

**25X1X6**


**Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000400060006-7**

**Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000400060006-7**

25X1C10b

Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000400060006-7

*Handwritten:* Re-copy copy



Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000400060006-7



# Significant Dates ▶

[ASTERISK DENOTES ANNIVERSARIES. All others are CURRENT EVENTS]

## JUN

- 1 International Childrens' Day, celebrated by Women's International Democratic Federation (WIDF; Communist front).
- 5\* Secretary of State George C. Marshall proposes European Recovery Plan ("Marshall Plan") in speech at Harvard. 1947. TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY.
- 11-12\* Marshal Tukhachevsky and seven other top Red Army generals arrested; later tried secretly and executed. 1937. THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY.
- 16\* First Congress of Soviets (Councils of Workers; and Soldiers' Deputies) meets; only 137 out of 1090 members are Bolsheviks. 1917. FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY.
- 16-17\* East German workers and youths demonstrate and riot, quelled by Soviet troops. (Commemorated annually in West Germany as German Day of Unity.) 1953.
- 17\* Hungarian government announces trial and execution of Imre Nagy, Premier during Hungarian revolt who had been seized in violation of promise of safe-conduct. 1958.
- 22\* Germany invades the Soviet Union. 1941.
- 25\* North Korean army crosses 38th parallel, invading South Korea, 1950.
- 28-29\* Demonstration by Poznan workers against wage abuses turns into riot; Polish government crushes riot, killing 44, wounding hundreds, though later moves to correct abuses. 1956.
- 28 Opening of International Union of Architects (UIA) Congress, Prague, followed by International Meeting of Women Architects, Bratislava. (UIA is basically professional, not a front, but meeting in Havana in 1963 exploited by Communists.)

## JUL

- 1\* Dominion of Canada established, uniting provinces under federal government. 1867. CENTENARY.
- 6-9 World Conference on Vietnam, Stockholm. (Communist fronts involved include World Peace Council and International Organization of Journalists; non-Communist World Conference of World Peace Through Law also participating.)
- 9-14 World Conference of World Peace Through Law. Conference in Geneva.
- 21\* Armistice ends Vietnamese war between French and Viet Minh forces. 1954.
- 23 Soviet Navy Day.
- 23\* Geneva Agreements guaranteeing independence and neutrality of Laos signed by 14 nations. 1962. FIFTH ANNIVERSARY.
- 28 (to August 5) First conference of Latin American Solidarity Organization (LASO: Communist front growing out of Tri-Continental Conference, Havana, January 1966).

# Media Lines

10 April 1967

East European Communist Regimes Publish More Foreign Language Newspapers. The Hungarians have recently begun publishing a combination English and German language daily newspaper, DAILY NEWS--NEUESTE NACHRICHTEN. The new paper is the brainchild of Sandor Barcs, Director General of MTI, the Hungarian state news agency. It publishes articles of major international interest in both English and German, and articles of lesser interest in the language of those readers most likely to be interested. The press run of the first issue was 3,000 copies, and according to the Hungarian press, this was increased to 16,500 copies by the end of the first week; 13,000 copies were sold in Budapest and the rest in the provinces. The Czechs have been publishing a German language newspaper (VOLKSZEITUNG) for a considerable time, but only recently got the agreement of the German Democratic Republic to allow copies to be circulated in that country. (See ML, BPG #211, 13 March 1967.)

Communist Czech Press Bureau Turns a Capitalistic Profit. The Czech party organ, RUDE PRAVO, noted with satisfaction that for the first time since the Communists seized power in 1948, the operations of the national press bureau were profitable in 1966. The Czechoslovak Press Bureau (CPB), which employs 30 foreign correspondents and transmits 70 hours per day in foreign languages (counting the overlapping transmissions in various languages), took in nearly \$1,000,000 more than it paid out in 1966.

More Communist Papers Likely to Fold. NORRSKENS FLAMMAN (Northern Lights), the only Communist daily in Sweden and one of the oldest left-of-center newspapers in Scandinavia, is experiencing serious financial difficulties; (it lost an estimated \$20,000 in 1966 despite heavy Party subsidies), and may have to convert to a weekly publication or cease publishing altogether. Its current circulation is only 8,000.

According to a UPI dispatch (31 March), FRIHETEN (Freedom), Norway's only Communist daily, has folded. Its circulation was known to have declined from 131,000 immediately following World War II to about 7,400 and the newspaper's influence had declined following the 1956 suppression of the Hungarian Revolution. The NKP Central Committee estimated it would cost about \$43,000 to keep the paper going through 1967.

Previous items in this space have told of similar difficulties of other Communist newspapers such as LE DRAPEAU ROUGE (Red Flag), Brussels (ML, BPG 202, 24 October 1966), and UNITA (Unity), Rome and Milan daily (ML, BPG 200, 26 September 1966).

# Briefly Noted





10 April 1967

*Another Example of World-Wide Espionage Effort*

Communist Spying Shows Moscow's Continuing Aim in Penetrating Free World Defenses

On 22 March 1967 the world press began carrying a number of reports exposing a Communist-directed espionage ring targeted against NATO, and involving Italy, Spain, Cyprus, Switzerland, and other countries. Actually, five Soviet case officers have been asked to leave their posts. A selection of replayable articles is being published in PRESS COMMENT



Recent events have shown again that the world is not sufficiently

aware of continuing Communist espionage and subversion. We have every interest in making them more aware. In areas where NATO developments are not of immediate interest, editorial treatment of the case should recall recent local cases in which Communist diplomats have been PNG'd but have since been replaced by others in unnecessarily large embassies and consulates

25X1C10b

In countries where appropriate, local governments should be urged to be more vigilant against Communist espionage and subversion in their areas.

25X1C10b

\* \* \*

*Popular Front Tactics Revisited*

Communist Influence in Finland Described by President Kekkonen

The 1 March 1967 issue of NEW TIMES, the weekly journal of world affairs published in 7 languages by Moscow's TRUD, the Soviet labor organ, carries a short feature (attached) which can be interpreted as a boast by the Communists about their sway over the Finnish Government.

Also attached are excerpts of the translation of Kekkonen's 4 February speech at the North Ostrobothnian Student Corporation festival -- distributed by the Finnish Ministry of

Foreign Affairs. Note the underlined portion for Kekkonen's own words about the Communists being involved in the founding of universities "and when the funds are made available they go abroad representing their country." By leaving out the words "when the funds are made available," Moscow's NEW TIMES suggest that Communists regularly act as spokesmen for Finland.

Kekkonen's speech illustrates how the Communists, once involved in a popular front government, become involved in many sectors in the nation's life under the guise of new-found respectability. NEW TIMES' treatment also shows how they seek to exaggerate their respectability and use the position claimed in one country to gain status in other countries.

What has been the reaction of the Finns themselves to the influence of the Communists since their front group, the Finnish People's Democratic League (SKDL), joined the present coalition government formed last May (██████████) 1966, "West European Communists Stress Popular Front Tactics: The Case of Finland," and #1089 of 16 January 1967, "Finland: Soviets Still Critical of Social Democrats"? One reaction is shown by the attached cartoon from the independent liberal HELSINGIN SANOMAT, Finland's largest and most influential paper. The internationally-known cartoonist "Kari" captions his drawing with a verbatim quote from Kekkonen's speech: "Whoever has faith in his own ideals does not fear cooperation with the Communists." From left to right he depicts the Communist Party thug, the squeezed and starving Social Democrat, the country bumpkin

Agrarian, the bemedaled Kekkonen, the fat Conservative (wearing a military helmet and clerical garb, representing the main support for this party), the white-collared Liberal, and the "Fancy Dan" Swedish People's Party member. The action with the hammer and sickle speaks for itself.

(For another view of current Finnish politics, see "Finland's Government: The Return of the Communists" by Katarina Brodin of the Swedish Institute of International Affairs in the January 1967 SURVEY, London. Although the dangers inherent in the "popular front" are not sufficiently emphasized in the article, there is some exploitable material on Soviet-Finnish relations.)

\* \* \*

*Soviet History: Brezhnev and Kosygin Style*      Persons and Un-Persons

In a recently published book, READER ON FOUNDATIONS OF POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE (KHRESTOMATIYA PO OSNOVAM POLITICHESKIKH ZNANIY) the Soviets are treated again to another version of their history. This book was produced primarily for use in the Party study system and 300,000 copies are being circulated.

The most noteworthy aspect of the book is the selection of authors. In a book of 400 pages, only five are represented: Marx, Engels, Lenin, Brezhnev and Kosygin. The major author is Lenin, Marx' and Engels' single contribution being the Communist Manifesto. No personal statements by Khrushchev are included, and party documents--mainly the CPSU program adopted at the XXII Congress--are the

only items representing the entire Khrushchev period. Stalin and his era are completely omitted.

Brezhnev's "works" are quoted in four of the five sections. These include his report on the 20th anniversary of the victory over Nazi Germany; portions of his report to the Party Congress appear in three other sections of the book. Kosygin's contribution is his report on the Five Year Plan to the XXIII Congress.

The significance of the inclusion of Brezhnev's and Kosygin's "works" will not be overlooked by the party cadre or by students of Soviet history. In this respect, assets might recall some of the more recent official attempts to rewrite history:

1) Stalin's SHORT COURSE was replaced by Khrushchev's 1959 version of the HISTORY OF THE CPSU.

2) The 50th Anniversary HISTORY (6 volumes): Two volumes have appeared and it is doubtful that the six volumes will be concluded this year. (One might speculate that party officials and historians are encountering difficulties in determining what is the right version.)


3) World War II history. An official six-volume history of World War II, published during Khrushchev's reign, credited Khrushchev with a vital role in the defense of Stalingrad (now Volgograd). Another "more objective" version of the Battle of Stalingrad was published in 1965 in which Khrushchev is mentioned only twice.

The rewriting of Soviet history continues and reflects the current

leaders' unwillingness to give an accurate accounting of the Stalin and Khrushchev periods, which represent 40 out of the 50 years of the Bolshevik era.

25X1C10b





#12

## Propagandist's Guide to WORLD COMMUNIST AFFAIRS



28 February-27 March 1967

### ICM AND "SOCIALIST CAMP" AFFAIRS

1. The leaders of most of the Warsaw Pact countries have been engaged in bilateral meetings apparently aimed at tightening cohesion in the wake of Rumania's establishment of full diplomatic relations with West Germany. The anti-Bonn elements seem to have succeeded in staving off further recognition, at least for the present. It had been speculated that Hungary and Bulgaria were the most likely to follow the Rumanian lead. Hungary's Kadar was invited to Moscow in late February on an "unofficial, friendly visit": the communique (Mar. 1) did not mention West Germany, but Hungary has not moved toward recognition. Bulgaria's Zhivkov made a similar "unofficial, friendly visit" to Moscow March 13-15: somewhat surprisingly, Bulgaria and the USSR decide to sign a new friendship treaty, although the existing 20-year treaty had another year to go. East Germany's Ulbricht goes to Warsaw March 14-15, Prague 16-17, and Moscow 21-23. He signs one new 20-year friendship treaty with the Poles which is openly anti-Bonn and includes firm commitments on present borders, and another with the Czechs which is less so and does not. Meanwhile Czech President Novotny in Warsaw signed (Mar 1) a new Czech-Polish friendship treaty which is essentially an updating of the old 20-year pact, but with less emphasis on Germany. Gomulka in turn visits Budapest March 8-9, where a simple affirmation of "identity of views" is made. And finally, the rambunctious Rumanians visit Moscow March 17-18 and leave after an "exchange of opinions," with no affirmation of any agreement.

2. There has been little public evidence of progress toward holding the scheduled April 24-27 meeting of European CPs in Karlovy Vary, Czechoslovakia (see [REDACTED]), but it appears that a considerable number of parties will not attend. We have a report of a Netherlands CP reply to the invitation it received from the French CP, declining to attend and strongly criticizing Soviet methods and motives in organizing it.

3. Chinese isolation was interrupted only in a way which seemed to emphasize it, as SecyGen Wilcox of the tiny New Zealand CP (the "other one" of the two national CPs loyally supporting the CCP) makes another of his frequent visits (March 8-16). On the other hand, relations with the Japanese Communists degenerate to the point of charges of "bloody, fascist atrocities" involving Chinese students in Tokyo (March 2 and continuing). And the continuing conflict with the Soviets brings reciprocal expulsion of two embassy officials (March 18-21), while Soviet personnel in Peking are harassed once more (March 27). The Soviets, meanwhile, have sharply stepped up their radio efforts to subvert the Chinese people (See esp. March 1).

25X1C10b



4. An interesting March 20 Radio Prague announcement indicates that more than 22,000 apprentices from N. Vietnam will soon be spending 3-5 years in training programs in the various countries of the "socialist camp."

#### INTERNATIONAL FRONT ORGANIZATIONS

5. The Soviet-promoted "Third Afro-Asian Writers Conference" is under way in Beirut as the period ends, boycotted and denounced as bogus by the Chinese and their "A-A Writers Bureau" (who plan to hold their own version in Peking later this year) (March 25 and continuing).

6. The Chinese reaffirm their intent to hold their own "Fifth AAPSO Conference" in Peking this year, and publicize the withdrawal from the Cairo-based Secretariat of "Indonesia, which is an elected member of the Permanent Secretariat." (March 17 & 20. This undoubtedly refers to the exile Indonesians residing in Peking.)

7. TASS announces that the Soviet A-A Solidarity Committee will convene an "international conference devoted to the October Revolution" and the national liberation movement in Baku this September.

#### COMMUNIST CHINA

8. As indicated in our unclassified outline summary, developments in China during this period continue to appear confused and indecisive in most aspects. There seems to have been an overall trend toward consolidation and moderation, with the Army increasingly serving as the sinews of the regime, -- but there is still much evidence of pressure, to "carry the CR through to the end."

9. Chou En-lai still appears as the man in charge, -- discreetly acting in the name of Mao and Lin Piao. Mao is again reported in a personal meeting with a visiting "dignitary," CPNZ GenSecy Wilcox, but Lin has still not been reported in public since November.

10. Chinese media continue to hammer away at: the Soviet revisionists, especially on the theme of collusion with U.S. imperialism; the "Indonesian rightwing military group"; and the "Indian reactionaries." A new charge against the latter, "using Tibetan bandit traitors to carry out frenzied anti-China activities" (March 22), follows Delhi's March 10 broadcast of a statement by the Dalai Lama pegged to the 8th anniversary of the Tibetan uprising against the Chinese and describing the "latest wave of barbaric persecution of Tibetan Buddhists, monasteries," etc.

11. To the underdeveloped world, NCNA transmits a PEOPLE'S DAILY March 15 commentary lauding the actions of the guerrillas in Thailand, Colombia, Zimbabwe, "and many other countries," as examples of Mao's thought on people's war.

12. Peking sternly warns the British against "connivance in the U.S. aggressor's use of Hong Kong as a base of operations."

25X1C10b

13. [REDACTED] report indicates that the Chinese are postponing the annual Sino-Soviet trade talks, and it is expected that the final agreement will remain at a low level.

#### SOVIET AFFAIRS

14. Perhaps most noteworthy are two Soviet ventures in the field of "unofficial" political/propaganda activity ostensibly carried on by Soviet "public figures" and "public organizations": (a) Radio "Peace and Progress," which has been broadcasting to non-Communist audiences for more than a year, but which has now been given a major new mission of subverting the Chinese people (see policy statement, March 1); and (b) a newly-formed "Soviet Committee in Support of Vietnam" consisting of "48 prominent public leaders" (March 16).

15. Soviet media devote major attention to developments in China, largely in the form of critical commentary rather than reporting. They hit repeatedly at: Chinese persecution of minorities, especially Moslems (March 9 and continuing); Chinese obstruction of aid to Vietnam (March 1, 2, 14); and Chinese trade with S. Africa (Feb 27, March 7, 16).

16. Soviet week-long entertainment of Austrian Chancellor Klaus (March 14-21) produces no visible results. Clandestine reporting indicates that the Soviets are trying to persuade and bribe the Austrians to act as host for a Government-level all-European conference on European security, but that the latter are holding out against it.

17. Soviet diplomatic personnel have been expelled from Italy, Cyprus, and Greece thus far, all apparently involved in a widespread espionage ring uncovered with the arrest by the Italian police of three Italian agents for the ring. (March 22 and continuing. See also Briefly Noted, this issue.)

18. Stalin's daughter, Svetlana Alliluyeva, who came to India with the ashes of her Indian husband, requests asylum at the U.S. Embassy, is flown to Rome and then to Switzerland, where she is granted temporary refuge. (March 8)

19. Internally, the 50th anniversary of the "February Revolution" is noted only as paving the way for October. (March 12) A PRAVDA theoretical article on the educational role of the Soviet state extolls "persuasion as the chief method of educational work" and defends the need for the "combination of persuasion and coercion." (February 27)

#### EAST EUROPE

20. Albania: ZERI I POPULLIT carries two major articles on the "social and moral degradation of the Soviet Union" (March 8 & 11). (See also numerous items on EE in the above sections.)

ASIA

21. North Korea: The N. Koreans underscore their new independence from the Chinese by signing a new, considerably enlarged trade agreement in Moscow (March 3). The defection of a leading official of KCNA, the official news agency, at Panmunjon has been branded a kidnaping, as N. Korean media anticipate that he will be "forced" to slander the North (March 22).

22. Indonesia: Security forces claim that they "nipped in the bud" a Communist uprising in West Java, capturing 16 Communists and documentary evidence (March 23). (See also Asian items in the above sections.)

