

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

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

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

Vol. 4, No. 32

October 21, 1966

<u>In this issue</u>	<u>Page</u>
U.S. Troops to Invade Mekong Delta	1
Judge Refuses to Stay Imprisonment of Fort Hood Three	3
Russell Committee Resists White House Pressure	4
Russell Defends War Crimes Tribunal	7
State Department Pressures Greece to Stop Trade with Cuba	8
At Hugo Blanco's Court-Martial	9
Campaign in Italy for Hugo Blanco's Release	14
More on the Deaths of David Aguilar and Eunice Campirán	15
Vietnam Center of Current Political Topics in Italian Left -- by Sirio Di Giuliomaria	17
Shake-up Reported in Staff of Cuban Newspaper	21
Another War Hawk Talks of Using A-Bombs in Vietnam	21
Documents:	
Mexican Students Protest Government Repression	31
Why Māgan Desai Joined Indian Trotskyist Movement	33
Grim Proof of the Nature of Vietnam Conflict	36
The Continuing Crisis In China -- Livio Maitan	22

U.S. TROOPS TO INVADE MEKONG DELTA

When Johnson's emissary Robert S. McNamara landed in Saigon October 10, he told reporters at a news conference that almost twelve months had elapsed since his last visit in December 1965. He called attention to what is obviously the most striking change that has occurred in that time. American troops in Vietnam have "more than doubled."

"It is quite appropriate," he was quoted as saying, "that we should again visit South Vietnam to review the progress of military and other operations."

In the secret conversations with the American military and

Reba Hansen, Business Manager,

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

New York, N.Y. 10010

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

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

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

Vol. 4, No. 32

October 21, 1966

<u>In this issue</u>	<u>Page</u>
U.S. Troops to Invade Mekong Delta	1
Judge Refuses to Stay Imprisonment of Fort Hood Three	3
Russell Committee Resists White House Pressure	4
Russell Defends War Crimes Tribunal	7
State Department Pressures Greece to Stop Trade with Cuba	8
At Hugo Blanco's Court-Martial	9
Campaign in Italy for Hugo Blanco's Release	14
More on the Deaths of David Aguilar and Eunice Campiran	15
Vietnam Center of Current Political Topics	
in Italian Left -- by Sirio Di Giuliomaria	17
Shake-up Reported in Staff of Cuban Newspaper	21
Another War Hawk Talks of Using A-Bombs in Vietnam	21
Documents:	
Mexican Students Protest Government Repression	31
Why Magan Desai Joined Indian Trotskyist Movement	33
Grim Proof of the Nature of Vietnam Conflict	36
The Continuing Crisis In China - Livio Maitan	22

U.S. TROOPS TO INVADE MEKONG DELTA

When Johnson's emissary Robert S. McNamara landed in Saigon October 10, he told reporters at a news conference that almost twelve months had elapsed since his last visit in December 1965. He called attention to what is obviously the most striking change that has occurred in that time. American troops in Vietnam have "more than doubled."

"It is quite appropriate," he was quoted as saying, "that we should again visit South Vietnam to review the progress of military and other operations."

In the secret conversations with the American military and

Reba Hansen, Business Manager,

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

New York, N.Y. 10010

diplomatic representatives in Saigon, the manpower question still stood at the top of the agenda. Charles Mohr, the special correspondent of the New York Times, cabled: "On the question of manpower, the United States command here would like to have the American troop strength increased to 600,000 as soon as feasible next year, informed sources said."

One far-reaching decision has already been made in further escalation of the war, Mohr reported. This is the introduction of U.S. troops into the Mekong Delta. "Although still controversial and still opposed by some Vietnamese, this last question has virtually been settled. Construction is under way on a base camp for an American Army brigade expected to operate in the area, which contains about 60 per cent of the South Vietnamese population."

The same correspondent reported again in the October 11 New York Times that "during the briefings, General Westmoreland's subordinates had told Mr. McNamara that more troops would be needed to carry out successfully the United States operations in South Vietnam."

How many more troops? "The sources," said Mohr, "declined to state the new force level requested by the United States Military Assistance Command in Vietnam, but it was previously disclosed that the command hoped to see the troop total reach about 600,000 men next year."

