side of the Arab countries, including the application of boycotts on an economic level.

THOUSANDS EXECUTED IN GUATEMALAN WITCH-HUNT

The reports coming out of the underground in Guatemala of a savage wave of repression, undertaken by the Méndez Montenegro government through the use of right-wing military terrorist organizations, are being confirmed by material appearing in the bourgeois press.

A good example is the account in the June 10 London Economist "from a correspondent in Guatemala City."

"Since last November," writes the Economist's correspondent, the revolutionary guerrilla fighters "have been heavily buffeted and thousands of their supporters have been slain in an anti-communist 'pacification' drive in the dry, hungry hillbilly country of the Guatemalan Oriente.

"The clean-up of the guerrilla zone," continues the correspondent, has been carried out in military style by a proliferating number of right-wing terrorist groups."

The line is a thin one between the official army and the groups specializing in the murder of civilians. "Some of these are phantom organizations under whose name soldiers in civilian dress carry out their more grisly operations."

There are also indications that the U.S. and the CIA may have a hand in the bloody activities:

"The principal terrorist organization, the White Hand, is a creature of the Movimiento de Liberación Nacional. In 1954, the MLN spearheaded the CIA-organized invasion from Honduras which, with the connivance of the Guatemalan military high command, overthrew the pro-communist regime of Colonel Jacobo Arbenz.

"Since last July MLN leaders in the Oriente and many of their followers have been disappearing into Honduras. A new low-range radio station, Radio America, based in Honduras has been warning peasants of a new invasion with massive

American support."

Even more concrete is the report that "...the White Hand's anti-communist vigilantes in the Oriente have received roughly 2,000 rifles and machine guns which were given to the Guatemalan army under the American military aid programme. These weapons have been used in the slaughter of guerrilla collaborators and sympathisers in the towns and villages along the Atlantic Highway..."

On the actual number of murders by the American-armed terrorists, the Economist estimates:

"Since the army began its offensive, between 40 and 50 of the estimated 200 to 300 hard-core guerrilla fighters have been killed. Army sources have put the death roll at roughly 2,000 in the eastern departments of Zacapa and Izabal, the central area of rebel activity."

These figures indicate the massive slaughter of civilians being carried out by the pro-U.S. army and its terrorist collaborators.

"One foreign missionary priest living in the guerrilla zone declared: 'There is seldom a day when you don't see a body floating down the Rio Montagua. The killings are always in the countryside, never in the town...'"

The Economist's correspondent says that "The surviving rebels have withdrawn into a deeper portion of the thicket, or into Guatemala City. Captured guerrillas in black hoods are now accompanying army patrols in order to point out men who have collaborated with the insurgents and guerrilla camp sites and buried arms deposits."

According to the Economist's Guatemalan correspondent, "The violence of recent months is believed to have claimed more lives than all the insurgent activity of the past five years."

NGUYEN CAO KY "STEPS DOWN"

Nguyen Cao Ky's decision June 30 to "step down" was good for a one-day sensation in the Western press. Whether for good or ill, however, Johnson's favorite puppet was not being replaced by anything cleaner or dirtier. Instead of "president" in the coming elections, he will run only as "vice-president." Another general, Nguyen Van Thieu is to have the glory of running for the main post. Meanwhile he keeps his job as premier.

The shift, which was widely described as "humiliating" for the blood-thirsty killer, whose hero is Hitler, was reported to have been the result of adroit behind-the-scenes knife work by Ky's fellow generals.

But it was abundantly clear that the key decision was made by Ellsworth Bunker, the U.S. ambassador to the puppet government. He was "persuaded," says a report in the July 1 New York Times, "that anything smacking of dishonesty or rigging would destroy the elections' effectiveness." From this it can be gathered that even Johnson's cronies were aghast at Ky's free-wheeling style of electioneering.

It appears, however, that the Saigon premier may soon be awarded a consolation prize that may do much to help salve his ruffled feelings. It was announced in Washington July 2 that the Joint Chiefs of Staff are putting heavy pressure on Johnson to escalate the war in Vietnam by a minimum of another 70,000 troops and they would be happier with 100,000.

But this is precisely what Ky has been demanding, although it must be confessed that the voice coming from his throat sounds much more like Gen. Westmoreland's than his own.

In any case, the "best informed sources" in Washington, according to the July 8 New York Post, "take it for grant-



TO GET CONSOLATION PRIZE?

ed that the U.S. is going to escalate the ground war in Vietnam."

As part of the routine, Johnson scheduled McNamara to make an "inspection" visit and decide what the generals really need in the way of another levy of American conscripts.

And during his tour, McNamara will, naturally, do his best to cheer up the humiliated Ky.

"BOHEMIA" TELLS CUBAN READERS ABOUT HUGO BLANCO

To the growing worldwide campaign of solidarity with Hugo Blanco has been added the voice of Bohemia, the weekly magazine published in Havana. Bohemia is well known in Latin America for its Cuban and world news, special features, documents and a variety of historical, cultural, medical, scientific and other material.

Each of three recent issues of Bohemia which have just been received in

New York carries information about Hugo Blanco. The April 14 number, which is dedicated to the anniversary of the Playa Girón victory, reprints in full an article describing the case of the Peruvian peasant leader.

The reprint is from issue No. 81 of the journal Gente, published in Lima, Peru. The account of Blanco's trial at Tacna, of the support for him demonstrated by the people, and of the background

of the case are all based on an interview with Doctora Laura Caller, one of the defense lawyers. [An English translation of the Gente article is to be found in World Outlook, October 21, 1966.]

Bohemia introduced this with several paragraphs describing the worldwide support for the defendants. For example, "To the House of Pizarro in Lima from all over the world come protests from hundreds of labor, student, and intellectual organizations; the Chamber of Deputies of Chile, various English Members of Parliament, the 62 Argentine trade-union organizations of Peronist persuasion, the League of Irish Workers, and the Pan African Congress of South Africa have sent telegrams; on the streets of Paris are to be seen many posters telling about the case and Committees for the Defense of Hugo Blanco are being formed everywhere."

Bohemia concluded the reprint from Gente with the comment that the Blanco trial, contrary to the expectations of

his persecutors, has become a demonstration of the readiness of the Peruvian people to support "the necessary road of insurrection."

