

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

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

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

Vol. 4, No. 25

August 12, 1966

<u>In this issue</u>	<u>Page</u>
Death by Starvation in Indonesia's Prisons	1
Background to the Purge in China -- by Antonio Farien	4
Rusk Heavily Guarded in Japan	15
Documents:	
Against Titoism, the Cubans Reaffirm the Revolutionary Road	16

DEATH BY STARVATION IN INDONESIA'S PRISONS

[AP correspondent T. Jeff Williams filed a dispatch from Klaten, Indonesia, that does not appear to have been widely reproduced in the Western press. It offers new facts about the horrible anti-Communist purge that began in Djakarta last October. More importantly, the article indicates that the slaughter is still going on, although in a quieter way. The Johnson administration is anxious to get on with the business of knitting relations with the new regime so as to help consolidate its ferocious dictatorship. But for publicity purposes on the home front, Johnson prefers the anti-Communist generals to appear with clean hands and not dripping with fresh blood. Perhaps that is why the dispatch was not considered fit to print in the major papers of the USA. The text below is from the July 17 issue of the Japan Times which is published in Tokyo.]

* * *

The long lines of prisoners, three abreast and wearing tattered sarongs, shuffled down the dusty road toward the river.

A sleepy-eyed soldier, his rifle carried loosely in the crook of his arm, ambled beside the 200 or more men he was guarding. They were going for their bath in this Central Java town.

Reba Hansen, Business Manager,

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

New York, N.Y. 10010

a labor press service

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

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

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

Vol. 4, No. 25

August 12, 1966

<u>In this issue</u>	<u>Page</u>
Death by Starvation in Indonesia's Prisons	1
Background to the Purge in China -- by Antonio Farien	4
Rusk Heavily Guarded in Japan	15
Documents: Against Titoism, the Cubans Reaffirm the Revolutionary Road	16

DEATH BY STARVATION IN INDONESIA'S PRISONS

[AP correspondent T. Jeff Williams filed a dispatch from Klaten, Indonesia, that does not appear to have been widely reproduced in the Western press. It offers new facts about the horrible anti-Communist purge that began in Djakarta last October. More importantly, the article indicates that the slaughter is still going on, although in a quieter way. The Johnson administration is anxious to get on with the business of knitting relations with the new regime so as to help consolidate its ferocious dictatorship. But for publicity purposes on the home front, Johnson prefers the anti-Communist generals to appear with clean hands and not dripping with fresh blood. Perhaps that is why the dispatch was not considered fit to print in the major papers of the USA. The text below is from the July 17 issue of the Japan Times which is published in Tokyo.]

* * *

The long lines of prisoners, three abreast and wearing tattered sarongs, shuffled down the dusty road toward the river.

A sleepy-eyed soldier, his rifle carried loosely in the crook of his arm, ambled beside the 200 or more men he was guarding. They were going for their bath in this Central Java town.

Reba Hansen, Business Manager,

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

New York, N.Y. 10010

No one attempted to escape, although any of them easily could have. If one ran, 10 would be shot.

They were Communists -- or at least arrested on such charges. But most of them, eager to talk and even more eager for a cigarette, claimed they didn't know why they were arrested.

But in some ways they could consider themselves lucky. They at least didn't have their throats cut during the massive anti-Communist bloodbath that swept this emerald archipelago in the fall of last year.

The killings began a few weeks after a Communist-backed coup d'état was attempted in Djakarta on Oct. 1. [It has not at all been proved that the attempted coup was "Communist-backed."] Six top generals were brutally murdered before the band of rebels was overthrown.

The act seemed to snap something in the minds of Indonesians from Sumatra to Bali. [It was not that mystic. The top command of the army initiated the purge.] The time had come, they said, to cleanse Indonesia of Communists. Until the coup attempt, the Indonesian Communist Party was at the peak of its powers here, third largest in the world.

Then came the nights of the long knives, the nights of terror in the jungle-darkened kampongs and the ill-lit city streets. Heads began to roll. How many were actually killed may never be known. Some officials in Western embassies in Djakarta put the figure at 300,000 within three to four months. Some say more but there is increasing evidence that the figure is considerably lower. [The AP correspondent fails to mention what the "increasing evidence" consists of. The latest estimates put the number of killed at around 500,000.]

The killing hasn't stopped yet. And the brutality continues. In Indonesia, a Communist is something below a snake or a rat. To kill him or her is considered a national obligation, not murder.

In this quiet farming town, a prison director talked openly of how the Communists were being treated in his domain.

He laughed with mild embarrassment as he discussed without emotion how one or more Communist prisoners died in his prison every day from sheer starvation. The Communists there were given 200 grams [about seven ounces] of cornmeal each day on which to live. Unless fed by friends or relatives who bring food from outside, they can't survive, the director said.

In this particular prison, the Communists are kept 400 to a cell block which is 50 meters long and 25 meters wide. They still wear the same unwashed rags of clothes they were wearing when arrested months ago.

Behind the dirty white walls of the prison, 4,000 men were

kept. There was only space for 1,000, the director said, again with a little laugh. He said 8,000 Communists were originally arrested in Klaten but he was vague as to what happened to the 4,000 not in prison. Some died in other areas when they were thrown from the prisons to waiting crowds who beat and ripped them to death, the director said.

There appeared little future for the Communist prisoners. If left in the jail, many appeared destined to die from starvation. One would hope to be taken to a large penal island off the South Java coast where thousands more Communists are kept.

But until then, they kept their mouths shut. The director laughingly explained that the guards had the authority to open fire with submachine guns into the cell blocks if the prisoners became unruly. The cells had rung to the chatter of gunfire and the screams of the dying several times, he admitted. Now they had learned to keep quiet.

The prisoners, such as those in Central Java prisons, were the survivors. Those who died by the thousands were killed by normally mild mannered farmers and shopowners during the weeks of violence that began last November or December.

Details of the killings came from all levels of the people -- shopowners in North Sumatra, coconut farmers in Central Java, an optical worker in Bali, rice farmers and youths.

In the East Java town of Blitar, in the shadow of rumbling Mt. Kelud volcano, a destitute farmer whose crops were destroyed by a recent volcanic eruption, told his story. Rachman, 25, and the father of two children with another on the way, said the killings around his village began in December. He was part of an execution squad trained by Ansor, a Moslem youth wing. They sought their victims in the still of the night. A frail house was surrounded, then the door was kicked open. By the flickering light of a kerosene lamp, four men held the struggling victim. Rachman sawed at the throat.

But for Rachman, one killing was enough. It turned his stomach and he never took part again, he said. Others took pride in their work, such as Mohammed, a Moslem youth organizer living in Bali. At 27, Mohammed worked in an optical shop and his fat bulk indicated he at least ate well.

Mohammed's spree began on Dec. 16 and ran until the end of January, as did most of the killings on the island of the gods. But if the gods of Bali minded the bloodshed, they gave no sign. Mohammed killed 72 by his own count. His underfed companion bragged of killing 50.

BACKGROUND TO THE PURGE IN CHINA

By Antonio Farien

[In a letter accompanying the manuscript, the author explains that during a trip to Europe he had the good fortune to meet Peng Shu-tse. "I found his observations on the current purge in China so interesting that I took extensive notes from which I later wrote this article. I then asked him to read it and make any necessary corrections. The footnotes, however, are entirely my own responsibility."

[Peng Shu-tse was one of the founding members of the Chinese Communist party and played a leading role in it until he was expelled in 1929 on charges of "Trotskyism." Subsequently he became a leader of the Chinese Trotskyist movement. For more about Peng Shu-tse and his companion Chen Pi-lan see: International Socialist Review, Summer 1963, "Chinese Revolutionary Exiles" by Ross Dowson.]

* * *

The recent events in China, such as the dismissal of Peng Chen from his key party post(1), are the result of a struggle inside the Chinese Communist party [CCP] that began almost a decade ago. In order to understand what is happening now we must take into account the whole evolution of the struggle and the opposition led by Teng To.(2)

We should start from around 1957 when Mao Tse-tung initiated the "Let a Hundred Flowers Blossom" and "Let a Hundred Schools of

(1) It was disclosed June 3 that Peng Chen, who had been missing from public activities since March 29, 1966, had been removed as first secretary of the Peking municipal Communist party, a post which he had held since 1955. Peng had also been mayor of Peking since 1951. He was a long standing member of the Politburo, a secretary of the CCP's Central Committee and was generally regarded as the fifth most powerful figure in China and a possible successor to Chairman Mao Tse-tung.

(2) Teng To, branded the "leader of the antiparty, antisocialist gang of conspirators" in the current purge, was one of China's leading journalists and a key political figure. He was director and former editor-in-chief of the People's Daily, the principal party newspaper, and editor of Frontline (Qianxian), the bimonthly theoretical organ of the Peking municipal Communist party, until it recently suspended publication. He was a secretary of the Peking municipal Communist party -- the immediate subordinate to Peng Chen -- and only last year became an alternate member of the party's North China Bureau (North China section of the party's national Central Committee). He was also president of the Chinese-Soviet Friendship Association.

Thought Contend" movement inviting the intellectuals and the people as a whole to speak their mind, to criticize the "three harms" within the CCP -- "bureaucratism, commanderism and subjectivism" -- and to help in "rectifying" and reforming the party. Within a very short time this movement became very large with many deep-going criticisms of the leadership being brought into the open.

Much of the important criticism was published in such papers as the People's Daily (Jenmin Jih Pao), the official organ of the party. Teng To, editor-in-chief at the time, encouraged criticism from the people and even wrote some articles of sharp criticism himself.