WESTERN EUROPE

23. France: The French CP scores notable gains in the national elections and improves its standing with the non-Communist left, while the Gaullists lose heavily. (March 5 & 12. See also Briefly Noted, 27 March 1967 issue.)

24. Italy: The left-wing Italian Socialist splinter party, PSIUP, loses a significant pro-Chinese splinter (February 21).

25. Austria: The Austrian pro-Chinese dissidents announce the formation of a "Marxist-Leninist Party of Austria." (Feb 28)

LATIN AMERICA

26. Cuba: Castro again publicly supports guerrilla warfare in Latin America, condemns the Soviet-favored established CPs -- with particular attention to the Venezuelan, and criticizes the (Soviet bloc) "socialist" countries for rushing in to establish relations with the help of the "oligarchies" ruling the LA countries. (March 13. See item #111, this issue.)

27. Venezuela: Prior to Castro's speech, Venezuelan terrorism had sharply increased, with the kidnaping and murder of the Foreign Minister's brother causing the Government to suspend constitutional guarantees on March 4. The Cubans drew Venezuelan accusations of complicity by publishing a statement of the Venezuelan FALN (Liberation Forces) in Havana taking credit for the murder as an act of "revolutionary justice," but Castro denied any knowledge of the affair. The Venezuelan CP denounces Castro's meddling. (March 16)

28. Colombia arrests more than 150 Communists after an upsurge of large-scale terrorism. (March 11)

TREATMENT:

1. Again, our Chronology is full of exploitable materials used by Communists against Communists:

-- We particularly like the juxtaposition of the March 1 Hungarian charge that the Chinese are using the mass psychology and propaganda techniques of Hitler and Goebbels with the March 2 Chinese charge that the Soviets are disciples of Goebbels. We point out that they are both right in the sense that Goebbels was a ruthlessly skillful practitioner, but we add that the Communists began to use these propaganda techniques long before Hitler and Goebbels came to power.

-- Similarly, the March 7 PEOPLE'S DAILY article castigating the Soviets for fearing to "let the broad masses of the Soviet people exercise democracy" and calling the Soviet regime a savage, despotic, fascist dictatorship: true, and who should know better than the Chinese, who still revere the most despotic of all Soviet leaders, Stalin?

-- The Albanian March 8 & 11 criticisms of Soviet degeneration are devastating and bolstered with examples from Soviet life.

-- The Soviets on Feb. 25 accuse Peking of lying and fabricating; -- and the Chinese on March 21 say that the Soviet Foreign Ministry "turns black into white and fabricates rumors and slanders." The latter followed an exchange in which the Soviets and Chinese again contradicted each other's versions of the "atrocities" in January and February. The same recriminations go on between the Chinese and Japanese Communists. Etc., etc.

2. Shades of Stalin! The Feb. 27 PRAVDA theoretical article on Soviet education, extolling "persuasion as the chief method of educational work" and going on to defend the combination of persuasion and state coercion should be replayed to those inclined to believe that the Soviet Communist leopard has been changing his spots.

3. It will not be difficult for propagandists to expose the mendacity of the Soviet effort to develop "unofficial" political/propaganda instruments such as Radio "Peace and Progress" (which even uses the same facilities as Radio Moscow) and this "Committee in Support of Vietnam," -- in a country where everything is tightly controlled not only by the government but by the Party above and behind the Government.

WORLD COMMUNIST AFFAIRS

CHRONOLOGY

The Turmoil in China

Again we treat the confused reporting on China in outline summary.

A. The teetering revolution. The radical Maoist revolutionaries are continuing their struggles for seizure of power at all levels with varying results, while the Army increasingly looms as the real force in the patchwork "3-way alliance" (revolutionaries, loyal cadres, and Army) structure which, under the visible leadership of Chou En-lai, apparently holds the country together.

(1) From central regime media, we note particularly:

(a) PEOPLE'S DAILY, March 1, Red Guard article, "Down with Anarchism," complains that "certain ill-intentioned persons peddle anarchism under the flags of 'mass line' and 'extensive democracy,' and cites Lenin (LEFT-WING COMMUNISM, AN INFANTILE DISORDER) on the need for "absolute centralization and the strictest discipline of the proletariat."

(b) An editorial note in PD on March 2 reiterates that the correct treatment of cadres is a "key question."

(c) RED FLAG No. 5 (Radio Peking March 9) editorial, "On the Revolutionary 3-Way Alliance," bows to the PLA (People's Liberation Army) as "the true pillar of support of the proletariat" and declares that any unit which seizes power should include the PLA in a 3-way alliance, no matter whether it be in "factories, rural areas, finance and trade agencies, cultural and educational departments, colleges, middle and primary schools," etc. However, it also states that the "revolutionary cadres...should, and may, be able to play the role as the core or backbone" of the provisional organs "if they are united as one with the masses." It concludes by quoting Mao on the need to "carry through to the end the great proletarian cultural revolution."

(d) WORKERS' DAILY, central organ of the All-China Trade Union Federation, reappears March 9, after having been suspended 5 weeks following its take-over by the "revolutionary rebels". Its lead editorial says that the former editorial staff was rightly accused of being unfamiliar with the works of Mao Tse-tung. (Reporting this from Peking, AFP's Bernard Ullman adds that "another suppressed newspaper, PEKING DAILY, organ of the Peking Municipal administration formerly under purged Mayor Peng Chen, reappeared during mid-February but is still not distributed as an official organ.")

(2) Who's Who at the Top? Chou En-lai continues to appear as the regime's leading spokesman, and a wave of posters supporting him on the 17th includes the claim that he is "Chairman Mao's close comrade in arms." Chou, however, continues to speak in the name of Mao and Lin Piao. Addressing a

workers meeting on the 22nd, he uses the formulation "The PLA was founded by Chairman Mao and is led by deputy supreme commander Lin Paio, "but Lin has not appeared in public since November. Some high-ranking victims of Red Guard attacks, including Acting First Secretary of the Peking Municipal Party Committee Wu Te, are reported rehabilitated and back on their jobs after conducting self-criticism. A notice posted in Peking on the 26th declares that 20 revolutionary organizations in the capital have formed a committee to crush the Liu-Teng group, who are "constantly seeking an opportunity to control the Army and seize political power, thereby plotting to revive capitalism in China." A poster seen on March 18 indicated a current CC meeting, but there has been no further information on the subject.

(3) The Army carries the burden of revolution -- without shooting!  
Chinese media emphasize the active roles played by Army units: aiding production teams, aiding in spring farming, sending out propaganda teams, etc. Mostly Army personnel appears not actively engaged in the work but rather transmitting directives from the regime and enforcing discipline in lieu of the normal power structure. Interestingly, the Army's most visible action -- the take-over of all power in Canton and its province of Kwangtung, reported directly from Canton by eyewitness David Oancia of the Toronto GLOBE AND MAIL and by travelers reaching nearby Hong Kong -- was barely mentioned by Chinese media. Oancia writes that the Army's assumption of power there followed "production breakdowns, struggles between rival groups, factories deprived of leadership, and attempted sabotage."

(4) The back-to-school movement.

(a) NCNA on March 6 announces that the primary schools in Peking and Shanghai have reopened. "The very first lesson was the study of Chairman Mao's quotations and writings....Courses in arithmetic, science and other subjects were also arranged." Two days later, Radio Moscow notes that "most" Chinese schools are still closed and that "teachers are afraid to return to work after the humiliations inflicted on them by Mao's organized teenage followers."

(b) A "draft" CC directive reported (by MAINICHI's Correspondent Takada) posted in Peking on the 11th states "the revolutionary teachers and students who are in factories and farms away from their campuses... should return before 20 March to the colleges or universities to which they belong and should engage in the CR there."

(c) Various correspondents report the appearance in Peking on the 23rd of a CC directive of the 18th ordering the Red Guards to remain at home and refrain from making further trips or long marches to exchange revolutionary experience.

(d) Peking Radio on the 26th describes a mass meeting of 10,000 Red Guard representatives of the middle schools in the capital, addressed by Chou, Chen Po-ta, Chiang Ching, etc., to form "their own new revolutionary organization -- The Red Guard Congress of the Middle Schools." A similar RG Congress of the Universities and Institutes of the capital

had been established on February 22, as disclosed by an NCNA Domestic item on March 2.

B. Epidemic and food crises? Chinese media continue to emphasize the regime's serious concern lest spring farming suffer from CR disruption, but there is no solid evidence that a grave food shortage is impending. However, reports of growing epidemics of meningitis, encephalitis, and other serious diseases, circulated by non-Chinese sources, seem confirmed by an NCNA release of March 22 on the large-scale departure of teams of doctors and nurses from the cities to work in the countryside to help insure a good harvest, as "both medical work teams and teams for propagating Mao Tse-tung's thought." It says that 570 have gone from Peking to far-off places and another 650 to nearer places for the spring farming season, and that "fifty teams comprising more than 1000 personnel have just left Tsinan city" for remote parts of Shantung province.

C. Chinese censorship confirmed: Western correspondents in Tokyo confirm that Chinese pressure on Japanese correspondents in Peking has resulted in a drastic reduction of their reporting. WASHINGTON POST's Richard Halloran reports the situation on March 8; on the 21st he follows up with a story of the Chinese expulsion of MAINICHI's Takata by refusal to renew his 180-day visa while routinely renewing those of the other Japanese correspondents. In sharp contrast to earlier patterns, Yugoslav media almost ignore events in China during this period (judged by reporting reaching us), whether through fear of reprisals or simply because of a sharp change of policy, while the Bulgarians increase their reporting. Soviet media are devoting large blocks of space and time to China, but largely in the form of highly critical commentary (to domestic, Chinese, and world-wide audiences) rather than reporting.

#### Chronology Continued

February 21 (delayed): The left-wing Italian Socialist Party of Proletarian Unity (PSIUP, split from the PSI in 1964) loses a pro-Chinese splinter. As reported by the Communist-oriented Rome daily PAESA SERA on the 22nd, 9 prominent members of the Bologna Federation's Executive Council, headed by the editor and financial backer of the "clearly Chinese-oriented magazine CLASSE E STATO," resigned after the Council, in the presence of national PSIUP Secretary Vecchietti, voted to expel 3 members for distributing "manifestos violently critical of revisionism in the CGIL" (General Council of Italian Labor).

February 25 (delayed): NEDELYA, the Sunday supplement of IZVESTIYA, accuses Radio Peking of "all kinds of lies -- juggling with facts, telling cock-and-bull stories, and failure to mention facts." "It is easier to judge the events in China from what Peking does not say than from its pronouncements."

February 27: PRAVDA 3-part theoretical article by Prof. D. Chesnokov, "Problems of Theory -- The Soviet State and Its Educational Role," extols "persuasion as the chief method of educational work." He deplors

those "who, in the spirit of petit bourgeois liberalism and anarchism, deny the necessity for...the combination of persuasion with coercion, who consider state coercion as incompatible with true democracy...."

The CPR Embassy in Lusaka, Zambia, denies charges in the ZAMBIA TIMES of increases in Chinese trade with South Africa through middlemen in Hong Kong, Japan and France. (AFP)

February 28: In a major editorial rebuttal of the Chinese "struggle against so-called 'economism'" ("any attempt to improve the serious material situation of the Chinese workers and peasants"), KRASNAYA ZVEZDA (Red Star) devastatingly reviews CCP economic bungling with the "great leap" policy and its resultant "philosophy of poverty." KZ concludes: "There will appear forces in the CCP which will restore the triumph of the M-L doctrine in the CCP and will lead their people onto the correct road..." (etc.)

Radio Tirana announces that "the constituent conference of the M-L's of Austria met on 12 February 1967 and established the M-L Party of Austria ....Comrade Franz Stroebel was unanimously elected First Secy of the Party's CC." Tirana goes on to broadcast an exchange of greetings between the "constituent conference" and the Albanian Party.

Radio Havana broadcasts the text of a statement made at "a press conference with national and foreign newsmen at the DPRK Embassy in Cuba" by a representative of the North Korean news agency KCNA denying and denouncing recent Chinese Red Guard calumnies, slanders, and false rumors against NK. (See #11, Feb. 26, for NK press conferences on same subject in other non-Communist capitals.)

February 28 and continuing: Soviet media carry a series of statements of support for Soviet policies and/or condemnation of the Chinese by various parties. Those which also call for a world party conference include: Argentina (28th); Colombia and Portugal (1st); Ireland (3rd); Syria (5th); Iraq (7th); South Africa (13th); and Denmark (14th).

March 1: Moscow's "Radio Peace and Progress" (ostensibly an "unofficial" voice of Soviet "public organizations"), which has been on the air in English, French, Spanish, and Portuguese, begins broadcasting in Mandarin to China, with 4 half-hour programs daily. Radio Moscow slightly reduces its "official" Mandarin programs from a total of 77 to 70 hours weekly. (Note: This corrects a Radio Bratislava item on subject Feb. 25, #11.) The inaugural program outlines policy, including the following excerpts:

"We representatives of Soviet mass organizations would like to extend our hand of friendship to you heroic Chinese working class and the glorious millions in the rank and file of Chinese Communist fighters..."

To our fraternal Chinese younger generation, listen, here is our appeal...: Mao Tse-tung and his clique is trying to dislodge you from the right track..."



We also send our regards to the members of the PLA, which in the past has always been with the people and has fought for their freedom and happiness....

In these programs we shall introduce you to Soviet public opinion regarding the undertakings of your country. You shall hear of the Soviet people's growing anxiety and concern for the Chinese people....

This station will alert you to the danger of Mao Tse-tung's policy toward the Chinese people and the fruits of the Chinese revolution. We will introduce to you the truth about the events taking place in your country, although Mao Tse-tung and his cronies are trying to conceal them by keeping mum....

Our station will invite world Communists and progressive activists to convey to you at length their opinions on events in your country....

We believe that the voice of our station will become the symbol of support of the Soviet people and all contemporary revolutionary forces for our Chinese friends...."

Radio Moscow reports testimony of Soviet engineer Birembaum who has just returned from helping to build a Soviet-equipped hydroelectric station on the Tsay River in North Vietnam. "At times all work come to a standstill because the shipment of Soviet cargo was delayed by Chinese authorities. These incidents were not accidental: it was all done deliberately by the Chinese customs officers on instructions from Peking...."

Hungarian Party chief Kadar concludes his 5-day "unofficial, friendly visit" to Moscow, reaffirming "full unity" on all international and ICM questions.

Budapest daily MAGYAR NEMZET article, "The Mao Cult and Its Opponents," by one of its correspondents who recently visited Peking, says:

".....Chairman Mao has for a long time been not only a wise leader and omniscient politician but a deity petrified into an idol who must be glorified and adored....The methods of mass psychology are used the same way Hitler used them; the same propaganda methods are used as those of Goebbels...."

Czech Party boss Novotny in Warsaw signs a 20-year renewal of the Czech-Polish friendship treaty originally concluded March 10, 1947.

March 2: PEOPLE'S DAILY Commentator article, "New Disciples of Goebbels," denies Soviet charges of Chinese interference with shipments to North Vietnam, citing a Feb. 21 issue of the Soviet Embassy, Ethiopia, bulletin SOVIET DAILY NEWS, the Feb. 22 NOVOSTI release in Washington described in #11, and a Soviet Army Day speech by Marshal Grechko:

"Gobbels...used to say that if you repeat a lie often, people will believe it. We can see that the leaders of the Soviet revisionist ruling group are following just this cynical philosophy of Gobbels. They have already become his disciples...."

March 2 and continuing: Strife between the Chinese and Japanese Communists escalates, with a new "bloody, fascist-like atrocity" involving Chinese students in Tokyo. AKAHATA on the 2nd and 3rd gave the first JCP accounts; It all began at the Zenrin Gakusei Kaikan (Good Neighbor Students Hall), which houses the Japan-China Friendship Association as well as dormitory quarters for Chinese students, when a gang of Chinese students stormed the JCFA offices "to protest against the alleged removal by Association personnel of wall newspapers put up at the entrance of the hall which "slandered our Assn as 'pseudo JCFA,' 'anti-China,'" etc., and to demand that the Assn "immediately remove itself from the building." Next day, A reveals that "some of the divisionists who bolted from the JCFA have formed a 'rebel corps' after the fashion of a certain foreign organization".

The other side of the story is presented at a press conference on the 3rd (NCNA Peking on the 8th) by Director Miyazaki of the JCFA (Orthodox) -- the pro-Chinese faction split from the JCFA last October. Complaining that the "Miyamoto faction" (JCP) had turned the JCFA offices "into a stronghold for anti-China activities" since the split, he supports as "absolutely justified" the "efforts to throw the ruffians of the JCP out of the hostel in order to safeguard the life and property of the Chinese students." NCNA adds: "On the wall of the press conference room were displayed bloodstained coats, shirts, and trousers of the Chinese students beaten up by the hooligans, as well as photographs of the incident taken on the spot...."

A on the 5th announces that delegates of 33 organizations formally established a "Japan-China Joint Struggle Liaison Council to protect the JCFA from violence and unreasonable intervention."

--At a "report the truth" meeting on the 6th, Sun Ping-hua, Chinese trade chief in Tokyo denounces pro-JCP elements for causing the clash, and is supported by Diet member Utsonomiya of the LDP (who apologized on behalf of the government party) and representatives of the Socialist Party and Sohyo (Trade Union Council) -- as reported by ASAHI on the 7th (AKAHATA denounces the latter two on the 20th). "Police said the riot was caused directly by a member of the pro-JCP JCFA who tore down Chinese students' wall posters".