The April 21 Bohemia (which also contains Che Guevara's message on Vietnam and world revolution) carries a photo of one of the Parisian posters on the Blanco case, with an explanatory caption.

The April 28 Bohemia (which includes Fidel Castro's speech praising the April 15 Spring Mobilization in the U.S.) reprints two messages by Hugo Blanco.

One is a short letter published in the bulletin of the Paris-based Committee of Solidarity with the Victims of Repression in Peru.

The other is an open letter to the workers and peasants of Peru, explaining the gist of his case and proclaiming his willingness to die for the sake of the revolutionary cause.

THE LOS ANGELES TEST OF THE "SPIRIT OF GLASSBORO"

An incident occurred between Kosygin's two tête-à-têtes with Johnson at Glassboro, the town that gave the English language the word "booze," which received little notice outside of the city where it occurred -- Los Angeles, California. The incident, nonetheless, cast its own light on the "spirit of Glassboro" or "spirit of Holly Bush," as some of the Washington propagandists preferred to call it, and perhaps it signified something new on the American political scene.

On Friday, June 23, after a final handshake and pat on the back for the representative of the Kremlin, who went far beyond the call of duty in displaying homely cordiality, the busy political chief of U.S. imperialism jetted to the West Coast for a \$500-a-plate fund-raising dinner sponsored by the local Democratic party bosses.

But the antiwar movement had organized a reception of its own. In response to the call to show Johnson what the people of Los Angeles really think about his war in Vietnam, a tremendous crowd turned out -- in fact the biggest of its kind in the history of the city. Estimates put the figure as high as 25,000 although the sponsoring committee, deciding to be conservative, put it at 20,000.

The demonstration was a legal one, having obtained the proper police permits, and it was conducted in an orderly way.

The Los Angeles police, however, appear to have been briefed to try a tactic that had not yet been attempted



"LET US REASON TOGETHER"

by the authorities in response to the many and mounting demonstrations that have been staged against U.S. involvement in the Vietnamese civil war.

"The police used loudspeakers to instruct the crowd to disperse," writes a correspondent of World Outlook. "Only those in the front ranks heard the instructions." Those behind, not hearing the police, kept moving forward.

"Shoulder to shoulder, the police advanced on the crowd, protected by crash helmets and with both hands on their clubs. The police separated the crowd into vulnerable sections and then when the demonstrators were unable to move they started swinging their clubs."

A 14-year-old girl reported: "The squad moved on us, swinging their clubs. My girl friend got knocked down. I tried to help her but a policeman kned her in the stomach and hit her in the jaw with his club. We got to the parking lot, where police were still bashing and pushing and kicking people."

Dozens of similar scenes were reported. One demonstrator told the Los Angeles Free Press how people fell as they tried to get away and were then beaten senseless by the pursuing cops.

"Motorcycle cops rushed along the curb, stopping every ten feet or so and striking out blindly with clubs."

"The police listed 200 as injured," writes our correspondent, "but many others were beaten and left to bleed. Unknown hundreds of others escaped to their homes. Only 51 were arrested, compared to the hundreds beaten. As the frenzy of beatings ended, Police Chief Tom Reddin said, 'It was a perfect police exercise. I am very satisfied.'"

The June 25 Los Angeles Times reported him as saying, "It was a beautiful plan and well executed."

Democratic Mayor Sam Yorty, one of the main hosts of President Johnson at the banquet, left his \$500 plate long enough to watch the execution of the "beautiful plan." According to the Los Angeles Times, he offered his thanks to the police, who are of course under his jurisdiction, "for making the President's stay an enjoyable and safe one."

Thousands of participants, for whom this was their first demonstration of any kind, were eyewitnesses of the police brutality, saw their fellow demonstrators being roughed up and clubbed, saw the blood streaming from lacerated skulls. Hundreds of thousands in the area saw the scenes on TV. As a result there was an uproar in the community.

Some of the participants began speaking as charter members of a new "June 23 Movement."

The civil-liberties organizations rallied to the defense of the victims. The issue became so hot that it finally was given notice in the New York press which had evidently hoped to ignore it.

Johnson, of course, was well aware of what was occurring, including the advance plans. According to the July 1 New York Post, "the President ate his dinner at the Century Plaza Hotel expecting to be rushed from the hotel at any minute."

The same source declares, "Apparently the [Secret Service] agents kept Johnson briefed on the developments outside because he referred to them when he later commended Police Chief Tom Reddin on the 'fine job your officers have done tonight.'"

Let us recall that Johnson flew to Los Angeles to participate in the execution of this "beautiful plan" to use police clubs on antiwar demonstrators, after his first meeting with Kosygin. If Johnson had had the slightest reason to believe that a bloody incident like the one contemplated against the antiwar movement in Los Angeles would pain or even embarrass the distinguished representative of the Kremlin, would he have gone through with it?

It is excluded, of course, that Johnson consulted with Kosygin about the evening's plans to use clubs on those who were coming to protest the war in Vietnam and to demand the withdrawal of American troops among other things. But whatever Kosygin said must have sounded extremely reassuring to the boss of the U.S. imperialist war machine.

If there were any doubts whatsoever, they were settled by the fact that Kosygin did not at once cancel his scheduled Sunday meeting with Johnson in order to indicate his solidarity with the antiwar demonstrators who had been brutally attacked and beaten in Los Angeles because they dared to engage in an action that signified solidarity with the Vietnamese people in their terrible ordeal.

Instead, wagging his tail to make friends, while keeping it tucked between his legs out of harm's way, Kosygin returned for the second sniffing of noses.

Small wonder that Johnson was reported to be "jubilant" over his success in luring the Soviet "leader" into a session of reasoning together. Of course, Kosygin can reply that it was he who won. He convinced Johnson of the virtues of "peaceful coexistence" and this is proved by what happened at Los Angeles.

AN INTERVIEW WITH CHEN PI-LAN ON THE "CULTURAL REVOLUTION"

[Chen Pi-lan is well known in the history of the Communist movement of China as a woman's leader in the twenties and thirties. She took an active part in 1925-27 revolution and was a founding member of the Trotskyist movement.

