

# 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. 26

September 9, 1966

In this issue

Page

Sartre Calls on Soviet Leaders to Deter Washington .....	1
Text of Sartre Editorial .....	4
Desertion on the Rise in South Vietnamese Forces .....	6
Judges "Incline" to Death for Hugo Blanco .....	7
Peking Opera Star Commits Suicide .....	10
"Tupac Amaru" Case Opens in Lima .....	11
Mexican Witch-Hunters Strike at Víctor Rico Galán .....	13
Yon Sosa Reportedly Merging Forces with Luis Turcios .....	15
America's Exploding Ghettos -- by Evelyn Sell .....	16
Increasing Unrest in India -- by Kailas Chandra .....	19
Tour in India for Tabata under Discussion .....	22
The Tarnish Deepens on the Wilson Image -- by John Walters .....	23
A Significant Change in the German Political Scene .....	24
Volunteers for Vietnam Brought in Denmark .....	26
Protest in Vancouver against Vietnam War .....	27
World's Greatest Swimmer .....	27
Documents:	
Open Letter to Pablo Neruda .....	28
Neruda's Reply to Cuban Intellectuals .....	35
In Response to Neruda .....	36

SARTRE CALLS ON SOVIET LEADERS TO DETER WASHINGTON

The indictment of Soviet and French Communist party policy on Vietnam contained in the August issue of Les Temps Modernes, the monthly magazine founded by Jean-Paul Sartre, has stirred up a heated controversy in Left circles of France. The statement of its editorial board, entitled "Capitulation or Counterescalation," calls upon Moscow to fix a line which the U.S. militarists cannot transgress without meeting with graduated reprisals. It proposes that the Soviet leaders, who command the necessary deterrents, warn Washington that one more step on the escalator, such as bombing the dikes

Reba Hansen, Business Manager,

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

New York, N. Y. 10010

# 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. 26

September 9, 1966

<u>In this issue</u>	<u>Page</u>
Sartre Calls on Soviet Leaders to Deter Washington .....	1
Text of Sartre Editorial .....	4
Desertion on the Rise in South Vietnamese Forces .....	6
Judges "Incline" to Death for Hugo Blanco .....	7
Peking Opera Star Commits Suicide .....	10
"Tupac Amaru" Case Opens in Lima .....	11
Mexican Witch-Hunters Strike at Víctor Rico Galán .....	13
Yon Sosa Reportedly Merging Forces with Luis Turcios .....	15
America's Exploding Ghettoes -- by Evelyn Sell .....	16
Increasing Unrest in India -- by Kailas Chandra .....	19
Tour in India for Tabata under Discussion .....	22
The Tarnish Deepens on the Wilson Image -- by John Walters .....	23
A Significant Change in the German Political Scene .....	24
Volunteers for Vietnam Sought in Denmark .....	26
Protest in Vancouver against Vietnam War .....	27
World's Greatest Swimmer .....	27
Documents:	
Open Letter to Pablo Neruda .....	28
Neruda's Reply to Cuban Intellectuals .....	35
In Response to Neruda .....	36

### SARTRE CALLS ON SOVIET LEADERS TO DETER WASHINGTON

The indictment of Soviet and French Communist party policy on Vietnam contained in the August issue of Les Temps Modernes, the monthly magazine founded by Jean-Paul Sartre, has stirred up a heated controversy in Left circles of France. The statement of its editorial board, entitled "Capitulation or Counterescalation," calls upon Moscow to fix a line which the U.S. militarists cannot transgress without meeting with graduated reprisals. It proposes that the Soviet leaders, who command the necessary deterrents, warn Washington that one more step on the escalator, such as bombing the dikes

Reba Hansen, Business Manager,

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

New York, N. Y. 10010

of north Vietnam or crossing the seventeenth parallel, and they, too, will order appropriate action.

The editors view this as the only way to stop the U.S. imperialists from plunging further ahead on their reckless course in Southeast Asia. They fear that, if the Kremlin remains passive in the face of stepped-up American aggression and fails to react in a firm manner at this critical juncture, the Pentagon will be emboldened to crush and occupy north Vietnam and destroy China. The Soviet Union would then confront the grim alternatives of general capitulation or general war and might submissively sign a global "Munich agreement."

The Nouvel Observateur, a weekly edited by individuals on the right wing of the Unified Socialist party, immediately took exception to the reasoning and recommendations of Les Temps Modernes in a piece by Jean Daniel. He declared that "the editorial writer should logically have concluded his article by calling for hostile demonstrations, not before Washington's embassies in various countries, but in front of the Soviet embassies." He argued that the thesis of Les Temps Modernes had a paralyzing effect because it shifted responsibility onto the Soviet Union.

In reality, Daniel said, "problems are no longer posed as they were in Marx's or even in Trotsky's day." While it is necessary "to save the revolutionary idea," it is also necessary to avoid "the involvement...which leads to total war." Since the French Left had no chance of influencing the Soviet Union, its role was to deepen the divisions among the American people over Washington's policies before "the Vietnamese vanish under the bombs."

In a reply to Nouvel Observateur the editors of Les Temps Modernes protested Daniel's distortion of their position. To seek to justify inaction on the grounds that the American ruling class is led by a pack of madmen, is a false argument, the editors contended. "America cannot disregard a Soviet ultimatum; she cannot wield reprisals against the USSR; or else she would deliberately choose world war. You reply that this is precisely what you are afraid of. You fear that the United States would take no notice. You believe in 'American madness,' while we believe, with good reason, that the policy of imperialism, in all its horror, is perfectly rational."

The editors argue that the supporters of Nouvel Observateur's views will be unable to influence U.S. policy before it is too late. "On the other hand, the USSR...is the foremost socialist power. Its policy, to the extent that it is decisive for the international strategy of the workers' and anti-imperialist movement -- an international strategy without which there can no longer be any local revolutionary victories -- is the concern of all revolutionaries and all socialists..." Should not our role then be, they ask, "to assure the socialist camp that its warning of counterescalation would be hailed with approval, with relief and hope by our peoples, because journals like yours, would have prepared them to call for such a desired Soviet response and consider it legitimate and necessary..."

Kosygin has more right to affirm that 'I am a citizen of Hanoi' than Kennedy ever had to proclaim 'I am a Berliner.'

The Temps Modernes rejoinder concluded that the advocacy of such a line by the French Left would facilitate a favorable decision by Moscow.

The French Communist paper, l'Humanité, which so faithfully echoes Moscow, is by no means of this opinion. Its August 19 issue carried a vitriolic editorial in true Stalinist style scoffing at "the armchair strategists of St.-Germain-des-Pres who want to brandish nuclear weapons" while sitting in their editorial office. Like Nouvel Observateur, they upbraid Sartre and his associates for directing their indignation at the Soviet leaders rather than at the American imperialists -- although condemnation of Washington's course is the basis for their proposals.

L'Humanité brands the proposals as "irresponsible provocations" on the ground that they incur the risk of thermonuclear war. The Soviet government, it says, is supplying all the aid needed by the Vietnamese to "neutralize the efforts of the aggressor." (The CP organ carefully refrains from saying "to assure the victory of the National Liberation Front.") It seeks to unload the central responsibility for the difficulties upon Peking's refusal to form a united front with the Soviet Union, though it correctly points out that this is one of the factors exploited by Washington to extend its escalation.

L'Humanite's blithe assurance that everyone can count on "the coolness and firmness of the Soviet leaders to hold the military power of the United States in check" is not shared by Sartre and the staff of Les Temps Modernes or by growing numbers of revolutionists the world over. While they reject Peking's blind and sectarian line of non-cooperation with the Soviet "revisionists" against U.S. aggression, they have become increasingly disturbed by Moscow's feeble reactions since Johnson's first air attacks on north Vietnam in February 1965.

Sartre is the most prestigious figure among the Left intellectuals of France. The forthright voicing of grave misgivings about Soviet policy in his magazine follows a line of approach to the world situation which has hitherto been confined to the international Trotskyist movement and certain speeches of Fidel Castro. These views are bound to have wide repercussions in the antiwar movement throughout Western Europe, especially among the youth who respect and follow Sartre.

The editorial is also noteworthy for its criticism of the careerist French politician, Mitterrand in the last election. His scorn for Mitterrand's kowtowing before Johnson, along with a rejection of de Gaulle's diplomatic maneuvering, indicates that Sartre is having some second -- and third -- thoughts on these questions.

TEXT OF SARTRE EDITORIAL

[The following is a translation of the editorial which appeared in the August 1966 issue of Les Temps Modernes and which has become the center of a sharp debate among radical circles in Europe because of its criticism of the ineptness and weakness of Soviet policy in the Vietnam situation. The editorial appeared under the title of "Capitulation ou Contre-escalade" (Capitulation or Counterescalation).]

\* \* \*

After having fruitlessly, but with impunity, bombarded "chosen objectives" in north Vietnam in 1964; after having increased their repressive ground forces in south Vietnam to 300,000 men -- slated to be 600,000 by the end of this year; after having poisoned crops, burned forests, destroyed villages, deported the inhabitants of entire regions, tortured and executed prisoners and "suspects"; after having unloaded on this small country, in 15 months, a third of the tonnage of bombs (rounded out between times by the use of napalm, harmless gases that nevertheless kill, and slivers of steel) dropped on all of Western Europe during the fifty-six months of the second world war; after having systematically bombarded, beginning with last year, the roads, bridges, railroads, buildings (including hospitals and schools) of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, and all that fruitlessly, but with impunity, the United States began bombarding Hanoi and Haiphong at the end of June.

They know the Vietnamese will not capitulate despite everything; neither the peasant fighters of the south, who took up arms again in 1959 on their own initiative to liberate themselves from a regime imposed from abroad; nor the government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, which is defending, alone, at a price without precedent in history, the right -- and the duty -- that a socialist state has to prevent the crushing of a revolution which surged up by itself in the other half of the same country.

That is why the American escalation will not halt at this point. Its next steps envisage the destruction of all organized social activity in the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. The American air force is preparing to bomb the dikes of the Red River, thus wiping out all the Tonkinese rice cultivation and a good part of the ten million inhabitants of the Delta; the American infantry is preparing to land on the shores of north Vietnam.