On the 9th, A complains that "since 1 March, a handful of rioters, including Chinese students, those who bolted from the JCFA, and the blind followers of a foreign influence, have been illegally occupying the classrooms of the Japan-China College...and have been using the desks, chairs, platforms, and other facilities...to set up barricades..." It also reports a March 8 effort by "the Chinese students and blind followers" to batter their way into the JCFA offices.

PEOPLE'S DAILY offers a harsh commentary on the 11th:

"...We Chinese people are deeply angered and hereby voice our strong protest...It is the revisionists in the JCP who, and who alone, created the serious, bloody incidents in Tokyo.... However, the paper AKAHATA, turning white into black and standing truth on its head, described such undisguised fascist-like atrocities as 'defense of the democratic movement' in Japan. This is a gross insult to the broad masses of Japanese Communists and the J. people."

--Next day Peking announces cancellation of the NCNA contract with the JCP-aligned Asia News Service (which on Nov. 8 had dismissed 8 Chinese-sympathizing employees) in favor of "the Chinese News Service which recently was set up by a group of Chinese here" (as reported by ASAHI on the 13th).

--The JCP strikes back in an unsigned A article on the 15th which "flatly branded Peking's accusations as formal intervention in the internal affairs of the JCP and democratic organizations in this country" (as reported by Tokyo JIJI on the 16th). "This is an important part of a series of direct and groundless charges by ultra-left opportunists and great-power-conscious elements in the CCP and can under no circumstances be allowed to go unanswered." JIJI adds: "This is the first outright criticism leveled by the JCP at Chinese Communist leaders since it officially washed its hands of Peking's hard-line policy last autumn."

March 3: A high-level North Korean Govt delegation departs Moscow for home after signing 1967 agreements on "economic, scientific, and engineering cooperation" which provide for "considerably larger Soviet exports" than formerly.

NCNA Peking reports a March 2 statement by the Afro-Asian Journalists Association condemning Soviet manipulation of the Feb. 15 Nicosia AAPSO council meeting "which caused an open split," and pledges to "do its utmost for the success of the 5th AAPSO Conference in Peking, which is the revolutionary center of the world."

March 5 and 12: The Communists gain and strengthen their position among the non-Communist Left while the Gaullists lose in the French national elections.

March 6: NCNA Peking transmits a statement by Chia Hseuh-chien, Deputy Secy Gen of the All-China Youth Federation, ... protesting vehemently against "the recent rabid anti-China outburst of Mechini, President of WFDY," who, "at a press conference on 21 Feb, wildly attacked and slandered China's GPCR and China's youth organizations. TASS, official mouth-piece of the Soviet revisionists, immediately reported this incident. This was another extremely grave anti-China incident....Facts prove once again that the WFDY has completely degenerated into an instrument of the Soviet line."

March 6, 12, 13, 14, 20, 22: The Chinese keep up their running attack on "the sinister, fascist features of the Indonesian right-wing military group in a series of NCNA Peking releases on these dates. Those of the 6th, 12th, and 22nd describe Chinese Embassy notes.

March 7: Bulgarian Party daily RABOTNICHESKO DELO reiterates Bulgarian support for a world conference.

PEOPLE'S DAILY article, "A Miserable Anti-China Clown," signed by The Red Flag Fighting Detachment of the Peking Aeronautical Institute denounces "a vicious anti-China article in IZVESTIYA" by Fedor Kalinychev.

"...In this masterpiece, K. let loose a diatribe about China having 'no real democracy' and about the 'wild behavior of the Red Guards...This is sheer distortion!" (After extolling the GPCR as "a tremendous democratic movement," the article goes on:) "We would like to ask you...when you attack others for having 'no real democracy', do you have the guts to let the broad masses of the Soviet people exercise democracy? Do you dare let the Soviet people air their views, contend and debate to the fullest extent, and speak out what is in their hearts? Do you dare let the Soviet people put up big-character posters in the streets....Do you dare let the Soviet people set up their own revolutionary mass organizations, hold revolutionary mass rallies, and rebel....?"

We will vouch for it that you dare not; you do not have the courage. You glibly profess that you back 'democracy' to the hilt, but in fact you are most afraid of proletarian democracy....

Yours is the most savage, most despotic, and most reactionary fascist dictatorship....

Radio Moscow broadcasts in English to Africa another commentary on the increase of Chinese trade with South Africa.

March 8: Stalin's daughter, Svetlana Allieluyeva, who had gone to India in December 1966 bearing the ashes of her late Indian husband, applies for asylum at the U.S. Embassy, New Delhi. The U.S. Government flies her to Rome, and arranges for her temporary asylum in Switzerland.

Albanian ZERI I POPULLIT article, "Social and Moral Degeneration of the Soviet Union -- Consequence of the Treacherous Policy of the K. Revisionists," recites a long list of examples from contemporary Soviet life to support its claim.

March 8-9: Polish bosses Gomulka and Cyrankiewicz have a "friendly visit" with Hungarian leaders, discuss international situation, "peace and security in Europe," and the situation in the ICM, and "confirm full identity of views on all matters discussed."

March 8-16: New Zealand CP Secy Gen Wilcox makes a "friendly visit" to Peking, is welcomed by Chou En-lai and Kang Sheng, meets with Mao on the 12th and makes no reported public statements.

March 9: PRAVDA decries and denies "several slanderous statements about the Soviet Union" made at an Accra press conference by Ghanaian police chief and deputy PM Harlley, who voiced "fabrications" that the USSR is trying secretly to deliver weapons to Ghana and that Russian-made explosives have been discovered in Accra.

March 9 and continuing: Radios Moscow and "Peace and Progress" hammer away on the theme of Chinese persecution of minorities, especially the Moslem peoples of Sinkiang, repeating charges of forced assimilation, forced marriages with Chinese, destruction and conversion of mosques, etc.

March 10: Delhi Overseas Service broadcasts a statement of the Dalai Lama on the 8th anniversary of the bloody Chinese suppression of the Tibetan national uprising in Lhasa. He says that in the latest wave of barbaric persecution of Tibetan Buddhists monasteries, temples and private homes have been ransacked and all symbols of religion destroyed.

March 11: Radio Moscow to Asia on the great harm caused to the national liberation struggle by Maoism says: "The people of Asia will never forget the irreparable losses sustained by several of their CPs as a result of the advice of the impatient Peking revolutionaries...."

The Colombian Government arrests more than 150 Communists following a wave of terrorism described by President Lleras Restrepo as part of a vast, subversive action, Reuters reports from Bogota. The arrests came only a few hours after 80 men, believed to be members of the self-styled National Liberation Army, dynamited and machine-gunned a train in northern Colombia, killing seven policemen guarding a payroll and two others on the train.

Albanian ZERI I POPULLIT editorial, "The Soviet Revisionist Gang Is Rapidly Advancing toward the Restoration of Capitalism," devastatingly analyzes the Soviet "new economic reform" and other recent economic developments in the USSR.

March 11-12, 18, 21: On the 11th, Peking makes 3 anti-Soviet moves: (1) expels two Soviet Embassy officials as "directly responsible for the incidents in which Chinese staff members of the Embassy were persecuted;" (2) transmits via NCNA a detailed statement of the Chinese staff strongly protesting Soviet "disregard of Chinese laws and legitimate rights of the Chinese working class in unreasonably dismissing and persecuting the Chinese staff"; and (3) lodges with the Soviet Govt

a "vehement protest against its new anti-China provocation at the Naushkiy Station in the USSR by forcibly impounding Mao Tse-tung's works displayed in the Chinese International Train and barbarously beating up the Chinese train crew on 6 March this year." Anti-Soviet demonstrations flare up again in Peking on the 11th and 12th but correspondents describe them as much smaller and more restrained than those of February.

--The USSR strikes back on the 18th, expelling two Chinese Embassy officials. It recites a long list of grievances which "go to prove that the CPR Embassy insolently ignores the conditions and norms accepted throughout the world, and permits actions absolutely incompatible with the status of a foreign diplomatic representation. These deliberate actions can only be regarded as hostile to the Soviet state."

--NCNA on the 21st disseminates a statement by the Chinese Chargé d'Affaires in Moscow rejecting the Soviet statement and strongly protesting against it: "The statement of the Soviet Foreign Ministry turns black into white and fabricates rumors and slanders." Giving the Chinese version of the incidents cited by the Soviets, the statement declares: "All the facts show that the activities of the Chinese Embassy are proper and aboveboard. Your slanders against the Embassy can only show that you are trying to worsen the relations between the two countries...."

March 12: The 50th anniversary of the overthrow of the Russian Tsarist Government (the "February Revolution") passes with no public celebrations in the USSR; instead PRAVDA articles emphasize the event merely opened the way for the Bolshevik October Revolution.

A PEOPLE'S DAILY article claims that "in January alone, Soviet papers and journals carried more than 200 anti-Chinese articles."

March 13-15: A Zhivkov-led Bulgarian Party delegation makes an "unofficial, friendly visit" to Moscow, decides to sign a new friendship treaty (although the existing 20-year treaty has another year of validity), and affirms "full unanimity" on the international situation and the WCM.

March 13 and 16: Cuban Premier Castro in another long speech criticizes the "Socialist" countries for rushing to establish relations with the "oligarchies" ruling in Latin America. He attacks at length the established, Soviet-aligned Venezuelan CP which, "in an act of virtual treason, has abandoned the armed struggle." Turning again to the Soviet bloc countries, he says:

"Whoever helps the oligarchies where the guerrillas are fighting is assisting in suppressing the revolution, because repressive wars are made not only with arms but also with millions of dollars."

The underground Venezuelan CP strikes back on the 16th in a "communique" accusing Castro of meddling in its affairs. "We categorically reject his pretension that it is he and he only who decides what is and is not revolutionary in Latin America."

March 14: UPI carries a Soviet NOVOSTI report of the "increasingly obstructive" Chinese tactics to delay Soviet shipments of war materials to Vietnam, especially at the border junction of Grodekovo.

March 14-15: East German bosses Ulbricht and Stoph make an "official Party and state visit" to Poland and sign a new 20-year friendship treaty directed specifically against "West German militarism and revanchism" and affirming the territorial integrity and the inviolability of the present borders of both.

March 14-21: Austrian Chancellor Klaus makes an official visit to the USSR: the communique cites broad agreement on many questions but no concrete moves resulting.

March 15: PEOPLE'S DAILY commentary, "Rousing the Masses and Relying on the Masses," lauds "the people's guerrillas in Thailand, Zimbabwe, Colombia, and many other countries" as "an illustration of how Chairman Mao's thought on people's war is being mastered by more and more revolutionary people."

TASS announces that "the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee has resolved to convene an international conference devoted to the October Revolution in Russia and the national liberation movement of the Asian, African, and Latin American peoples in Baku in September."

March 16: TASS announces the first meeting of the "Soviet Committee in Support of Vietnam," consisting of "48 prominent public leaders" headed by Chairman Petr Pimenov. "Its aim is to wage an effective struggle to consolidate the international movement against aggression in Vietnam," and it "has set up a commission to investigate the crimes of the U.S. aggressors in Vietnam."

NCNA Peking denounces the inauguration of Brazilian President Costa e Silva as a "power transfer actuated by the Brazilian gorillas to strengthen their pro-U.S. fascist dictatorship over the country."

March 16 and 23: TASS Kampala reports that the Kenyan EAST AFRICAN STANDARD summarizes and denounces a booklet published by NCNA Hong Kong containing speeches made by Chiang Ching (Mrs. Mao) and Chou En-lai to a conference of Chinese diplomats from Africa on extending the "cultural revolution" to Africa. "Chinese, hands off Kenya," TASS quotes the paper as declaring. On the same day, AFP Kampala reports a local NCNA denial of the report, claiming it to be a forgery. AFP added that the Chinese Ambassador to Kampala "had returned to Peking to take part in the cultural revolution." A week later, NCNA Peking transmits a statement denouncing both "this fabricated report broad-

cast on 16 March by TASS" and "some reactionary propoganda material signed 'Belgian Committee of international Red Guards'" which "has been circulated in a number of African countries." "Such anti-China propoganda is obviously a new plot against China jointly hatched by imperialism, revisionism, and reaction...."

March 16, 18, 19, 26: Moscow continues to waver in treating developments in Indonesia. Radio Moscow's commentary on Sukarno's ouster, on the 16th, criticizes him for tying himself to the Djakarta-Peking axis and yielding to Chinese pressures and also for his contemptuous disregard of economic problems. It concludes that "only the future will show" how things will go under the new leaders. Shortly after, brief items by Radios Moscow (18) and "Peace and Progress" (19) view with restrained alarm a Djakarta decree outlawing "over 170 Marxist books and magazines." A week later, PRAVDA, citing the suppression of Communist publications, warns:

"M-L, which now meets with a hostile attitude in Indo, is the outlook of the Soviet people.... This fact should be taken into consideration by states which want to develop friendly relations with the Soviet Union...."

March 16-17: The East German Ulbricht-Stoph delegation which went to Prague from Warsaw signs a somewhat similar 20-year friendship treaty with the Czechs -- not, however, including any reference to territorial integrity or guaranteed borders.

March 17-18: A Ceausescu-led Rumanian delegation makes a "friendly visit" to Moscow and leaves after an "exchange of opinions," with no affirmation of agreement.

March 17 & 18: The Chinese charge Soviet-U.S. collusion in NCNA items on the 17th (a) reporting the US-Soviet consular convention, and (b) transmitting a statement of the Chinese Committee for Afro-Asian Solidarity (reiterating Chinese intent of hold the "5th AAPSO conference" in Peking this year), and on the 18th commenting on U.S. and Soviet aid to India.

March 19: PRAVDA article on the 96th anniversary of the Paris Commune says the Mao group's attempts to draw a parallel between the PC and their "outrages" are "blasphemy"; Maoism is actually the opposite of the Commune.

March 20: NCNA Peking reports a statement issued by the Indonesian Organization for Afro-Asian Solidarity (OISRAA) entitled: "Thoroughly Expose Soviet Revisionists' Splitting Activities and Make the Fifth AAPSO Conference in China a Great Success!" It states that "Indonesia, which is an elected member of the Permanent Secretariat of AAPSO, declares its withdrawal from the Cairo-based permanent secretariat."



PEOPLE'S DAILY Red Guard article, "What Sort of Stuff is the Freedom Preached by Soviet Revisionism," says:

"....The 'freedom' preached by Soviet revisionism is nothing but a mask dripping with blood. Behind this mask of 'freedom', unemployment and starvation await the working poeple, and revolutionaries are thrown in jail, as is happening in the U.S., India and the Soviet Union."

Following NCNA Hong Kong items on the subject on the 16th and 18th, the Chinese Froeign Ministry on the 20th delivers to the British Charge d'Affaires a note "strongly protesting against the British Govt's continuing connivance in the U.S. aggressor's use of Hong Kong as a base of operation in their war of aggression against Vietnam." It concludes: "You must stop providing the U.S. with Hong Kong as a base of operations...; otherwise, you must be held responsible for all the grave consequences arising therefrom."

Prague Radio announces an agreement with Hanoi "under which 2,100 Vietnamese apprentices will be trained in Czechoslovak enterprises." They "will spend the next 3 to 5 years in Czechoslovakia." The first 500 will arrive in July. It adds that "an additional 20,000 Vietnamese have already left or will leave for other countries of the socialist camp for similar training."

March 21-23: The East German Ulbricht-Stoph delegation makes "a friendly visit" to Moscow. The communique affirms "their complete identity of views" and adds that Brezhnev "accepted their invitation to the 7th SED Congress opening 17 April."

March 22: PEOPLE'S DAILY Commentator denounces the Indian Govt's use of "the Tibetan bandit traitors of China to carry out frenzied anti-China activities," revealing that the Chinese Govt had sent a note on the subject on March 20. PD adds that this "is part and parcel of the anti-China campaign whipped up by U.S. imperialism and the Soviet revisionist ruling clique. All the world knows that the Indian reactionaries live on the alms of these two masters of theirs...."

At the conclusion of the 242nd meeting of the Military Armistice Commission in Panmunjon on the North-South Korean border, Yi Su-kun, a Vice President of KCNA, the N. Korean state news agency, defects by jumping into the car of the senior U.S. representative and asking to be taken to the South. KCNA immediately reports that Yi was kidnaped: "It is clear that the U.S. imperialists kidnaped the journalist of our side to hurl slanders and calumnies against the northern half of Korea through him, by threatening and blackmailing him...." In Seoul, Yi says he escaped because of the "political straitjacket" and "barbarous manner" in which intellectuals are treated in the North.

March 22 and continuing: Italian police sources disclose that three Italians had been formally charged with spying for the Soviet Union and that a Soviet Embassy attaché, Yuri Pavlenko, who abruptly return-

connection with the case. An informant reportedly says that the case involves a widespread espionage ring aimed at NATO. Two Soviet representatives, Embassy attache Boris Petrin and Aeroflot manager Nikolay Ranovin, are reportedly expelled from Cyprus on the 24th and two more, Second Secretary Albert Zakharov and Commerical Attache Igor Ochurkov, from Athens on the 26th, all reportedly as part of the spy network uncovered in Italy.

March 23: The Indonesian news agency ANTARA reports that the security authorities has "nipped in the bud" a planned uprising by the underground PKI in West Java; 16 Communists were captured, along with documents concerning their planned activities. Radio Djakarta discloses that 56 of the 86 members of the old PKI Central Committee are still at large.