[Born in 1902, she joined the socialist youth movement in April 1922. She became a member of the Chinese Communist party in October 1922. She was active in the Peking branch under Li Ta-choa. Later she moved to Shanghai.

[In the spring of 1924, the party sent her to Moscow to study. She remained there until the outbreak of the Chinese revolution the following year and then returned to Shanghai where she served as a member of the regional committee and as secretary of the Women's Section and as editor of the magazine China Woman.

[In the fall of 1925, she met Peng Shu-tse, a founding member of the Chinese Communist party, and they became life-long companions.

[Shortly after Peng and Chen Tu-hsiu, the founders of the Chinese Communist party, were expelled in 1929 because of their assessment of the errors committed by the party leadership during the preceding revolutionary period, she, too, was expelled. The charge was "Trotskyism."

[There was substance to the accusation, since the errors committed by the young Communist party were due primarily to the baneful influence of Stalin; and full insight into the nature of the errors came from studying writings by Leon Trotsky which had been kept from the knowledge of the ranks and most leaders of the international Communist movement but which finally reached China in a roundabout way and came to the attention of Peng Shu-tse and Chen Tu-hsiu.

[In 1932, when her husband and Chen Tu-hsiu were imprisoned by Chiang Kai-shek, she continued to work at building the Trotskyist movement, supporting herself and two children by teaching and writing under the most difficult underground conditions. She wrote a number of articles under the pen name of Chen Pi-yam which were published in various periodicals and later compiled in two volumes. The publication of this work established her reputation in China as an authority on the woman question.

[After Peng's release from prison in 1937, she became editor of a monthly magazine New Voice and a member of the Political Bureau of the Revolutionary Communist party of China, the Trotskyist

organization.

[Throughout World War II, the Chinese Trotskyists fought against Japanese imperialism and at the same time struggled for a socialist revolution in China. With the victory in 1949, however, some of the best-known Trotskyist leaders had to leave their homeland due to Mao's extremely factional attitude toward them. Those who remained suffered extreme persecution. Some disappeared, others were killed, a number were imprisoned. The ultimate fate of many of those who were imprisoned is not known to this day. Some are still behind bars. Chen Pi-lan is among those who, much against their will, have been forced to live in exile.

[The interview below was granted to Antonio Farien. In the opening he refers to two interviews with Peng Shu-tse. For these see World Outlook, August 12, 1966, and February 10, 1967.]

* * *

Question: In my interviews with Peng Shu-tse, who analyzed the situation in China in some detail, I have gotten a fairly clear idea of the origins and subsequent evolution of the "great proletarian cultural revolution," the different and contrasting positions of the Maoists and anti-Maoists, and the possible future perspectives of the struggle.

In the first stage of the "cultural revolution," the people who were attacked were artists, writers, scholars and educators. Therefore, I would like to ask you some questions about the differences of opinion on questions of literature, art, education, etc.

First of all, may I ask you to describe and analyze the differences between the two factions on these questions, as it seems these differences can be most important and give us a much clearer and better understanding of the general lines and positions of the two contending factions.

Answer: Yes, this is true. If one understands the differences on these questions, one can get a very good idea as to what the general struggle between the two factions is about.

In reality, when Mao launched the "cultural revolution" movement, he began by attacking the drama of Wu Han, Hai Jui Dismissed from Office, Tien Han's drama, Shi Yao Whan (a woman's name) and the writings of Teng To, Midnight Discussions on Yen Shan and Notes from a Three-Family Village. In other words, Mao began by attacking the leading cadres in the cul-

tural fields which, of course, gave rise to the name, "cultural revolution."

We all know that under Stalinist dictatorial regimes, there is no political freedom, and, under these conditions, there is much dissatisfaction among the people. Dissatisfaction of this kind is usually reflected in literature and art since most artists and writers are very sensitive to the world around them. They observe the daily life of the people and see their plight as well as their hopes and aspirations. Through the means of literature and art, then, they mirror what they have observed -- the bad as well as the good.

It is for just this reason that the Stalinist policies have always severely restricted the cultural fields in order to keep the bad side from being exposed, including the bureaucratic regime. Literature and art were no longer allowed to reflect the actual reality but became mere propaganda to praise the policies of the bureaucrats as well as them as individuals.

It is very clear that such a situation existed under Stalin's regime; and the policies elaborated by Zhdanov on literature and art are typical examples.

The policies elaborated by Mao in this respect have been in no way different, except perhaps they have been more restrictive and harsher. The result in China has been an almost constant resistance in the field of literature and art to Mao's policies. The present purge of people in this field is by no means the first, although it is the largest and most serious.

Q: Could you briefly tell us when Mao began to purge these people in the cultural fields and why?

A: Mao's policy of restricting literature and art began in May 1942 during the Yen-an period. It was during this time that Mao made his well-known "Talks at the Yen-an Forum on Literature and Art" which were given in preparation for the purge of a well-known writer.

In these long discourses, except for a few quotations from Lenin, whom he cited as his authority, Mao demanded that literature and art serve only the workers, peasants and soldiers in line with the political policies of the party; and he was against any exposures or satires of his Yen-an regime. The writers were only supposed to praise the Communist New Democracy, revolutionary heroes, etc.; and he pointed out that there were many defects in the field of literature and art and that it was necessary to launch a movement in order to purge them.

During this time, there were several writers who had written some articles exposing the real life in Yen-an, such as the famous woman writer, Ting Ling, who wrote an article entitled, Impressions of the March Eighth Holiday; the famous poet, Ai Ching, who wrote an article entitled, One Should Understand and Respect the Writers; and Wong Shi-wei, who wrote a series of articles entitled, Crotalaria Sessliflora. The latter were the sharpest exposure of certain aspects of Yen-an. He criticized the lack of democracy and contrasted the privileged life of the bureaucracy to that of the rank and file. These articles attracted much attention among the people and especially among the young Communists.

Mao could not tolerate such criticism and for this reason called a meeting to discuss the questions of literature and art where he gave his talks. These meetings and talks not only prepared for the purge which followed; they also laid the foundations for the basic line of Communist party policy in questions concerning literature and art.