These next steps of the escalation are known, as the earlier ones were known a long time in advance. The United States is deliberately taking the risk of a world war because, in view of the internal division in the socialist camp, they consider this risk to be very small. Their aim, which goes far beyond Vietnam, is to demonstrate:

(1) That imperialism has enough forces to crush, there or anywhere else, a victorious revolutionary movement, whether or not

it is armed;

(2) That every socialist state that tries to prevent this repression will itself be pitilessly annihilated, even if the revolution that it seeks to aid has broken out in the other half of the same nation;

(3) That despite the solemn mutual defense treaties which bind this state to the rest of the socialist world, it will be abandoned by them, so formidable is the warlike determination and the strategic superiority of the United States;

(4) That, consequently, every attempt, armed or peaceful, which tends to change the social and international relations imposed by American imperialism, is a hopeless undertaking anywhere in the world for a long time to come.

This demonstration has not yet been completed but it is well on the way. For six years imperialism has been on the offensive in the entire world, making and unmaking regimes, in Santo Domingo, Brazil, West and Central Africa, Indonesia, Bolivia, Argentina... In the wake of the American aggression against Vietnam, the most extreme and obscurantist reaction moves forward on all fronts, without the Wilsons, the Brandts, the Mitterrands, the Mollets, the Nennis, who protest very politely -- for isn't Johnson irascible and doesn't one have to have his ear in order to influence this great American? -- taking into account that imperialism, at its present pace, can soon dispense with their loyal services.

In this situation humanitarian and pacifist phraseology is as disgusting as praise of the Gaullist strategy is idiotic. Actually de Gaulle does nothing to aid the struggle of the Vietnamese people; he is using both that struggle and the American gliding toward a war against China to restore to European imperialism a part of its lost independence. That oppressed peoples should seek to derive advantage and borrow arms from the weakest -- and therefore the less dangerous -- imperialism against the most powerful is entirely in order and a matter of tactics. But to take that as a pretext for identifying Gaullist imperialism with anything progressive only reveals the vacuity of the international strategy to which opportunism leads.

Lack of clarity, cowardly waiting, "realism" are the grave of the socialist and revolutionary movement; they prepare further defeats as surely as nonintervention against Spanish fascism in 1936 prepared 1940 and its sequel. However, the obvious parallel is not only with the war in Spain but also with the capitulations which preceded and followed the Munich agreement.

The United States is convinced that the Soviet Union will retreat to the very end before engaging in any test of strength. It believes that a provocation against China will not make the Soviet camp budge. It thinks it can coerce China either to lose face by remaining passive before the annihilation and occupation of the

Democratic Republic of Vietnam or to provide them with the pretext, by its reaction, to destroy its nuclear centers and, if that is not enough, to transform the Chinese cities into immense charnel houses. They calculate that the USSR will watch the humiliation or massacre of the Chinese without acting. They calculate that after that the USSR will be glad to grasp the bloody hand of America and sign a new global Munich pact.

Is this calculation insane? If so, it is high time to say so. Each week that passes without the socialist camp fixing precise limits, the breaching of which will entail direct reprisals, renders the unfolding of the American plan more probable. Each new aggression against the People's Republic of Vietnam narrows the margin of maneuver for the socialist camp and comes close to the moment when it will be confronted with the worst dilemma -- general capitulation or general war.

The incapacity to fix this limit and threaten the United States, before any new phase of the escalation, with "graduated reprisals" of counterescalation, is disheartening and tragic. As easy to measure out as the American escalation, the counterescalation of the socialist powers would have the superiority of being legitimate and effective. The aero-naval bases and the installations of the American Seventh Fleet are located at Formosa, at Okinawa, in Thailand, in the Philippines, in the Gulf of Tonkin. Seven years ago, the Soviet artillery demonstrated its ability to hit a target 10,000 kilometers away.

To proclaim that there is a strict limit beyond which one would return blow for blow; to assure, while so doing, support to all the peoples discouraged by the American killings as well as by their own inability to aid Vietnam which is fighting for them all; to deliberately assume the risk of war today is the surest way to avoid the choice tomorrow between the reality of an imposed war and the destruction, one after the other, of the revolutionary states and movements of Asia and elsewhere.

#### DESERTION ON THE RISE IN SOUTH VIETNAMESE FORCES

Statistics released August 29 in Saigon show a sharp rise in the number of desertions from the South Vietnamese armed forces. In the first half of 1966, some 67,000 deserted. If this rate keeps up 134,000 will have deserted by the end of 1966. This compares with 113,000 in 1965. At present the armed forces number 750,000 men. Thus about one in seven can be expected to desert.

Why this increase in desertions if things are going as well as Johnson makes out? First of all, the unpopularity of Saigon's cause continues to mount with the immense destruction and slaughter. Secondly, there is a growing feeling that the Americans have taken over -- so let them do the fighting, too.

JUDGES "INCLINE" TO DEATH FOR HUGO BLANCO

The Belaúnde government appears to have definitely decided to finally bring Hugo Blanco and some thirty other defendants to trial. The world-famous Peruvian Trotskyist peasant leader has been held in prison at Arequipa for more than three years, having been captured on May 30, 1963. Reports in the Lima newspapers indicate that the isolated town of Tacna, where even adequate press coverage will be difficult, has been selected for the hearing. The date, however, has not yet been announced.

According to the August 17 La Tribuna of Lima, the authorities have not yet decided on the sentence. The "Fiscal of the Police Zone will demand 25 years in prison for Blanco, while it is asserted that the judges incline to the death penalty."

The timing of the trial is significant. It comes in the wake of the crushing of the new guerrilla fronts that flared up in Peru last year. As part of the campaign that ended with the murder of Javier Heraud, Luis de la Puente and Guillermo Lobatón, Belaúnde opened a nationwide witch-hunt. In the atmosphere of terror that still exists in Peru, the authorities evidently count on disposing of Hugo Blanco and other revolutionary leaders without touching off a reaction in the labor and peasant movements that could place the regime in immediate peril.

All kinds of difficulties have been placed in the way of Hugo Blanco's defense. "Because Blanco has no attorney," reports the August 17 La Tribuna, "the Police Zone appointed one. This is due to the fact that no lawyer in Arequipa, including the Communists, cared to take up his defense."

That is only part of the truth. "During the process of gathering information," reports the August 20 issue of Revolución Peruana, the organ of the Frente de Izquierda Revolucionario [Revolutionary Left Front] which is headed by Hugo Blanco, "he was denied use of the most elementary juridical norms of defense. Even worse, a harsh regime was imposed on him and he was kept permanently incomunicado. His attorneys were jailed, as in the case of Dr. Víctor Angles, who was held for eight months in the penal colony of El Sepa in 1964, and likewise Dr. Alfredo Battilana who was held for three months in 1965."

During his three years and three months in prison at Arequipa, continues Revolución Peruana, Hugo Blanco "has been held incomunicado all this time, without visits even from his relatives. He has been held in isolation from the rest of the prison inmates. His correspondence, as well as reading matter, has been rigorously censored by the officers of the Republican Guard. In addition, Major G.R. Del Carpio has lately intensified his provocations against Hugo Blanco, through constant insults and open provocations, with the obvious aim of faking an attack in order to kill him in cold blood, as was done with the peasant leader of Chumbivilcas, Arcadio Hurtado, July 26,

1964, in the Cuzco jail.

"Due to all this, Hugo Blanco has gone on hunger strikes ten times as the only means to get better treatment, the longest being 28 days during August 1965."

The political importance of the case can be gathered from the fact that in Peru, Hugo Blanco is a legendary figure among the millions of peasants. Outside of Peru, his standing can be judged by the following statement made by Che Guevara in Algiers, July 23, 1963: "Hugo Blanco is the head of one of the guerrilla movements in Peru. He struggled stubbornly but the repression was strong. I don't know what his tactics were, but his fall does not signify the end of the movement. It is only a man that has fallen, but the movement continues. One time, when we were preparing to make our landing from the Granma, and when there was great risk that all of us would be killed, Fidel said: 'What is more important than us is the example we set.' It's the same thing. Hugo Blanco has set an example, a good example, and he struggled as much as he could. But he suffered a defeat, the popular forces suffered a defeat. It's only a passing stage. Afterward will come another stage."

In his book Cuzco: Tierra y Muerte [Cuzco: Land and Death], published in Lima in 1964, Hugo Neira of the staff of the Lima daily Expreso, described the way the peasants view Hugo Blanco:

"Fought by the right, his image distorted by prestige due to erroneous reports about him being a guerrilla fighter, injured by the silence, if not sabotage, of the traditional, bureaucratic groups of Communism, extolled by the FIR (Frente de Izquierda Revolucionario), feared and hated by the unorganized yanacunas and the hacendados, admired by the union ranks, Hugo Blanco looms over the whole South.

"This is the straight truth, without falsification, of what this man, who is a prisoner today in Arequipa, means to the peasant masses.... 'We owe him everything,' say the peasants. In fact every change in Convención and elsewhere in the country, was accelerated due to the danger they saw in the peasants having no hope other than hope in the revolutionary unionism of Blanco.

"Devotion to Blanco is total; they don't dare bring him to trial. I am referring to the unionized peasants. 'He is our chief,' they say.... And in every peasant's home there is an empty bed. It's the one that was waiting hopefully for the leader when he was going around the region organizing or when he was passing during the night, under the stars, fleeing from the police...."

Hugo Blanco was a student of agronomy at the University of La Plata in Argentina when his interest was aroused in Trotskyism. He left the university and became a worker in a meat packing plant at Berisso. Rapidly proving his capacities, he became one of the leaders of the Trotskyist wing of the Partido Socialista de la Revolución Nacional, the predecessor of the present Partido Revolu-

cionario de los Trabajadores.

Returning to Peru, he became a leader in a local of a building trades union in Lima and also of the Peruvian Trotskyist movement. He was one of the organizers of the demonstrations that greeted Richard Nixon in the ill-fated 1958 South American tour of the vice-president of the United States.