March 24: IZVESTIYA carries Soviet charges of U.S.-Chinese collusion to the extreme assertion that Peking agents have "closed ranks with the CIA, FBI, USIA and other "subversive U.S. agencies" in an effort to split local CPs and discredit the USSR and the idea of Communism in Latin America. Radio Moscow broadcasts this article in Spanish on the 26th.

March 25 and continuing: The Soviet-promoted "Third Afro-Asian Writers Conference" opens in Beirut, boycotted and denounced as "bogus" by the Chinese and their Peking-based A-A Writers Bureau (which plans to hold the "real Third A-A Writers Conference" in Peking later this year). PRAVDA, reporting that "over 40 delegations" had arrived by the opening date, predicts that the Chinese will apply the same disruptive tactics as at the Nicosia AAPSO Council meeting in February.

March 27: TASS Peking reports a new incident of harrassment of Soviet diplomatic personnel in the Peking suburbs, as "goons from the 'Ching kangshan' Red Guard detachment of Tsinghua University" surrounded and abused an Embassy car full of Soviet personnel -- one a woman -- for six and a half hours on "a ridiculous charge of 'having violated the sovereignty of the CPR!'"

REFERENCE: PROBLEMS OF COMMUNISM, No. 1, January-February 1967, contains a well-written, 8-page, carefully sourced review by Kevin Devlin of the Sino-Soviet struggle for control of the ICM since 1963, entitled "Which Side Are You On?" ... We take this opportunity to refer our readers again to the volume of useful commentaries on world Communist affairs to be found in this bi-monthly journal published by USIA. The same issue, for example, also contains a 10-page round-up on "The Communist Party of Japan" by Australian scholar J.A.A. Stockwin; another 10-page essay on "Soviet Theory and Indian Reality" by Canadian Professor Stephen Clarkson; four commentaries by international specialists in a series on the evolution of the Soviet political system; two articles in a new series on "The Soviet Elite"; and a number of other features.

10 April 1967

1112.

AFRO-ASIAN SPLIT: MOSCOW VS. PEKING

The Aftermath of Nicosia

25X1C10b

\* \* \* \* \*

SITUATION: The Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organization (AAPSO) had suffered for years from the repercussions of the Sino-Soviet dispute. AAPSO has now definitely split into a largely Soviet-dominated main section and a smaller section under the influence of the Chinese. The immediate cause of the split was the decision of the recent Soviet-controlled AAPSO Council Session in Nicosia, Cyprus (13-16 February) to transfer the 1967 (5th) AAPSO conference from Peking to Algiers. The Chinese lost little time in announcing that "the Conference" (read: their rump conference) will take place in Peking this year. (For fuller background on the developments in Nicosia, see BPG #211, item #1106, dated 13 March 1967).

The Peking Diehards.

There is good reason to believe that the two AAPSO conferences will be held in 1967. The Peking conference will inevitably be small: most of the delegates will be exiles or representatives of split African and Asian national ("rebel") organizations. Participants will most likely include: Peking-based exiles (Indonesian, Thai) who have denounced the Nicosia meeting; pro-Chinese factions of divided national Afro-Asian committees (Japan, Ceylon); African organizations which were expelled or walked out of the Nicosia meeting; and some others who were displeased with the Soviet control at Nicosia.

The decision for shifting the Conference to Algiers was far from unanimous (see item #1106). It is significant that the delegations from North Vietnam and from the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam (NLFSV) reportedly called at first for the 5th conference to remain in Peking, but Hanoi was evidently pleased with the meeting's position on Vietnam (see below), and finally backed the move to Algiers.

Nicosia -- A Landmark.

In any event, the Nicosia meeting is a turning point in AAPSO's history which formally began at a meeting in Cairo of representatives of African and Asian "peoples" in late December 1957 -- the first AAPSO conference. The "peoples' solidarity movement" was (and still is) an amalgam of Sino-Soviet opportunism and of Afro-Asian ideology based on anti-imperialism.

The significance of the Nicosia meeting, of the resultant split, and of its meaning in terms of AAPSO as an organization, is demonstrated by the respective Soviet and Chinese interpretations and the mutual Sino-Soviet recriminations which continue better than a full month after the close of the meeting.

Peking Withdraws from Cairo Secretariat.

On 17 March, the Chinese Committee for A-A Solidarity issued a bitter statement (for full text see Attachment) condemning the Soviet revisionists for manipulating the "illegal" Nicosia meeting, which openly split the A-A movement and solidarity against imperialism. The statement reiterated that the 5th AAPSO Conference will be held in Peking this year and announced formation of a preparatory committee. The statement stresses that the Chinese AAPS Committee shall henceforth have nothing to do with the AAPSO secretariat in Cairo, which is under the control of the "Soviet revisionists." The statement contends that the Soviet "revisionist clique" has split from the AAPS movement so that it can be of more use to U.S. imperialism; and distorts the Chinese predicament by claiming that "with the removal of this cancer -- the Soviet revisionists -- the Afro-Asian peoples' cause of solidarity against imperialism will undergo a sounder development and forge ahead more vigorously."

Amplification of the Master's Voice.

The Peking-based Indonesian AAPS "organization" issued a statement which condemned the Soviets and their actions in AAPSO in even harsher terms than did the Chinese. It denounced the "Soviet revisionists and their lackeys" for: "having hatched a splittist meeting" which betrayed the struggle of the Afro-Asian peoples; inviting and adopting as members "revisionist, splittist cliques" (Ceylon, Japan); forcing through a resolution on the 50th anniversary of the October Revolution, and ordering a resolution on the "capitulationist Tashkent spirit"; closing their eyes to the massacres and persecutions by the Suharto-Nasution fascist regime. The statement also said that the permanent AAPSO secretariat in Cairo degenerated and completely failed to fulfill its tasks; hence, "Indonesia" declares its withdrawal from AAPSO's Cairo secretariat.

Peking's Multiple Voice.

The Peace Liaison Committee of the Asian and Pacific Regions (PLCAPR) also issued a statement on the illegality of the "stage-managed" Nicosia meeting, stressing that PLCAPR has been represented, whenever possible, at bona fide AAPSO meetings because of the organization's importance in the struggle for peace. The attempted takeover of the organization by revisionists is a blow to "peace in our region", the statement said, and urged all member countries to support the AAPSO

meeting in Peking, (The PLCAPR is a regional World Peace Council secretariat. It was established at an Asian and Pacific Peace Conference in Peking in October, 1952. Its purpose was to coordinate "peace activities" in that area under the leadership of the Chinese. After some years of inaction it was revived in 1961 by the Chinese as part of their campaign against the Soviet Union and as a potential rival to the WPC.)

Moscow: Chinese Stymie AAPSO and International Fronts.


Soviet commentary, as expected, is more sober. Hailing Nicosia (i.e., their outmaneuvering of the Chicoms at Nicosia) as a "business-like" meeting and as a step forward for AAPSO, a PRAVDA commentator points out that the Chinese had attempted for some time to drive a wedge into AAPSO with a view to turning it into a Chinese political instrument; that the Nicosia meeting demonstrated the growing realization among "mass international organizations" (read: Soviet-sponsored international fronts); that the Chinese leaders do not contribute anything positive to these (front) organizations; and that the Nicosia meeting demonstrated the international isolation of the Mao Tse-tung group in the very geographic area which has been the main target of its chauvinistic and hegemonist aspirations. Radio Moscow (to Southeast Asia -- see attachment) stressed that at Nicosia, the council "removed everything" that interferes with AAPSO's unity; and it put stress on the importance which the meeting accorded the Vietnam problem, with its resolve of stepping up practical aid to the Vietnamese people.

Soviet A-A Committee Displaying Initiative.

Wasting little time in capitalizing on having gained the upper hand over the Chinese, the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee resolved to convene an international conference in Baku in September, devoted to the October Revolution and the liberation movements of the Afro-Asian-Latin American peoples. The brief announcement also expresses the Soviet committee's support of the Nicosia resolution on solidarity with Vietnam. The inclusion of the Latin American liberation contingent would seem to be a Soviet step toward consolidating under their control the Afro-Asian-Latin American Solidarity Organization, founded in Havana, Cuba in January 1966. (On current Soviet and Cuban rivalry in Latin America, see also Item #111, this issue.)

Nicosia Met Hanoi's Requirements.


Most significantly, Hanoi (VNA - 15 March) strongly supported the Nicosia meeting's resolution on Vietnam which "condemned the barbarous crimes committed by U.S. imperialism". Hanoi also points out that the Week of Solidarity with the Vietnamese People (13-19 March), which was decided upon at Nicosia, supplemented a program adopted by the (largely Soviet-manipulated) Tri-Continental (AALAPSO) Conference in Havana.



10 April 1967

1113.

HO CHI MINH'S BLUNDERS



25X1C10b


\* \* \* \* \*

SITUATION: A propaganda war that has admittedly been going rather badly for the free world suddenly took a sharp tack for the better in March. Thanks for the change in direction must go to North Vietnam's President Ho Chi Minh, who by consensus of free world propaganda experts, has been guilty of a major propaganda blunder. What happened was this: On 2 February 1967 President Lyndon Johnson secretly dispatched a letter to Ho Chi Minh stating that the U.S. was prepared to stop bombing North Vietnam as soon as he (Johnson) was assured that North Vietnamese infiltration into South Vietnam by land and sea had been stopped. Thirteen days later Ho answered Johnson's letter, also secretly. The North Vietnamese President reiterated his usual list of U.S. offenses against the peace-loving Vietnamese people; he also reiterated the by-now dog-eared Four Points (upon which Ho has made peace negotiations contingent) and completely ignored Johnson's offer to cease bombing. He also ignored other proposals included in the President's letter. So much for Mr. Johnson's secret peace initiative.

On 21 March came the shocker: Ho Chi Minh publicly released the texts of Johnson's letter and his reply. Why he chose to do so is a mystery -- by most standards Johnson's letter was straightforward and sincere, its wording free of diplomatic ambiguities. To most readers it seemed crystal-clear that the President was actively trying to find a new route to the negotiating table. On the other hand, except to the hardcore, Ho's letter is filled with hackneyed phrases and "reasoning"; his accusations have been repeated so often that the meaning of the words has worn away, and his tired polemics suddenly look as shoddy as they really are. He completely failed to show any receptivity to what was clearly a new and personal peace proposal; he even failed to show ordinary diplomatic courtesy to the US President in his answer.


Of the same piece of cloth were U.S. and North Vietnamese reactions to UN Secretary General U Thant's standstill truce proposals made public on 28 March. Secretary of State Rusk for the U.S. and Hanoi Radio for North Vietnam reflected precisely the same temper and tone as did President Johnson and Ho just a week earlier. (See articles attached and PRESS COMMENT issues 27-30 March 1967 for details.)

25X1C10b



~~SECRET~~

(1113 Cont.)





Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000400060006-7

25X1C10b



Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000400060006-7

~~SECRET~~

(1113)

1114.d.

SOVIET WRITERS CONGRESS: Totalitarian  
Control VS. Intellectual Freedom

25X1C10b

\* \* \* \* \*

SITUATION: The Fourth Congress of Soviet Writers is to convene in Moscow on 22 May 1967 according to the decision of an "expanded session" of the board of the USSR Union of Writers. (LITERATURNAYA GAZETA [LITERARY GAZETTE] No. 1, 1967.) The main concern of the Congress, according to a statement by LITERATURNAYA GAZETA editor Aleksandr Chakovsky, is to be the 50th Anniversary of the October Revolution and "the role of Soviet literature in its celebration."

The Congress, if held, could be the most important single event since the Sinyavsky-Daniel trial in February 1966 in the long struggle between the regime and the liberal creative writers. Alternatively, it could be as insipid as the stage-managed 23rd Party Congress in March-April 1966. Which way the Congress turns out will depend on whether Chakovsky's above-noted statement is correct, or whether the liberals broaden the agenda to include the treatment and fate of fellow-writers Sinyavsky and Daniel, basic socio-political issues of freedom and justice, and standards of literary quality. The specter of liberals raising such taboo issues is the probable reason why the regime rescheduled the Congress several times between 1963 and 1967.

There are several reasons why one might wonder whether the Congress will convene at the scheduled time. First, the Congress, initially scheduled for 1963, has already been postponed at least three times. Second, the situation among writers remains unsettled, largely because of the Party's concerted but unsuccessful efforts since March 1965 to govern the content and objectives of literary works; those efforts (which still continue) were dramatically demonstrated by the arrest and trial of Sinyavsky and Daniel. A third reason for skepticism is that the Soviet rulers appear to fear that some writers would use the Congress as a platform from which to express opposition to the regime and to expose the continuing lack of genuine intellectual freedom; such opposition, particularly during the period leading up to the 50th Anniversary of the October Revolution, would be difficult to tolerate.

For reasons of prestige and image, however, the Soviets may be obliged to carry out their plan to hold the Congress. Besides the above-noted announcement, a press conference on 3 January 1967 attended by Western correspondents generated wide publicity for the Congress. Under


these circumstances, another postponement would be generally construed to be a sign of weakness and lack of party confidence in the Soviet intelligentsia.


The nature of the Congress, if held, is a subject for further speculation. If recent trends continue, the Congress will be an insipid affair; the agenda and the participants will probably be tightly controlled by the hard-liners (frequently called "conservatives" but actually Stalinists), and press coverage will probably focus on aspects selected by the regime. As of less than two months before the scheduled opening of the Congress, the Soviet press has made little mention of the Congress and has said nothing about its agenda, length, and its sponsors and organizers; the only feature to stand out so far is the repeated press emphasis on "patriotism." At the same time the regime has applied additional heavy pressure to the liberals' major asset, the monthly magazine NOVY MIR (NEW WORLD) and to its well-known editor, Aleksandr T. Tvardovsky. NOVY MIR and Tvardovsky were rebuked in late March for failing to heed earlier criticisms and warned to halt their ideological transgressions. General Secretary Brezhnev, in his well-publicized election speech of 10 March, made it quite clear that the CPSU would like the Congress to serve its interests by encouraging writers to turn out works to celebrate the 50th Anniversary of the Revolution and to provide "communist education" for the people. In that same speech Brezhnev echoed recent press criticisms of liberal writers and thus implicitly warned them not to stir up trouble at the Writers Congress.

If the Congress were to express the ideas and problems (even, perhaps, the will) of the majority in the Writers Union, the regime would have to revise radically its attitude toward writers and literature. The permissiveness of the 1954 and 1959 Writers Congresses would, however, subject the regime to the risk of far-reaching, explosive criticism of its system and recent policies. Thus, the Soviet leaders will probably continue to try to keep the Congress under control.

As matters now stand, the likelihood on balance is that the Congress will be held and that it will turn out quiet and uneventful. However, either one of these probabilities could be upset by events. Unclassified background information is attached to facilitate assessing any new developments concerning the Congress.

25X1C10b





1115 WH, EUR. CASTRO'S NEW, CONTINENT-WIDE OFFENSIVE

He promotes Guerrillas, opposes "urban-based" Communist Parties

"Left-Wing Communism: An Infantile Disorder."

Lenin

25X1C10b

\* \* \* \* \*

SITUATION: Castro is trying to spark a new offensive of guerrilla warfare in Latin America operating apart from, and often against, the established Communist parties of the hemisphere. While in a sense "new," the operation in many ways is a return to older Castro tactics. Prior to the Havana Conference of November 1964, Castro aided various guerrilla organizations which were not necessarily allied with the local Communist party. This led to strife between the two local groups and between the local party and Havana. At the November 1964 conference of Latin American parties it was agreed that Cuba would thenceforth extend aid only to groups approved by the local party. The agreement was apparently faithfully observed until the Tri-Continent Conference, which convened in Havana in January 1966. The emphasis at the Tri-CC was on revolutionary violence and the word was followed by the deed--at least as far as Castro is concerned.

2. In the past few months guerrilla warfare has flared up in Venezuela, after having been almost eliminated. The offensive is being carried by established guerrilla groups augmented by dissident Communists who have broken away from the Communist party of Venezuela (PCV). They established their bases in the mountains and forests and are now working directly with Havana, which supplies funds, arms, training, and even operational guidance. In the meantime the PCV has been cut off from effective contact with Havana, has been heatedly denounced by Castro, and has borne the brunt of the Venezuelan government's crackdown. Relations were further worsened by the brutal assassination of Dr. Julio Iribarren Borges, the brother of Venezuela's foreign minister. The Havana representative of the Venezuelan guerrillas, Elias Manuit, claimed that his organization, the FALN, had applied "revolutionary justice" against Iribarren. The Venezuelan government then stated that it would protest to the Organization of American States against this gross intervention by Castro. The PCV, in turn, strongly denounced the FALN for the act, attempting to dissociate themselves from government reprisals. On 13 March Castro denied any involvement in the affair and countered by accusing the Venezuelan government of a long series of "crimes against Venezuelan

patriots." His most scathing remarks were directed against the PCV for its efforts to dissociate itself from the assassination. He denounced the party leaders as vacillators, defeatists, cowards, and theorizing charlatans. In a public reply the PCV called Castro's attack ignoble, self-seeking, and treacherous and rejected the "role of revolutionary pope that Fidel Castro asks for himself."

3. The story is much the same in Colombia where the Cuban-backed ELN guerrilla group has made several spectacular attacks against government forces, for which the Communist Party of Colombia (PCC) gets the blame. The PCC leaders are reportedly outraged by Castro's actions and are threatening to "break relations" with Havana. In Guatemala the Cuban-backed guerrilla group, FAR, has been told by Havana that it will get more support when it succeeds in taking control of the Guatemalan Communist Party by ousting "conservative" members of the Central Committee and replacing them with pro-Castroites. The "conservative" party leaders say they would rather disband the party than see it come under Castro's control.