Not long after these discussions and meetings, a special meeting was called to purge Wong Shi-wei. Many of the party's officials, such as the heads of the Central Propaganda Department and the Organizational Department and the president of the Center of Academia, as well as cadres working in the field of literature and art, and other writers, took part in this meeting.

One might wonder why it was of such a serious nature. The reason is simple. Wong joined the party in 1926. This made him an old party member and one of the most important members of the Center of Academia. Wong had translated into Chinese more than two million words of the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin. He was, as well, a very capable writer and was respected by almost everyone, especially the youth. Thus the purge of Wong Shi-wei was a most important event in the Yen-an period.

The meeting lasted sixteen days during which Wong expressed and defended his opinions in the face of vigorous attacks by the leading cadres and officials of the party. There were a number of cultural workers who agreed with Wong's opinions and sympathized with him. Yet, due to his being condemned as antiparty, anti-Marxist and Trotskyist by some of the party leaders, and especially by Chen Po-ta -- who is now the leader of the present cultural revolutionary group but who at that time was Mao's private secretary -- who criticized Wong most maliciously, they became fearful and re-treated. Nevertheless, Wong, from beginning to end, remained strong in defending

his ideas as correct.

The meeting finally ended by condemning him as being antiparty, anti-Marxist and Trotskyist; he was expelled from the party, thrown into prison and tortured. Finally, he acknowledged that he was a Trotskyist; and hence he was killed.

We should take special note of the fact that Wong Shi-wei's book, Crotalaria Sessiliflora has exercised great attraction and has interested many youth, including members and sympathizers of the CCP as well as its youth organization. The book has circulated throughout China by means of handwritten copies passed on and on, time after time. The original copy that I read was borrowed from a sympathizer of the CCP and was of this type.

Because of the bravery and boldness of Wong's resistance against the vicious attacks and his insistence on the correctness of his own position, he became very famous. His name is to be found in most histories of this period.

Q: Were there any other purges after Wong?

A: After the CCP took power in 1949, Mao's cultural policies were put into effect for the nation as a whole.

The first to resist and criticize them was Hu Feng, who was a very famous left theoretician on literature and art. He considered Mao's "Talks at Yen-an" to be mechanistic and therefore he said that "mechanism has controlled literature and art circles for the last ten years...this ideology of literature and art has been sterilized...when one speaks they must employ Mao's thought which causes people more than enough trouble."*

He held that truth is the highest principle of art. He was against what he regarded as the oversimplified policy of having literature and art serve only political ends and was against the limitation of themes as proposed by Mao. Thus he insisted that all writers should have the right to choose their own subjects.

The ideas and opinions of Hu Feng, as I have indicated, are, of course, based on principles which everyone should be able to accept. However, from Mao's point of view, such ideas were out of bounds and in 1955 he began a campaign against Hu Feng and his followers. This campaign lasted several months and was carried out on a national scale.

*The quotation is from "On the Counterrevolutionary Double-dealer Chou Yang," by Yao Wen-yuan, published in Hongqi, No. 1, 1967. -- A.F.

Not only were Hu Feng's followers attacked and criticized, but many people in the universities, middle schools and cultural organizations who only sympathized with him were also attacked and purged. According to reports published at the time, more than 130 Hu-Fengists were imprisoned or put in labor camps. Since that time there has been no news of him or his followers.

Almost immediately after the Hu Feng purge came the "Let a Hundred Flowers Blossom and a Hundred Schools of Thought Contend" movement, April to June 1957. It was during this period that a number of left writers criticized Mao's policies on literature and art, such as Ting Ling, Ai Ching and Feng Hsueh-feng, the most famous contemporary theoretician of literature and art. These three were all leaders of the party in the cultural fields, especially Ting Ling and Feng Hsueh-feng, who were respectively chairwoman and vice-chairman of the National Association of Literature and Art Workers.

In June, when Mao began to suppress the "Blossom and Contend" movement, they came under attack.

For example, in September, a special meeting was held in Peking to purge Ting Ling. There were around one hundred participants in this meeting, including many high officials of the party in the cultural fields, such as the minister and vice-minister of culture, Shien Yen-ping and Chou Yang.

This meeting, like the one held in Yen-an to purge Wong Shi-wei, lasted sixteen days and was very exhausting for Ting Ling as she was subjected to one attack after another, accusing her of being a rightist and a reactionary. Attacks against her which appeared in the People's Daily made a connection between her and Wong Shi-wei and accused her of being like him.

Shortly after the meeting, Ting Ling, Feng Hsueh-feng, Ai Ching and many others were imprisoned or sent to "reeducation camps." As with Hu Feng and his followers, nothing further has been heard about their fate.

Concerning Ting Ling, I should say a few more words. In 1923-24, she was a classmate of mine in Shanghai University where we lived in the same home. We became very close friends, so I know her very well. She had a very strong character and was very democratic minded.

Also during the "Blossom and Contend" movement, we should take notice of the position taken by Shien Yen-ping. In a meeting called by the Central United Front Department on May 16, 1957, Shien Yen-ping expressed his own views on liter-

ature and art. He said, "In regard to literature and art, it must be considered a special field. By only depending on some of the party's basic texts and without any special knowledge in this field, it is impossible to resolve concrete problems concerning literature and art...What then should be done? There is the short road which is dogmatism and commanderism." It is very clear that Shien was criticizing the whole apparatus of the cultural department.

Shien considered that in literature and art, there existed a "general phenomenon" of "monotony" and "repetitiousness." He explained that the "sickness" of repetition was due to reducing everything to formulas and to the lack of variety in themes. In short, these sicknesses were due to not carrying out the policy of the "Blossom and Contend" movement.

All the criticisms of Shien Yen-ping no doubt implied that Mao's policies on literature and art restricted the creative initiative and freedom of the writers; hence the monotonous and repetitious works which were devoid of any liveliness or creativity.

Q: Since Shien Yen-ping was the minister of culture, that is, the highest leader in the cultural field, why is it that he spoke out against Mao's policies and why was he not purged with the others?