The Lima police sought to arrest Hugo Blanco for his role in organizing a welcome of this kind in Lima for Nixon, and he went into hiding in his home town, Cuzco. At the time, the peasant movement was on the rise in the area. The main peasant organization was dominated by lawyers belonging to the Communist party.

Hugo Blanco became deeply involved in this movement. He had several advantages. Besides the understanding of the class struggle gained from his study of Trotskyist theory and his experience in practical work in both Argentina and Lima, his native tongue was Quechua, the language still spoken by the Peruvian peasants since the time of the Incas.

In contrast to the Communist party leaders, who spoke only Spanish, Hugo Blanco became the first leader of Federación Campesina del Cuzco who could speak to the membership in their own language. He became a powerful exponent of the right of the peasants to preserve and to develop their own language and to use it in all matters relating to governmental and civic affairs.

In opposition to the Communist leaders, who were tied to a Stalinist background and who sought to confine the peasant struggle to merely legal means and court battles, Hugo Blanco advanced a program of mass struggle. The objective was to form powerful peasant unions that would engage in mass actions, particularly around the land question, under the guidance of a revolutionary-socialist party.

This program did not deny the role of armed struggle, but visualized this, including the formation of guerrillas, as subordinate to the problem of organizing a revolutionary party and mobilizing the peasants and workers on a mass scale.

Under the leadership of Hugo Blanco, the peasants of the valley of La Convención registered huge successes. Two factors, however, prevented this movement from moving ahead to the conquest of power. One was the loss of militancy among those peasants who actually won plots of land. The other was the wide dissemination of a superficial appreciation of the Cuban Revolution. To many revolutionary-minded youth it appeared that a revolution could be won by merely constituting a small band of guerrillas willing to engage in heroic battles with the armed forces. What was lost sight of was the need to become deeply immersed in mass work. Isolated battles were not sufficient to set mass forces into motion.

A strong tendency thus appeared in Peru to misread the pos-

sibilities of guerrilla war. Hugo Blanco stood against this, doing his best to put the role of guerrillas into proper focus. The distinctions he made were not widely known, however, and he himself became known as a guerrilla leader despite his insistence on the primary importance of mass work and party building.

The Peruvian armed forces found it extremely difficult to capture Hugo Blanco due to his close ties with the peasants. It was only when he had to enter Cuzco in desperate need of medical help that they finally got their hands on the 28-year-old leader. He was charged with "responsibility" for the death of "five rural policemen" killed during skirmishes with land-hungry peasants, of "subversion" and "armed attack," and similar alleged crimes.

In widespread actions against the peasants at the time, the armed forces also arrested hundreds of others, some thirty of the outstanding leaders being held along with Hugo Blanco in prison without trial. These include such well-known peasant figures in Peru as Fortunato Vargas, Andrés Gonzales, Leonidas Carpio, Pedro Candela, Gerardo Carpio, and Aniceto Muñoz.

As indicated above, it has been very difficult to organize an adequate defense for Hugo Blanco and his fellow defendants because of the effect of the terror launched by the government. From sources in Peru we learn that it is even difficult to get funds for the defense.

Protests from abroad are therefore all the more important. These should be placed with the consulates and embassies of the Peruvian government.

In addition protests and demands for the immediate release of the defendants should be sent to the Tercera Zona Judicial de Policia, Arequipa, Peru, and to Presidente Fernando Belaúnde Terry, Lima, Peru.

Copies of such communications as well as reports of actions can be sent to two publications: Caretas, Camaná 615, Oficina 308, Lima, Peru; and Oiga, Av. Salaverry 674, Lima, Peru.

Copies should also be sent to Dr. Alfredo Battilana, Av. Nicola de Pierola, 966; Oficina 215, Lima, Peru.

For additional background on the case, see World Outlook, January 1 and August 20, 1965.

#### PEKING OPERA STAR COMMITS SUICIDE

According to the Hong Kong Star, Chou Hsin-fang, one of the most famous singers of the Peking Opera, committed suicide after being made the object of criticism in Mao's current "cultural revolution." He took his life two days after his close friends Hu Ti-wei and Chin Su-won hanged themselves following criticism.

"TUPAC AMARU" CASE OPENS IN LIMA

On August 4 a trial closely related to the Hugo Blanco case opened in Lima. It ran for five days and then, due to a legal technicality, was adjourned until September 8.

The postponement, although it came on a motion by the defense, was not exactly welcomed by the prisoners. They have been sitting in Peru's notorious dungeons since May 1962 without a hearing.

Although the Belaúnde government claims that only a "common crime" is involved -- the holdup of three banks in 1961-62 -- it waited for more than four years before bringing the defendants to trial. The truth is that it is a highly political case and the representatives of the ruling oligarchy deemed it best to wait until the labor and peasant movements reached such low ebb that a trial could safely be held. They appear to believe that with the defeat of the guerrilla fronts that appeared last year, it is now safe to go ahead.

Forty-two defendants are named in the indictment. Some of them are listed only as "John Doe"; others were never captured. But fourteen had already served more than four years before their trial opened.

These include the Argentine Trotskyist leader Daniel Pereyra Pérez; Eduardo J. Creus, an Argentine revolutionist known in the meat-packing and metallurgical unions; and José Martorell Soto, a Spanish revolutionist.

Among the Peruvians are three engineering students, Jorge Tamayo, Fernando Alfaga and Joel Silva. Activists in the labor movement include Raúl Terzi, Pedro Candela, Guillermo Abrahamshon, José Ojeda, Víctor Argote, and Juna Núñez Tello.

Under accusation of "involvement," the police also arrested a number of Trotskyist leaders and members of Frente de Izquierda Revolucionario, including Félix Zevallos, Antonio Aragón, Vladimir Valer, Gorki Tapia, Héctor Loaiza, Angel Avendaño, Leoncio Bueno, R. Rodríguez, and J. Huarcaya.

At the time, the "expropriations" created a tremendous sensation in Peru. The final holdup was the biggest in the history of the country, involving more than 2,600,000 soles [this equalled almost U.S. \$100,000].

Much more sensational than that, however, was a letter dated April 21, 1962, which was sent to the press by some of those involved. They included top students at the university from highly respectable families who explained that the "expropriation" had been carried out to help finance the Latin-American guerrilla movement.

They announced that they had left the Trotskyist movement because out of tactical considerations it opposed such actions as they had decided on. They said they had formed a new group, the "Tupac Amaru" movement which was dedicated to advancing the guerrilla movement in order to develop the socialist revolution and win power in Peru.

Unfortunately for these dedicated youths, the police in a routine traffic incident in Cuzco accidentally picked up one of them together with a truck carrying 424,000 soles. The others were quickly apprehended.

The incident touched off a big public discussion, filling columns of the press, over the social and political implications. Even conservative editors had to confess that Peru was ripe for revolution and that the motives of the young students were of an idealistic nature, however mistaken they were in touching private property in such a reprehensible way.

It was precisely because of the widespread sympathy for those involved that the Peruvian government considered the case too hot politically to bring to trial. After subjecting some of the defendants, such as Daniel Pereyra to brutal torture, the authorities simply held them in prison.

When the trial finally opened August 4, the prosecution attempted to block its political side from coming to the fore. The Belaúnde government is quite concerned about presenting it as a "common crime" thereby helping to pave the way for a similar way of handling the case of Hugo Blanco, the well-known Trotskyist peasant leader, whose trial appears imminent.

Two of the defense attorneys, Doctora Luisa Caller Iberica and Doctor Alfredo Batillana Maggiolo, succeeded in cutting through this with a motion requesting the presence in the docket of Pedro Candela Santillana. Candela occupies the unique position of being a defendant in both this case and the Hugo Blanco case. He has been held in prison at Cuzco.

Prosecutor César Barrós Conti objected. At first the judge, Carlos Carranza Luna, declared that Candela had been placed in the category of an "absent" defendant (a defendant who is still "at large"). Batillana argued that Candela could scarcely be considered to be at large since telegrams had been placed before the court before the hearing began, showing that he was held in prison at Cuzco. He cited precedents showing that the defense motion had a strong legal basis.

The court decided to deliberate. The judge's deliberations were probably facilitated by the fact that Candela had gone on a hunger strike. Candela sent a telegram stating that he would not take any food whatsoever until he was brought to Lima to be tried together with the other defendants.

After deliberating over the arguments, the court decided to grant the defense motion. Candela was brought by plane to Lima; but, according to Peruvian law, the delay compelled postponement of the trial.

Candela's presence also facilitated the line of the defense. In presenting her motion, Doctora Caller stated that it was necessary to question Candela in order to establish the motives for the bank holdups. These, of course, were political.

The move also created problems for the prosecution in the Hugo Blanco case since Candela is also one of the chief defendants there. The Lima papers speculated that it might mean a delay in prosecuting Blanco.

The authorities have shown by their whole course of action that once they open Hugo Blanco's trial, they hope to railroad it through with minimum opportunity for the labor and peasant movements to begin mounting pressure for a fair trial and the immediate release of the popular revolutionary figure.

Actions in behalf of the defendants should be made at Peruvian consulates and embassies. Protests should be sent to Presidente Fernando Belaúnde Terry, Lima, Peru.

Copies of the protests and reports about actions should be sent to Dr. Alfredo Battilana, Av. Nicola de Pierola, 966; Oficina 215, Lima, Peru.

#### MEXICAN WITCH-HUNTERS STRIKE AT VICTOR RICO GALAN

The government of Gustavo Díaz Ordaz is continuing to show its inclination to test out McCarthyite methods as a means of answering unrest over inflation and other economic, social and political problems facing the Mexican people.

Having got away with arresting the well-known Adolfo Gilly and a number of followers of J. Posadas on charges of "subversion" and "plotting" to overthrow the government by "force and violence" [see World Outlook May 13 and June 17], the political police have now moved against a better known target -- Víctor Rico Galán and Raúl Ugalde Alvarez and their supporters.

Víctor Rico Galán is a prominent leftist Mexican writer well-known for his sympathetic defense of the Cuban Revolution.