At the high tide of the "blossom and contend" movement (April to June 1957), facts about the arbitrariness and special privileges enjoyed by the CCP bureaucracy poured in from all corners, especially from young students and revolutionary intellectuals. Members of the CCP itself and its youth organization also responded. (3) By June the movement had developed to such an extent that it seemed that the Hungarian Revolution of 1956 might be transplanted to Chinese soil. (There was a rebellion, for example, by more than 3,000 students in a high middle school -- the equivalent of high school in the U.S. -- in Han Yang near Hankow.)

The leadership became frightened at such a possibility and immediately discontinued the movement -- in the middle of June -- and vigorously counterattacked all its critics. The left revolutionary elements were ruthlessly suppressed under the blanket charge of being "rightists." Thousands upon thousands were forced to recant, were suspended from their posts, placed under surveillance and even arrested and sent to labor camps. Many party and youth organization members, besides suffering expulsion, were fired from their jobs, dismissed from school, placed under surveillance or arrested, etc. Teng To was removed from editorship of the People's Daily.

The opposition was accused of being headed by rightist elements, representatives of the bourgeoisie and large landlords, etc., the charges being similar to those leveled by the CCP at the present time against victims of the purge. However, close examination of some of the facts that have slowly sifted out since, shows that this accusation does not seem to have been justified in many cases. For example, in Red Flag (Hung Chi or Hungqi), the ideological journal of the CCP's Central Committee, it was reported: Teng To "vigorously supported the rightists attacking the party. The extreme rightist

(3) During the rise of the "blossom and contend" movement, Liu Shao-chiu, chief of state, the second leader of the CCP, openly admitted: "There is serious bureaucracy...mass criticism is spreading to every corner of China, including factories, farms, schools and other organizations. The target of criticism is the leadership." (Speech at the reception party given to representatives of the LSSP of Ceylon visiting China. People's Daily, May 19, 1957.)

Lin Hsi Ling was his most intimate friend."(4) But if anything, Lin Hsi Ling, a student movement leader and member of the CCP youth organization, reflected in her writings, the revolutionary tendency of this movement. Lin Hsi Ling, who was purged in 1957, had written that "the present upper strata of China does not correspond with the property system of common ownership" because "the party and state apparatus has become a set of bureaucratic organs ruling people without democracy." Therefore, she proclaimed "not reform but a thoroughgoing change."(5)

The statement in Red Flag about Lin Hsi Ling also sheds light upon the political thinking of Teng To. Since she was identified as being so close to Teng To, one can probably surmise that their political positions were not much different. Also in speaking of Teng To, she said that he was not an orthodox Marxist. In other words, Teng To did not agree with everything the infallible Mao Tse-tung said, or rather, Teng To was not a Maoist Marxist.(6)

In 1958 after the crushing of the "blossom and contend" movement, the CCP adopted an adventuristic policy in order to rationalize its forceful suppression of the so-called rightist opposition. Around May the Central Committee of the CCP adopted the slogan, "A Big Leap Forward." Under this slogan a program was initiated to make steel in small backyard furnaces. Around 100 million people were mobilized to carry out this program. Almost all students as well as professors, workers, peasants and even housewives had to make steel. This program lasted about one year -- June 1958 to July 1959.

A little later, in August 1958, Mao gave the order that every peasant must enter the People's Communes as fast as possible. Three months later 99 percent of the peasants were in the People's Communes. The CCP ordered the privately owned land, stored grain, animals, etc., to be turned over to the communes; all peasants were to eat in the commune's kitchens; the children must attend the com-

(4) Red Flag, seventh issue of 1966, "A Criticism of the Bourgeois Position Taken by the Frontline and the Peking Daily."

(5) Tai Haung, another example, was a reporter for Hsinhua and a member of the CCP. He proposed to build a new party and "to realize democracy, freedom and the eradication of a privileged class."

(6) An example of what is meant by orthodox Marxism in China is to be found in the June 10, 1966, issue of the Peking Review (p. 4) which quotes an editorial carried by the People's Daily, June 4, 1966. "No one who dares to oppose Chairman Mao, to oppose Mao Tse-tung's thought, to oppose the Central Committee of the Party, the dictatorship of the proletariat and the socialist system can escape denunciation by the whole Party and the whole nation, whoever he may be, whatever high position he may hold and however much of a veteran he may be. The only possible result is the total loss of his standing and reputation."

mune's nurseries, etc. This policy was designed to communalize all the peasants within a five-year period.

The peasants were given no choice in the matter. They were forced to join and to give up all their holdings to the commune. This resulted in wide dissatisfaction among the peasants. At least one-half of the peasants -- there were approximately 500 million at the time -- were against such measures and opposed the communes actively by committing acts of sabotage, such as killing their animals, cutting down fruit trees or destroying crops. This precipitated a tremendous scarcity of nonstaple foods, and the situation became very serious in the summer of 1959. At the same time the failure of the backyard steel-making program became clear -- three million tons of steel had been made, but little of it met minimum standards in quality.

The bankruptcy of these two policies which had been bureaucratically imposed by Mao and the top leadership of the CCP became quite evident to everyone, and mounting dissatisfaction was very apparent among the masses. They referred to Mao and his policies as "petty bourgeois fanaticism." This dissatisfaction made inroads into the cadres of the CCP. Many top leaders in the Central Committee, the army and government administration were also in sympathy with the masses. Among the leaders voicing dissatisfaction was Peng Teh Huai, minister of defense.(7)

As early as the spring of 1959 he criticized the policies of the party; i.e., he criticized Mao Tse-tung. This precipitated a crisis inside the party. The Central Committee along with Mao called a plenum in August 1959 to deal with it. This meeting became known as the Lushan conference.

At the plenum a serious dispute took place among the top leaders. Although the actual proceedings have never been released, two important measures were adopted: (1) Peng Teh Huai was relieved of his position along with Wuang Keh Cheng, chief of staff of the army, and many other members of the Central Committee also disappeared.(8) (2) A resolution was passed which made certain concessions to the peasants; i.e., the people's communes would be reorganized.(9)

(7)Peng Teh Huai was a sergeant-major in the army of the Kuomintang. At the end of 1927 he led his troops over to join Mao Tse-tung. He was commander in chief of the Chinese forces in the Korean war after which he became minister of defense until 1959.

(8)Peng Teh Huai disappeared from public view and has not been seen since. His name, however, still appears on the list of the Politburo, but this is only a formality, since only a party congress has the power to remove someone from the Politburo and the CCP hasn't held a congress since 1958.

(9)For information on the reorganization of the communes see Peking Review, September 1, 1959.

A short while after the plenum, Teng To formed a small group. His closest collaborator in the group was Wu Han, a leading historian and vice mayor of the municipal government. In June 1959, before the plenum, he had written an article called "Hai Jui Scolds the Emperor." Hai Jui was governor of Nanking under the Ming dynasty. (Peking was the capital.) The emperor was a bad one, unjust to the people, so Hai Jui sent him a letter criticizing him. Wu Han used this historical analogy to describe the present situation; i.e., "Peng Teh Huai Scolds Mao Tse-tung."

After the plenum Wu Han wrote a drama called "Hai Jui Dismissed from Office." When Hai Jui was governor he carried out a few token reforms. One of these was a small land reform in which he took some unjustly acquired land from the big landowners and returned it to the small peasants from whom it had been taken. The big landowners became furious and complained bitterly to the emperor who promptly dismissed Hai Jui from his governorship. The people were very angered at this turn of events. Hai Jui was very popular, becoming known as the honest official. Here too, Wu Han utilized the historical analogy to describe and criticize the present situation; i.e., "Peng Teh Huai Dismissed from Office."

The drama was openly published in January 1961 in the Peking daily papers, and afterwards it was performed on the stage in Peking. It received an exceptionally enthusiastic reception from the people and many critics gave it high praise.

The third closest collaborator in the secret group organized by Teng To was Liao Mo-sha, head of the United Front Work Department in the Peking municipal CP. He along with Wu Han and Teng To -- 1961 to the end of 1962 -- wrote many articles which appeared in the Peking Daily (Beijing Ribao), Peking Daily Evening (Beijing Wanbao), and Frontline. The Peking Daily and the Peking Daily Evening, the daily newspapers of the Peking municipal CP, were also controlled by Teng To. Since he was the secretary of the Secretariat in the Peking municipal CP, he had the power to control and direct all the cultural institutions of the city, including the newspapers.

Some of these articles were published under the titles, "Notes from Three-Family Village" and "Evening Talks at Yenshan." Later they were published in book form under the same titles. The authors used old fables, parables, historical analogies, satire, etc., in their articles to criticize the leadership, its program and the situation at the time.

Teng To, for example, wrote an article which included a poem that was supposed to have been written by a small boy:

The Heaven is my Father,
The Earth is my Mother,
The Sun is my Nurse,
The East Wind is my Benefactor,
The West Wind is my Enemy.

Teng To criticized the poem saying that it was only hot air -- "great empty talk." This was an indirect criticism of Mao's famous slogan: "The East wind prevails over the West wind."

Teng To wrote in one article, "The wisdom of man is not unlimited. If anyone should want to know everything and possess unlimited wisdom, he would be a fool. People who think of themselves as being omniscient, despise the masses" and "attempt to win victory by devious means. Such people, if they do not correct their faults, will be defeated in the end." The passage refers to Mao; i.e., Mao is foolish for acting as though he were infallible and using bureaucratic means to maintain his power, because in the end he is going to be defeated if he doesn't change.

In another article entitled "Special Treatment for 'Amnesia,'" he accused the leadership of suffering from "amnesia," because they "quickly forget what they have seen and said...go back on their own word, fail to keep faith..." He then prescribes that the leadership should "say less and take a rest when time comes for talking."