A: In order to answer this question, it is necessary to give a short résumé of Shien's personal history. He joined the CCP in 1921 and at that time he was already the author of several articles and the editor of the large magazine, Novel. After the defeat of the revolution of 1927, he left the CCP. However, he continued to write and published several books under the pen name of Mao Toing, some of which became very celebrated and he himself became very well known. It was for this reason that he became minister of culture after the CCP took power in 1949. He held this post until January 1965 when he requested that he be allowed to retire.

As to the reasons why he criticized Mao's policies and why he was not purged, we must note that first of all, his speech was made during the peak of the "Blossom and Contend" movement; secondly, Shien was not a member of the party; and, thirdly, the Ministry of Culture was really controlled by Chou Yang.

According to some recent reports, however, Shien has been arrested in the current purge. It is most probable that he was arrested because of the position he expressed in his speech of 1957.

During the 1925-27 revolution, I had quite a bit of personal contact with Shien, and so I also knew him very well. He was an extremely cautious man and most likely, in my opinion, he has probably not made any criticism of Mao's policies since 1957.

Q: Since you said that it was really Chou Yang who controlled the Ministry of Culture and since Chou Yang himself has recently been attacked, what were his ideas and did they conform with those of Shien Yen-ping?

A: Chou Yang's opinions on literature and art are not only similar to those of Shien Yen-ping, they are much more profound. If we turn only to the article by Yao Wen-yuan, recently published in Hongqi, No. 1, 1967, "On the Counterrevolutionary Double-dealer Chou Yang," attacking Chou Yang, we can see what his position is.

For example, Yao Wen-yuan very clearly states, "Chou Yang, like Hu Feng, repeatedly advocated the propaganda that 'the highest principle of art is truth,' and he was against the 'oversimplification and vulgarization,' the conditions placed on writers and the role of literature as propaganda. Chou Yang considered that 'dogmatism' and 'sectarianism' and the harsh attitude towards artists and writers has seriously restricted their freedom." "As to the 'question of making literature and art serve politics,' there was narrow, one-sided and incorrect understanding." Therefore, Chou advocated that "there should be no limits on subjects and that we should help people see the diversity of the world, the laws of history and the complex nature of life." "Regardless of the subject, it can reflect the spirit of the present period."

In another article, Chou Yang said, "It is better to describe the intellectuals technicians, and others from the point of view of the proletariat. However, the working class should not be sectarian; that is, it should not only write about the workers and peasants. The idea that proletarian literature is only about workers and peasants is not correct."

Chou Yang was especially against literature and art serving only politics. He also said, "The writers should not only write about current affairs and should not follow the policy put forward today and then follow a different policy that might be put forward tomorrow."*

"In a word, Chou Yang considered

*Quotations taken from an article criticizing Chou Yang by Li Chi-kai and others, published in Wenhui Bao, July 31, 1966.
-- A.F.

that writers should write what they themselves see and according to what they themselves feel, even if what they see and feel does not correspond to the ideas and policies of the party. The writer must be loyal to the facts, to the truth and to the objective conditions, and write freely what he believes." Therefore, Chou Yang advocated assuring freedom in the sphere of writing.*

Q: If Chou Yang disagreed with Mao's policies, why was he allowed to remain as vice-minister of culture, being in fact the real head of the ministry, to carry out Mao's policies?

A: This is an important question and it is very necessary that it be answered. Under the personal dictatorship of Mao, many leaders and cadres of the party disagreed with his policies, but nevertheless they were forced to carry out Mao's decisions. Chou Yang was only one of many such cadres and leaders. He often found himself in a contradictory situation, that is, not believing in Mao's policies and even speaking and writing about his differences, but nevertheless forced to carry out Mao's line in practice.

For example, before the purge of Hu Feng in 1955, during a discussion meeting on Hu Feng's case, Chou Yang said, "Hu Feng's general political position is in agreement with the party."** In other words, Chou Yang did not want the case of Hu Feng to become too serious. When Mao ordered Hu Feng to be purged as a reactionary, Chou was obliged to carry out his orders.

In 1957, when Ting Ling, Feng Hsueh-feng, Ai Ching and the others were attacked, Chou Yang was forced into the same contradictory position as in the case of Hu Feng. It was for this reason that Yao Wen-yuan accused him of being a "double-dealer" or "two-faced counter-revolutionary." In reality, then, under the pressure of Mao, many cadres were obliged to carry out policies with which they did not agree. This reflects the contradiction between Mao and the cadres of the party of which the present crisis is only a culmination, reaching to the point of explosion.

Q: Can Chou Yang's opinions be considered as exemplary for most of the cadres in the cultural fields?

*See article entitled, "A Reevaluation of Chou Yang," published in Ming Pao magazine, August 1966. -- A.F.

**See article by Yao Wen-yuan cited earlier. -- A.F.

A: Yes, it seems as though Chou Yang's opinions reflect most of those of the rank and file. For example, the two other vice-ministers of culture, Sha Yeh and Lin Mo-han, as well as the secretary of the party group heading the All-China Federation of Literature and Art Circles, Yang Han-sheng, all shared the same opinions as Chou Yang.

Yang Han-sheng's opinions were even more radical than Chou's, however, and it was for this reason that he has been subjected to harsher criticism than many of the others.

Q: Could you give us some idea of Yang Han-sheng's opinions?

A: Yes, I can, but first I should give you a few details about his personal history. Yang Han-sheng was also a classmate of mine at Shanghai University in 1923-24. He was at that time a member of the party and was a very active participant in the revolutionary movement. After the defeat of the revolution in 1927, he remained in Shanghai and was active in the underground, and it was during this time that I had much contact with him and his wife. Beginning in 1928, he wrote several novels and afterwards became a very important party cadre in the cultural work of the party.

Because he remained loyal to certain traditions of the party during the second Chinese revolution, he disagreed with the many restrictions which Mao placed upon writers and artists and criticized them very harshly.

For example, in 1962, at a meeting of playwrights and actors in Canton, he said, "The party's policy on literature and art [that is, Mao's policy] is equal to ten ropes binding the hands and feet of writers. These ten ropes prove to be five obligations: (1) one must write about important subjects (2) one must write about heroes and outstanding figures (3) one must participate in collective writing (4) one must finish his work in a certain amount of time (5) one must always have the OK from the party leadership. From these five obligations arise five ventures: (1) to write about the contradictions among the people, especially between the masses and the leaders (2) to write any satirical dramas (3) to write any tragedies (4) to write about the defects and failures of a hero (5) to write about the weaknesses of any of the party's leaders. All of this leaves a writer in despair and makes it difficult for him to write, and even when he does write, his work is only repetitious."