In true witch-hunt style, as has become their custom, the Mexican political police staged a series of raids, rounded up a number of suspects, submitted them to intensive questioning, most likely not without the use of torture, and then issued a statement to the press (August 12) virtually trying and condemning the prisoners without permitting them a single word in self-defense.

According to the police, the defendants had held "meetings" in which they "planned the organization of tactics and activities clearly subversive and against the internal security of the nation." As proof, the police submitted photographs of arms they claimed to have seized in the homes of those arrested.

These included "three radio transmitters; a home-made time bomb, possibly charged with nitroglycerine, nine rifles, three pistols, some cartridges of various calibers, and mechanisms to be converted into pistols." Obviously this was sufficient armament to give the fragile Díaz Ordaz government a bad case of the jitters!

The police announced that 33 persons had been picked up in the first raid. In a second raid, 17 more were added to the list.

Among them was Moisés Lozana Villafaña, a student at the National School of Political Sciences. The police said he admitted belonging to the Liga Obrera Mexicana but denied belonging to the group headed by Víctor Rico Galán. The LOM constitutes the Mexican Section of the Fourth International.

According to the police, the "Movimiento Revolucionario del Pueblo" headed by Rico Galán "plotted" a subversive action against the government, scheduling it to begin on September 1. The police did not enlarge on how the "plotters" expected to take over with their limited radio apparatus, nine rifles, three pistols and one home-made time bomb. Instead, the police praised themselves on their timely action in breaking up the "plot."

This was enough, of course, for screaming headlines in the Mexican capitalist press. The defendants were barred from making any statements and were denied the opportunity to be questioned by reporters. To make up for this, the police issued statements claiming to be admissions made by the defendants under interrogation. The Mexican press, a very model of cooperativeness with the police in dispensing capitalist justice, faithfully printed these police documents.

Even from this material it is clear that the main crime of the defendants was to hold meetings in which social and political subjects were discussed and in which the "idea" of guerrillas was advanced.

Among the proofs was a carbon copy of an "essay" on guerrilla warfare, and the assertion that Rico Galán "authorized" the purchase "from a bookstore" of a manual on explosives and demolition in which he marked several pages. It was also claimed that he bought a book on marksmanship and invited his group to engage in target practice.

Study of two "subversive" books was cited: Che Guevara's manual on guerrilla warfare and Mao Tse-tung's writings on the use of guerrilla warfare in fighting the Japanese occupation of China.

Among the criminal activities listed by the police, Raúl

Ugalde was cited as having taught classes in political economy and Víctor Rico in dialectical materialism.

In view of Víctor Rico Galán's energetic defense of the Cuban Revolution in innumerable articles, it was feared that the Díaz government might be moving toward some kind of blow at Havana. It was noticeable, however, that the police in the statements they issued to the press, avoided references to Cuba aside from mentioning Che Guevara's book on guerrilla warfare.

Most likely the government was proceeding cautiously in order to ascertain what kind of reaction this latest McCarthyite move might have. If they can get away with it, then they will undoubtedly proceed still further.

#### YON SOSA REPORTEDLY MERGING FORCES WITH LUIS TURCIOS

In an article sent from Mexico City and published in the September 3 issue of the New York National Guardian, Cedric Belfrage reports that the Guatemalan guerrillas appear to be moving toward a unification of forces.

Through newsmen, the new government of Julio César Méndez Montenegro offered Yon Sosa and Luis Turcios an amnesty if they would give up their struggle. Both of them rejected the offer.

"Yon Sosa, whose brother and niece were among Peralta's murder victims," continues Cedric Belfrage, "had hardly said goodby to the reporters when a military force arrived to get him: his 'MR-13' guerrillas were waiting for them and killed 15. The FAR guerrillas under Turcios announced 'days of punishment' for the murder of the 28, in which they cut communication wires, derailed trains, carried out death sentences on officials they had condemned, destroyed hacienda pastureland fences, exploded bombs outside landlords' homes. They also kidnaped three more officials and, in an action with the military, killed 14 and captured new arms. In a press statement Turcios...said he was fully informed about the army's plans for an all-out counter-guerrilla campaign and for a coup against Méndez..."

"Brightest news for Guatemalans was that MR-13 and FAR seemed about to cooperate again, after a period of high tension between them. The FAR had broken with -- and Cuba's Fidel Castro had later denounced -- MR-13 because of its infiltration by 'Trotskyists'..."

"The infiltrators turned out to be 'Posadists' -- a group claiming to represent the Fourth International in Latin America but in fact expelled from that body. MR-13 recently ousted the Posadists, who caused the movement great damage, for misappropriating funds; and Yon Sosa's subsequent endorsement of the Tricontinental resolutions (though he still objects to the 'Soviet peaceful coexistence line') eliminated most problems between MR-13 and FAR."

## AMERICA'S EXPLODING GHETTOS

By Evelyn Sell

A continuous series of major eruptions in America's Northern ghettos marked the summer of 1966. On June 22 Cleveland, Ohio, erupted and an even greater explosion took place in the same city July 18-24. Omaha, Nebraska, witnessed similar events on July 2 and again on August 1. Chicago's ghetto flared on July 12 and the conflagration continued for six days. On July 12 ghetto residents battled the police in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. On July 13 an outburst shook Brooklyn, New York, and a "truce" wasn't declared until ten days later. On August 3-4 police in Providence, Rhode Island, were pelted with rocks and bottles for two nights. Smaller outbursts occurred north, south, east and west.

As in 1964 and 1965, incidents between police and ghetto residents provoked the Afro-Americans to express their frustrations and grievances with fire bombs, bricks and bottles. Some new features were evident in this summer's rebellions against ghetto conditions: defending themselves against the police and National Guardsmen, ghetto dwellers turned whole areas into battlefields; the city authorities, unable and unwilling to take steps to relieve ghetto conditions, attempted to blame the "riots" on carefully laid plans of militant black groups; there was a rapid growth of the cleavage between moderate Negro leaders and those black people who agree with the ideas underlying the slogan "black power."

The events in Cleveland and Chicago clearly highlighted these features. On July 18 Cleveland gunfire was exchanged between police and Negroes in the Hough area. The battles were set off by trouble between a policeman and a Negro resident. On the following day firebombs were thrown, store windows were smashed and looting occurred. Black snipers shot at police. National Guardsmen were brought in the next day to seal off the area. On the twenty-first, carloads of white youths rode through the area, provoking continuation of the open conflict. The area was not declared "peaceful" until July 25 and 26 had passed with no major incidents.

Cleveland authorities immediately claimed that the "rioting" was organized by Negro "extremist groups." A particular target of these charges was the "JFK House," a youth center organized by 37-year-old Lewis Robinson who said the main purpose of the center was teaching Negro history and "getting the kids off the street." Authorities claimed that the JFK House, named after Jomo "Freedom" Kenyatta, was a school to teach young Negroes how to make fire bombs.

City Council President James Stanton said, "The selectivity of the fire-bombings and the lootings makes it clear there was organization." Ohio's Democratic Senator Frank Lausche said that the "riots" in Cleveland and other large cities "are part of a national conspiracy executed by experts." A grand jury was con-

vened and heard testimony from a 17-year-old Negro boy who claimed that a 200-member gang called the "Black Panthers" had planned the systematic sniping, looting and fire-bombing.

On August 9 the grand jury report was issued. It stated that the outbreak was "organized, precipitated and exploited by a relatively small group of trained and disciplined professionals at this business.

"They were aided and abetted by misguided people of all ages and colors, many of whom are avowed believers in violence and extremism, and some of whom also are either members of or officers in the Communist Party."

Cleveland Mayor Ralph Locher, testifying on August 26 before a Senate subcommittee investigating the crisis of America's big cities, said that the Cleveland "riots" had been fomented by trained agitators who were assisted by Communists. Locher disputed the statements made by U.S. Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach who said on August 17:

"The Department of Justice has looked carefully into the causes of the riots. We conclude that they were indeed fomented by agitators -- agitators named disease and despair, joblessness and hopelessness, rat-infested housing and long impacted cynicism.

"These sources of agitation are not the product of Communists or black nationalists or terrorists. They are the product of generations of indifference by all the American people to the rot and rust and mold which we have allowed to eat into the core of our cities."

Katzenbach said that extreme left-wing elements had tried to capitalize on the situations in Watts and Hough, "But there is no indication that these riots were planned, controlled or run by extreme left-wing elements."

The truth of Katzenbach's statements is well known to everyone in America not blinded by racism and anti-Communism. Government officials across the country have echoed the idea that poverty and misery lay behind the long hot summers of 1964 and 1965. They made great promises about how the Great Society's War Against Poverty was going to cure all the ills of the big cities and their ghettos. But the glittering promises have not been kept and ghetto frustrations have mounted ever higher. More and more big city officials are relying on the naked force of police, National Guardsmen, courts and jails to combat the deepening black revolt.

The attack against black militants has sharpened and will continue to sharpen even more as Martin Luther King's philosophy of nonviolence is replaced with the ideas of black power.

A year ago King imported his methods and organization into Chicago in an attempt to infuse his nonviolent attitude into the

Northern ghettos. At the time he started this work in the North, his leadership hold in the South had already been challenged by young militants in the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee [SNCC] and the Congress of Racial Equality [CORE]. A further sign of the disintegration of King's hold on the movement was the raising of the "black power" slogan during Meredith's March in Mississippi at the beginning of this summer. The test of King's effectiveness in a Northern ghetto came when the rebellion broke out in Chicago on July 12.

King rushed to the scene, pleaded for calmness and urged people to attend meetings and tell him their grievances in order to "relieve the tension." He was so ineffective in his appeals to the black people in the streets that he was forced to go on television and publicly beg the white power structure to give him help, grant a few concessions, give him something to take back to the ghetto to help him maintain his leadership position. The power structure met with King and some small concessions were granted but King's reputation was not enhanced.

Pressured by the growing strength of the black power ideas and the ghetto outbursts, King was forced to prove his militancy, fearlessness and ability to lead. He articulated his problem: "Somewhere there has to be a synthesis. I have to be militant enough to satisfy the militant, yet I have to keep enough discipline in the movement to satisfy white supporters and moderate Negroes." The tactic he hit on has failed to satisfy either group.