4. Guerrilla fighting has now broken out in Bolivia. First reports say that the guerrillas are partly Bolivian, partly "foreign", well-armed, Cuban trained. There are also reports that a guerrilla-minded faction is breaking away from the Brazilian Communist Party and planning an armed struggle, possibly with support from Paraguayan Communists.

5. The philosophy behind the new Cuban offensive has been set forth in detail in a booklet titled "Revolution Within the Revolution?" by a French Communist, Regis Debray. Debray is a young (26) high-school teacher who became infatuated with Castroism during a visit to Cuba in 1961. He made a tour of Latin America in 1964, studying the experiences of the various Communist parties and guerrilla bands. On the basis of his observations he published an article in Jean Paul Sartre's Les Temps Modernes in January 1965, and a second in July 1965 in Revista, published in Havana. These earned him an invitation to the Tri-Continental Conference in Cuba where he has been ever since, except for a six-weeks' trip to the USSR in September-October 1966. The central thesis of "Revolution Within the Revolution?" (as summarized in the New York Times on 16 March 1967 -- Press Comment of 16 March 1967) is that "the relative failure of revolutionary guerrilla activities in Bolivia, Peru, Colombia, Guatemala and Venezuela in recent years can be attributed to their dependence on urban-based Communist parties for political direction and material support...The new theory promulgated by Mr. Debray is that the political and military command of the revolution must be concentrated in the guerrilla movement, a mobile fighting unit, not in a city-based Communist party leadership." Debray claims that a new guerrilla movement operating on an international scale will soon arise in Latin America.

6. Several sources have reported that Debray is now Castro's favored philosopher, which is not surprising since he expounds what Castro has

long asserted. Debray's booklet was reprinted in two separate Mexican leftist publications, Política and Sucesos para Todos, and extensive abstracts of it have been broadcast in Creole from Havana to Haiti.

25X1C10b

7. While attempting to launch new waves of guerrilla warfare across Latin America, Castro has bitterly criticized Moscow for its economic and diplomatic relations with the governments of Latin America, which he considers "trading with the enemy." His views were bluntly stated in a speech on 13 March 1967 (excerpts attached). The speech also contained violent criticism of certain Soviet-lining Latin American Communist parties, notably the Venezuelan party. Altogether his actions have raised widespread belief that he is directly opposing the Soviets and acting contrary to their interests.


8. We cannot say with certainty to what degree Castro is contravening Soviet interests -- i.e., Moscow's real policy objectives in Latin America, probably differing from ostensible Soviet diplomacy -- nor what degree of control the Soviets can exercise over him. However, for general propaganda purposes, it is usually in our interest to suggest or imply that Castro and the Soviets are acting in collusion and that the apparent bickering between them is either minor or planned. There are useful arguments to support this assertion:

(a) Moscow is not basically opposed to violence. A recent broadcast by Moscow's Radio Peace and Progress lauded the anniversary of the Tri-Continent Conference and gave honorable mention to the guerrilla movements of Guatemala, Venezuela, and Colombia. Pro-Moscow Venezuelan Communist Jesus Faria, as quoted by L'HUMANITE on 17 March 1967 (copy attached), said that the PCV had started and was continuing armed struggle; "our party has not envisaged, much less approved, the abandonment of any one whatsoever of these forms of struggle."

(b) Castro's violence casts the Soviet Union in the role of doves, a useful stance for it in Latin America where it is attempting to expand its diplomatic and commercial contacts. This sort of two-pronged offensive, of carrot and stick, is normal for the Soviets.

(c) Castro could not exist without massive military and economic Soviet support. If the Soviets viewed Castro's actions as seriously harmful, they could certainly devise a wide choice of means to make life considerably more uncomfortable for him, even if they cannot absolutely control his actions. But there has been no known complaint from Moscow, no reduction in their subsidy -- the 1967 trade agreement just concluded promises a 23% increase over last year's -- not even any subtle hints in Pravda; in short, no evidence of friction.







March 1967

Excerpts from speech by Finnish President Kekkonen at North Ostrobothnian Student Corporation festival in Helsinki on 4 February 1967

The communists emerged from "underground" after the war and organized large political, trades and cultural movements. There are communists in the factories, local government councils, science and art, Parliament and parliamentary committees, now even in the government. They participate in the founding of universities and when the funds are made available they go abroad representing their country, and they are written about in the columns of even the so-called bourgeois press. Is all this harmful to the country? On the contrary, have not communists through their own organizations and by the force of their own idealism infused the country with, one would like to say, national spirit and vigour, a new belief in tomorrow and work for its good? With the help of these organizations broader circles have been offered an active social life....

The World Youth Festival was held in Helsinki in summer 1962. I listened to its programme on the radio. A group of young Finnish singers rendered the Finlandia hymn. The participants were declared to be communists and there probably were many of them in this choral group. I heard them sing with bright voices: "Arise Finland, raise high your head crowned with great memories, arise Finland, you showed the world that you rejected serfdom and that you did not succumb to oppression, your day will dawn, Oh native country." I admit that I have seldom listened to the Finlandia hymn in a more receptive mood. I wished at the time that as many Finnish bourgeois as possible were listening to the festival programme.

In speaking of Finnish patriotism, it is my belief that Finland is held equally dear by Finnish communists as by other Finns. The Finnish people would in fact be weak if every fourth citizen were an enemy of the native country. Communists have, no doubt, another idea that their opponents of social and economic justice and its political implementation. Co-operation with the communists for the building of Finnish society thus means for those who think otherwise a clash of ideas. The man who believes in the fitness and vigour of his own idea will have the courage to follow it.

## President Kekkonen on the Role of the Communists

CPYRGHT

**S**PEAKING to students in Helsinki recently on the progress of democracy in Finland over the past decades, President Urho Kekkonen stressed the role of the Communist Party. With close to a quarter of the electorate solidly behind them, the Communists represent a major political force in Finland today.

The President pointed out that the Communists share actively in the work of public and government bodies, are represented in the Cabinet and act as Finland's spokesmen abroad.

"Through their organizations and by the power of their conviction," said he, "the Communists have heightened the national spirit and brought a new optimism and confidence in the mor-

row. They contribute significantly to the common effort. This draws ever wider sections of the population into public activity."

Pronouncing himself for full equality of the Communists with other parties, the President said: "It is essential for the peaceful development of our society to recognize the fundamental right of the people's democrats to share as equals and at government level in the administration of the state. For those who do not share their views, working with the Communists to build up our society involves a contest of ideas. This is a challenge that can be accepted only by those who have confidence in the viability and power of their own ideas..."

Moscow, NEW TIMES, 1 March 1967 CPYRGHT



Helsinki, HELSINGIN SANOMAT, 7 February 1967

Peking (NCNA), 17 March 1967

In defiance of the strong opposition by many member organizations of the council of the Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Organization and the revolutionary people in Asia and Africa, the illegal eighth council session of the organization held in Nicosia under the manipulation of the Soviet revisionists blatantly threw overboard the resolution adopted by the 1965 Winneba conference on the convocation of the fifth Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Conference in Peking in 1967, and arbitrarily decided to hold a bogus fifth conference in Algiers. In this way, the Soviet revisionists have openly split the Afro-Asian people's movement for solidarity against imperialism, completely unmasked themselves and exposed their counterrevolutionary features to the broad light of day.

Worming their way into the Afro-Asian people's solidarity movement, the Soviet revisionists have consistently followed a counterrevolutionary line of sham opposition to imperialism but real capitulation, sham support but real betrayal, sham unity but real split, and have done no end of evil. At the above-mentioned meeting they went to the length of using the most unscrupulous means, like a dying man in his last struggle. Making use of this illegal meeting, they conducted a counterrevolutionary, antipopular, and anti-Chinese farce. They caused this meeting to assume a hypocritical posture of "supporting Vietnam" to cover up their double-dealing in peddling the "peace talk" scheme for U.S. imperialism and splitting the Afro-Asian people's solidarity movement. Organizationally, they recruited turncoats and renegades, drawing some people in while pushing out and attacking the revolutionaries. They even called police to the meeting hall to intimidate revolutionary delegates, practicing fascist dictatorship over them. The Afro-Asian people will never tolerate this.

In order to change the venue of the fifth conference and accomplish their scheme of creating a split, the Soviet revisionists, in the course of the meeting, frantically slandered and attacked China's great proletarian cultural revolution and the great and invincible thought of Mao Tse-tung. But they are like "mayflies lightly plotting to topple a giant tree." The world-shaking great proletarian cultural revolution in China is encouraging the oppressed nations and peoples to rise up in rebellion and defeat imperialism, revisionism, and the reactionaries of all countries.

The brilliant thought of Mao Tse-tung is increasingly winning the hearts of the people. It has illuminated the path of struggle for the revolutionary people of Asia, Africa, Latin America and the whole world and is guiding the world's people to complete liberation. Even at this schismatic and anti-Chinese Nicosia meeting manipulated by the Soviet revisionists, delegates from such organizations as the South West African National Union, the Bechuanaland People's Party, the Swaziland Progressive Party and

the Basutoland Congress Party, inspired by the invincible thought of Mao Tse-tung, justly and sternly denounced the Soviet revisionists' crime of splitting the Afro-Asian people's solidarity movement and unhesitatingly withdrew from the meeting. They held high the red-covered "Quotations From Chairman Mao Tse-tung" and spoke out the common desire of the Afro-Asian people: "We want to be in Peking for the fifth Afro-Asian people's solidarity conference; we want to meet Chairman Mao!"

The Chinese people send revolutionary greetings to the African freedom fighters who are fearless before violence and dare to struggle. The Chinese Committee for Afro-Asian Solidarity reaffirms its statement issued on 3 February 1967: The Chinese people will not fail to meet the expectations of the Afro-Asian peoples and are determined to convene the fifth Afro-Asian people's solidarity conference in Peking in 1967. We hereby formally announce that the Chinese preparatory committee for the fifth Afro-Asian people's solidarity conference has been officially set up. It will undertake preparations for the fifth conference with friends from all countries who uphold the revolutionary line of solidarity against imperialism. The Chinese people warmly invite friends from the Asian and African countries to come to Peking, the bulwark of the world struggle against imperialism, and to make common efforts to insure that the fifth Afro-Asian people's solidarity conference is revolutionary, militant, united, and successful.

It must be pointed out that the present permanent Secretariat of the Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Organization in Cairo is already in the control of the Soviet revisionists. Correct propositions put forth by the secretaries of the different countries, who defend the revolutionary line of solidarity against imperialism and stand for what is just, have long been arbitrarily suppressed. As a matter of fact, the permanent Secretariat has already degenerated into a tool of the Soviet revisionists for implementing their counterrevolutionary line. We therefore declare that we shall henceforth have nothing to do with this organ.

The Soviet revisionist leading clique has betrayed the October revolution, consistently undermined the national liberation movement of the Afro-Asian people, and acted as the number one accomplice of U.S. imperialism. Now it has split from the Afro-Asian people's solidarity movement so that it can be of more use to U.S. imperialism and sell out the Afro-Asian people's cause of solidarity against imperialism. With the removal of this cancer -- the Soviet revisionists -- the Afro-Asian people's cause of solidarity against imperialism will undergo a sounder development and forge ahead more vigorously. "Past the sunken boat, a thousand vessels sail; beyond the withered tree, ten thousand saplings spring." A completely new solidarity movement against imperialism which really gives expression to the revolutionary aspirations of the Afro-Asian people will surely come into being. Let the new czars in the Kremlin who are in mortal fear of the Afro-Asian people's cause of solidarity against imperialism wail and tremble!

The great leader of the Chinese people Chairman Mao has said:  
"People of the world, unite and defeat the U.S. aggressors and all their running dogs! People of the world, be courageous, dare to fight, defy difficulties, and advance wave upon wave. Then the whole world will belong to the people. Monsters of all kinds shall be destroyed."

Everywhere in Asia and Africa, there now appears an inspiring vista of militant struggle. The revolutionary people of the two continents are rising, regrouping their forces, and advancing rapidly along the road of independence and liberation. With the force of an avalanche and the power of a thunderbolt, they will certainly bring to bear their full strength against imperialism, colonialism and neocolonialism headed by the United States, modern revisionism, and all monsters and freaks and eventually bury them all. A new Asia and Africa, radiant with splendor, will certainly appear on the horizon. The fifth Afro-Asian people's solidarity conference to be held in Peking will be a clarion call to the Afro-Asian people to battle for new victory. All people of Asia and Africa who want independence and liberation, unite, form the broadest possible genuine anti-U.S. united front to fight for the realization of our great common goal!

Radio Moscow, 11 March 1967.

(Statement by Professor Georgiy Kim, executive member of the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee, member of the Soviet delegation at the Nicosia meeting of the Afro-Asian Solidarity Organization.)

The Nicosia council meeting of AAPSO was held during an alarming situation when the military machine of the largest imperialist power, the United States, was cruelly crushing our sister nation, Vietnam. The events now taking place in Vietnam deeply concern all peoples of all continents.

The U.S. aggression in Vietnam is nothing but an attempt by international imperialism to launch a counteroffensive against the revolutionary and national liberation forces. That was why the delegations of practically all countries represented at the council meeting -- and more than 50 countries attended -- attached so much importance to the Vietnam problem. All the speakers clearly realized the urgency of stepping up practical aid to the Vietnamese people.

The meeting gave a warm reception to the head of the Soviet delegation Mr. Pimenov, who described the diverse aid the USSR is rendering the fraternal Vietnamese people. The council session also paid due attention to the support given to the liberation of the peoples of Angola, Mozambique, Portuguese Guinea, and South Arabia. It stressed the urgency of a more decisive struggle against racism.

An indicator of the majority feeling within the Afro-Asian solidarity movement was the desire of the council participants to effectively remove everything that interferes with the movement's unity. At present the world anti-imperialist movement is going through many difficulties because of the splitting activities of the Mao Tse-tung group.

Incidentally, attempts were made at the Nicosia meeting to break up the meeting on instructions from that group. The brazen behavior of two men who posed as NCNA correspondents but who had arrived in Nicosia to interfere with the normal working of the Afro-Asian forum was met with outrage. They urged a group of African students studying in West Europe to try to use the meeting for slander, similar to that used by the Hung Weiping, against AAPSO. But this noisy group represented no one and was severely reprimanded by the chairman of the Cyprus solidarity committee and the meeting's chairman, Dr. Vassos Lissaridhis. The group had to leave the conference hall. At the persistent demands of the majority at the meeting the group was expelled from the solidarity meeting. The splitters' voices were in discord in the general stream of demands for the movement's unity. Delegates from Angola, Madagascar, and Sudan, among many other countries, decisively denounced those who place their narrow selfish interests above the holy task of the common struggle.



It is no secret that U.S. imperialism is now placing special hopes upon differences and a division in the ranks of the revolutionary anti-imperialist forces. It was for precisely this reason that the participants in the meeting in Nicosia declared that all who hold these great ideals dear must rally in one rank. There is no more important task today than reaching unity in the struggle against the aggressive designs of imperialism. All participants showed they clearly understood that the successes of the national liberation movement are closely linked to support from the socialist countries. The desire for unity was also expressed in the council's decision to shift the seat of the next, fifth, AAPSO conference to Algiers. Earlier, the place was to be Peking, but many national committees have asked that the conference be held in another country as the conditions in China are not conducive for successful work.

Let us go to Algiers under the slogan of unity of our ranks. Let us preserve and strengthen our movement which is called upon to play an important role in the nation's struggle for freedom, independence, and social progress.

U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT  
3 April 1967

CPYRGHT

CPYRGHT

## A BID FOR PEACE...

Full text of a letter—dated February 2 and made public March 21—that President Lyndon Johnson sent to President Ho Chi Minh of Communist North Vietnam:

Dear Mr. President:

I am writing to you in the hope that the conflict in Vietnam can be brought to an end. That conflict has already taken a heavy toll—in lives lost, in wounds inflicted, in property destroyed and in simple human misery. If we fail to find a just and peaceful solution, history will judge us harshly.

Therefore, I believe that we both have a heavy obligation to seek earnestly the path to peace. It is in response to that obligation that I am writing directly to you.

We have tried over the past several years, in a variety of ways and through a number of channels, to convey to you and your colleagues our desire to achieve a peaceful settlement. For whatever reasons, these efforts have not achieved any results.

It may be that our thoughts and yours, our attitudes and yours, have been distorted or misinterpreted as they passed through these various channels. Certainly that is always a danger in indirect communication.

There is one good way to overcome this problem and to move forward in the search for a peaceful settlement. That is for us to arrange for direct talks between trusted representatives in a secure setting and away from the glare of publicity. Such talks should not be used as a propaganda exercise, but should be a serious effort to find a workable and mutually acceptable solution.

In the past two weeks, I have noted public statements by representatives of your Government suggesting that you would be prepared to enter into direct bilateral talks with representatives of the U. S. Government, provided that we ceased "unconditionally" and permanently our bombing operations against your country and all military actions against it. In the last day, serious and responsible parties have assured us indirectly that this is, in fact, your proposal.

Let me frankly state that I see two great difficulties with this proposal. In view of your public position, such action on our part would inevitably produce worldwide speculation that discussions were under way and would impair the privacy and secrecy of those discussions. Secondly, there would inevitably be grave concern on our part whether your Government would make use of such action by us to improve its military position.