"Speak Big Words" was the title of another article in which he says that big words are not always useful and can even be damaging. In the essay, "The Theory of Treasuring Labor Power," he accuses the leadership of wasting the people's time and labor power -- "we should...take care to do more in every way to treasure our labor power." Both of these were indirect references to the "Big Leap Forward," i.e., the program has been a failure and even harmful and wasteful.

Teng To wrote another article entitled "Cheng Pang-chao and His Style" in which he quoted this famous artist, who said that one must become a master and not a servant. In other words, the people must control the leaders of the revolution and not just become the servants or slaves of the Maoist bureaucracy.(10)

There were around 150 such articles written by Teng To and the group around him, all of which were indirect criticisms of the policies handed down by Mao and the top leadership. These articles also reflected criticisms coming from the masses. In 1961-1962 the economic situation in China had become serious: food was scarce and during the summer of 1962 alone more than 100,000 persons fled to Hong Kong.

(10) See the Daily Light (Kwangming Jih Pao) November 21, 1963. For more on the writings of Teng To and his criticisms (in English) see: Peking Review, May 27, 1966 (No. 22) "On 'Three-Family Village'" by Yao Wen-Yuan. This article was one of the main attacks directed against the opposition, published May 10, 1966, in Shanghai's Liberation Daily. An article written by the same author, Yao Wen-Yuan, an editor of Liberation Army Daily (see footnote No. 18), published in November 1965, which attacked Wu Han and his drama, was criticized by Teng To -- "Yao Wen-Yuan's article is not completely right and Wu Han is not completely wrong." (People's Daily, May 12, 1966).

At the end of 1962 the economic situation started to improve to a certain degree, so the leadership -- feeling more secure -- adopted stronger measures to better control the peasants. Measures were also taken in order to control the intellectuals and students -- many were sent to the countryside to work and be "reeducated."

In face of the more and more aggressive policy of the CCP leadership, which included blocking publication of their articles, Teng To and his group started to retreat.

In November 1965, in an article published in the Wen Huai Daily and then in the People's Daily and many other papers, the CCP for the first time openly criticized Wu Han's drama "Hai Jui Dismissed from Office."

After that the campaign against Wu Han's "Hai Jui Dismissed" spread throughout the country. Every day the People's Daily, and especially the Liberation Army Daily (Jiefangjun Pao) plus many other papers all over China carried articles criticizing Wu Han.

Between November 1965 and April 1966, however, there were a few writers mainly in Peking and Shanghai who wrote articles defending him. Wu Han also wrote an article -- while admitting he had made some mistakes in the drama -- defending himself and his work.

However, since April the situation has changed radically in many ways: (1) Up to then Wu Han was said to have only made some mistakes and to be revisionist in his thinking. Now he is accused of being antisocialist, antiparty and even counterrevolutionary -- supporting the bourgeoisie and trying to restore capitalism. (11) (2) The papers stopped publishing articles by Wu Han and his supporters. (3) More and more people came under attack and Teng To was made the central target. As a result, parts of "Notes from Three-Family Village" and "Evening Talks at Yenshan" were published in the People's Daily with commentary as proof of his counterrevolutionary objec-

(11) Red Flag "asked why they [the Peking papers] had never mentioned that Professor Wu 'is willing to be a slave of the U.S. and is guilty of scheming and planning for the reactionary Kuomintang (Chinese Nationalist) clique?'" Red Flag as quoted by the New York Times, May 17, 1966.

"A revolution was under way which was 'sweeping away the representatives of the bourgeoisie who have wormed their way into the party, monsters of all kinds and all various forms of decadent bourgeois and feudal ideology.'" Red Flag quoted in the International Edition of the New York Times, June 13, 1966.

"The representatives of the bourgeoisie, infiltrated into the party, seem to be a colossus, but in fact, like all reactionaries they are nothing more than paper tigers." Red Flag quoted in Le Monde, June 14, 1966.

tives.(12) (4) The newspapers and the journals edited and controlled by Teng To and his group came under attack from such publications as the Peking Daily, Peking Daily Evening (or Peking Evening News), Frontline and, beginning in May, Peking Literature and Art (Beijing Wenyi), Kweichow Daily and the Yunnan Daily. (5) High party officials like Peng Chen, the mayor of Peking, became targets.

Since the beginning of the Sino-Soviet dispute, around 1960, the CCP has not only criticized the revisionism of Khrushchev, but also his repudiation of Stalinism at the twentieth congress of the CPSU. Since then they have carried on a systematic campaign to establish a worldwide cult of Mao Tse-tung similar to that of Stalin's. Since last November this campaign has been greatly stepped up. For example, the People's Daily, a six-page paper, now devotes an average of four pages daily to this task. Each day a slogan such as: "One must study the thinking of Mao Tse-tung and raise higher the red banner of Mao's thought," "The people must study Mao's books, hear his words and work according to his instructions" or "Mao's thought is the beacon of revolution for the world's people" appears on the front page. In other words, Mao's thought has become a panacea and his writings a bible. A typical example of the articles is one in the May 16, 1966, issue. A musical concert that took place in Shanghai is reported. In conjunction an article describes how Mao's thought influenced the concert.(13)

A similar article was sent in by a cook. After a satisfied customer asked him how he cooked so well, he sat down and wrote an article explaining the secret of his success -- he used Mao's method.

In the University of Peking an English teacher told his class that in order to learn English, they must use Mao's method. (Mao knows no foreign language except a few words of English.) Such stories are not the exception but the rule.(14)

The attempt to establish the cult of Mao is connected with the present purge. Because of Mao's many mistakes, his standing is low among the intellectuals. It is understandable why they are opposed to deifying him. They favor an intelligent and fruitful discussion of the problems which continue to haunt China and her development.

The increasing difficulties and failures of Mao's foreign policy have also undoubtedly played a great role in the present purge if nothing more than in its timing and fierceness.

(12)See People's Daily, May 9 and May 11, 1966.

(13)For the English version of this article see: Peking Review, May 27, 1966 (No. 22) p. 18.

(14)For information on how Mao Tse-tung's teaching "On Contradiction" can lead to higher sales of watermelons, see Hsinhua, May 19, 1966.

The disastrous role of Moscow's opportunism is undeniable. However, the extremely sectarian position taken by Peking in rejecting a united front against U.S. imperialism -- especially in regard to the Vietnam war -- has not only weakened the struggle against imperialism, but has heightened the danger of an attack on China herself and increased the possibilities of a nuclear war.

This sectarian position has also led to the increasing isolation of China in the socialist world. Many of the workers states that leaned towards China at the beginning of the dispute, such as Korea and Vietnam, are now leaning more toward Moscow. Also the defeats suffered by the colonial revolution and the failure of Chinese diplomacy in the "third world" have led to increased isolation for China and to the demoralization of Peking's followers all over the world.

The crushing of the Communist party in Indonesia [PKI](15) with hardly a fight, stands out as one of the greatest defeats and tragedies for China. D.N.Aidit, whose policies were almost identical to those followed by the Khrushchevists, spoke many times in China; his books were translated into Chinese and he was highly praised by the leadership of the CCP who held up the PKI as a model Communist party, and one to be emulated by the other Communist parties in the world. In other words, the responsibility for the tragedy of the PKI and the Aidit leadership falls directly on the CCP, and especially on Mao.

Because of such events, the people and especially the intellectuals placed an even bigger question mark over Mao's leadership. The intellectuals, such as Teng To and his group, who were already voicing doubts, base their opposition around three main points: (1) They are against the bureaucracy and its arbitrariness and want more freedom of thought, criticism, etc. In other words, they want a program such as the "blossom and contend" movement to be the norm. (2) They are against the adventurism of the CCP with its programs like the "Big Leap Forward" and its wasting of the people's labor in such things as the backyard steel-making, forced collectivization of the peasants into the People's Communes which they claim has not been successful but has even been damaging. (3) They oppose the idea that Mao is omniscient and infallible, and they are against making a cult of his personality.

From Mao's point of view the opposition of the intellectuals to his regime is intolerable and must be ended. The present situation reminds Mao and the leadership too much of the Hungarian Revolution (1956) as can be seen from their references to the "literary men of the Petöfi Club who acted as the shock brigade in the Hungarian

(15) This was the largest Communist party in the capitalist world. It had a membership of three million and more than ten million sympathizers. To date between 250,000 and 500,000 have been slaughtered.

events. The turbulent wind precedes the mountain storm."(16) But Mao does not even want the wind to blow let alone allow it to get turbulent. He has not only attacked those intellectuals and party leaders who looked upon the gentle breeze as a breath of fresh air but even those who only tolerated it.

At the beginning of May, the leadership of the CCP raised the general slogans: "Big Leap Forward in the Ideological Field" and "The Great Revolution of Socialist Culture" in order to eliminate the "poisonous weeds" of the "bourgeoisie" and "feudalists," i.e., to eliminate all differing tendencies and elements. However, in order to carry out the purge, Mao has mainly utilized the army, because even the party cannot be trusted to any great extent as the Peking municipal party so well demonstrates.

In March 1966 Lin Pao, minister of defense,(17) gave instructions to the army that it must take a strong position against the "antiparty and antisocialist" tendency. The army cadres were mobilized for the campaign, and since then, the most vicious articles attacking the opposition have come from the Liberation Army Daily (Jiefangjun Pao)(18) which has already gone so far as to suggest the physical elimination of the opposition.

The campaign has been carried on to create an atmosphere of terror in order to stifle criticism from the intellectuals and to assure maintenance of control over the masses who feel likewise. They publish continual reminders of what happened to those who dared criticize the party during the "blossom and contend" movement. "Your fate cannot be better than that of your forerunners and brothers-in-crime!" "Your days are numbered."

Nor is this intimidation directed only against the intellec-

(16)Quoted from the People's Daily in the Peking Review, June 10, 1966 (No. 24), p. 9, "A Great Revolution that Touches the People to Their Very Souls."