On July 30 King launched a campaign to make Chicago an open city by breaking down all housing discrimination. Along with 250 followers he marched into an all-white neighborhood and was met with a barrage of rocks, bottles and jeers. Police had to protect the marchers from the violence of the whites. This scene was repeated time and again during the ensuing month.

The American Nazi party and the racist National States Rights party involved themselves wholeheartedly in the attacks against the open-housing demonstrators. One leaflet distributed by the American Nazis was a call to arms. "We expect you to be immediately available," the leaflet stated, "with your own weapons and ammunition at home when we call on you to stand against the black rioters...when the police are overwhelmed."

A climax was reached in this campaign when King announced plans to march into Cicero, a Chicago suburb which was the scene of terrible race riots fifteen years ago. Local authorities declared they would order out the National Guard to protect the marchers because of the expected trouble from the white population. Meetings were held with King in an attempt to avert the proposed march. On August 26 King announced that he was calling off the march in return for promises given by city, business and church officials to vigorously promote open housing.

A group of Negroes organized in the West Side Organization

denounced King's agreement as a "sellout." A spokesman of the group said King's actions were "a betrayal, and I call it treason." Chester Robinson, head of the organization, announced that he would have 300 persons ready to march into Cicero on August 28 as originally planned.

King obviously didn't "satisfy the militant." A black power spokesman in Detroit derided King's whole open-housing campaign with the comment that he didn't want to move into the hate-filled neighborhoods of racist whites. On the other side, King didn't satisfy the "white supporters and moderate Negroes" who became alarmed at the violence and tension created by the marches.

All King accomplished was to show the white capitalist power structure that he was no longer the useful tool that had served them so conveniently in the past. All King accomplished was to make black militants in the North say the same things this summer that black militants in the South were saying last summer: "No sir. No more marching. It don't accomplish nothing. From now on we're using black power; muscle."

### INCREASING UNREST IN INDIA

By Kailas Chandra

Bombay

As India's capitalist rulers celebrated the country's nineteenth "Independence Day" on August 15, popular discontent was bursting through the seams in every state, but unfortunately without any positive leadership at the present moment. Mass demonstrations in many towns of the frontier state of Assam, where the police opened fire in various areas and the army was called in, were an indication of the growing restlessness of the masses against the Congress regime.

The All Assam Samyukta Andolan Parishad, composed of various left parties which met August 7, decided to postpone the date for a state-wide "Bundh" [general "shutting down," a popular term in recent years for a general strike and voluntary closing of business] until September 9.

Meanwhile, however, students in various towns had decided to hold demonstrations against hoarders and profiteers. The student protest movement, supported by other sections of the urban masses, spread to many towns, including Jorhat, Goalpara and Gauhati where the authorities promptly resorted to repressive measures. Curfews were imposed and several hundred students were rounded up throughout Assam.

That students should have taken the lead in protesting the failure of the bourgeois state to curb rising prices was an indirect censure of the traditional left leadership -- the two Communist parties [pro-Moscow and pro-Peking], the Praja Socialist party, the

Samyukta Socialist party, etc. -- which failed to respond to the situation in a positive manner.

On August 9, according to official reports, the "antitrade disturbances" resulted in "looting" and raiding of shops. Police resorted to "lathi" charges in the district towns of Lakhimpur, Shibsagar and Nowgong. In Jorhat a crowd attacked police contingents, injuring at least five policemen.

By August 10, the situation had become more serious. The police opened fire in Shillong, the capital city of the state, and Shibsagar, where the student demonstrations allegedly took a "violent form." An indefinite curfew was also clamped down on the industrial towns. In the upper Assam region, all educational institutions were ordered closed. In Shibsagar a three-day curfew was imposed. Large crowds, including students, were reported to have indulged in "looting of shops, smashing petrol pumps and attacking police parties."

On August 10 Nowgong town was completely paralyzed. The state government arrested more than 900 persons, mostly students, hoping that the situation could be brought under control by repressive methods and mass arrests.

To appease popular resentment, Chief Minister Chaliha announced the same day that his government would release all the arrested students -- except those charged with "violence." But fresh disturbances flared up in Shillong, demonstrators placing barricades across the streets there. In some parts of the state capital a running battle was fought between crowds and a section of the border security force -- the regular army. Army jeeps moved in to clear away the barricades. Six police were listed killed. Although the student leaders considered "safe" were being released, the situation remained tense all over the state.

On August 11 again, further clashes took place in Shillong. A "private party" was reportedly engaged in a shooting fray. It was later indicated that a contingent of police opened fire from a private car in the curfew area. One person was killed.

On August 12, all sections of the people observed "hartal" [general strike] in Shillong, Gauhati and other towns as a protest against the repressive policies of the government. Eleven were arrested; otherwise the day passed off peacefully. At a public meeting in Gauhati, speakers demanded stern measures against hoarders and profiteers and effective steps to hold the price line.

In view of the situation, Home Minister Nanda of the central government announced in Parliament that he was seeking the help of opposition parties "to restore law and order" in Assam. He proposed convening a meeting of all parties to consider steps to meet the people's demand for goods and daily necessities at controlled rates. The government could not conceal the fact that the mass upsurge in Assam was spontaneous, not having been initiated by any of the tradi-

tional oppositional parties of the left, which in fact appeared to have completely withdrawn into the background.

The Assam upsurge came in the wake of a state-wide general strike called by the left parties in Uttar Pradesh July 12. This was a massive protest against the Congress government's failure to "hold the price line," especially after devaluation. Despite large-scale arrests of prominent left leaders, the Uttar Pradesh "Bandh" was a tremendous success. The workers and peasants of the traditionally backward state were drawn into a major political struggle against the government for the first time since independence.

The left parties in Bihar organized a state-wide "Bandh" on August 9. A few days before the scheduled demonstration, the government arrested nearly 2,000 leaders and prominent workers of the left parties as a "preventive measure." Despite the police repression, the general strike was a fairly big success.

The inability of the left leadership to project a wider perspective to the struggle prevented it from developing to a higher stage of all-out struggle of the masses against the bourgeois state. This is the basic weakness of the mass movement in most of the states. The traditional left parties also seek to make opportunistic use of these movements in the electoral field. But the growing militancy of the masses has its own logic.

The one-day Uttar Pradesh "Bandh" was followed by a week-long general strike of state government employees in protest against police high-handedness and in favor of cost-of-living (dearness) allowances. At first the state government adopted a tough attitude, cane-charged employees attending a public meeting and threatened to dismiss a large number of union leaders. But students, white-collar employees of banks, etc., and some sections of industrial workers went on sympathetic strikes. Fearing state-wide unrest, the Congress government in Uttar Pradesh, which is headed by Mrs. Sucheta Kripalani, sought a compromise partially conceding the demands of the civil servants and withdrawing the dismissal orders against the leaders.

This was a major victory for the civil servants, who number about 4,000,000 in India (not including 2,000,000 central government employees) and who have been agitating for higher pay to neutralize the rising cost of living, especially after devaluation. In the most "advanced" state of Maharashtra, the civil servants, numbering about 200,000, abstained from work on August 11 by applying en masse for a leave. It was a unique demonstration of solidarity in a protest action against the government's refusal to grant them an increased dearness allowance.

There is widespread ferment among the government employees, who have not been drawn into a major trade-union struggle since 1960 when the central government employees went on an all-India general strike that eventually failed due to lack of effective support from the organized trade-union movement led by the traditional left.

In the state of Gujarat, considered to be a stronghold of Gandhism, the Congress government early this month arrested a large number of leftist leaders, including the Left Communist mayor of Admedabad, Dinkar Mehta. The arrests were made under the so-called Preventive Detention Act in anticipation of antigovernment demonstrations planned by the Maha Gujarat Janata Parishad on August 9 (known as Martyrs Day in memory of the "Quit India" struggle launched by the Congress in 1942) and on August 15 (Independence Day).

Nevertheless Independence Day (formal independence was granted in August 1947) was observed by working-class parties and organizations as a "protest day" throughout the country. In Bombay an important conference sponsored by seven left parties, including the two Communist parties, the Samyukta Socialist party, and the Socialist Workers party, called for a Bombay "Bandh" on August 25 to demonstrate the indignation of the masses against the capitalist policies of the Congress government. Preventive arrests were expected in Bombay also.

The conference was an important milestone for the movement. Instead of the usual talk about winning economic concessions within the existing capitalist framework, the conference raised the question of power -- the need for the workers and peasants to conquer power. The participation of the Socialist Workers party in preparations for the conference helped orient things in this direction.

#### TOUR IN INDIA FOR TABATA UNDER DISCUSSION

Bombay

Dr. A. I. Limbada, treasurer of the Unity Movement of South Africa, paid a visit to India in August to discuss arrangements for a projected tour by I. B. Tabata, president of the UMSA, sometime in 1967.

Dr. Limbada, a refugee of Indian origin from Verwoerd's apartheid regime, accompanied the head of the South African liberation movement during his recent tour of independent African and Arab countries.

While in Bombay and New Delhi, Dr. Limbada was interviewed by the press on the activities and program of the UMSA which is little known in India.

Tabata toured the United States last year under the auspices of the Alexander Defense Committee. His first-hand account of the struggle against apartheid met with a very favorable response from audiences throughout the country.

THE TARNISH DEEPENS ON THE WILSON IMAGE

By John Walters

London

The recent deflationary package rushed through by the Wilson government plus the attempts at freezing wages has led to a further diminution of Harold Wilson's reputation, even in the eyes of his most fervent admirers.

Ivan Yates, writing in the Observer of August 14, headed his article "Disillusion in the ranks over Wilson." The reasons for this are manifold. Late on the night of August 10 Wilson announced a ministerial reshuffle, George Brown going to the Foreign Office, while former Foreign Secretary Michael Stewart took over Brown's previous job at the Department for Economic Affairs. Richard Crossman was moved from Housing to the Leadership of the House of Commons (an important post as he will be in charge of the Parliamentary timetable), and there were some other changes in the Cabinet.