In conclusion, he advocated that "it is necessary to do away with all restrictions and to break out of all limitations. We must respect the rule of cre-

ativity, that is, freedom for the writers."*

Yang Han-sheng was severely attacked by the Maoists for the above opinions as well as for many other things. In 1957, Yang and Tien Han went to the USSR for the anniversary of the October Revolution. While they were there, they saw many plays such as "The Infinite Perspective" and the "Bluebird." These two dramas were exposures of the personal cult of Stalin and the purges of his opponents. They portrayed Stalin's rule to be "like that under the Tsars," and pointed out that "the USSR no longer needs the period of terror."

When Yang Han-sheng and Tien Han returned to China, Yang said that the actors of the USSR were very "bold"; "we are very timid. We should make the utmost effort to reform, to be bold and creative."**

For these things, the Maoists accused Yang of being a "counterrevolutionary revisionist"; yet, in reality, he was only expressing agreement with the de-Stalinization taking place in the Soviet theater. It was this which Mao could not tolerate.

Q: Wu Han, Teng To and Tien Han are some of China's most famous writers who not only have been among the first to be attacked but also among those who have been the most severely attacked by the Maoists. Have they ever expressed their opinions on literature and art?

A: Wu Han, Teng To and Tien Han have, of course, differences with Mao's policies, but these have never been expressed openly as far as I know. They have, however, written plays and articles in which they have indirectly criticized Mao's policies and his personal cult and dictatorship. The two plays, Hai Jui Dismissed by Wu Han and Shi Yao Whan by Tien Han, which uses historical plots in order to criticize Mao and his policies are good examples.

Teng To also wrote many articles in which he indirectly attacked the policy of the people's communes as well as Mao's infallibility. But this was explained in your interview with Peng Shu-tse, and so it is not necessary for me to repeat it. Here, I would only like to

*See article entitled, "Criticism of Yang Han-sheng's Ten Ropes," published in Renmin Ribao, December 29, 1966. -- A.F.

**See the article entitled "Yang Han-sheng as a Propagandist of the Revisionist Literature and Art," published in the Worker's Daily, February 27, 1967. -- A.F.

point out that even those who attacked Mao indirectly could not be tolerated by Mao.

Q: Were any of the leaders in the cultural fields, such as Chou Yang, against any of Mao's other policies?

A: Almost all of those who disagreed on questions of literature and art were also in disagreement with Mao's overall policy. Since the leaders and cadres working in the cultural fields have frequent contact with writers and artists working directly with the masses, they learn from them the feelings and aspirations of the masses.

For example, in a meeting held in Darien, August 1962, of writers from all over the country, the overwhelming majority of them expressed their dissatisfaction with and criticized the "great leap forward" policy and especially the people's communes, as well as Mao's policies on literature and art. They felt that "the life of the peasants is getting worse and worse," and "the general line is the psychology of an upstart." Similarly, "the Great Leap Forward is like a stimulant," and "the people's communes are adventurism." Chou Yang himself said, "The Great Leap Forward represents subjective idealism." Again, "the people's communes have been established too early." He even said, "It is good to let the peasants have their own plots," and he advocated "opening the free market" in the countryside.*

The criticisms of the "great leap forward" and the people's communes by Chou Yang and the other writers are echoes of the criticisms advanced by Peng Teh-huai in 1959. Therefore, in a meeting of the All-China Federation of Literature and Art Circles in June 1964, Mao made an address in which he said that "in the past 15 years, these associations and most of their publications [a few said to be good] had for the most part failed... to carry out the policies of the party... and failed to reflect the socialist revolution and construction. In recent years, they had even verged on revisionism. If they did not take serious steps to remodel themselves, sooner or later, they were bound to become organizations of the Hungarian Petöfi club type."**

From what Mao said, it is clear that he feared the intellectuals in the cultural fields and it is easy to understand why he began the cultural revolu-

*See above, Li Chi-kai in Wenhui Bao. -- A.F.

**Yao Wen-yuan, "On the Counterrevolutionary Double-dealer Chou Yang." -- A.F.

tion and a purge of all those who opposed him. Mao feared an actual development such as the Hungarian revolution of 1956 in China itself, started by similar groups as the Petöfi Club and it is for this reason that he began his purge by singling out these cadres in the fields of literature and art.

Q: Why is it that many of the famous educators such as Lu Ping, president of Peking University, Li Ta, president of Wu Han University, Kuang Ya-ming, president of Nanking University, etc., have been purged? Did they have differences, and possibly refused to carry out Mao's policies in education?

A: These educators were against Mao's policies on education. But this is a complicated and difficult question. It would make it much clearer if I would first outline Mao's attitude toward education.

Since the CCP took power in 1949, Mao has based his educational policies on the principle that "education must serve politics." Mao often stressed the idea that "students and professors should remould their thought." Mao compelled the students to attend political lectures and to participate in political discussions and physical work. In other words, his policy was to make Communists out of all the students and to get them to accept and support the party's policies. The learning of other subjects, Mao does not regard as being important; or, at best, it is only a secondary consideration. Because of such policies, the standards of education have greatly diminished.

In the "great leap forward" program of 1958, Mao put forward the idea of an "educational revolution." He stressed the idea that "education must be accompanied by productive work." Under this slogan, the professors as well as the students were sent to the countryside to participate in the work of the people's communes, while others were sent to work in the factories, still carrying on their political studies and activities. These conditions led to almost a standstill in the students' regular studies. This was the situation in 1958-59.

Mao's policies and their results aroused much dissatisfaction among the professors, teachers and students. For example, Li Ta said, "The Educational Revolution has destroyed the educational process. The fundamental courses have been torn asunder. The quality of education has been lowered, the methods of teaching and studying have been disorganized. All the schools controlled by the party have become anarchic. The relations between teachers and students, between the young and old and between the masses and the party have worsened to the great-

est degree."