For a short explanation of the Petöfi Club (Circle) see: World Outlook, Vol. 4, No. 18 (June 3, 1966), p. 4-12, "The Internal Struggle in Peking" by George Novack.

(17)Lin Pao, minister of defense, and Teng Sha-peng, general secretary of the party, seem to be much closer to Mao now because of their positions and their importance in carrying out the purge. They are probably the two most likely figures right now in the line of succession to Mao as party chairman.

(18)Liberation Army Daily (Jiefangjun Pao or Chiefang Chun Pao), the official army newspaper, is the chief organ used in attacking the opposition. The Daily Light (Kwangming Jih Pao), a newspaper for intellectuals, The People's Daily (Jenmin Jih Pao), the principal party newspaper, and The Red Flag (Hung Chi or Hongqi), the ideological journal of the party's Central Committee, are among others that have followed close behind.

tuals in Peking or the upper echelons. It involves intellectuals in every field along with officials and cadres in the party and government at all levels and all over China. (It is also safe to assume that each of the prominent figures who have been attacked represents a larger group.) (19) From all appearances, however, they seem to be very loosely and poorly organized). While at first, there may only be slanderous attacks in the press plus removal from posts, it is most likely that arrests with long prison terms will follow or possibly worse in some cases.

The fierce action taken by the party against those who dared to question Mao's infallibility and criticize the policies of the party leadership, set the stage in which Kuo Mo-jo, China's most noted scholar, made his speech of self-criticism in order to protect himself from the onslaught. (20)

(19) Peng mentioned two other well-known figures who have been denounced whom I failed to include in the above text. One is the very famous playwright Tien Han, chairman of the National Association of Drama. He also wrote a drama like Wu Han's which came under fire last February. The second is the famous historian Chien Po-tsan who has been a professor in many of the universities in Shanghai and head of the history department at Peking University.

Others not mentioned in the above article who have been denounced or purged include: Chou Hsingfang, a famous actor and head of the Shanghai Opera company; Lu Ping, Secretary of the Peking University party committee, and his deputy secretary, Peng Pei-Yung (or Peng Pei-yun); Sung Shi, a member of the Peking University party committee; Li Chi, a director in the party's Peking municipal branch; Hsia Yen, noted playwright who was vice-minister of culture from 1954 to last year; Wang Hsiao-chuan, the Kweichow provincial party committee's propaganda chief and editor of the Kweichow Daily; Li Meng-wei, editor of the Yunnan Daily in the Yunnan province; Fan Chin, a woman who is director of the Peking Daily and vice-chairman of the All-China Journalists' Association.

(20) The speech was made April 14, 1966, to the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress of which he is a vice-chairman. (See Hsinhua, May 7, 1966).

Kuo Mo-jo was born in 1892 in the province of Szechwan. He joined the CCP in 1927. After the defeat of the revolution of 1925-27, he left the party and fled to Japan, where he spent the next ten years in exile writing several histories. During the war against Japan (1937-45) he played a role in organizing the Chinese people to struggle against the occupation forces. It was during this time that he wrote By the Moonlight and The Wave (1941 and 1942). He has also translated many works into Chinese, notably War and Peace by Tolstoy and Faust by Goethe. In 1959 he was given the Stalin Peace Prize. He rejoined the CCP only about three or four years ago. However, he holds many important positions in China. He is president of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, chairman of the All-China Federation of Literary and Art Workers, chairman of the China Peace Committee and holds more than twenty other official positions.

The purge of the opposition, represented by Teng To and Wu Han, reflects a serious contradiction inside the CCP -- a contradiction which developed from the suppression of the "blossom and contend" movement. By suppressing progressive intellectuals and others, Mao may be able for the time being to silence the oppositional mood but he cannot suppress the objective conditions which gave rise to it in the first place. And in the future it will undoubtedly again challenge the bureaucracy. As Teng To put it, "People who think of themselves as being omniscient, despise the masses" and "attempt to win victory by devious means. Such people...will be defeated in the end."

The victory, however, will not be scored by reaction or by the procapitalists who are undoubtedly to be found in the administration, and in very high posts at that. The victory will be won by those seeking proletarian democracy based on the conquests of the revolution. That victory will reinforce those conquests and assure China a genuine big leap forward, not only at home but internationally.

RUSK HEAVILY GUARDED IN JAPAN

The Japanese government was clearly very nervous about the fifth Joint U.S.-Japan Ministerial Meeting in Kyoto July 5-7. The presence of Secretary of State Dean Rusk offered an opportunity for the Japanese people to express their feelings about the escalation of the war in Vietnam.

Some 4,500 police smuggled Rusk into town from the airport. A total of 3,500 police guarded the conference participants and the hall. They deployed 2,840 uniformed officers, plainclothesmen and members of riot squads along routes to the hall to prevent entry of any "undesirable character."

At the hall itself, 600 policemen were posted. Ten police cars escorted carloads of U.S. and Japanese delegates between the hall and the Miyako Hotel.

All arriving cars were checked at a point one kilometer from the hall. Cab drivers having no entry pass were turned back. Even innocent hikers in the surrounding hills were turned back by the police.

Rusk was probably grateful for the police. All the routes to the hall were plastered with signs reading in Japanese, "Warmonger Rusk Go Home." For Rusk's benefit, the well-known international phrase, in letters of the English alphabet, were added, "Yankee Go Home." Periodic demonstrations were staged, too. The participants were mostly students and members of unions affiliated with the General Council of Trade Unions of Japan [SOHYO].

AGAINST TITOISM, THE CUBANS REAFFIRM THE REVOLUTIONARY ROAD

[We are printing below the full text of an editorial which appeared in Granma, the official organ of the Central Committee of the Communist party of Cuba. The editorial is in reply to various articles in the Yugoslav press attacking certain positions of the Cuban revolutionary leadership as "sectarian."

[The reply by the editors of Granma is of unusual interest, we believe, because of its clear statement of the Cuban position on a number of issues under discussion among revolutionists on a worldwide scale. Particularly worth noting are (1) the explanation of the forces impelling Latin America toward a socialist revolution; (2) the vigorous defense of the Vietnamese people against American imperialism, which includes an appeal to utilize revolutionary means to help them out; and (3) the reaffirmation of the stand taken by the Cuban delegation at the twenty-third congress of the Communist party of the Soviet Union in favor of united action to help the Vietnamese and use of all the means necessary to stop the bombing of north Vietnam.

[World Outlook has previously called attention to the polemic between Belgrade and Havana and stressed its importance. (See World Outlook February 25, April 1, and April 15.)

[Among other things, the polemic provides clear evidence of the differentiation between the Cuban position and that of the reformists and the right wing in the world Communist movement on a number of key issues.

[The translation is the official one provided by the May 15 English edition of Granma under the title, "Reply to the Yugoslav Press." We have corrected obvious typographical errors and a couple of phrases where the translation could be misinterpreted. The subheadings appear in the original.]

* * *

1.

AID TO STRUGGLING PEOPLES
IS DUTY OF PROGRESSIVE GOVERNMENTS AND STATES

Continuing to pursue the road of intrigue and defamation, the Yugoslav press persists in its attacks on the revolutionary positions of Cuba. It is important to refute these arguments, since they reveal conciliatory stands which it is correct and necessary to unmask.

Let us analyze what they impute to us from the point of view of surrender of principles -- because that is what they represent -- and also from a revolutionary viewpoint because that is what Cuba is defending.

The Yugoslav correspondent states in the Mexican magazine, "Siempre," that, "The editorial written by GRANMA, answering simple news items in the Yugoslav press and not an 'official editorial' which was never published..."

The leadership of the so-called "League of Yugoslav Communists" may be cowardly enough not to accept formal responsibility for the issues which they have repeatedly raised, and continue to raise in their press. But the Communist Party of Cuba does not employ such dishonest procedures. If they do not wish to appear "officially" in the polemic, that is a question that only concerns the Yugoslav leaders. They may have their reasons for trying to hide their faces in this ridiculous manner. For our part, we can assure the Yugoslav correspondent for Latin America that he is not important enough to initiate a polemic with the Communist Party of Cuba.

It should be understood, then, that from the very beginning we interpret this debate as a polemic between the leadership of our Party and the so-called "League of Yugoslav Communists."

No Right to Interfere
in Our Discussions
with the Leaders of China

The Yugoslav daily, "Politika," presents the discussion between Cuba and the leaders of the Communist Party of China as based on purely commercial differences. In addition, they stressed that the attack on Yugoslav leaders was an attempt to round out our position in the polemic with the Communist Party of China. Our line is very clear. Our position is a firm one. We have no double intentions. We have argued with the Chinese leaders for reasons of principles concerning the relationship that ought to exist between two Communist parties; two socialist States. We dispute with the leaders of the "League of Yugoslav Communists" also on matters of principle, but on another plane that has nothing to do with the relationship between Communist Parties, since there is no communist party in Yugoslavia, and the so-called "League of Yugoslav Communists" is neither a party nor is it communist. On this question we wish to answer the Yugoslav spokesmen: "In our debate with the Leaders of China, you have no right to interfere. There is a popular expression which is appropriate as a reply to these accusations: 'No one has offered you a candle at this burial.'"

Traitors and Waverers
Are Always Accusing Revolutionaries
of Being Adventurers, Lunatics, and Deluded Dreamers

The Yugoslav press has attacked the stand of the Communist Party of Cuba as being adventurist, and lacking in objectivity and realism. These accusations honor us coming from the spokesmen of the so-called "League of Yugoslav Communists."

The accusation that we are adventurers, lacking in objectivity and realism is the same accusation that has been leveled throughout history against all revolutionary and combative parties and organizations.