The net result however was that the Wilson team remains the same; no one has been dropped, and no new ministers have been appointed. All this may seem to have been a game of political musical chairs, but what it does do is to let George Brown off the hook as far as implementing the wage freeze. This is now left to Jim Callaghan at the Treasury, who is now the senior economics minister.

The recent panic measures taken to prop up the pound have the stamp of orthodox Treasury thinking, so that the press have seen both the measures and the ministerial changes as a victory of the Treasury and Callaghan. However for him personally, this may prove to be a hollow victory, since he must now carry the can for the new policies. As for Michael Stewart he will have the double odium of responsibility for the past, as far as Vietnam is concerned, and for the future, being one of those supporting the incomes and prices policy (i.e., wage freeze).

Life is certainly not going to be easy for the government in the next few months. Nineteen trade unions have submitted motions for this month's Trades Union Congress opposing the government's legislation on wages. These unions represent over three million of the eight million affiliated members. Furthermore, a number of unions are actively opposing the wage freeze. Clive Jenkins, general secretary of ASSET [Association of Supervisory Staffs Executives Technicians], has said, "This is a voluntary freeze -- and we are simply not volunteering." His union is threatening to take to court any employer who attempts to withhold pay awards that have been negotiated; they argue that this will be a breach of contract.

Should they do this, it will put the government right on the spot since they have included clauses in the recent Prices and Incomes Act which allows them to make the freeze legally enforceable should they think this necessary. Both Wilson and Brown have made it

clear that the government intend to take legal action if workers do not "volunteer." Ian Mikardo has characterised this Act as coming from the stable of Mussolini's Corporate State. Even M.P.'s who have never been considered to be left-wingers in any way have voiced harsh criticisms of the Act; and throughout the whole trade-union movement there is a spectrum running from vehement opposition to mutterings on the right wing. Should the government attempt to impose its wage freeze by legal means, it will be faced with monumental problems.

Nor is it only on the trade-union front that the government faces trouble. A number of city councils up and down the country are going ahead with rent increases for council houses, this despite the appeals not to do so by the Housing minister. However, some of the selfsame councils are sticking to the wage freeze for their own employees, so there will be trouble brewing all round on that front.

Looming ahead, of course, is the Trades Union Congress where, as I have indicated, the government's policies are in for a rough time. Beyond that, in October is the Labour party conference. The resolutions for the conference were drafted before the present crisis, in fact most of them were sent in around the time of the honeymoon period of the general election. Therefore they do not completely reflect the state of party opinion at present. Now, with cuts in expenditure, new taxes, unemployment looming ahead in the winter, this year's conference will be no victory parade for Wilson. The gilt is wearing off the Wilsonian image, and far from appearing as the all-conquering hero he will have to explain how this government of "go ahead planners" came to be thrown into such panic by the British and foreign bankers.

#### A SIGNIFICANT CHANGE IN THE GERMAN POLITICAL SCENE

##### Frankfurt

The political scene in the German Federal Republic has undergone a change. The victory of the Social-Democratic party in the elections to the Landtag of North Rhine-Westphalia [NRW] constitutes a danger signal for the Erhard government. It was widely expected that the SPD would gain, but no one foresaw the landslide that gave it 49.5% of the ballots.

The Christian Democrats, traditionally strong among the Catholic workers and women and therefore always in first place in the Ruhr, the industrial heart of Germany, got only 42.8% of the votes, while the Free Democratic party (bourgeois-liberal) registered 7.4%.

The Catholic workers deserted their "traditional" party and voted for the only oppositional alternative open to them -- the SPD -- mainly because of the crisis in coal and steel which looms large despite the general prosperity and shortage of labor.

Like their husbands, the women are angry over continuously rising prices. The yearly inflationary rate, as reflected in prices, has in fact topped 4% for the first time.

In the mining and steel-producing centers, the SPD gained from 10% to 15%. This is quite unusual in the German political scene, since it gives the party a 60% majority in many of these towns.

With the SPD holding 99 out of 200 seats in the Landtag, the outcome has a significance extending beyond the most industrialized and densely populated sector of Germany. Erhard, who appeared endowed with almost mythical powers as the creator of the German economic "miracle," suffered a heavy blow to his prestige.

For a time opinion was divided in ruling circles over what to do. The "Ruhr barons" together with the most reactionary sector of "public opinion," particularly the chain of papers owned by the "press king" Axel Springer, advocated a three-party coalition, including the Christian Democrats, Social Democrats and Free Democrats.

The July 21 Die Welt, a daily controlled by Springer, explained quite unabashedly how this solution would favor the interests of German capitalism. "The people of the Ruhr must finally be told the whole naked truth regarding coal. They must be told in the most direct way that a state depending in a crucial way on the export trade needs cheap energy and that government financial aid in a country that has more than one million foreign workers does not eliminate the factor of rising costs...Only if the three parties in NRW carry out this task in common can they eliminate the fear of competition among themselves...The leading employers are not at all attracted by the thought that the Social Democrats in NRW could be pushed into an unnecessarily hard opposition..."

In other words, before opting for a coalition solely between the Christian Democrats and Free Democrats, the bourgeoisie argued over advantages and disadvantages of bringing in the Social Democrats.

The first consideration of those favoring including the SPD was the political desirability of associating the Social Democrats with the harsh measures that might well have to be taken in the coming period against the miners and steel workers.

Another concern was to avoid a situation in which the SPD, deprived of the fruits of victory, moved into a strong oppositional position, while the workers under the pressure of objective forces turned more and more in a radical direction.

Finally there was the fear that the SPD, capitalizing on its current gains, might move into position to win a majority in the parliament in Bonn in 1969. The best antidote to that would be to include the SPD in a coalition, thus making sure that it shared responsibility for projected antiworking-class measures.

The counterarguments finally won the day. The bourgeoisie decided to exclude the SPD from the coalition and to continue ruling openly for two main reasons. First, they feared that the SPD position in the Bundesrat (something like a senate) would be strengthened and that this would hamper bourgeois rule on a federal level. Secondly, the situation did not seem dangerous enough for the time being to require resorting to SPD rule; i.e., utilizing the SPD to block the workers from proceeding down the revolutionary road.

In addition, they had convinced themselves before the election that a victory for the SPD would mean a "Scandinavian" situation, with a Social Democratic government in office for decades. The German bourgeoisie prefer to avoid that.

The Christian Democrats also hope that they can recover from the setback, perhaps by sacrificing Erhard.

But there are differences over how to revitalize the party. One wing hopes that it can be done through an adroit foreign policy. They want to imitate and even outdo the SPD which tried to arrange an open discussion with the Communist party officialdom of East Germany. This would fit in well with the current American maneuver of relaxing relations with the USSR in Europe. Although the SPD move failed, it was very popular.

Another wing, a very dangerous one headed by Franz Joseph Strauss, wants to stir up the nationalist brew, projecting a "de Gaullist" Germany adhering to "independent" policies well seasoned with a McCarthyite attitude toward the left.

One thing is clear -- the most solid position of capitalism in Western Europe, the German Federal Republic, received a rude shock. It is not at all certain that the Christian Democrats can succeed in repairing the damage.

The German working class has established a new opening. If thoroughly explored and vigorously followed up, it could mean establishment of a "Labor" government by 1969.

For the time being the working class has no other electoral alternative but the SPD. It is significant that the "German Peace Union" [DFU], which usually gets the votes of former Communists [the Communist party is banned in West Germany], did not run separate candidates in NRW but called for supporting the SPD.

#### VOLUNTEERS FOR VIETNAM SOUGHT IN DENMARK

An "Organization of Volunteers for Vietnam," set up in Denmark, is prepared to send recruits to help the National Liberation Front in any way possible, including combat duty. The volunteers are ready to leave, according to Finn Ejnar Madsen, general secretary of the group, as soon as Hanoi indicates that they are needed.

PROTEST IN VANCOUVER AGAINST VIETNAM WAR

Vancouver

Paddy Neale, secretary of the Vancouver Labor Council, told a rally of 1,000 people August 6 that the trade unions should be involved in the movement against the war in Vietnam even for selfish reasons. "It is workers who are first sent overseas and workers who are first killed in any war," he said in his opening remarks as chairman.

The rally, held at the Peace Arch on the U.S.-Canada border as part of the International Days of Protest against the war in Vietnam, then heard talks by Grace MacInnes, NDP Member of Parliament from Vancouver-Kingsway; Dr. Giovanni Costigan, Professor of History at the University of Washington; and Richard Lord of Yakima Valley College in Washington.

A car cavalcade, taking people from Vancouver to the rally, was organized by the Vancouver Vietnam Day Committee. Twenty cars carrying signs demanding "Withdraw U.S. Troops from Vietnam Now" and "End Canadian Complicity" passed through the many smaller communities between Vancouver and the border.

Also as part of the International Days of Protest, a panel discussion sponsored by the Vietnam Day Committee was held Sunday evening. Jim Harding, past president of the Saskatchewan New Democratic Youth and national chairman of the Student Union for Peace Action; Randy Enomoto, graduate student at the University of British Columbia and recent student candidate for chancellorship of the university; Ray Burns, chairman of the UBC Vietnam Day Committee; Peter Cameron, a leader of the UBC "March of Concern" fee protest; and Joyce Meissenheimer, a member of the Vancouver Vietnam Day Committee, participated in the panel on "What we can do to stop the war in Vietnam." The meeting was chaired by Judy Peterson, chairman of the Vietnam Day Committee.

The discussion from the panel and from the floor centered around the problems of building an antiwar movement in Canada, the program and organizational forms that the movement should adopt and the importance of action aimed at exposing the complicity of the Canadian government in the war.

WORLD'S GREATEST SWIMMER

The Peking press reported that on July 16 Mao Tse-tung, despite winds and waves in the Yangtze River, covered almost 15 kilometers in 65 minutes. This compares with the 3 hours and 56 minutes it took Travaglio, the previous long distance world champion, to cross the 16-kilometer span of the Santa Fe River.