With these problems in mind, I am prepared to move even further toward an ending of hostilities than your Government has proposed in either public statements or through

private diplomatic channels. I am prepared to order a cessation of bombing against your country and the stopping of further augmentation of United States forces in South Vietnam as soon as I am assured that infiltration into South Vietnam by land and by sea has stopped. These acts of restraint on both sides would, I believe, make it possible for us to conduct serious and private discussions leading toward an early peace.

I make this proposal to you now with a specific sense of urgency arising from the imminent new-year holidays in Vietnam. If you are able to accept this proposal, I see no reason why it could not take effect at the end of the new-year, or Tet, holidays.

The proposal I have made would be greatly strengthened if your military authorities and those of the Government of South Vietnam could promptly negotiate an extension of the Tet truce.

As to the site of the bilateral discussions I propose, there are several possibilities. We could, for example, have our representatives meet in Moscow where contacts have already occurred. They could meet in some other country, such as Burma. You may have other arrangements or sites in mind, and I would try to meet your suggestions.

The important thing is to end a conflict that has brought burdens to both our peoples, and, above all, to the people of South Vietnam. If you have any thoughts about the actions I propose, it would be most important that I receive them as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Lyndon B. Johnson

...AND A REBUFF :



CPYRGHT

CPYRGHT

**Full text of Ho Chi Minh's reply to the Johnson letter. This was sent to Mr. Johnson on February 15, and its contents broadcast by the Vietnam News Agency on March 21:**

Your Excellency:

On Feb. 10, 1967, I received your message. This is my reply:

Vietnam is thousands of miles away from the United States. The Vietnamese people have never done any harm to the United States. But, contrary to the pledges made by its representative at the 1954 Geneva Conference, the U. S. Government has ceaselessly intervened in Vietnam. It has unleashed and intensified the war of aggression in South Vietnam with a view to prolonging the partition of Vietnam and turning South Vietnam into a neocolony and a military base of the United States. For over two years now, the U. S. Government has, with its air and naval forces, carried the war to the Democratic Republic of [North] Vietnam, an independent and sovereign country.

The U. S. Government has committed war crimes, crimes against peace and against mankind. In South Vietnam, half a million U. S. and satellite troops have resorted to the most inhuman weapons and the most barbarous methods of warfare, such as napalm, toxic chemicals and gases, to massacre our compatriots, destroy crops, and raze villages to the ground.

In North Vietnam, thousands of U. S. aircraft have

dropped hundreds of thousands of tons of bombs, destroying towns, villages, factories, schools.

In your message, you apparently deplored the sufferings and destruction in Vietnam.

May I ask you: Who has perpetrated these monstrous crimes? It is the U. S. and satellite troops. The U. S. Government is entirely responsible for the extremely serious situation in Vietnam.

The U. S. war of aggression against the Vietnamese people constitutes a challenge to the countries of the socialist camp, a threat to the national independence movement, and a serious danger to peace in Asia and the world.

The Vietnamese people deeply love independence, freedom and peace.

But, in the face of the U. S. aggression, they have risen up, united as one man, fearless of sacrifices and hardships. They are determined to carry on their resistance until they have won genuine independence and freedom and true peace. Our just cause enjoys strong sympathy and support from the peoples of the whole world, including broad sections of the American people.

The U. S. Government has unleashed the war of aggression in Vietnam. It must cease this aggression. That is the only way to the restoration of peace. The U. S. Government must stop definitively and unconditionally its bombing raids and all other acts of war against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, withdraw from South Vietnam all U. S. and satellite troops, recognize the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation, and let the Vietnamese people settle themselves their own affairs. Such is the basis (*sic*) content of the five-point stand of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, which embodies the essential principles and provisions of the 1954 Geneva Agreements on Vietnam. It is the basic (*sic*) of a correct political solution to the Vietnam problem.

In your message, you suggested direct talks between the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the United States. If the U. S. Government really wants these talks, it must first of all stop unconditionally its bombing raids and all other acts of war against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. It is only after the unconditional cessation of the U. S. bombing raids and all other acts of war against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam that the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the United States could enter into talks and discuss questions concerning the two sides.

The Vietnamese people will never submit to force, they will never accept talks under the threat of bombs.


Our cause is absolutely just. It is to be hoped that the U. S. Government will act in accordance with reason.

Sincerely,

Ho Chi Minh



# Worldgram<sup>®</sup>



INTERNATIONAL WEEK<sup>®</sup>

FROM THE CAPITALS OF THE WORLD

BANGKOK....SAIGON....TAIPEI....BEIRUT....CAPE TOWN....

>> As Southeast Asia reads the future after the exchange of letters between President Johnson of the U.S. and President Ho of Communist North Vietnam....  
There is almost no chance at all of a negotiated peace in Vietnam.

>> "Hanoi cannot negotiate!" That is what our staff man hears in Bangkok. Communist rule in North Vietnam is based on a promise to conquer the South. North Vietnam alone is overpopulated, poor. Russia will not and Red China cannot make the North an industrial state. It needs the South's rice and land. Hanoi's Red bureaucracy--the 300,000 to 400,000 who run the dictatorship-- may now see that they cannot win the war in the South. But old men are clinging to old ideas. Ho is 76. His aides are mainly in their 60s and 70s. Bangkok's experts say these men will not risk peace talks--ever.

>> What about a slowdown of the war if Hanoi's Reds get more punishment than they can bear? That's possible, say Southeast Asians who know Hanoi's leaders. Even then, they say, negotiations are not likely. Hanoi's old men may one day let war run down, send fewer combat troops south. But talks? No.

>> Keep this in mind about President Johnson's offer to halt U.S. bombing of the North if Ho's men will quit sending troops into war in the South....  
Ho has never admitted his Northerners are in combat in South Vietnam. True, there is evidence enough to convince all save die-hard Reds. But Ho is not likely to talk about quitting what he has never admitted doing.

>> Suddenly there is overwhelming evidence that Hanoi's Reds are waging the war in the South. U.S. forces have just overrun Communist headquarters and base camps in a major sweep. The intelligence haul adds up to this:  
200,000 pages of documents concerning Viet Cong and North Vietnamese Red operations in South Vietnam. 140 reels of motion-picture films, plus many still photographs of North Vietnamese regulars commanding and fighting in the South. Letters, diaries telling how, when and where Hanoi's troops are operating.

>> Conclusions of U.S. intelligence men checking over the evidence in Saigon: North Vietnamese regulars are 40 per cent of Red main forces in the South. A North Vietnamese general has run the war in the South for over two years. So-called "National Liberation Front" of South Vietnamese Reds turns out to be only a façade for Hanoi's Reds. The NLF issues no orders in the South, has no chain of command, military or political, no real power in South Vietnam.

There is no room for doubt. It's Ho's war. Ho's decision to keep fighting.

WASHINGTON POST  
28 March 1967

**Secretary General Warns of Danger Of Wider War**

By Robert H. Estabrook  
*Washington Post Foreign Service*

**UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., March 28**—Secretary General U Thant made public today the peace proposals for Vietnam that he presented to all participants on March 24.

He also warned of "ominous indications that the Vietnam war may spread beyond its present frontiers and that the United Nations itself may be suffocated.

The peace proposals call for:

- A general "standstill" truce.
- "Preliminary talks" between the United States and North Vietnam that could include Britain and the Soviet Union as co-chairmen of the 1954 Geneva Conference, or Canada, India and Poland as members of the International Control Commission, or all seven nations.
- Reconvening of the 1954 Geneva conference with the participation of the Saigon government and the National Liberation Front (Vietcong).

The United States has accepted these proposals and offered to enter into discussion on details of a cessation of hostilities "immediately and constructively."

Hanoi Radio has excoriated Thant's plan as unrealistic and insisted that the United Nations has no right to interfere. An informed ambassador said this afternoon that this was the only outright opposition so far to Thant's proposals.

CPYRIGHT

**Hanoi's Position Seen Isolating It In World Opinion**

By Murrey Marder  
*Washington Post Staff Writer*

The United States disclosed yesterday an "affirmative" reply to a new peace plan by U.N. Secretary General U Thant and matched this against a "negative" response from North Vietnam.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk treated Hanoi's public attack on the Thant proposal Monday, before it was made public, as the equivalent of a rejection.

**Justification For U.S.**

Rusk claimed that by spurning the new proposal, which would start with "a general standstill truce" in all Vietnam, Hanoi has newly isolated itself in world opinion. Rusk told a news conference, "The principal pillars of their hopes are eroding from under them."

What is probably the prime significance of the new diplomatic rebuff by Hanoi was evident by implication: It can serve the United States as added justification for pressing the war in both North and South Vietnam with greater intensity.

The support the United States now can display for its demand to reduce hostilities on both sides as a prelude to peace talks, also is bound to increase pressure inside the Administration for intensified strikes.

All Rusk would say on the key point of future U.S. actions was to reiterate firmly: "We shall meet our commitments in South Vietnam. We shall do our duty there."

**No Great Surprise**

There was no great surprise in official circles over Hanoi's criticism of the Thant proposal.

BALTIMORE SUN  
30 March 1967

**HANOI ADAMANCY PUZZLING TO U.S.**

**China's Influence Cited As Possible Reason**

By PAUL W. WARD

*(Washington Bureau of The Sun)*

Washington, March 29—United States officials confess to being mystified by the uncompromising resistance of South Vietnam's foes to all peace proposals, including the plan which U Thant, United Nations Secretary General, made public yesterday.

Canvassed for explanations for Hanoi's adamant stand, some of them suggested today that it may be dictated by Communist China, North Vietnam's chief supplier of arms, ammunition and food.

**Czechoslovakian Radio**

They cited, in that connection, a March 26 broadcast by Czechoslovakia's radio that called for a "compromise" between Hanoi and Washington and added:

"Unfortunately, Vietnam is situated too close to China, and Chinese advice does not always go unheeded."

Others, stressing the current upward trend in defections among the Communist-led forces in Vietnam, suggested Hanoi has to broadcast denunciations of all peace proposals in order to prevent disintegration of those forces.

But most were disposed to second what Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, said at a press

conference here yesterday when asked what "makes them keep on fighting and refusing to negotiate in the face of what must be a loss of international support."

"It is very hard to say: I can't enter into the minds of the leaders in Hanoi on a matter of that sort," Rusk replied, adding:

"I would suppose, really, that they are under some misapprehension. They are making some misjudgments and miscalculations on some point—either the state of international opinion or the state of opinion within the United States.

"It's possible even that they still have some slender hopes of some military success in the South . . . but . . . the principal pillars of their hopes are eroding from under them, and they should become interested in peace . . . at an early date and not at some long delayed future date."

**Private Efforts**

Rusk prefaced all that by stressing that Hanoi's scornful publication March 21 of a theretofore secret peace proposal made February 8 by President Johnson and Thant's avowedly reluctant publication yesterday of one he had made March 14 completes the record of "private" peacemaking efforts to date.

"Despite all of the efforts made privately by many people in many places, the private record and the public record are now in agreement," he said, adding that "there is nothing in the private record that reflects any different view on the part of the authorities in Hanoi than you now have on the public record."

WASHINGTON POST  
24 March 1967

CPYRGHT

# Brooke Backs Johnson On War, 'Reluctantly'

By J. Y. Smith

Washington Post Staff Writer

Sen. Edward W. Brooke (R-Mass.) "reluctantly" joined yesterday the supporters of President Johnson on the war in Vietnam.

"This is far from an easy position for me to take," said the Senator, who has frequently expressed misgivings about the bombing of North Vietnam and American efforts to secure peace in Southeast Asia.

He had taken it, he said, because Hanoi "continues to place unreasonable conditions on the negotiations for a peaceful settlement. It does not appear that suspension of the bombing in the North would, by itself, produce fruitful negotiations."

A just-completed trip to South Vietnam and five other Asian nations had led him to conclude, the Senator continued, "that the general direction of our present military efforts in Vietnam is necessary."

Brooke made the statement in his first major speech in the Senate. His mother, Mrs. Helen Brooke of Washington, was in the half-filled visitors' gallery as he spoke. Brooke is the first Negro ever elected to the Senate by direct popular vote.

LOS ANGELES TIMES  
23 March 1967

By William Tuohy

Los Angeles Times

SAIGON, March 23 -- A

western diplomat who recently chatted with Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap in Hanoi says the North Vietnamese Defense Minister is confident of winning the war.

This diplomat indicated that Giap, the architect of the Vietnamese Communist victory over the French in 1954, believes the 1968 U.S. presidential election will repudiate President Johnson's Vietnam policies.

Giap's view of the U.S. political situation has apparently been reinforced by the public controversy between President Johnson and Sen. Robert F. Kennedy (D-N.Y.) over bombing the North, sources indicated.

### Erroneous View

Giap's reportedly "cheerful" assessment of the war—from the North Vietnamese point of view — conforms with recent propaganda statements made by Hanoi.

Hanoiologists in Saigon have long maintained that North Vietnamese leaders have a totally erroneous view of U.S. public opinion, in that they believe there is an overwhelming tide of U.S. feeling against involvement in the war.

In their propaganda and public statements, North Vietnamese leaders have suggested that they need hold out only until the 1968 elections when a frustrated American public will vote for a "peace" candidate, who will pull American forces out of Vietnam. Hanoi's propaganda still pic-

tures as a great American hero the pacifist Robert Morrison who burned himself to death outside the Pentagon as a protest against the American involvement in Vietnam.

Thus, according to the specialists in Saigon, President Johnson's recent moves to tighten the screws on North Vietnam may be vitiated by the statements attributed to Kennedy and Sen. J. W. Fulbright (D-Ark.), calling for a halt to the bombings.

### Prevailing Opinion

It is difficult for Hanoi to believe, these experts say, that Kennedy and Fulbright do not represent prevailing American opinion.

That two such powerful Senators are so vocally opposed to President Johnson's policies signifies to the North Vietnamese that millions of Americans share their views, according to Hanoiologists.

And that is why the North Vietnamese leaders like Giap are confident that by the fall of 1968 the American people will have run out of patience with the commitment in Vietnam.

CPYRGHT

April 1967

HANOI'S REJECTION OF U.S. PROPOSAL

Ho Chi Minh's letter rejecting a U.S. peace bid was seen by the foreign press as a propaganda failure for North Vietnam. Editors said Ho had "slammed the door" on negotiations in his bitter reply, thereby enhancing Mr. Johnson's position as a peace seeker.

The Washington correspondent of Munich's left-center SUEDEDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG declared: "President Johnson can expect an improvement in the domestic political climate for his Vietnam policy.... Although the State Department has regretted the disclosure, Ho Chi Minh no doubt has rendered Johnson a great service..."

Right-of-center FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE said Ho had rendered "a great political service by depicting Mr. Johnson as a man who does not exploit his peace efforts for propaganda purposes, and lays himself open to charges of inactivity rather than let his peace feelers be jeopardized by premature disclosure."

Ho's action was "tantamount to blowing up a bridge that has been established with great difficulty," the paper said, "Useful preparations for peace talks have been destroyed. The most valuable capital involved was the secrecy of the contacts in Moscow and via Moscow. Such a breach of confidence is not easy to repair."

Independent-right STUTTGARTER ZEITUNG asserted:

"Some of the President's critics at home will appreciate the fact that Johnson is really trying to bring about a peaceful settlement, and that the continued course of the conflict is dictated by the stubbornness and relentlessness of the North Vietnamese, more than anything else."

Pro-Christian Democratic MUENCHNER MERKUR of Munich judged: "By disclosing the exchange of letters, Ho Chi Minh has not only proved himself inaccessible even to the most reasonable offers, but he has slammed the door to negotiations for the foreseeable future. He has pulled the rug from under the feet of America's doves."

Influential DIE WELT of Hamburg said Ho's "icy no" was "a capital mistake," to be contrasted with President Johnson's "remarkably circumspect" letter, which did "not contain anything that might be interpreted as reflecting arrogance of power..."

In London, the conservative DAILY MAIL said:

Mr. Johnson's letter was "couched in terms of almost abasing moderation and avoidance of self-rightedness," while Ho Chi

Minh offered "nothing but the old, stale agitprop slogans, the old lies, the old claims to represent the entire Vietnamese people, the old inflexible refusal of any kind of moderation."

The GUARDIAN's Washington correspondent reported that the publication of the letters "has made a considerable impact here. It has gone a long way towards convincing critics of the Administration of two points -- that they have been less than just to the President in calling into question the seriousness with which he has been seeking to bring Hanoi to the conference table, and that they have been unwarrantably optimistic about the readiness of Ho Chi Minh to negotiate."

In Italy, Rome's independent-center MESSAGGERO carried a report from New York that "Johnson and the Democratic Administration come out of this looking very good indeed.... We see a new Johnson here. He endured unjust attacks rather than seek short-range popularity. His hope was that his silence would help negotiations."

Influential CORRIERE DELLA SERA of Milan said:

"Johnson emerges strengthened from this, and his critics have been weakened.... It would have been easy for Johnson to answer Senator Kennedy and the Democratic Party's left wing by publishing this exchange of letters. Some White House advisers counseled this, but Johnson refused rather than compromise talks with Vietnam. It is a paradox that Hanoi has helped Johnson by revealing all this."

Christian Democratic POPOLO, Rome, said that "at least, a first contact has been made.... The doors to an honorable peace are at least open." Independent-conservative RESTO DEL CARLINO of Bologna declared: "The impression is that all that is needed to get negotiations under way is a bit of courage on each side in taking a first step."