The Russian bolsheviks represented by Lenin, were called adventurers who lacked objectivity and realism. Yet, today, one scarcely remembers the critics of Leninism and the undying memory of Lenin is present in the heart and acts of millions of workers all over the world.

In the history of our country the "Mambí" liberation fighters were called lunatics and adventurers when they launched their war of liberation and defeated the European colonial power. Those who fought against imperialism in Cuba in the decades of the 1920's and 1930's were also termed deluded dreamers and adventurers. Julio Antonio Mella and Antonio Guiterras were the object of similar accusations. More recently, those of us who fought against the tyranny of Batista, were also called lunatics, adventurers and deluded dreamers. Nonetheless, history has demonstrated that the real deluded and foolish ones were our enemies. That is why the charges made by the spokesmen of the so-called "League of Yugoslav Communists" sound very familiar to us. We have become accustomed to hearing the same imputations throughout the whole history of our revolutionary movement and we are accustomed to replying to those charges in the most appropriate manner.

Aid to Those Who Fight Intervention

Is a Contribution

to Peaceful Coexistence

A Belgrade news reporter falsely accuses us of having ignored the resolution approved in the Tricontinental Conference concerning peaceful coexistence. We would like to make clear that this resolution was proposed by the Cuban Delegation. We elaborated it in accordance with our political criteria and we have no reason to deny this, since, as was made very clear in the resolution, the problem of coexistence refers exclusively to relations among the States of different social systems, great and small, and does not affect, as the Yugoslav columnist would wish, the struggle of the oppressed classes against their oppressors, and of the exploited peoples against imperialism.

Moreover, however, the resolution concerning coexistence had even deeper implications: it posed the thesis that when progressive and revolutionary states aid those peoples who are struggling against imperialist intervention, they are defending the principles of peaceful coexistence. Aid to the national liberation movements which struggle against foreign military intervention and against their domestic exploiting classes allied with imperialism, is, according to the resolution approved by the

Tricontinental Conference, a contribution to peaceful coexistence. Let the so-called "League of Yugoslav Communists" know this very clearly, in the event that it has not read this resolution carefully. Peaceful coexistence, in our opinion, is not a dogma before which we must prostrate ourselves. We do not accept peaceful coexistence as a policy applicable only to powerful states, with imperialism having the right to make war on small nations as it chooses; much less do we understand as peaceful coexistence the Yugoslav practice of acting as an instrument of the imperialist policy of the United States. It is inexplicable, almost cynical, that a spokesman of Yugoslav politics invokes nothing less than an agreement of the Tricontinental Conference.

Aid to Peoples Who Are Struggling
Is a Duty of Progressive States
and Governments

The Yugoslav newspapers have echoed since the beginning the imperialist thesis that the Tricontinental Conference had approved tactics of subversion and intervention in the internal affairs of other countries. This imperialist line was exhaustively refuted in the GRANMA editorial entitled "The cynicism of the imperialists and their lackeys," of January 28, 1966; in Fidel Castro's letter to the United Nations, of February 11, 1966; and in our first reply to the Yugoslav press on February 13, 1966. The affirmation that the Tricontinental Conference approved interventionist tactics is the worst type of canard. When the imperialists insist that this is so, they are only defending their own interventionist positions. When the Yugoslav leaders affirm it, they spread the additional poison of saying that certain delegations to the Conference left unhappy with this "Cuban position."

The Yugoslav spokesmen are doubly vicious since they support an imperialist line, and they attempt, though futilely, to rupture the revolutionary unity achieved in the Conference.

The line approved by the Conference, and we have repeated it many times, is that the right and duty of the progressive states is to aid the peoples who struggle against imperialist intervention. It means cooperation with the peoples who suffer intervention; that is, it opposes intervention. It also means cooperation with the liberation movements which struggle against the reactionary classes allied with imperialism. If the Yugoslav spokesmen feel that this is an interventionist thesis, we challenge the Yugoslav press to answer the following questions:

Can the aid given by progressive and socialist states to the people of Viet Nam be considered interventionist?

Can the international cooperation with Cuba in her struggle against imperialism be characterized as interventionist?

Can the aid of Socialist states and governments to peoples confronting imperialist intervention and in struggle against domestic reactionary classes serving imperialist interests be classified as interventionism?

If the replies to these questions are negative, then they will be in agreement with the resolutions approved by the Tri-continental Conference. If they are affirmative, they will be in agreement with imperialism. We answer these questions negatively, and say, as did the Conference, that when the progressive governments and States provide such aid, they are combating intervention, they are defending the principle of self-determination and of national law.

But, moreover, to accuse the aid given by the socialist states to peoples struggling against imperialism as interventionist, is tantamount to brushing aside, or ignoring, the fundamental principles of proletarian internationalism.

The cynicism and shamelessness of the argument that such aid, in solidarity with the peoples who struggle for their liberation, constitutes an act of intervention can only emanate from bourgeois, imperialist, or lackey positions. No true Marxist-Leninist can deny that it is the duty of the socialist states to cooperate in every way possible with the peoples engaged in combat against the chief enemy of the working classes: imperialism. Those who deny this can never be considered Marxist-Leninists.

2.

NO FORCE CAN DETAIN THE REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE
OF THE PEOPLES OF THE AMERICAS

The Yugoslav spokesmen, obviously referring to us, repeat an argument employed by opportunists and traitors, to the effect that for the extremists, "a man with a gun is worth more than a combatant for revolutionary principles." Consistent revolutionaries, those of us who combat reaction, traitors and opportunists, do not raise this contradiction. We reply to this fallacious argument by stating that, under certain definite conditions, such as those that exist in most Latin American countries, for example, the most valuable combatant is the one who fights for revolutionary principles, and is also prepared to take up arms. In the same declaration, they insinuate that we evade the debate on ideas, in order to open the way, exclusively, to armed struggle. First of all, in this respect, we would remind the Yugoslav spokesmen that revolutionary ideas are not simply the formal expedients nor stereotyped phrases of opportunists and traitors. There are some who confuse revolutionary ideas with hollow words. Individuals who live isolated from the necessities of the peoples of the world, with no understanding of, and no interest in, the profound revolutionary changes which are taking place in our times, can never give us lessons in the value of ideas. Ideas have revolutionary value to the extent that they

interpret reality and transform it in favor of the exploited classes. Those who have remained historically congealed by passivity, inaction, opportunism and self-accommodation cannot teach us the value of political ideas. And that is the situation of the Yugoslav leaders.

Violence is the Midwife of History

Only from an anti-Marxist, opportunist and superficial position can one support the thesis that armed insurrection implies a renunciation of the ideological struggle.

Historically, the defenders of armed struggle and violent methods are those who have made the most important theoretical contributions to the world revolutionary movement. Very few remember those who conciliated in the different revolutionary periods. But the names of Marx, Engels and Lenin cannot be forgotten even by our enemies.

The theoretical arsenal of Marxism-Leninism as a scientific theory of class struggle was developed by an analysis of the experiences of the great popular insurrections, and especially by a study of the European revolutions of 1848, the Paris Commune of 1871 and the Russian Revolutions of 1905 and 1917.

Every Communist knows that -- as Marx stated -- "violence is the midwife of history," and that armed insurrection is the highest expression of class struggle. Whoever ignores this or tries to conceal it, is not a communist!

This truth originated from the irreconcilable nature of the contradictions between the interests of the oppressing classes and those of the oppressed classes. This is the ABC of Marxism-Leninism. It is not we, the revolutionaries, who engender violence. And it is not, moreover, an artificial creation of our minds. Violence is an objective necessity deriving from the system of exploitation of man by man, from the division of society into antagonistic classes and from the brutal resistance of exploiters to any social change of a revolutionary nature.

Revolutionary armed struggle presupposes the participation of the exploited masses in the combat against their oppressors. We do not deny that this should be complemented by other forms of struggle. But it is important that the other forms not be permitted to hold back, and thus weaken, the prestige among the masses of the just and fundamental idea of armed struggle but, on the contrary, that they help to develop and advance the armed struggle.

To accuse us of disparaging the importance of ideas shows profound ignorance of the Cuban Revolution, which precisely has demonstrated to Latin America the decisive importance of subjective factors and, consequently, ideological factors, in a revolution today -- the political preparation of a vanguard, revolutionary conviction and the decision to triumph or die in the battle.

The Cuban Revolution has made an important ideological contribution to the theoretical and practical aspects of the Revolution in the Americas.

In Fidel Castro's historic speech while undergoing trial for the attack on the "Moncada" garrison, known as "History Will Absolve Me," in the First and Second Declarations of Havana, and in many other documents of the Cuban Revolution, we have been conducting an intense ideological struggle in relation to fundamental problems of tactics, strategy and methods of struggle in our times.

Let the Yugoslav spokesmen know that Cuban Communists fight in the arena of ideas with the same conviction and force with which we fight on the field of battle. Let these Yugoslav spokesmen also know that by defending from Marxist-Leninist positions our criteria concerning armed struggle, we are waging a transcendental ideological battle in Latin America, and we will carry on this battle to its final practical consequences.

Can They Show Us a Victorious Revolution without Violence?

The leadership of the so-called "League of Yugoslav Communists," which has neither the knowledge nor the experience of Latin America that the Communist Party of Cuba possesses, has taken upon itself the right to expound on the nature of organizations, parties, and revolutionary forces in this Continent. From a distance of thousands of miles they have accused us of a lack of objectivity and realism. Light years away from the oppressed peoples of Latin America, and from their revolutionary situations, they set themselves up as judges of parties, organizations and forces of this continent. With unheard-of insolence, they deny to the Cuban Revolution, the first socialist revolution in the Americas, the right to express objective and realistic opinions concerning the roads to revolution on our continent.