OPEN LETTER TO PABLO NERUDA

[We are publishing below an "Open Letter" addressed to Pablo Neruda by a group of Cuban intellectuals, protesting the way the Chilean poet permitted himself to be used by American propagandists at the recent international gathering of the PEN Club. The letter raises political issues of importance to revolutionists concerned about the defense of the Cuban revolution, the advance of the socialist revolution in Latin America, and opposition to the imperialist aggression in Vietnam. The translation of the "Open Letter" is the official one which appeared in the August 7 issue of Granma, the organ of the Central Committee of the Communist party of Cuba.

[The "Open Letter" is followed by Neruda's reply and a rebuttal by the authors of the "Open Letter." These appeared in the August 14 issue of Granma.

[In the Hispanic world, Pablo Neruda is generally recognized as Latin America's greatest living poet, ranking as one of the top three in the whole history of Latin-American poetry. Besides his renown as a poet, Pablo Neruda is also a well-known political figure. He served as a consular official for Chile in various countries. During the Civil War in Spain he openly expressed his opposition to Franco and was recalled by the Chilean government. Elected to the Senate during World War II, he joined the Communist party of Chile. When the party was banned, he went into exile, living abroad until 1953. Some of Neruda's poems frankly reflect his political views.

[Neruda's revolutionary convictions stand to his credit. It must be observed, however, that he is not an independent political thinker. In 1953 he was awarded the Stalin Prize, an honor not unrelated to flattering verses he composed in praise of the dictator when the "cult of the personality" was in fashion among the Communist parties. He is at present a member of the Central Committee of the Communist party of Chile.

[Despite his fame in the Hispanic world, Pablo Neruda is little known in the English-speaking world. A selection of his poems is available, however, in a bilingual book published in 1961 by Grove Press.\*

[We call special attention to Neruda's reference, in his reply, to the "opinions of U.S. Communists" as justification in part for the way he conducted himself. Unfortunately, he does not explain in what way the "U.S. Communists" encouraged him to play the role he did. The authors of the "Open Letter" refrain from challenging Neruda on this. Perhaps they are considering the advisability of taking Neruda's hint and sending an open inquiry to the

---

\*Selected Poems of Pablo Neruda, edited and translated by Ben Belitt, Grove Press, Inc., New York. 320 pp. \$2.95.

leaders of the Communist party, U.S.A. From the viewpoint of revolutionary socialist principles, this would seem unavoidable if -- as seems likely -- the leaders of the North American organization maintain a policy of silence about this instructive exchange between the leading intellectuals of the Cuban and Chilean Communist parties.]

\* \* \*

Havana, July 25, 1966  
"YEAR OF SOLIDARITY"

Comrade Pablo:

We consider it our duty to tell you about the concern aroused in Cuba by the use our enemies have made of certain recent activities of yours. We also wish to insist upon certain aspects of United States policy that must be combatted, and in this struggle we need your aid as a great poet and militant revolutionary.

It would not occur to us to censure automatically your participation in the Pen Club Congress, which could have yielded positive results, nor your visit to the United States since this visit could also have yielded positive results for our causes. But have the results been positive? Before replying, one would do well to consider the reasons that might have motivated the United States to grant you an entrance visa, after twenty years of denial. Some say this is a sign of the beginning of the end of the so-called cold war. However, at what other time in the years since the war in Korea has a socialist country been subjected to the systematic physical aggression that Viet Nam is suffering today? Can any evidence of our entry into a period of universal harmony be found in the recent coups d'état organized with the participation of the United States in Indonesia, Ghana, Nigeria, Brazil, and Argentina? No honest person can hold such an opinion. If the United States, despite this reality, grants entry visas to certain leftists, this must have other explanations. In some cases, it is because the "leftists" have ceased to be leftists, and have converted themselves, on the contrary, into diligent collaborators with U.S. policy. In other instances involving authentic leftists (which is your case and that of several other participants in the Congress), the United States expects to derive some benefit from their presence: for example, creation of the belief that world tension has relaxed; diversion of attention from crimes the U.S. is committing on the three underdeveloped continents (and from crimes being planned, as in the case of Cuba); and above all neutralization of the growing opposition to U.S. policy among students and intellectuals, not only in Latin America but also within the United States itself. Some time ago, Jean Paul Sartre rejected an invitation to visit the United States in order to avoid being used, and also to give concrete expression to his repudiation of U.S. aggression in Viet Nam. Although we know of your politically honest statements and other positive activities of yours, there is reason to believe, Pablo, that your recent visit to the United States was intended to be used and, in fact, has been used in furtherance of U.S. policy.

In that organ of imperialist propaganda known as LIFE en español (LIFE in Spanish -- whose very name gives a whole definition: a veritable program), Carlos Fuentes, whose byline as a contributor there surprised us, outlines the Congress you attended in an article entitled: "THE PEN: burial of the cold war in literature" (August 1, 1966). One of the most outstanding figures at this supposed burial, he notes, was you. We also discovered incidentally, thanks to this article, that the round table of the Latin-American group was chaired by Emir Rodríguez Monegal, whom Fuentes audaciously labels as the "U Thant of Spanish American literature," but whom, with equal metaphoric poverty but greater accuracy, he might better have called the "Quisling of Spanish American literature." As you know, Rodríguez Monegal has been given the editorship of the new Spanish-language magazine (after the failure of Cuadernos) published by the Congress for Cultural Freedom, an organization financed by the CIA, according to The New York Times (International Edition, April 28, 1966).

It is unthinkable for us to entone the praises of a supposed peaceful coexistence or sing of the end of the cold war in any field at a time when U.S. troops, fresh from aggressions in the Congo and the Dominican Republic, are savagely attacking Viet Nam and when the U.S. is preparing once again to do the same in Cuba (either directly or through the use of Latin-American mercenaries). For us, Latin Americans: for us, men of the Third World, the road to true coexistence and the definitive termination of war (cold as well as hot) must pass through guerrilla warfare and the struggle for national liberation, and not through impossible reconciliation. Since the necessary precondition to coexistence is existence, the only peaceful coexistence we can believe in must be integral, the kind postulated by President Dorticós in Cairo: peaceful coexistence which will prevent bombs from falling not only on New York and Moscow, but on Hanoi and Havana as well; which will permit the complete liberation of all our peoples, the poorest and most numerous on earth.

"We aspire," as Fidel has said, "to a world in which equality of right prevails for the small (nations) the same as for the great."

We are not Christian Democrats, we are not reformists, we are not ostriches. We are revolutionaries. We believe, as the Second Declaration of Havana states, that "the duty of a revolutionary is to make the revolution," and that only the fulfillment of this duty will make it possible to exist -- and coexist -- and put an end to all war.

It is not enough to protest verbally against the most obvious aggressions. It is not enough to deplore, for example, the criminal war in Viet Nam which is only one particularly horrible manifestation of Yankee policy, made possible by other steps taken previously. All support for the earlier steps must also be denied, and, when the case arises, all support must be given to those who unleash revolutionary violence to combat the violence of oppression.

Proof of the fact that the U.S. imperialists believe that

your trip has been highly favorable to them may be found in the enthusiasm expressed about the visit by spokesmen for U.S. interests, such as LIFE en Español and the "Voice of the United States of America." If they believed for a moment that your visit had served the peoples' cause, would they have been so jubilant? It causes us concern, therefore, that they have been able to use you in this way. It is sad, nothing more, that some miscreants lend themselves for this purpose in return for direct or indirect rewards from the imperialists. But that you -- truly great in your profound and original literary work, and great as well in your political posture, above any suspicion of courting such rewards -- can be used for these purposes is, we think, more than merely sad; we find it grave, and consider it our duty as comrades to call it to your attention.

While it is true that your visit to the United States has been used in this way, it is nonetheless possible to think that other results might have been obtained from it; but what possible positive interpretation can be given to your acceptance of a decoration from the Peruvian government and your cordial luncheon with President Belaúnde?

When you were in exile, Pablo, what would you have thought of any writer or political figure of Latin America who permitted Gabriel González Videla to decorate him and chat cordially with him? Would you have thought that it strengthened the bonds between Chile and the writer's country? Would you have conceded Gabriel González Videla the honor of representing Chile while you, precisely for being a true representative of your people, were exiled?

You can easily imagine, therefore, the present thoughts and feelings of not only those in exile but also of the guerrillas in the mountains of Perú who are fighting valiantly for their country's liberation; of the numerous political prisoners who, because they are in agreement with the guerrillas, are languishing in Peruvian prisons and some of whom, such as Héctor Béjar, lie slowly dying; of others who are living under threat of the death sentence imposed upon those who lend aid to the new liberators of their country -- the followers of Javier Heraud, Luis de la Puente, and Guillermo Lobatón, whose blood has been added to that of the martyrs of whom you have sung in magnificent poems. Will they accept the idea that the Belaúnde government, in according you this medal (at the suggestion of whatever organization), was able to do this in the name of Perú? They, and not the rulers you amicably comported with, are the true representatives of the Peruvian people, just as the true representatives of Chile are the miners who were massacred, Recabarren, the exiled Neruda who gave us his splendid Canto General, the great popular leaders of your great people, and not González Videla or Frei.

Frei has been chosen by the Yankees as the leader of their reformism (they even permit him to have relations with the USSR), in the same way that the "gorillas" of Brazil, and lately of Argentina as well, are their leaders of military governments. But one and the other, using differing methods, share the same objective: to halt

or crush the liberation struggle. These actions of yours have not strengthened the bonds between Perú and Chile, but between Belaúnde and Frei: Yankee imperialism.

Clearly, Pablo, the ones who have profited from your recent activities are neither the revolutionaries of Latin America nor, for example, the Negroes of the United States. Those who have benefited are the ones who propose a remarkable kind of coexistence which ignores the despoiled masses and those who are engaged in the liberation struggle. This is a kind of coexistence which is reserved for the pro-reformist petty bourgeoisie, for those who want Marxism without revolution, for the intellectuals and writers of Latin America, rejected up to now, humiliated, unknown and defrauded. The imperialists have thought of a new way to buy up another of our continent's raw materials: the intellectual. Transported luxuriously to the United States, he is returned to our peoples in the form of "an intellectual who believes in the revolution made with the good faith and encouragement of the U.S. State Department." The real situation in his country has not changed. What has changed is the position of that intellectual in society, or rather, his position with respect to the imperial metropolis.