In an editorial the same day, the Times, which has been deploring Johnson's continued escalation of the war, stated in the opening sentence of its lead editorial: "Secretary of Defense McNamara's visit to South Vietnam will no doubt be followed by a decision to send more manpower and materiel to fight the war."

Upon leaving Saigon to report back to his boss in the White House, McNamara said that he had seen nothing during his four-day tour to indicate the need for a "faster rate of deployment" of U.S. troops to Vietnam.

This bare-faced statement was probably intended as a contribution in maintaining the notorious "credibility gap" of the Johnson administration. From all that can be learned or deduced, the Johnson administration had already made all the basic decisions concerning another big step escalating the war before McNamara's plane took off from Washington.

A fresh reminder of the intentions of the Johnson administration was the reluctant admission by the State Department October 14 that two American helicopters had attacked a Cambodian army post at Snoul, twenty miles within the border, on September 20.

Robert J. McCloskey told the press that the two helicopters had "strayed across the border and fired on Cambodian territory. This was due to pilot error." He read the usual perfunctory statement kept on file for such occasions: "We profoundly regret the

loss of innocent lives and the damage caused by this tragic mistake...."

But this is the fourth such "error." In May 1965 Skyraiders attacked two Cambodian border villages. On July 31 and August 2 of this year helicopters attacked the village of Thloktrach.

So brazen has American imperialism become in these matters that it now appears they consider everything is put right if it is admitted an "error" was made. Would Johnson assume a posture of such godlike serenity if things were reversed -- if, for example, American border towns were bombed in "error" by Chinese planes?

JUDGE REFUSES TO STAY IMPRISONMENT OF FORT HOOD THREE

U.S. Supreme Court Justice William J. Brennan Jr. refused October 12 to issue an order to delay imprisonment of the "Fort Hood Three" for refusing to obey orders to go to Vietnam.

Pvt. Dennis Mora, Pvt. James A. Johnson and Pvt. David A. Samas were convicted in September by a court-martial composed of U.S. army officers. They were given sentences ranging from three to five years in prison for stating their refusal to become war criminals by participating in the slaughter of the Vietnamese people.

The three courageous American soldiers appealed their sentences and are prepared to carry them to the Supreme Court. This lengthy process, however, may take a number of years. In most cases, pending final decision of the Supreme Court, defendants are released on bail.

Attorneys for the Fort Hood Three thus sought a stay from a member of the Supreme Court in the execution of the sentence passed by the court-martial. By refusing to grant the stay, Brennan in effect indicates that his mind has been made up long before the case reaches his court.

Brennan's stand also has the practical effect of making the defense efforts more difficult, since the three victims cannot participate in a campaign to raise funds to meet the extremely high legal costs involved in an appeal.

The three prisoners have also confirmed that they are still being subjected to a cruel prison regime. This is probably petty revenge for the reports from Vietnam that the fighters of the National Liberation Front were given fresh inspiration by the example set by the Fort Hood Three.

The case has gained international renown, but further publicity is required, including expressions of solidarity. These should be sent to the Fort Hood Three Defense Committee, 5 Beekman St., 10th Floor, New York, N.Y. 10038.

RUSSELL COMMITTEE RESISTS WHITE HOUSE PRESSURE

In our issue of September 30, World Outlook quoted a dispatch from the Paris correspondent of the New York Times stating that on "one point France wants no further aggravation of relations with the United States"; namely, permitting the War Crimes Tribunal sponsored by Bertrand Russell to meet in Paris.

In view of the fact that the de Gaulle regime felt that it would aggravate relations with the U.S. to permit the tribunal to meet in Paris, World Outlook suggested that the pressure emanated from Washington, that the State Department may well have hinted to the French that a ban would be well received, and that de Gaulle had probably decided to make a cheap concession to Johnson on this point.

Further substantiation of World Outlook's deductions appeared in the Paris daily Le Monde of October 8. Le Monde, as is well-known, has very good connections with top officials of the de Gaulle regime. Under the headline, "President Johnson Will Not be 'Tried' in Paris," Le Monde printed the following report:

"The 'tribunal' organized by the philosopher Bertrand Russell, winner of the Nobel peace prize, to 'try' President Johnson and the principal American leaders 'accused' of war crimes in Vietnam, will without doubt not meet in Paris.