The people of this continent have a rich tradition of experiences in the struggle. The most recent is the Cuban Revolution. There are other experiences in contemporary times that are worth studying, as well -- those of the Russian and Chinese Revolutions, the experiences of Korea and Viet Nam, etc. Not one of these diverse experiences fails to confirm the necessity for the use of violent methods in the struggle against imperialism, colonialism and neocolonialism.

We are not denying that in a given country, under certain very special conditions, an exception could occur in the future. Nevertheless, not one case can be cited of a victorious revolution which has been able to avoid the use of violence, insurrection or armed struggle as fundamental methods. This is a universal experience and the political positions of Communist parties must be developed

by taking into account what has been learned in the practical experience of revolution, by generalizing from that experience and by probing deeply into it.

Cuba does not impose its own experience on others. Actually, the triumph of the Cuban Revolution arose from Latin-American conditions. And those conditions, with Cuba as an example, determine the road to revolution. The experiences of Cuba must be analyzed in relation to the conditions in each country.

We understand the special conditions that exist in Chile, Uruguay and other countries. We have a high estimation of the great mass movement which is developing in Uruguay. The specific conditions in that country require special analysis. However, in Montevideo, in the midst of street demonstrations, strikes and other modes of protest, specified forms of violent action have appeared. The solidarity of the people of Uruguay with Cuba is one of the most militant on the continent and we evaluate as positive the forms of struggle that the Frente de Izquierda de Liberación of Uruguay is developing.

We could take the situation in Chile as a case in point. Comrade Fidel Castro has spoken in detail of the problems of this country. We understand the means of struggle that are possible under Chile's present circumstances -- circumstances which are, naturally, subject to change. Other conditions prevail in Argentina, Brazil, Venezuela, Colombia, Peru and Guatemala. We could give our opinions concerning the conditions in each Latin-American country to prove, once again, that our opinions are based on the objective analysis of each situation, and not on hasty or subjective judgments. However, we should not go into this now in detail, but we do want to give the general picture of Latin America in order to reply to certain points formulated by the Yugoslav spokesmen.

Let's Delve More Deeply into Leninism

There is one fact that must be taken into account. The bourgeois revolution and consequently, agrarian reform, was never completed in Latin America. Capitalist development was not a consequence of the growth of agriculture. Yankee imperialism extended itself over the Continent, replacing the earlier European colonial powers, and paralyzing all independent development of our peoples. A type of capitalism, largely imported, developed alongside the feudal land system, subordinating the national economy to the interests of foreign oligarchies.

In the big cities, the miserable living conditions are striking. Alongside the mansions and the unlimited wealth of the native oligarchies and the bourgeoisie, in great part parasitic and commercial, exist the poverty-stricken neighborhoods inhabited by the workers and hundreds of thousands of unemployed, where the extraordinarily antagonistic character of the contradictions between

the small minority, possessors of everything, and the great masses, exploited and dispossessed, is obvious to any observer. The "Favela" in Rio de Janeiro, "Villa Miseria" in Argentina, and "Los Cerros" in Caracas, are only three examples of the extreme poverty in which hundreds of thousands of urban dwellers in Latin America are forced to live, in contrast to the opulence of the residential neighborhoods of the ruling classes.

In the countryside, those who cultivate the land do not own it. Millions of peasants live under feudal or semifeudal regimes, in the most shocking conditions of exploitation.

In certain regions, capitalist and imperialist development has created a strong proletariat, with a high degree of class consciousness. A body of intellectuals with a strong tradition of struggle also exists, which is embracing an increasingly progressive stand. Amidst the great class contradictions, there are broad intermediate strata, also oppressed, which demand social changes. At the base of all of this system of oppression is imperialist penetration, supported by the professional armies, which are its shock troops.

The peasant's demand for land, the struggle of the proletariat for new social gains, the fight by large sectors of the people in defense of their revolutionary and patriotic traditions, the influence of Cuba in the Latin America of today -- all constitute a force which is destined to prevail.

Add to this the influence of political and patriotic traditions on the great masses of the population, and the ideological, cultural and political unity among our peoples which has deepened in the struggle against imperialism. Our nations form a coherent group of peoples, destined to play a transcendental role in the history of the world.

Are the conditions that we have pointed out of a feudal-economic, semifeudal latifundist-bourgeois structure not similar to those that prevailed in Czarist Russia? There, also, a powerful working class existed, with strong traditions of struggle, as well as an exploited and combative peasant class, combined with a strong ideological and political movement among the progressive intellectuals and the Russian proletariat.

Those who would like to understand better what is going on in Latin America and in the underdeveloped world should study well the Leninist analysis and apply it to the panorama of today. The ideas of Lenin are increasingly valid. Forty-five years ago, these ideas expressed a reality which was in the process of development but which today manifests itself on a worldwide scale.

Let us delve more deeply into Leninism. If we study the course of imperialism in the countries which have been subjected to colonization and to feudal exploitation of the land, we can clearly understand certain Latin-American realities.

The Peoples of the Americas
Have Accepted the Challenge
of Imperialism

A profound moral disintegration is evident in the exploiting classes. Bourgeois, imperialist and semifeudal society in Latin America does not possess the necessary political strength to confront the actions of the masses. In its dilemma, lacking political or social means of opposing the revolutionary movement, it resorts to calling out the professional armies. Coups d'état, military coups, and changes of governmental figures follow one upon another. In this process, the professional armies have come to represent the last support of the reactionary classes and imperialism. Brute force, used against the people, increases the sense of patriotism and the will to combat which is latent in broad sectors of the populations, thus creating favorable political conditions for the revolutionary movement.

The fundamental wisdom of Fidel Castro's revolutionary strategy during the insurrectional period in Cuba lay in his ability to understand clearly that the liquidation of the professional army of the regime was a step of prime importance in the development of the Revolution, and that the only definitive way to guarantee the power of the people was to organize an army of workers.

Moreover, there are very concrete situations which permit an objective evaluation of what the path of the Latin-American Revolution must be. The example of Cuba has been pointed out. We should not forget a contrasting example: What happened in Brazil when President João Goulart attempted to carry out a timid land reform? What is the Brazilian experience in relation to peaceful methods of revolution? The mere planning of reforms by the Brazilian government was sufficient to provoke the latifundist caste and imperialism, utilizing the professional army, into a coup d'état and the inception of a brutal repression.

Is this not a sufficiently eloquent lesson in what can be obtained through the legal and semilegal mechanisms of the so-called "bourgeois democracy" of Latin America?

We could cite many other examples. But, in addition, the military intervention in Santo Domingo, the declaration of the President of the United States to the effect that another revolution in Latin America would not be tolerated; the resolution of the Yankee House of Representatives which formulates their supposed imperial right to intervene in any country of Latin America; all of these are facts which the oppressed nations of the Continent must follow. Santo Domingo under intervention, Cuba constantly attacked and menaced, the events in Guatemala twelve years ago, and the long succession of Yankee interventions throughout more than a century, point to the road of socialism for Latin America. The peoples of America have accepted the imperial challenge, and they

are ready to fight. Some of them are already fighting. Others will fight in the future and all will march on the road to revolution and socialism!

The Beginning of the Colonial War
Will Mean the Collapse
of Imperialism

What will happen when insurrection gathers momentum in several countries at once? Imperialism does not have the necessary strength to check the revolution of the oppressed peoples. It has had to employ 245,000 men in order to confront the heroism of the people of a country as small as Viet Nam.

How many divisions and how many men will they need to confront a whole continent? How many situations similar to that of Viet Nam can imperialism face simultaneously? What will happen when, not one, but several, and even the greater part of the peoples of the Continent, take to the road of revolutionary action? How many U S. soldiers will have to die in the mountains or on the plains of the Americas defending a system of exploitation which is not theirs and which oppresses them as well, and which has, in addition gained universal repudiation?

There is another factor which in certain circumstances can contribute positively to the peoples in their struggle for liberation. This factor is the people of the United States and the internal contradictions of the U.S. ruling classes. With respect to the struggle in Viet Nam, certain sectors of the U.S. people have been developing extraordinarily positive activities. Moreover, there is not unanimity in relation to the U.S. policy in Viet Nam, among the ruling sectors of the United States. The heroic struggle of such a small country as Viet Nam has been able to cause this rift. With the growth of the revolutionary movement in Latin America, these contradictions will intensify and the antiwar movement among the people of the United States will take on considerable strength, above all, taking into consideration the fact that hundreds of thousands more soldiers will have to be mobilized and will die on Latin-American soil.

There is no force capable of detaining the revolutionary struggle of the peoples of America. Imperialism will encounter a tragic crossroads: they must permit revolution to take its course, or start a colonial war. A colonial war will mean the collapse of imperialism in Latin America.

The experience of the French colonial system in Algeria confirms this. The liberation of numerous countries in Asia demonstrates it. Universal experience confirms it. This truth, which becomes every day more evident, can only be denied by imperialism and its allies, among whom, obviously, we must include the so-called "League of Yugoslav Communists."

3.

YUGOSLAV GOVERNMENT POSITIONS
SAME AS IMPERIALISTS' ON VIET NAM

The capitulating position of the Yugoslav government in the case of Viet Nam has many antecedents. One of the most outstanding was the maneuver promoted by the Yugoslav leaders in a meeting held in Belgrade of a group of ambassadors from the "nonaligned" countries. By this maneuver, the Yugoslav leaders tried to impose points of view which could only serve the interests of the imperialists. How can one conceive of a meeting called in Belgrade to discuss the problem of Viet Nam, in which the Yugoslav government forebore to name the United States as the aggressor, did not mention the violation of the sovereignty of the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam, and did not demand an end to the criminal attacks which the United States is carrying out against that nation?

In that meeting, the position of Yugoslavia was clearly reflected in the following points:

-- No condemnation of the presence of United States troops in South Viet Nam, much less a demand for their withdrawal.