French papers were mystified and dismayed at Hanoi's action. Conservative FIGARO'S Washington correspondent asked: "Doesn't Mr. Ho Chi Minh understand that he has just singularly simplified Mr. Johnson's task? One is struck with dismay at such misapprehension of the psychology of the mass of American people. Once again the two adversaries give the impression of living on two different planets. This hardly permits much optimism."

Moderate-right LA CROIX demanded: "Why did Hanoi believe it opportune to make the exchange of letters public while, most evidently, only secret diplomacy can reach a compromise?"



Elite LE MONDE said Hanoi had "put itself in the wrong" in American eyes, while Mr. Johnson's letter would be credited as "evidence of goodwill on the domestic propaganda level." The U.S. was "waging the war in order to reach a 'Korean solution' embellished with a few harmless concessions in order to help Hanoi to retreat.... The response from Hanoi has made it clear that there cannot be any possible deal in this perspective. This may not be a surprise for Washington, but it is nevertheless a shock. The war will continue to downright barbarity."

The paper added: "This is no good news for the White House, which officially takes refuge behind 'limited objectives' -- limited to a continent -- in order to preach patience to the Americans."

Belgium's HET VOLK of Ghent accused Ho of an act of "diplomatic vandalism" by which "a number of previously open channels have been closed.

"What does Ho do"? He waits until the truce is over and even lets the extra day Johnson offered him go by. Only after the bombings have been resumed from sheer necessity does he send his answer, stating that he cannot negotiate 'under pressure of American bombing.'

"Now he crowns that destructive action by bringing everything out into the open. Not only have contacts via Moscow or Rangoon, as was proposed by Johnson, become useless, but future contacts via other channels are considerably hindered in view of the danger of premature publication and use for enemy propaganda."

Center-oriented DER BUND of Bern said the text of Mr. Johnson's message "shows convincingly that, this time at least, it was an absolutely honest, aboveboard, and realistic attempt. Doubters of American sincerity and readiness to negotiate have had the wind taken out of their sails -- and by Hanoi itself, which first broke the silence."

The Washington correspondent of the prestigious NEUE ZUERCHER ZEITUNG said the North Vietnamese action "significantly strengthens the President's position vis-a-vis all his American critics, and it can hardly do Hanoi any good.... One has the feeling that Hanoi is burning its bridges."

Ho's conduct, the paper judged, "is the more inscrutable since the revelation of this exchange of letters seems to benefit Johnson." The latter's message "is proof of the earnestness with which he has followed the peace line of his double course."

Conservative SVENSKA DAGBLADET of Stockholm said channels for contacts had been damaged but the new situation had "certain advantages" for Washington: "Critics of the U.S. have made a great point of the Americans' coolness to peace feelers presumably made by North Vietnam. While the factual basis for such soundings was doubtful to say the least, Ho Chi Minh has now personally confirmed that Johnson actually did make a concrete proposal."

In Australia, the Sydney MORNING HERALD found the "most disturbing feature of President Ho's letter was precisely the tone of arrogance.... There is little doubt that President Johnson is prepared to take the harder measures his military advisers have long been urging. No other course seems to be open to him...."

"But the balance sheet is not entirely on the debit side. A meeting place has been arranged and may be used again. The Americans and the Russians have shown their desire to put an end to killing. The North Vietnamese have registered their conditions. The military strategists might subject them to a cool, careful review."

Hanoi's role has at last been clarified, the NEW ZEALAND HERALD of Auckland said:

"The fiction that North Vietnam is only a minor participant is no longer maintained. The Hanoi regime emerges clearly as the principal with which a settlement must be reached."

ASAHI, however, insisted that "the disclosure at this time of an abortive secret contact is not a useful factor toward settlement" of the conflict, "for it appears to be the renewed expression of Hanoi's firm resolve... This is pessimistic material for peace."

The HINDU of Madras said: "The correspondence makes it clear that Hanoi is not prepared to embark on peace negotiations with the Americans which would involve the closing of the frontier between North and South Vietnam and the denial of recognition to the Viet Cong as the only spokesmen of South Vietnamese nationalism. Hanoi is evidently confident that the Viet Cong, which it controls and directs, will win the allegiance of the South Vietnamese people and keep the American forces at bay.

"In spite of the stepping up of the air raids on the north, the North Vietnamese believe that victory will ultimately be theirs."

April 1967

Background of relations between the CPSU party and intellectuals in the Soviet Union, 1946 to early 1966.

The role of Andrey Zhdanov in Party-intellectual relationships was of great importance between 1946 and the death of Stalin. With some fluctuations in intensity, Zhdanov throttled free expression and attempted to harness writers to the service of the state. He assaulted "cosmopolitanism," an action equivalent to anti-Semitism. Although he died in 1948, his influence was such that the entire period from 1946 to 1953 was known as the "zhdanovshchina," a synonym for cultural terror. Thus, the mention in IZVESTIYA of 25 Feb 66 of Zhdanov on his 70th birthday as "a true son of the people" could well be interpreted as a threat by the regime to increase its restrictive measures unless the intellectuals get back into line.

Upon Stalin's death a short-lived surge in freer intellectual expression was observed. It was curtailed in mid-1953, resumed in 1954, accelerated in early 1956, halted in late 1956, reversed in mid-1957, expanded in 1959, halted in late 1962, cautiously resumed in mid-1963 after which it increased somewhat until October 1964 when Khrushchev was ousted.

During the first 4 months of the regime of Brezhnev and Kosygin the intellectuals substantially stepped up their outpouring of anti-Stalinist expression.

The first sign of a reaction against the intellectuals was detected in early March, 1965, in a published report of the RSFSR Writers' Congress. There, to gasps of dismay from the liberals, Soviet literature and films were criticized by the conservatives who quoted the Chinese Communists. From then on, an increasingly bitter exchange between the more liberal and the conservative organs was witnessed. It was capped and epitomized by two articles, one by Sergei Pavlov, the head of the Komsomol, and the other by the 60-year-old Aleksey Rumyantsev, the chief editor of PRAVDA. Pavlov, writing in PRAVDA of 29 Aug, lashed out at movies, literature, and the theater for the unhealthy criticism which was engendering "nihilism" in youth, and he pointed out the need for caution in dealing with the cult of the personality (i.e., attacks on Stalin). Rumyantsev in PRAVDA of 9 September, apparently in rebuttal to Pavlov and others, stated his belief that nihilism is engendered by hushing up and glossing over difficulties, not by the passionate effort to expose wrongs in order to set them right; to underscore the meaning of his words, he went down the list of the liberals under attack and defended them.

Within the next 10 to 12 days, Sinyavsky and Daniel were picked up by the KGB, and Rumyantsev was removed from his job. (Rumyantsev now has an insignificant job with the Academy of Sciences.) Pavlov, on the other hand, is still the chief of the Komsomol and he has spoken out

(Cont.)

further in the vein of the hard line. The hard line, especially in IZVESTIYA, became dominant and more strident in Soviet media. In January in PRAVDA, for the first time in years, "cosmopolitanism" was referred to as something to be fought. And, seemingly to bring the circle to a close, the above-noted reference to Zhdanov was made in IZVESTIYA.

Some feeble opposition to the above-noted trend has been observed. NOVY MIR, the liberal writers' organ, has defied the implied ban on publication of unacceptable material. Individual writers, such as Paustovskiy, have protested against the Sinyavsky and Daniel case. And PRAVDA held back for some time before joining the ranks of the hard liners attacking the two. PRAVDA also commemorated the 20th Party Congress, implicitly supporting de-Stalinization; but it also praised Zhdanov.

Background to Soviet Writers Congress

The first three Writers Congress were held in 1934, 1954, and 1959 under circumstances either favorable or not unfavorable to the Soviet regime. Careful preparations by Stalin's regime were started two years before the 1934 Congress. The 1954 Congress was held at a time when writers had been restrained once again after having enjoyed immediately after Stalin's death a short respite from the tight control of the Party. The 1959 Congress took place at a time when the writers and the regime were on relatively good terms with one another.

In spite of these circumstances, some differences between the writers and the regime were allowed to rise to the surface. At the 1954 Congress several writers commented boldly on the flood of trashy literature; this was the first skirmish between Party and intellectuals after the long period of Stalinist suppression and terror. In 1959, at the Third Congress, whereas proceedings appeared to run smoothly several well-known authors published biting articles in the press in defense of creative freedom.

The fourth Writers Congress, now scheduled to begin on May 22, 1967, was due originally in 1963, four years after the Third Congress. In the fall of 1964, immediately after Khrushchev's ouster, public references were made to writers' expectations that the next congress would be held in early 1965. The largest republic in the USSR, the RSFSR, held its Writers Congress, evidently in the expectation that the national congress would be held shortly thereafter. Again in the winter of 1965 references were made to the effect that writers expected their national congress to be held in the middle of that year. In early 1966 Aleksey Markov, a secretary of the Writers Union, said that the congress would be held in June of that year. (Pravda, January 28, 1966) Finally, it was announced in the fall of 1966 that the Writers Congress would be held before the end of the year. (Pravda, September 19, 1966)

This record of frequent postponements of the Writers Congress is reason enough to raise doubts that the most recently announced congress will actually take place. Adding to these doubts is a series of developments since the Sinyavsky-Daniel trial of February 1966, including:

-the events at the 23rd Congress of the CPSU in March-April 1966, when the "liberal" authors were virtually excluded and the Stalinist voice on literature was prominently featured (as contrasted to the preceding Party Congress in 1962, when Aleksandr Tvardovsky, the outstanding liberal, gave the address which was regarded as representing writers' views);

-a growing effort by intellectuals from many spheres of creative activity in the USSR to protest at the highest levels against the Sinyavsky-Daniel trial and restalinization, and against the restraints imposed on the freedom of thought in the USSR;

-The Soviet regime's apparently continuing dissatisfaction with the production of literary works in general, as evidenced by its refusal to present any Lenin Prize awards for literature in 1965 and 1966, and its nomination in 1967 of only two relatively little-known poets for such awards;

-a significant reduction in the number and boldness of published literary works by "liberal" authors;

-a concerted effort to strip NOVY MIR (NEW WORLD) of its leadership and thus (it is widely conjectured) to quiet the voice of that widely respected literary journal which has been the main vehicle for liberal writers (see the Literary Supplement to the London TIMES, March 2, 1967, and the ECONOMIST, March 11, 1967).

Opposing all the above reasons for doubting that the Writers Congress will take place as scheduled is the fanfare given the announcement in LITERATURNAY GAZETA (LITERARY GAZETTE) No. 1, 1967 and the press conference on the Congress which took place on 3 January 1967. Although Soviet press coverage since then has been sparse and uninformative, there are no concrete indications that the Congress will be postponed once again.

Considering the likelihood that the proceedings at the Congress will be as difficult as ever to decipher, it will be useful to bear in mind the source of the comments reported at the Congress. For this purpose, the names and positions of a number of the most prominent representatives of the Stalinists and the "liberals" are presented below.

The Stalinists, or hard-liners, are:

-Vsevolod Kochetov, editor of the arch-conservative journal OKTYABR (OCTOBER)

-Nikolay Gribachev, author

-Vadim Kozhevnikov, author

-Anatoly Safronov, playwright

-Mikhail Sholokhov, author (awarded Nobel Prize for literature in 1965; delivered scathing denunciation of Sinyavsky and Daniel at 23rd Congress of the CPSU, thereby earning the undying disgust of liberal writers)

-Aleksey Markov, Secretary of Writers Union

-Sergey Pavlov, Chief of the Komsomol (scorned by liberal writers for his unrestrained denunciation of Pasternak)

-Gen. Aleksey Yepishev, Chief of Main Political Administration of Soviet Army and Navy (an outspoken critic of the harm done to Soviet youth by the works of liberal authors)

-Marshal Nikolay Krylov, Chief of Soviet Rocket Forces (a critic of "liberals")

On the "liberals" side the outstanding figure is Aleksandr Tvardovsky. Tvardovsky was the leader of the intellectuals' resistance to Khrushchev's 1962-63 campaign to harness writers to tasks of the state. He has been buffeted by increasingly sharper criticism by Stalinists for the past year. This criticism reached a peak on March 29, 1967 when PRAVDA, IZVESTIYA, and LITERATURNAYA GAZETA joined in unprecedented unison to rebuke Tvardovsky for ignoring previous rebukes; Tvardovsky, refusing to recant, merely acknowledged that he had heard the criticism.

Other noted "liberals" are:

-Andrey Voznesensky, poet

-Konstantin Simonov, author who recently refused to having his war-time memoirs edited by those who objected to the anti-Stalinist content of his manuscript

-Vladimir Tendryakov, author

-Viktor Nekrasov, author

-Aleksandr Solzhenitsin, author

-Ilya Ehrenburg, author ( a well-liked figure amongst "liberals" because of his steadfast pursuit of truth)

-Vasily Aksenov, poet

-Konstantin Paustovsky, writer

-Bela Akhmadulina, poetess

-Korney Chukovsky, writer

-Lidiya Chukovskaya, daughter of the aforementioned and a bitter foe of Stalinist Sholokhov

-Yury Kazakov, writer

Considering that the Writers Congress may turn out to be a meaningful event in the long struggle between Soviet writers and the regime, and that all of the members of the Writers Union are aware of this possibility, any absences by prominent liberal writers should be looked at with skepticism.

April 1967

Excerpts from interview with Jesus Faria, "L'HUMANITE", 17 March 1967

*--What is your view of the present situation in Venezuela?*

About two years ago the Venezuelan Communist Party, which is the avant-garde of our people, proposed the formation of a democratic government with the objective of reestablishing peace in our country. That was a demand and an order which conformed to the interest of the working class and the laboring masses.

Contrary to what may have been written and said, this proposal was not aimed at reaching a compromise. It enveloped in reality a patriotic and concrete objective of national liberation. What we want is peace and democracy, a plan for the democratic development of the riches of our country.

But the government replied like any government devoted to the interests of imperialism: by new imprisonments, by an increased repression, by the suppression of the most elementary constitutional rights, by the occupation of the University of Caracas, by a reinforcement of the government's bloody repressive apparatus....

*--Under these conditions, what are the prospects for the future for the Venezuelan people?*

There is absolutely no possibility of agreement with the present Venezuelan government, within which we see no indication of a change of policy....

*--What are the different forms of struggle employed by the Venezuelan Communists?*

The Venezuelan Communists are fighting on all fronts, putting into practice all forms of struggle, including armed struggle. We unleashed this four years ago and we are continuing it in the countryside as well as in the most important cities with our Armed Forces of National Liberation (FALN).

Up to now, and contrary to what certain newspapers have written, our Party has not envisaged, much less approved, the abandonment of any of these forms of struggle.

Nevertheless, a miniscule anti-Party group has formed within our Party, led by a former member of the Central Committee, of a military and "caudilloist" tendencies, messianic even, whose failure is already flagrant. This group has not managed to attract more than fifty or so members of the Party and of the Communist Youth. It is completely isolated from the serious elements of our Party and from democratic opinion in our country.



April 1967

Excerpts from speech by Fidel Castro,  
Havana, 13 March 1967

...Doubtless the Venezuelan revolutionaries, just like revolutionaries in all parts of the world, committed diverse errors, diverse errors of concepts of struggle, diverse errors of a strategic type, and errors of tactical type. Various factors contributed to those errors. One of them was the fact that the revolutionary movement was very strong in the capital and on the other hand, as had happened in many other Latin American countries, through the fault of the communist parties, the revolutionary movement was very weak in the rural areas....

Since the official Venezuelan party was strong, and the leftist parties were weak in the rural areas although strong in the capital, for a long time there was an overestimation of the importance of the capital and the struggle in the capital in the minds of the leaders of the revolutionary movement of Venezuela. That is not all. It was in Venezuela that the revolutionary movement achieved the greatest penetration in the ranks of the professional army in recent times...That led to another error in concept--a minimization of the guerrilla movement and a pinning of their hopes on a military uprising....

...Besides erroneous concepts of strategy these strategic errors also led to serious practical errors. The guerrillas found themselves abandoned and deprived of the most elementary resources...The revolutionary leadership of the party, in an effort to direct the guerrilla forces from the plains and from the capital, did not do what was necessary, what a truly bold and revolutionary leadership would have done, what the leaderships of the great contemporary historical movements did to bring victory. That is, they should have gone to the mountains with the guerrilla forces to direct the war from the battlefield, to direct the war from the mountains....

It is absurd and almost criminal--and we do not say that it is 100 percent criminal because it is the result of ignorance rather than deceit--to attempt to direct guerrilla forces from the city. They are two different things, so very different; their theaters of action are so dissimilar that the greatest folly, the most sorrowful and bloody error which a person can make, is to attempt to direct guerrilla forces from the city. The guerrillas were really not considered a force capable of growing and of seizing revolutionary power in countries such as ours. Instead, they were considered an instrument of agitation, political instrument, a tool for negotiations. Underestimating the guerrilla forces led to subsequent errors. In Venezuela the guerrillas were constantly being instructed to cease fire. That is folly, because a guerrilla who does not fight perishes for lack of action; a guerrilla who does not fight does not progress; a guerrilla who takes a respite is a guerrilla doomed to defeat.

(Cont.)

That is what happened in Venezuela, and naturally, as the result of inept leadership, coups and setbacks followed one after another....

The leadership of the Venezuelan Communist Party began by talking about democratic peace. Many people wondered what the talk about democratic peace was....

At the bottom the intention was to abandon the armed struggle, and the way was just being prepared. How did we know these things, these facts?