"According to the Home Office [ministère de l'intérieur], in fact, the French government reportedly informed the British philosopher that it considered his project 'unthinkable,' that a personality could not in any case substitute himself for justice, and that consequently there was no question of 'trying' President Johnson in France. Entry to French territory is not at all forbidden to Bertrand Russell, it is affirmed, but, they let it be understood, it would not be the same for the possible witnesses for such a trial. The philosopher had, in fact, announced his intention of having several citizens of North Vietnam and South Vietnam make depositions. Jean-Paul Sartre and Simone de Beauvoir were sounded out about taking part in the tribunal. In Japan at present, they have not yet indicated their response.

"The 'tribunal' is to hold a preliminary meeting in London on November 13 and not in Paris as previously announced. The 'trial' will not take place until the month of March. Bertrand Russell is thinking of organizing it in either London or Stockholm, after the discreet warning of the French government."

The French Friends of the Russell Foundation sent a letter of correction to the editor of Le Monde. This was published by Le Monde October 11, with equal space and prominence (on page 2) being granted to it as was allotted to the report about the moves of the Home Office.

The following is a translation of this letter of correction:

"Convinced that the French government would not envisage conceding to the pressure exercised by the government of the United States in this affair as in many others, the French Friends of the Russell Foundation declare that the projects of the Russell Foundation remain unchanged: the opening session of the tribunal will be held in London the coming November 13; the inquiries in Vietnam and in other countries sponsored by the tribunal will then be followed up for close to three months; the hearings of witnesses and the debates before the tribunal, which will begin in March 1967, will take place in Paris.

"Le Monde, in addition, announced that Jean-Paul Sartre and Simone de Beauvoir, who had been sounded out by Bertrand Russell to take part in the tribunal, had not yet indicated their response. Le Monde was certainly led into an error on this point. In fact, it was in the month of July 1966 that Jean-Paul Sartre and Simone de Beauvoir sent Bertrand Russell a positive response."

Meanwhile in New York, Russell Stetler, Executive Director of the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation, sent a letter to the New York Times correcting its report. However, that mighty voice of Western Democracy and the Free World did not deign to publish the objection to its Paris dispatch. (The text of this letter as well as a follow-up were published in full in the October 17 issue of The Militant.)

According to Russell Stetler, the members of the tribunal are holding a preliminary meeting in London in November. That this meeting is being held in London, he said, "in no way implies a response to pressure from the French Government. On the contrary, we still intend to hold the full proceedings of the tribunal in Paris, at a later date, and the French Government has refused to ban the tribunal, although under overt pressure from Washington to do so."

One fact stands out very clearly in all this -- the Johnson administration is very anxious to block the War Crimes Tribunal. It is so anxious to do so, in fact, that it would appear that not even its highly publicized pique over de Gaulle's policies was permitted to stand in the way of steps seeking the concession.

The evident fear, if not anger, in Washington over the War Crimes Tribunal leads one to suspect that Johnson himself is behind the pressure on the de Gaulle regime. The head of the Great Society is in the position of a criminal up to his elbows in blood and he wants no searchlight turned in his direction and no microphone provided for the victims receiving his attentions.

For de Gaulle to bow to this pressure from the White House is, of course, ignoble and another blotch on Western "civilization." However, it should not be forgotten that de Gaulle is nothing but an imperialist politician like Johnson, concerned about power and not morality.

The concession, from de Gaulle's position, has much to recommend it. The price tag is well within the means of the French budget,

certainly being less costly than an H-bomb, for instance. And it is easy to camouflage the dirty move by rising to the defense of "justice" against its "perversion" by "personalities."

In addition, a tribunal investigating the imperialist war crimes in Vietnam is not without an element of embarrassment to the French ruling class. Is it not at least ironic that such a trial should be held in Paris? Won't it stir consciences again about France's own role in Vietnam...and in Algeria...and in many parts of the world where de Gaulle is still hanging on to colonial empire and discreetly seeking to extend it?

There is in fact a glaring gap between the real policies of the de Gaulle regime and its pretensions at voicing opposition to Washington. At times the contrast between what de Gaulle says and what he does is almost ludicrous. Take for example the show he has been putting on about encouraging Hanoi and then read the following small but very instructive item which appeared in the October 12 Le Monde and which we have translated in its entirety:

"The 'New York Herald Tribune' wrote Tuesday, under the signature of Mr. Ronald Koven, that the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam is at present seeking to obtain authorization from the French government to establish an official bureau in Paris analogous to those it has in Moscow, Cairo, etc. According to information which we have been able to obtain from the best source, France nevertheless does not envisage accepting the installation on its soil of an NLF mission."