-- No condemnation of the violation by the United States of the Geneva Agreements.

-- No condemnation of the permanent presence of U.S. aircraft carriers and other naval units in territorial waters of the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam.

-- The proposal of a peaceful settlement by negotiations, without the establishment of any provisos.

There are certain conclusions which can be drawn from the attitudes of the Yugoslav government in these meetings and from their published documents: When the government of Yugoslavia speaks of "foreign intervention" in Vietnamese territory, it does so in a generalized way, with no adequate denunciation of the role of Yankee imperialism.

In the speech by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Yugoslavia at the celebration of the twentieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations, Viet Nam was depicted as "a most dangerous center of tension, or of war," with no indication of the revolutionary content of that struggle nor denunciation of the aggressive action of the United States government. Nevertheless, it was recommended in the speech, that a political solution be given to the problems which have arisen in Viet Nam.

The imperialist war against the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam and the people of South Viet Nam has not been condemned nor denounced by the Yugoslav government in its true character, but

only referred to as, "a danger capable of provoking an extension of the war." Several Yugoslav publications have censured the intransigence of the Vietnamese in refusing to enter into any kind of negotiations without the previous withdrawal of the Yankees from South Viet Nam territory. One of these publications even labeled this firm Vietnamese position as "mistaken" and "extremist."

Let's Analyze the Official Statement
of the Yugoslav Government

The correspondent for "Politika" in Latin America states that in a Prensa Latina bulletin, dated February 3, an official statement by the government of Yugoslavia appeared which "made it clear that the United States' actions in Viet Nam have been condemned," and expressed the view that the solution to the conflict in Viet Nam could only be based on the Geneva Agreements. This was cited by the correspondent in an attempt to refute statements contained in an editorial of GRANMA in February of this year. Nevertheless, a simple reading of the declaration of the Yugoslav government reveals the weak and conciliatory political position maintained by the Yugoslav leadership in the case of Viet Nam. Since the "Politika" correspondent has brought it up, we shall demonstrate this affirmation.

The text of the Prensa Latina news release is as follows: "The government of Yugoslavia issued a statement today expressing its profound anxiety in regard to the renewal of air bombardments by the United States against the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam.

"The people and government of Yugoslavia" -- the declaration states -- "have pointed out on many occasions that tragic consequences are inevitable unless a political solution to the problem is found in consonance with the Geneva Agreements and with the rights of the Vietnamese people to liberty, independence and self-determination.

"And finally," the Yugoslav government states, "the decision by the United States to renew their bombardments places a serious responsibility on them before all humanity."

No one who considers himself a revolutionary can accept these statements as the expression of an energetic, decisive and firm position. Let the leaders of the so-called "League of Yugoslav Communists" ask themselves if they, in the epoch of the struggle against the nazis, would have made such statements to Hitler. There is the key to the question.

Our position in relation to the intervention of the United States in Viet Nam is one of a fight to the death against the invader, and the Yugoslav position is conciliation with the imperialists. From our point of view the correct stand is to demand strict adherence to the Geneva Agreements. The Yugoslav position

is satisfied simply with announcing that: "tragic consequences are inevitable unless a political solution to the problem is found in consonance with the Geneva Agreements." In our opinion, it is indispensable to demand an immediate end to the criminal bombings of the cities of Viet Nam, and to strongly demand, as well, the withdrawal of all imperialist forces from Vietnamese territory.

In the Yugoslav declarations they simply state that "the United States assumes a great responsibility by the bombings." There is no concrete condemnation of the imperialist aggression in South Viet Nam. In fact, they do not mention the intervention of U.S. forces in South Viet Nam at all. Only the "anxiety" of the Yugoslav government is expressed in regard to the renewal of bombings of the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam.

Merely to denounce the action of imperialism in Viet Nam is, naturally, not enough. It is necessary, in addition, to declare that peace negotiations cannot be accepted until the conditions previously laid down by the National Liberation Front of South Viet Nam and the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam are fulfilled.

By requesting peace negotiations, without demanding the ending of the bombardments nor the withdrawal of troops, the Yugoslav government in fact coincides with the imperialist stand, and thus, stands contrary to the positions defined by the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam and the NLF of South Viet Nam, which have been upheld by the socialist countries and by the revolutionary movement all over the world.

The government of Yugoslavia, on a question as vital to the revolutionary movement as the heroic fight being waged by the Vietnamese people, places itself outside the position adopted unanimously by the socialist countries and by the revolutionary movement of the entire world.

How Did the Yugoslav Declaration Come About?

As we all remember, the U.S. government, several months ago, confronted by military reverses in Viet Nam, the growing wave of world protest, and particularly the protest of the American people themselves, found itself obliged to announce a hypocritical "peace offensive," initiated by a halt in its bombardment of the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam. This peace offensive was a political maneuver on the part of the United States, designed to coerce the Vietnamese people into accepting imperialist conditions. Thanks to the firm stand of the Vietnamese people and their leaders, the maneuver failed, prompting Johnson to resume the bombings against the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam. This decision has met enormous opposition throughout the entire world.

The declaration of the Yugoslav government concerning Viet Nam is simply a timid and token reply to the renewal of bombardments

against the DRV. Declarations similar to that of the Yugoslavs have been formulated by some capitalist countries and by some U.S. congressmen. Moreover, some capitalist countries have specifically condemned the imperialist aggression against Viet Nam.

Viet Nam Has Denounced
the Yugoslav Positions as Coinciding
with Those of Yankee Imperialism

But, moreover, it has been the Vietnamese themselves, who on repeated occasions have accused the Yugoslav government of supporting imperialist positions and of proposing negotiations under circumstances which are inadmissible from the points of view of the government of the DRV and the National Liberation Front.

Yugoslavia was not accepted as an observer at the Tri-continental Conference because the Vietnamese delegation insisted that the government of that country had maintained points of view similar to those of the imperialists concerning the Vietnamese war. More recently, the newspaper "Nhan-Dan," official organ of the Vietnamese Workers' Party, denounced that the Yugoslav government had supported the U.S. plan to get the puppet administration of Saigon into the United Nations surreptitiously. In its denunciation, the Vietnamese paper stated that Yugoslav Federal Executive Council President Peter Stanbolic's tour of several Asiatic countries was an adjunct of the plan to persuade the governments of those countries to support Yugoslavia's proposals for negotiations in the problem of Viet Nam.

This is a new maneuver of the Yugoslav government to rally support from a group of "nonaligned" countries for their sellout policy in the Viet Nam question.

Shocked by Our Request
that All Military Forces Necessary
Be Employed to Halt the Bombardments

Of course, from this point of view, it is logical that the Yugoslav press correspondent in Moscow was shocked by the statements contained in the greeting of the Cuban delegation to the twenty-third Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

As is known, the greeting of our Central Committee underlined the necessity of employing whatever forces might be required to detain the Yankee bombardments of the DRV, of running all indispensable risks and of tightening unity of action among the Socialist countries and the revolutionary movement throughout the world in terms of this objective.

The Yugoslav leaders call this an adventurist position. They do not point out that it is the Yankee imperialists who are the

real adventurists in the Vietnamese war.

We may ask the leaders of the so-called "League of Yugoslav Communists" a few questions. Do you want the Vietnamese people to shed their blood and, without the decisive aid of the socialist countries, to endure the criminal aggression carried out by the strongest imperialist power on earth? How do the Yugoslav leaders think that the bombardments can be stopped? By convincing the Yankees through persuasion and discussions?

If they think they can do this -- and we know they don't believe such a thing -- it is they who are deluded. But the Yugoslav leaders are not deluded. They are actually accomplices of the imperialists in Viet Nam.

We challenge the leaders of the so-called "League of Yugoslav Communists" to tell us, concretely, the formula for paralyzing the bombardments against the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam. Naturally, these questions cannot easily be answered by any "reporter" or "functionary" of the Yugoslav Government. Our challenge is directed to the leadership of the so-called "League of Yugoslav Communists."

Yugoslav Leaders Surrender to Imperialism

The Yugoslav newspaper "Vjesnik," of Zagreb, writes that the Cuban statements in the twenty-third Congress of the CPSU were "considered to be pseudorevolutionary."

The truth of the matter is that our statements were not "pseudorevolutionary" for the Yugoslav Press but, on the contrary, too revolutionary.

The Yugoslav leaders and the pro-imperialist and reactionary press, have carried on identical intrigues with respect to the declarations of the Cuban delegation. Imputations similar to those of the Yugoslavs were voiced by imperialist agents concerning the statement of the Cuban delegation. The fact is that the Cuban statements aroused tremendous repercussions throughout the world, and served to emphasize Cuba's position with respect to the Vietnamese struggle. But what matters most is not what Cuba said. What matters most is that Cuba, 90 miles from the shores of imperialism, threatened by the strongest capitalist country in the world, surrounded by an economic blockade, interests itself in the furthering of the Revolution all over the world. While the leaders of the so-called "League of Yugoslav Communists," whose country is situated thousands of miles away from the frontiers of imperialism, fear it and become cowards, play imperialism's game, placate and serve it by proclaiming its lies and reactionary libels against the revolutionary fighters of the world, we, bordering the U.S. coast, challenge Yankee imperialism. The Yugoslav leaders, at a distance

of thousands of miles and in a part of the world where the balance of power is extraordinarily in favor of socialism, oppose revolution and sell out to imperialism. This is one difference between the so-called "League of Yugoslav Communists" and the COMMUNIST PARTY OF CUBA!

4.

THE ROAD OF TREASON VERSUS THE ROAD OF REVOLUTION

The newspaper "Politika" maintains its charges of "sectarianism" against the Tricontinental Conference agreements.