He also said, "The Educational Revolution in 1958 caused a very bad situation. It destroyed the activities of the intellectuals and hampered their self-respect."*

The crisis described by Li Ta represents the common opinion of the overwhelming majority of educators, professors, teachers and students.

Li Ta was one of the founding members of the CCP and was one of the twelve who attended the founding congress in 1921. He was elected to the Central Committee of the party and became the head of the Central Committee's Propaganda Department. Sometime afterward, he left the party because he disagreed with the decision that the members of the CCP should join the Kuomintang, although he remained a Marxist.

He translated many Marxist books and propagandized the ideas of Marxism in many of his own articles. It is evident that he helped the Marxist movement when he was outside the party.

Since he was a professor and had studied education from a Marxist point of view, including the educational system in the USSR, he became very well known as a Marxist educator. This was why the CCP, after taking power, appointed him as the president of Wu Han University.

It was because of his profound knowledge as an educator that he realized the dangers of Mao's educational policies and criticized them very severely.

Mao's policy of "educational revolution" met with bankruptcy following the failure of the "great leap forward." At the beginning of 1960, Mao was no longer able to maintain his policies and so he temporarily sat back while Liu Shao-chi and Teng Hsiao-ping took on the responsibility of dealing with the situation.

Educational policies, then, were somewhat changed and corrected. First of all, the Central Educational Department published the "Sixty Points of Higher Educational Reforms." The chief reforms were aimed at encouraging the students to study in their special fields and to make sure that they had the necessary time to do so. The students were supposed to participate in physical work and political activities; however, these things were not supposed to interfere with or be done during the time set aside for study and class. A regular system of teaching and studying was to be reestablished as well

*See Ming Pao magazine, No. 12, 1966, p. 37. -- A.F.

as a disciplined relationship between the students and professors. In order to raise the quality of education, examinations were also to be reinstated. Many of the students were to be encouraged to take up studies in the scientific fields as well as foreign languages. The schools were no longer supposed to interfere in the love life of the students, nor were they supposed to apply any other inappropriate pressures. Attention was also to be brought to the health of the students and to their welfare in general.

The Peking municipal government, headed by Peng Chen, carried out these new reforms very enthusiastically and elaborated a series of concrete measures to implement them. For example, it was stated that "students and teachers should not be demanded to learn politics too quickly, nor should any time be taken away from their regular studies for political activities. The teachers must know and teach their subjects as well as possible and the students must learn their lessons as well as they can. The use of abstract political ideas and terms, the empty preaching and the long political reports must be avoided."

The president of Peking University, Lu Ping, from 1961 completely abandoned the "educational revolution" policy and turned the university into an experiment for the new education reforms. He lowered the amount of time required for physical labor and political activity and made sure the students had adequate time to study their particular subjects. Hence the students of Peking University were much better off from 1961 to 1962.

Lu Ping also advanced the slogan, "Learn from the USSR," that is, China should also try to copy some of the educational policies in some of the Western countries; and he advocated inviting the old professors who had been expelled in the past years to return to their teaching posts.

Li Ta, Kuang Ya-ming and many of the other educators carried out similar reforms. Thus the universities and colleges succeeded in returning to normal and constructive educational practices.

This educational reform, in the eyes of Mao Tse-tung was an absolute negation of his own policies of "education serving politics" and "education combined with productive labor," and he considered it to be a "revisionist educational line" or the "restoration of bourgeois educational policies." With this he deliberately prepared to purge those who were responsible for these reforms.

On June 13, 1966, Mao published a notice in the name of the Central Com-

mittee of the CCP and the State Council. This document is a concrete manifestation of the purge in the educational field and contains two major points:

(1) All universities and middle schools were ordered closed for six months in order to "carry out thoroughly the cultural revolution." In reality, this meant to "carry out thoroughly" a purge in all the universities and middle schools. Following publication of the notice, there was a furious struggle and all Mao's opponents in the universities and middle schools came under attack and were purged.

(2) Almost all opponents were attacked by the students as they carried out Mao's orders, resulting in the purge of such people as Lu Ping, Li Ta, Kuang Ya-ming, Peng Kang, president of the University of Communications in Sian, Ho Lu-ting, president of the Museum College in Shanghai, and Chiang Lan-tsein, president of Tsing-hua University in Peking. As for the professors, the purge is difficult to estimate; however, from all reports, it seems as though the number would run into many thousands.

The People's Daily held that the most important question was to see "whether we shall pass on Mao Tse-tung's thought from generation to generation." This is comparable to the religious attitude towards the Bible, and Mao's "cultural revolutionary educational" reforms come close to paralleling the educational methods of the Catholic Church during the Middle Ages.

Q: What, in your opinion, will be the outcome of the "cultural revolution"? That is, what do you think will be the overall influence and effect of Mao's "cultural revolution" on Chinese culture?

A: Mao's purge has included almost all those cadres working in the Central Propaganda Department, the Central Cultural Ministry in the All-China Foundation of Literature and Art Circles, the All-China Union of Stage Artists, National Federation of Film Workers and the National Federation of News Workers as well as writers, musicians, painters, educators, professors, etc., who are the embodiment of China's culture. To purge them means to destroy China's culture. I will only point out here two indisputable examples of what Mao's "cultural revolution" means concretely to Chinese culture.

(1) Since Mao launched the "cultural revolution" in May 1966, most writers have not dared to write anything. The publication of most cultural magazines has stopped, film-making has almost come to a standstill; the publication and republication of many books of foreign origin and even many by Chinese authors has been

terminated; many cinemas and theaters have ceased to operate. In other words, almost all cultural activities no longer exist.

(2) Since all the middle schools and universities were closed in June 1966, not one university has reopened and it was only last March that a part of the middle schools began to reopen in such places as Peking and Tiensing. Even before the "cultural revolution" and Mao's purge, there was a great lack of teachers and professors; now, of course, there are even fewer.

The worst part is that from the elementary schools to the universities there is a chronic shortage of textbooks, since almost the whole printing establishment has been given over to printing the works of Mao Tse-tung. For example, in the last half year, fifteen million Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung have been produced, each containing four large volumes, as well as eighty million Quotations from Mao Tse-tung. In addition to this, another eighty million copies of the Selected Works have been scheduled for publication this year. Nearly all other books, therefore, such as textbooks, literature and even the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin have ceased to be printed.