...certain documents came into our possession,...documents that were disseminated among the militants of the Venezuelan Communist Party for discussion,....

One of these documents is written by Pompeyo Marquez, Teodoro Petkoff, and Freddy Munoz. Its essence is as follows: First, some changes have occurred that oblige the revolutionary movement to revise certain aspects of its tactics, basically with relation to the armed struggle. The rough outline of the situation is this: The armed struggle has sustained a number of setbacks and has been weakened; the revolutionary movement is not at present in a condition to continue an open, frontal clash with its enemies; the armed branch of the party has been severely damaged; the bloody, brutal repression is affecting the revolutionary movement's capacity to organize, unite, and mobilize the broad masses and give a fitting reply to the government's policy.

Because of the continuous blows and setbacks and its own present weakness, which prevent successful actions, the armed struggle, unless appropriate measures are adopted to safeguard its tools, may lose the role it has been playing in the recent past, a period in which it gave the masses promise of a revolutionary transformation. Actually, in the present hour, it is no longer playing that role, and its future depends on what steps we take today.

...as a result the party must fall back on the military front and recommend suspension of armed action in order to regroup its forces and prepare them for a new revolutionary stage, which from the operational point of view must be qualitatively superior to those known heretofore. Until our recovery has been basically achieved and progress is made in promoting fresh forces and regrouping nationalist sectors, all operations by the FALN must cease.

This military falling back must be accompanied by a political offensive which will enable us to cover the withdrawal, relieve repressive pressure, and regain the political initiative.

What the failures, the incompetents, had to do was not to condemn, discipline, and expel those who had shown ability to defeat the enemy in the open field of war in the mountains, but to resign. That was the

only honest thing, the only just thing--to assume responsibility for the failure and turn over the leadership of the party to those who had demonstrated ability to wage war.

...And it was not possible for us revolutionaries, it was not possible for us--faced with a choice between the uncertain, the defeatists, and men determined to achieve their goal of liberating their fatherland or dying for Venezuela, who were not a group of theorizing charlatans but a group of fighters--for an elemental reason of principle and revolutionary ethics we could not but express our solidarity with those fighters.

In the name of what principles, what reasons, what revolutionary essentials were we obliged to declare the defeatists right, those of defeatist, vacillating tendencies? In the name of Marxism-Leninism? No! In the name of Marxism-Leninism we could never have held them to be right. In the name of the international communist movement? Were we perchance obligated by the fact that it was the leadership of a communist party? Is that perchance the idea we must have of the international communist movement? For us the international communist movement is, first, just that: a movement of communists, a movement of revolutionary fighters; and whoever is not a revolutionary fighter cannot be called a communist.

We conceive of Marxism as revolutionary thought and action. Those who do not have a truly revolutionary spirit cannot be called communists....

Our position regarding communist parties is based strictly on revolutionary principles. Those parties which unhesitatingly follow a line--a revolutionary line--we will support in spite of everything. Those parties which call themselves communist or Marxist and believe themselves to have a monopoly on revolutionary feeling but who really are monopolizers of reformism we will not treat as revolutionary parties. If in any nation those who call themselves communists do not know how to fulfill their duty, we will support those who--even though they do not call themselves communists--behave like real communists in the struggle....

To reject beforehand all who since the beginning have not been called communists would be an act of dogmatism and sectarianism....

...What defines a communist is his action against oligarchies, action against exploitation, action against imperialism, and, in this continent, action in the armed revolutionary movement. What defines communists of this continent is their action in the guerrilla movement in Guatemala, in Colombia, and in Venezuela.

No one who has the right to call himself a communist will support the rightwing's official leadership against Douglas Bravo. Communist parties will have to be differentiated between guerrillas who fight in Venezuela and defeatists who want to renege, who practically want to sell out the guerrilla movement. This will be a point of differentiation, for we are reaching a time when they will have to be differentiated....

Individuals acting for mere reasons of sect or dogma, those with a spirit of splittism, condemn the fighters. They will not be considered revolutionaries....

What have official representatives done regarding the death of Iribarren Borges? In the first place what do we think about that death?...We have no information on Iribarren Borges. We know only the news which was published by the AP and other press agencies. We do not know who killed Iribarren Borges.

Our honest opinion...in this case is: if it was the revolutionaries, we think it was a mistake....

...This is our opinion. A revolutionary can disagree with an action, with a method, with something abstract, but what is not moral, what is not revolutionary is to take advantage of a certain action to join the hysterical chorus of the reactionaries and imperialists to condemn the revolutionaries.

If the revolutionaries are responsible for this action, we will express our view, but we will never join the chorus of hangmen ruling Venezuela to condemn the revolutionaries. What has the official leadership of the Venezuelan Communist Party done?....

...They accused the guerrilla fighters, taking advantage of the most repugnant opportunism, hoping to appease the proimperialist and puppet Leoni government...This position regarding heroic fighting men, who maintain the Venezuelan revolutionary banner on high, asks for their heads. What they have done is only a step from asking Leoni for a rifle to kill Douglas Bravo.

There has been a wave of statements. What kind of attitude is this? This is a cowardly action, an opportunist, repugnant action. This is joining the chorus of the counterrevolutionary hysteria and the chorus against Cuba.

These statements of cowards and opportunists are never the statements of the revolutionary, for the revolutionary can criticize, he can disagree with an act, but he does not join in this shameful action....

Not everything is rosy in the revolutionary world. Complaints follow on complaints because of contradictory postures. While some are condemned for restoring relations with Federal Germany, a crowd is running about in search of relations with oligarchies of the Leoni and company type....

What would the Vietnamese revolutionaries think if we sent delegations to South Vietnam to negotiate with the puppet government in Saigon? What will those who are fighting in the mountains of America think if we try to seek close relations with the puppets of the future Yankee

aggressions and interventions in this continent?....

This revolution will maintain its absolutely independent position to which the peoples who know how to fight have a right, to which the worthy peoples have a right. We proclaim to the whole world that this revolution will continue its way, that this revolution will pursue its own line, that this revolution never be anyone's satellite or be subjected to anyone's conditions, and that it will never ask anyone's permission to maintain its posture, be it in ideology or in domestic and foreign affairs....

April 1967

Excerpts from "Revolution Within the Revolution?"  
by Regis Debray

In many American countries guerrilla warfare has repeatedly to suggest dependence on a patriotic front or a party.

The placement of guerrilla warfare under the strategic and tactical orientation of a party which has not radically changed its normal peacetime organization, or to make guerrilla warfare one more branch of party action will bring as its consequence a series of fatal military errors. Let us review these rapidly: today, they are familiar to everyone.

1. Coming Down from the Mountains

The arm, however, well equipped with weapons it may be, must consult the head before it takes action. The head, or leadership, is found in the capital. ...The principles of democratic centralism make it necessary for the commander of a guerrilla front ... to participate in leadership discussions. ...He must go down to the level where policy really operates and functions. ...This involves a fatal risk. Sooner or later, the military officer in charge will be killed....

..."The cities," Fidel has said, "are graveyards for revolutionary individuals and resources." This does not even take into account the disastrous moral effect on the combatants of the degradation of their leaders... A commander cannot go down to the cities to attend any political meetings. He must make the politicians come up to him, to a safe place, to discuss and decide matters. ...This presupposes that the commander is with means with which to exercise his leadership or that he can obtain them....

2. The Lack of Political Power Leads to Logistics and Military Dependence of the Mountain Forces on the Cities

This dependence often leads the leaders in the city to abandon guerrilla warfare.

The subordination of guerrilla warfare to urban political leadership not only has very real practical results for the guerrilla fighters but also creates in them an inferiority complex and a feeling of dependence. They have to wait for everything: their political leaders, guidelines, money, weapons, and even the date set for operations. The moral and political principle, if the guerrillas do not have strength of their own, is lost to view, and the guerrilla fighter becomes daily more of a prisoner of the hopes of imminent aid from outside. The guerrillas must wait for the promised aid to come, and on the promised day it does not come, or only a part of it does, and more days of waiting are necessary. ...Thus, it is that they attempt to wage "their armed struggle," although it often means simply waiting.

(Cont.)

And this is natural.... The city jungle is not so savage. There men struggle to be recognized as hired animals, rather than fighting just to exist. There is a living for all, unequal, perhaps, but available in any case.... It is truly said that we bathe in social life. Prolonged baths soften one....

The terrible isolation in which a number of these nuclei in the mountains have had to live for months and sometimes years is not explained so much by clandestine sabotage, indifference or betrayal on the part of their area apparatus, as by an inevitable difference in living conditions, and thus, in thought and behavior, between the two sectors. The best of the comrades in the capital or abroad, although they may have been sent on important missions, and are dedicated to their work, fall victim to this difference, which represents an "objective betrayal." ... The two sectors do not breathe the same air....

Lack of logistical self-sufficiency. Some guerrilla fronts have survived on two hundred dollars a year from the political organs sponsoring them, while that same political party spent thousands of dollars during the same period on propoganda work abroad and domestically, on maintaining officials inside and outside the country, in establishing press organs, holding amnesty conferences, etc., in order to extract profit from the prestige the existence of these guerrilla fronts lacking in combat equipment and isolated gave them. From this experience and similar ones, following conclusion has been drawn: it is less risky and safer for a guerrilla group to make forays from its own base, ... to neighboring villages to obtain foodstuffs and campaign equipment, to establish its own depots, to bury or hide them, and thus to guarantee its freedom of action for some months....

However risky these attacks may be, they are preferable to waiting in vain.... Lack of military independence. The guerrillas cannot plan military operations months in advance for a given day in accordance with the national political calendar established by the regime in power... It is only reasonable that campaign plans be drafted by those individuals who have to carry them out... Political leadership cannot draft military plans alone, as it sees fit, in order to contribute to maneuvers against or pressures upon the bourgeois regime, and then transmit them to its military apparatus "for implementation," as the customer gives his orders to the waiter who transmits it to the kitchen....

### 3. The Lack of a Single Command

The lack of a unified command is the reason for the lack of a general plan of action... Only a truly consistent and vigorous leadership provided with a reasonable long-term strategic plan based on a wise political analysis could correlate these two aspects of direct action. By remaining in the cities, the political leadership will inevitably be destroyed or splintered by the repressive forces. But the force of tradition, the habitual adherence to given forms of organization

which have been consecrated and solidified by time prevents a break with the established structure and the adoption of the new form of struggle required by the war situation....

Currently, there are countries in which many political leaders would agree, at certain moments, to leave the city, to go into the mountains and to free the existing repression. But in fact, the situation is different every day. One day there is a coup d'etat "in the air" or a meeting which is to be held, the hope that the fighters will be resolved in the finding of a sudden solution. There is always a pretext....

In all cases there is a search to unite the advantages of all the forms of struggle and to avoid their various disadvantages. No one is willing to choose one form of struggle as basic and subordinate the other to it. Both arms are allowed to act, each one in its own way and on its own account, without correlated action, and without subordination of the tasks. This abstract, reformist or contradictory political leadership transforms the revolutionary movement into a marionette without strings....

Uncontrolled urban actions result from the lack of a single command and any clear strategy of armed struggle. Since there is no clear strategy, there is no plan of action. The guerrilla is isolated from the city. Each acts on his own account. The urban forces, or those who stand in their stead, are not in any clear way subordinate to the mountain guerrillas. For this reason, the true guerrillas should be recognized as the guiding and motive wing of the movement....

It is obvious that terrorism in the city cannot play any key role and that it also involves some dangers of a political nature. But if it is subordinated to the basic struggle, that in the rural sector, it has from a military point of view a strategic value....

All modern American experience confirms this disharmony and disagreement between the mountain and the plains forces, giving it the force of law....

No deliberative political front can take charge of the effective leadership of a people's war. Only an executive group which is technically able and centralized, and is united on the basis of identical class interests can do so. In a word, a revolutionary general staff is needed. A composite national front is by nature disposed to political disagreements, discussions, endless deliberations and temporary compromises....

It has been demonstrated that military experience in a people's war is more decisive than political experience without contact with guerrilla forces in the training of revolutionary cadres. The major



leaders in Latin America today are young men, without broad political experience prior to their entry into the guerrilla ranks. It is ridiculous to continue to speak separately of "political cadres" and "military cadres," "political leaders" and "military leaders," and pure "politicians," who would like to continue to be just that, but serve no purpose in heading the armed struggle of the people. Purely "military" men do, and in directing guerrilla warfare and living the guerrilla life they become politicians too. The experience of Cuba and that more recently in Venezuela, Guatemala and other countries shows that in guerrilla warfare the fighters are trained politically more quickly and more profoundly than by spending an equal length of time in a training school, even when they are of petty bourgeois or peasant origin....

#### The Basic Lesson for the Present

I. What should be strengthened today, the party or the guerrilla factions, as the nucleus of a popular army? Which is the decisive unit? Where should the main effort be put?

This today is the question on which the militants in all the vanguard countries of Latin America in which guerrillas are operating are divided....

It has been given a classic answer in the history of Marxism and in fact by history itself.... It is the party which must be strengthened first, because the party is the creator and the guiding nucleus of the people's army....

As far as orthodox history goes, these principles have been applied to date in the victorious revolutionary struggles in our era in terms of the separate existence of a political vanguard and the military tools, with the absolute domination of the former over the latter....

Castro says that there can be no revolution without a vanguard, and this vanguard need not necessarily be the Marxist-Leninist party, and that those who want revolution have the right and the duty to establish themselves as a vanguard, independent of these parties.

It takes courage to state things as they are in a fearless voice, when these facts go against a tradition. There is, then, no metaphysical equation -- vanguard equals Marxist-Leninist party. There are merely dialectical relations between given functions -- that of the vanguard in history -- and a given form of organization -- that of the Marxist-Leninist party....

...The effective orientation of a revolutionary armed struggle demands a new method of leadership, a new type of organization and new ideological and physical reflexes on the part of those responsible as well as the militants.

The new style of leadership. It has been widely demonstrated that a guerrilla war is not directed from abroad, but from within, and with acceptance of the necessary quota of risks. In a country in which a war of this sort is being waged, then, it is necessary that the majority of the leaders leave the cities and join the guerrilla army....

A new organization. The conversion of the party into an effective guiding organ equal to the historical situation also makes it necessary to do away with the plethora of commissions, secretariats, congresses, conferences, mass gatherings, plenary sessions, meetings and assemblies on all levels -- national, provincial, regional and local, to mention the most important.... This conversion further requires the provisional suspension of "internal democracy," in the party and the temporary abolition of the rules of democratic centralism which guarantee it...

New ideological concepts. Nor are certain deliberate attitudes consistent with the objective state of war, for example, if an entire political line is based on the contradiction existing between inimical classes or groups with divergent interests within a single bourgeois social class. The result of such policy is often the obsessive search for alliances within this or that faction of a bourgeoisie, negotiations for support, electoral maneuvers from which the dominant class has always, to date, benefited, the safeguarding of unity at all costs, above the level of principle and revolutionary interests. This changes the party little by little, and its survival in a given form becomes an end in itself more sacred than the revolution....

How to overcome these lacks? Under what conditions can these parties resume their vanguard functions even in guerrilla warfare? ...

II. How is the vanguard party formed? Can the party, under the conditions existing in Latin America, create the people's army or is it the latter which must create the vanguard party?...

... The most decisive political definition is membership in the guerrilla force, the armed forces of liberation. Thus, little by little, this little island has created unity at the base including all parties as it has grown and obtained its first victory. Finally, the future people's army will give rise to the party of which it should have theoretically been the tool. It has been said, for its shock value, that the usual tool of winning power -- the party -- was created after the takeover of the regime. But no: It was there before, in embryonic form. It was the rebel army....

The Latin American revolution and its vanguard, the Cuban revolution, are thus making a decisive contribution to international revolutionary experience and Marxism-Leninism...

Under certain conditions, the political apparatus is not separate from the military apparatus. The two form an organic whole. This organization is the people's army, the nucleus of which is the guerrilla force. The vanguard party may exist in the form of the guerrilla center itself. The guerrilla force is the developing party....

...Precisely because of the clarity of the revolutionary line and because of adamant resolution, it has been necessary to separate, at a certain point in development, from the existing vanguard parties (Guatemala) or to impose upon them (Venezuela) the necessary political, ideological and organizational concepts at the basis for all possible agreements to be made or dissolved. In a word, in these two cases, it was necessary to destroy all organic dependence on political parties and put something else in the place of the failing political vanguard. That is to say, it was necessary to reach the point at which the Cuban revolution began.

Thus a divorce lasting some decades between Marxist theory and revolutionary practice has come to an end. However contingent and fragile the reconciliation may seem, it is this guerrilla warfare with its unpolitical leadership which incarnates it....

...Any guerrilla movement which wants to carry the people's war through to the end, to transform itself, if necessary, into a regular army and to undertake a war of movement and to take a stand will have in Latin America to become the undisputable political vanguard, an essential aspect being that its leadership must be incorporated in the military command....

Dialectically speaking, in the long run, in some areas in America, there will be no choice to be made between a vanguard party and a people's army. At present, however, there is an order to objectives historically substantiated. The people's army will be the nucleus of the party and not vice versa. The guerrilla forces are the political vanguard "in nuce" and the true party can be born only as a result of its development.

To this effect, the guerrilla movement must be developed in order to develop the political vanguard.

To this effect, under the current circumstances the main emphasis must be placed on the development of the guerrilla warfare and not in the strengthening of existing parties or the creation of new ones.

To this effect, in those same places, the insurrection work of today is political work No. 1....