When the Yugoslav press arbitrarily accuses the Tricontinental Conference of sectarianism, it is motivated by the position of conciliation and submission held by the so-called "League of Yugoslav Communists" with regard to imperialism.

In what sense could the Conference be considered sectarian? In its composition? In the limitation of participating delegations? In the narrow content of its agreements?

We challenge the so-called "League of Yugoslav Communists" to point out any other conference or international meeting in which a greater number of revolutionary parties and organizations has been represented. We challenge them to indicate any conference or meeting in the history of the anti-imperialist movement which has adopted broader and more combative agreements than the Tricontinental Conference.

Revolutionary organizations from 82 countries were represented in the Conference, among them, parties and organizations which are in power in their countries. Also included were organizations representing revolutionary movements in arms. Moreover, practically all the communist parties of Asia, Africa, and Latin America were present.

In the specific case of Latin America, the representation of its anti-imperialist organizations was never so wide or so militant.

Seventy organizations from 27 countries of the Latin-American continent were present. The fundamental agreements of the Conference were unanimously approved. The approved line did not only take into account the importance of the national liberation movement, but also the role of the socialist camp and of the working class in the capitalist countries, and an exhortation to the U.S. people was formulated, as well, urging them to intensify the struggle against the war in Viet Nam.

The Yugoslav leaders accuse this Conference, which adopted transcendental agreements and achieved cohesion among the anti-imperialist forces of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, of being sectarian. In the diversity and type of organizations represented, as well as in the depth and extension of its resolutions, the

Tricontinental Conference has meant a major step forward in the battle to achieve a massive anti-imperialist front in the world. In all of history there has not been a wider, more combative, and deeply rooted anti-imperialist front than that which has arisen from the Tricontinental Conference. In spite of this, the Yugoslav press maintains that the Conference was sectarian and affirms that there were important Latin-American organizations which were not present. The Yugoslav newspaper "Politika" lies when it states that the MNR of Bolivia was denied participation in the Conference. The participation of the MNR in the Tricontinental Conference was never requested.

Organizations Allied to the Imperialists...
and to Yugoslavia...Did not Participate
in the Tricontinental Conference

Which are the organizations that, according to the "League of Yugoslav Communists," should have been present at the Conference, and whose participation, nevertheless, was denied? Could it be Acción Democrática of Venezuela, at the head of a puppet government serving imperialist interests, which represses workers, assassinates peasants and applies criminal methods and violence against communists and revolutionaries in general? Venezuela's Acción Democrática, traitor to the cause of the masses, sworn enemy of revolution and of communism, has had its general secretary, Paz Galarraga, visiting Yugoslavia recently.

Perhaps the so-called "League of Yugoslav Communists" would like to have seen the APRA of Peru represented in the Conference, APRA, ally of imperialism, sold out to the native reactionary classes. Should the political group of José Figueres, instrument of Yankee interests in Central America, have been present at the Tricontinental Conference?

We challenge the leaders of the "League of Yugoslav Communists" to present a concrete list of the names of anti-imperialist organizations which asked to participate in the Tricontinental Conference and were rejected.

The truth is that the organizations which may be cited by the Yugoslav press spokesmen do not form part of the revolutionary camp. They are allies or servants of imperialism in one degree or another. The so-called "League of Yugoslav Communists" tries to appear unaware of this. The fact is, beyond any doubt, that the Yugoslav leaders coincide politically in many ways with the forces allied with imperialism in Latin America.

There Were No Communists or Socialists
among the Chileans Who Left Cuba

In making the absurd accusation that the Conference approved a sectarian platform, the newspaper "Politika" states the following:

"The narrowed, sectarian platform of the Latin-American representatives in the Tricontinental Conference naturally produced results that are not unanimously acceptable to all the progressive and democratic forces of the Continent." Further along in the same paragraph it affirms: "Recently, for example, the Chilean Parliamentary Delegation, which also included communists and socialists, interrupted its visit to Havana in protest, expressing in this way its dissent from the extremist Cuban declaration."

The paragraph just quoted states that communists and socialists departed. Those who are not aware of the details of this matter receive the impression that Chilean communists and socialists were opposing statements of Fidel Castro. The truth is that among those Chileans who left there was not one communist or socialist. The communists did not come with that delegation. One socialist was included and he -- along with several Christian Democrats -- remained in our country.

We should clarify that the Chilean Delegation's visit had nothing to do with the Tricontinental Conference. It was a delegation which had been invited by the Cuban Government to see at first hand the accomplishments of the Cuban Revolution. This is another example of the broad way in which we analyze the political forces of the Continent. Nobody who knows even slightly the process of our Revolution and the history of our relations with the parties, revolutionary organizations and also with institutions and persons of the most diverse tendencies, can be misled about these matters.

The history of our revolutionary process has demonstrated to us in a very objective way the need that exists to rally all combative forces around the great revolutionary objectives.

Our policy with regard to narrow positions is known by the friends of Cuba throughout the world, and even by many of our enemies. We have been able to win friends and supporters in many sectors which have doubts and worries concerning the ideas of communism. That is, in noncommunist sectors. We have won them, which is the interesting part, by maintaining the same radically Marxist-Leninist positions and revolutionary firmness which the spokesmen of the Yugoslav press have termed "extremist."

But the entire world is also aware of the profoundly radical and revolutionary positions of the Communist Party of Cuba, which would never accept close relations -- as the Yugoslav Government is doing -- with the military authorities and reactionaries of Indonesia, who have assassinated thousands of communists and unleashed a brutal repression against the people. Are the "illustrious," "broad-minded," and "antisectionarian" Yugoslav leaders by chance upset because Cuba opposed the participation of the reactionary delegation of Indonesia in the Conference, and supported the progressive delegation?

Yugoslavia Was Not Admitted to the Tricontinental
Because Her Stand on Viet Nam
Coincided with that of the Imperialists

As we stated in our February editorial, the Yugoslav press charges the Tricontinental Conference with being sectarian in character because the Yugoslav Organization of Solidarity was not admitted to the Conference.

We wish to point out to the Yugoslav leaders that if the delegation from their country had been admitted, important revolutionary forces from Asia (Viet Nam and Korea, for example) and from Latin America, such as Guatemala, Venezuela, the Dominican Republic and Cuba, would have refused to participate in the Conference. In order to widen the scope of the Conference so that true representatives of the forces of our continents might take part, it was necessary to agree that the Yugoslav Organization of Solidarity not be invited as observers.

Where does the responsibility lie? With us, the Cubans? No, gentlemen of the so-called "League of Yugoslav Communists"! The responsibility is yours and yours alone! A popular expression states that: "One cannot be with God and with the Devil as well." This applies as well -- even though you seem to have forgotten the fact -- to the struggle against imperialism.

They Seek Unity in Order to Hold Back
the Revolutionary Struggle
and Placate the Imperialists

The Tricontinental Conference demonstrated the effective way to unite the peoples and their militant organizations. This way is the way of Revolution.

The development of the revolutionary struggle in Asia, Africa and Latin America will generate a powerful mass movement in the entire world. The socialist camp, workers, intellectuals and students in capitalist countries, will come forward to support the oppressed peoples, as is already being made clear in the universal repudiation of the Yankee interventions in Viet Nam and the Dominican Republic. In other words, the fight for national liberation in the underdeveloped countries will stimulate new forms of revolutionary action in the entire world and will help build wider, deeper and more concrete unity.

What the Yugoslav spokesmen do not understand is that in the last few years a crisis has definitively arisen in relation to certain schematic concepts of methods and forms of struggle.

In Latin America, the Cuban Revolution has hastened this crisis. To what did conformism and passivity lead? To the advance

of imperialism on this continent, to the consolidation of exploitation, and to the isolation of the revolutionary vanguard. Passivity and conformism bred only isolation and sectarianism.

The Cuban Revolution made it very clear that energetic, decisive, valiant and audacious action unites the masses, strengthens the bonds between the vanguard and the people and pushes the class struggle ahead. In this way the Cuban Revolution forged something more than a "united front." We forged a Marxist-Leninist revolutionary vanguard, around which the unity and strength of all of the people has grown.

The Yugoslav position is something very different. For them "the front of the masses" should be sought in an alliance of diverse political organizations, no matter what positions these organizations hold in regard to imperialism. For us, this front of the masses can only be achieved by uniting those anti-imperialist forces which are prepared to fight against the reactionaries, oligarchic governments and imperialism itself.

We Seek Unity to Make the Revolution

They prefer to ally themselves with reactionary governments like that of Venezuela in Latin America; with the reactionary, land-owning military caste in Indonesia; or with the usurpers in Ghana in Africa. This is the tricontinental alliance which is satisfactory to the so-called "League of Yugoslav Communists."

We prefer to unite ourselves with the guerrillas of Venezuela, with the heroic patriots in Viet Nam, with the highly esteemed and steadfast communist leaders in Korea, and with those in so-called Portuguese Guinea. Citing these examples clearly illustrates the type of unity we Cuban revolutionaries desire.

There is no doubt that the type of unity that interests the Communist Party of Cuba is much broader, since it represents the exploited and oppressed masses of the world. The Yugoslav type of unity is with groups of corrupted politicians, with reactionaries and conservatives. We defend the unity of the peoples, of fighters, of revolutionaries. We try to reach the masses by means of Revolution. They attempt to oppose the revolutionary movement of the masses by an alliance with the forces that capitulate and sell out to the imperialists.

At the root of all this is the fact that we seek unity in order to fight imperialism and make the Revolution, while they seek unity in order to hold back the revolutionary struggle and placate imperialism.

This is the difference between the so-called "League of Yugoslav Communists" and the Communist Party of Cuba. The position taken by the Yugoslav leaders points the way to treason. Our position points the way to Revolution.