Latin America is in a state of permanent violence, manifested in constant military coups, of which the most recent is the one in Argentina, repression in Guatemala and Perú, systematic slaughter in Colombia, massacre of demonstrating workers in Chile, "suicides" of guerrilla leaders in Venezuela, military intervention in the Dominican Republic, and a constantly menacing posture toward Cuba. The Latin-American intellectual returns to his country and raises his voice to proclaim in dulcet tones: "The new era of coexistence has begun..." No! What has begun is the epoch of violence, social as well as literary, between the peoples and imperialism.

The people continue hungry, suffocated, longing for social equality, education, material well-being and dignity not afforded by any simple statements appearing in LIFE. Of course, any Latin-American intellectual can go to New York, to Washington if necessary, but he must go to struggle, to present matters in our own terms. This is our moment in history and we can in no way renounce it. We do not speak in the name of a country nor of a literary circle. We speak in the name of all the peoples of Latin America, all the humiliated and hungry peoples of the world. We speak in the name of two-thirds of humanity. The "new left" and "literary coexistence" -- terms invented now by the imperialists and reformists to serve their own interests, just as before they invented the "cold war" to describe their campaigns of undeclared war upon the forces of progress -- are new instruments for dominating our peoples.

In the same way that the Alliance for Progress is no more than the attempt to neutralize the Latin-American revolution, the "new cultural policy" of the United States toward Latin America is no more than a way to neutralize our students, professionals, writers and artists in our struggles for liberation. Robert Kennedy admitted this clearly in his televised speech on May 12: "A revolution is

coming (in Latin America)...This is a revolution which will come, whether we like it or not. We can affect its character, but we cannot alter its inevitability." What role will be played by our students, professionals, writers and artists in this revolution which, as Kennedy himself stresses, is inevitable? The obstructionist role of a cowardly and submissive rear guard? Is this in accord with the line of our tradition, the tradition of Martí and Mariátegui, Mella and Ponce, Vallejo and Neruda? We cite the text of Kennedy's proposal for the first "antitoxin" to be used against this revolution, the truly revolutionary revolution: "Exchange of intellectuals and students between the United States and Latin America."

This is clearly a program of castration, and it has already begun to function. But this "toxin" of ours, this violence, is sacred. It has centuries of justification. It is demanded by millions of our dead, by millions of condemned and desperate men. It is sanctified by the fury and hope of the three continents. It has been incarnated among us by Tupac Amaru and Toussaint Louverture, Bolívar and San Martín, O'Higgins and Sucre, Juárez and Maceo, Zapata and Sandino, Fidel Castro and Che Guevara, Camilo Torres and Fabricio Ojeda, Turcios and the numerous guerrilla fighters scattered throughout Latin America whose names are still unknown to us. We want a total revolution: a revolution which gives power to the people, which changes the economic structure of our countries, which makes them politically sovereign, which provides education, food and justice for all, which restores the dignity of Indians, Negroes and mestizos, which finds expression in antiacademic and perpetually dynamic cultural development. To carry out this total revolution, we must be able to rely upon our best analytic and creative minds from México in the North to Argentina and Chile in the South.

After the Cuban Revolution, the United States understands that it is not dealing with a continent of "Latins" or sub-humans, but a continent which is demanding its rightful place in the world, and demanding it violently and now, just as are its own Negroes, the Negroes of the U.S.A. After the Cuban Revolution, the United States, in the same way that it "discovered" that our continent needs agrarian reform, is also "discovering" that we have a real literature. The most recent step in this process of discovery has been to propose the purchase (or at least the neutralization) of our intellectuals, so that our peoples may once again be left without a voice. And it is no longer a matter of using discredited personages such as Arciniegas and company. The U.S. imperialists have used up the conservative-liberals, the reactionaries, their first crop of agents. Now they must speak in terms of "the left" with men of "the left," since otherwise they would have no audience outside the worst reactionary circles. They are searching in all realms (including the cultural field) for men who will pretend to speak in our name while presenting revolution and violence as being in bad taste. And by paying a price they find those prudent men, collaborators and traitors.

Our mission, Pablo, cannot be, under any circumstances, to lend ourselves to playing their game, but to expose them and attack them.

We must proclaim a state of alert across the continent: an alert against this new imperialist penetration into the field of culture; against plans such as "Project Camelot"; against the scholarships which place our students on imperialism's payroll or convert them into simple agents of imperialism; against certain kinds of insidious "aid" to our universities; against the guises assumed by the Congress for Cultural Freedom; against the publications financed by the CIA; against the conversion of our writers into trained parlor monkeys and Yankee sycophants; against translations which, although they may find an assured place in the catalogs of the biggest publishing houses, cannot guarantee the author a place in the history of our peoples nor in the history of humanity.

Some of us shared with you the hard and beautiful years in Spain; others of us learned from your works how the best poetry can serve the best causes. We all admire your great work, the pride of our America. We need to know that you are unequivocally at our side in this long battle which will end only with the definitive liberation that our Che Guevara called "la victoria siempre."

Fraternally,

Alejo Carpentier	Graziella Pogolotti
Nicolás Guillén	Rine Leal
Juan Marinello	José R. Brene
Félix Pita Rodríguez	José Rodríguez Feo
Roberto Fernández Retamar	Humberto Arenal
Lisandro Otero	Salvador Bueno
Edmundo Desnoes	Roberto Branly
Ambrosio Fornet	Luis Suardiáz
José Antonio Portuondo	César López
Alfredo Guevara	Raúl Aparicio
Onelio Jorge Cardoso	Euclides Vázquez Candela
José Lezama Lima	Luis Marré
Virgilio Piñera	Ezequiel Vieta
Samuel Feijóo	Rafael Suárez Solís
Pablo Armando Fernández	Loló de la Torriente
Heberto Padilla	Gumersindo Martínez Armengual
Fayad Jamis	Aldo Menéndez
Jaime Sarusky	David Fernández
José Soler Puig	Manuel Díaz Martínez
Dora Alonso	Armando Alvarez Bravo
Regino Pedroso	Renée Méndez Capote
José Zacarías Tallet	Jesús Abascal
Angel Augier	Gustavo Eguren
Carlos Felipe	Victor Agostini
Abelardo Estorino	Jesús Orta (Nabori)
José Triana	Francisco de Oraá
Mirta Aguirre	Noel Navarro
Miguel Barnet	Oscar Hurtado
Jesús Díaz	José Lorenzo Fuentes
Nicolás Dorr	Reynaldo González
César Leante	Joaquín Santana
Antón Arrufat	José Manuel Otero

Rafael Alcides Pérez  
Alcides Iznaga  
Mariano Rodríguez Herrera  
Santiago Alvarez  
Fausto Canel  
Roberto Fandiño  
Miguel Fleitas  
Jorge Fraga  
Manuel Octavio Gómez  
Sara Gómez  
Sergio Giral  
Julio García Espinosa  
Tomás Gutiérrez Alea  
Nicolás Guillén Landrián  
Manuel Herrera  
José Antonio Jorge  
Luis López

José Massip  
Eduardo Manet  
Raúl Molina  
Manuel Pérez  
Rogelio París  
Enrique Pineda Barnet  
Rosina Pérez  
Alberto Roldán  
Alejandro Saderman  
Humberto Solás  
Miguel Torres  
Harry Tanner  
Oscar Valdés  
Héctor Veitía  
Pastor Vega  
Santiago Villafuertes

NERUDA'S REPLY TO CUBAN INTELLECTUALS

Dear Comrades:

The expressions of concern over me made by a group of Cuban writers have puzzled me deeply, because they are groundless. I ask you to take into consideration more than the speculations and the mutilations of my texts published in certain reports in the Yankee press; perhaps greatest weight should be given to the opinions of U.S. Communists.

You seem to be unaware that my entry into the U.S., as well as the entry of Communist writers of other countries, was accomplished by breaking down long-standing U.S. State Department prohibitions, thanks to actions taken by leftist intellectuals. In the U.S. and other countries included in my visit, I set forth my communist ideas, my unshakeable principles, and my revolutionary poetry. I have a right to expect and demand that you, who know me well, do not harbor or spread any inadmissible doubts in this respect. In the U.S. as well as everywhere else, I have been heard and respected on the basis of what I am and always will be: a poet who does not hide his thinking, and who has placed his life and his work at the service of the liberation of our peoples.

As for me, my concern is more realistic than yours, regarding the manner in which certain differences -- much more significant than my own person -- are being dealt with. I take the liberty to urge you to explore this more deeply and to place the stress upon mutual responsibility and the maintenance and development of the necessary anti-imperialist continental unity between writers and all revolutionary forces.

Once again I express through you -- as I have through my

poetry -- my passionate adherence to the Cuban Revolution.

Fraternally,

Pablo Neruda

IN RESPONSE TO NERUDA

Comrade Pablo:

It is precisely because of your position as a Communist and revolutionary poet that we wrote to you, because of actions that -- without a doubt -- the enemy had used to his own advantage. Your reply does not come any nearer to the fundamental problems approached in our letter. Instead, it mentions the distortion of your texts by reports in the Yankee press. We did not even take these reports into account. Rather, we limited ourselves to concrete facts: your relations with Belaunde and the benefit the imperialists derived from your trip.

We wrote to you because we are very realistic in our appreciation of the immense value to true "anti-imperialist continental unity." This unity, more significant than any single individual, expresses itself in our peoples' struggle for liberation and in the cohesion between principles and action, and affects the destiny of all our America.

We are certain that you will weigh the points we expressed to you in our letter. We cordially urge you to accept the invitation we previously sent you to visit Cuba next January. This will make it possible for us to discuss these matters as comrades, and to seek the most effective way to meet the new Yankee offensive in the cultural field.

Fraternally,

The letter is signed by the Cuban intellectuals who had signed the earlier letter as well as others who requested that their names be added.