Generally, then, I can say that not only have cultural activities stagnated since Mao launched his "cultural revolution," China's culture is being destroyed to the point of disaster.

Finally, I would like to say that the "proletarian cultural revolution" is theoretically absurd. When the proletariat takes power in a country, its greatest task is to overthrow the remaining capitalists in the world and complete the socialist revolution. Before the world capitalist class has been destroyed, it is impossible to construct a real proletarian culture. However, after the world socialist revolution has been completed, the proletariat itself will begin to disappear; that is, classes and, of course, class antagonisms will begin to disappear. It is at this point, then, that socialist culture will begin naturally to establish itself. Therefore, it is in no way

necessary to establish a proletarian culture.

Mao's launching of the "cultural revolution" is not only theoretically absurd, it is also foolish from a practical point of view. The socio-economic base in China is so backward that there are many areas which remain in a state of primitive production. As for culture, the majority of the peasantry remain illiterate along with almost half the working class. If under these conditions, to launch a "proletarian cultural revolution" in order to establish "four news" -- new culture, new ideas, new habits and new customs -- does not display ignorance, then it reveals illusionary and foolish idealism.

If Mao really intended to raise the cultural level of the workers and peasants, he should have started by eliminating the illiteracy of the masses. In order to achieve this, it would, first of all, be necessary to increase the standard of living of the masses, that is, increase their pay and decrease their hours of work. It would be necessary to let them have time and energy to study and to participate in cultural activities.

Mao's policy is, however, just the contrary, demanding that the workers and peasants work longer hours with no improvement in their living standards. Mao's recent campaign against "economism" and his refusal to grant any concessions to the working class show his attitude quite clearly; that is, the working class should serve only as instruments of production in the interests of the bureaucracy.

In reality it can be said that Mao utilized the label of "proletarian," only in order to rationalize his attack and to purge his opposition under the accusation of "taking the capitalist road." However, we can see that Mao has not attacked the real capitalist and bourgeois elements still existing in China. This in itself is enough to prove that Mao's "proletarian cultural revolution" is nothing more than a purge which he is carrying out in order to maintain his own bureaucratic rule and personal cult.

KYOTO STUDENTS BLOCK ARMY USE OF UNIVERSITY

Some 2,000 students at Kyoto University boycotted classes and staged a marathon meeting beginning June 29 to compel the administration to discontinue utilizing their school for military purposes. Twenty-five army men are studying nuclear physics there among other subjects.

Dr. Azuma Okuda, president of the institution, appeared before the students.

By 10:20 p.m. he promised to take up the matter at a meeting of deans the following day. This was not acceptable to the shouting, jeering students. Finally at 6 a.m., Okuda conceded.

It was reported that during the meeting he had to receive injections to hold down his blood pressure and vitamins to keep going.

BERTRAND RUSSELL URGES BAN ON USE OF NAPALM

[Bertrand Russell, who initiated the War Crimes Tribunal that recently found the U.S. government guilty of aggression and other crimes against peace and against humanity in Vietnam, has been following the events in the Middle East with close attention. On June 12 he denounced the blitzkrieg carried out by the government of Israel as "aggression." (See World Outlook, June 30, p. 644.)

[On June 27, in another statement to the press, Bertrand Russell expressed his revulsion over the Israeli use of napalm in its attack on the neighboring Arab states. The world-famous philosopher and pacifist urged that this fiendish "antipersonnel" weapon belongs in the same category as dumdum bullets and gas chambers and should be banned. The full text of his statement follows.]

* * *

There is now extensive evidence that Israel used large quantities of napalm in its recent blitzkrieg against its Arab neighbours. U Thant announced on June 9 that the United Nations representatives on the spot had reported to him that Israeli aircraft were "continuously bombing, napalming and strafing" Syrian positions. The Washington Post has reported Syrian hills "covered with burned and blackened fields, silent testimony to the liberal use of napalm." The Beirut correspondent of the Economist has reported that in Jordan the informed estimate is "between 14,000 and 18,000 people killed, of whom maybe almost half were

civilian. The main cause of death was napalm bombing. Eyewitness reports from Lebanese doctors speak of continuous napalm bombing of roads where civilians were fleeing from the West Bank. Ambulances and medical units were bombed. Three hospitals were totally destroyed. Refugees in and around Amman are estimated by UNRWA [UN Relief and Works Agency] and others at 100,000, of whom 60,000 were already refugees living in the camps near Jericho which were bombed....The estimates of Egyptian casualties are still very rough. It is feared that there may be as many as 20,000, some of them military..." The Times published a report from Cairo on June 19 of its correspondent's visit to victims of napalm in hospital.

Napalm causes third degree burns which destroy the whole thickness of the skin, and frequently destroy the underlying muscles and even the bones. If the wounds remain open for long, keloids (or hypertrophic scars) occur on the scars. There is also the danger of fibrosis and contraction of the scars which usually leads to pronounced disability and disfigurement. The keloid formations can become cancerous.

It is abundantly clear that napalm is an antipersonnel weapon which has no place in any civilised community. Whether it is used in Syria or Vietnam, the Andes or Iraq, it is intolerable in its fiendishness. Napalm must be banned in the same way as dumdum bullets and gas chambers.

SUMMER SCHEDULE

World Outlook is now on its summer schedule.

This means publication every

other week on the average.

With the fall we will resume our regular weekly schedule.

In this issue

Page

The Meaning of the New Guerrilla Front in Bolivia	658
Bolivian Students Declare University "Free Territory"	662
Documents:	
First Balance Sheet of the Middle East Conflict [A Resolution of the Fourth International]	663
Thousands Executed in Guatemalan Witch-hunt	667
Nguyen Cao Ky "Steps Down"	668
Hugo Blanco Case:	
"Bohemia" Tells Cuban Readers About Hugo Blanco	668
The Los Angeles Test of the "Spirit of Glassboro"	669
An Interview with Chen Pi-lan on the "Cultural Revolution"	671
Kyoto Students Block Army Use of University	679
Bertrand Russell Urges Ban on Use of Napalm	680