Bertrand Russell and the other prominent figures who have agreed to serve on the international War Crimes Tribunal are to be commended for their firm stand in face of the blatant pressure from the war criminals in Washington. But more than praise, they deserve support.

This support would seem to be especially called for in France. The powerful working-class organizations there could mobilize voices by the millions behind the War Crimes Tribunal. We have in mind in particular the French Communist party and the unions under its influence.

Action from them on a massive scale would certainly give those officials in the de Gaulle government who are unduly responsive to commands and seductive voices from Washington cause to stop and think...and perhaps reconsider.

Let the French labor movement, particularly the French CP, speak up -- and in a way that shows they mean it!

It is within the bounds of possibility, however, that the French CP will display in this matter a gap between words and deeds at least matching the one shown by de Gaulle if not greatly exceeding it. The French CP generally deviates little from the signals it receives from Moscow. And with Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko

engaged at present in intimate chats in Washington with one of the greatest war criminals of all time, wouldn't the Soviet diplomats rather incline to indicate to their French cothinkers that in the interests of "peaceful coexistence" it would be best not to embarrass de Gaulle in a delicate matter like this?

Perhaps they calculate, even Johnson would not be unappreciative if the French CP were to cooperate by simply playing dead, a role for which it is perfectly cast.

RUSSELL DEFENDS WAR CRIMES TRIBUNAL

[The following letter from Bertrand Russell was published in the New York Times of October 6.]

* * *

To the Editor:

The New York Times (Sept. 10) reports from Saigon that the United States, "pleased with the effectiveness of chemical defoliation and crop destruction missions...is taking steps to triple the capability of those efforts." The Times further reports that in this year alone "1,324,430 gallons" have been sprayed.

Let me state first of all that I possess documentary evidence of the toxic character of these chemicals and of their extraordinary effects on human beings, which include paralysis, blindness, convulsions, hallucination and inability to achieve unconsciousness (to fall asleep).

You have published a letter criticizing our War Crimes Tribunal on the ground that the judges should not also be the accusers [July 5]. This criticism rests on a basic misconception of the nature of the tribunal.

We are not establishing an adversary proceeding, because we cannot compel Government witnesses to appear in their own defense, although President Johnson has been invited either to come or to appoint representatives. Rather, the tribunal functions as a commission of inquiry, formed by men who have prima facie evidence of crimes and, like a grand jury, have brought an indictment.

We are not stones without feeling, oblivious to the barrage of evidence concerning war crimes in Vietnam. We are people compelled by conscience to form a tribunal because we have witnessed the crimes against the people of Vietnam and wish to examine exhaustively their full meaning, with a view to assessing the responsibility of those who have perpetrated them.

Americans are familiar with the bringing of indictments on the basis of prima facie evidence and also with the precedent of the Dewey Commission which, composed of eminent international figures, examined fairly the evidence concerning Stalin's purge trials in the late 1930's.

I suggest that those who raise procedural points in objecting to the international War Crimes Tribunal would be better occupied in assessing their own responsibility for the horrendous acts against the people of Vietnam, acts which our tribunal will examine relentlessly and exhaustively.

Justice Robert H. Jackson, Chief Counsel at Nuremberg, stated:

"If certain acts and violation of treaties are crimes, they are crimes whether the United States does them or whether Germany does them. We are not prepared to lay down a rule of criminal conduct against others which we would not be willing to have invoked against us."

Bertrand Russell

London, Sept. 16, 1966

STATE DEPARTMENT PRESSURES GREECE TO STOP TRADE WITH CUBA

On October 12 the U.S. State Department confirmed that it had put fresh pressure on the Greek government to compel all ships flying the Greek flag to halt trading with Cuba. A report from Athens had said that Washington "cautioned" Greece that unless the demand was complied with it could mean the cutting off of all military and economic aid.

In response to a previous demand from the State Department, the Greek government issued a decree, effective in September 1963, banning all trade with Cuba. Ships that were already under contract were exempted until their contracts expired.

One shipowner, Achilles Franghistas, has continued to send ships to Cuba. The Greek government took legal action against him, but the recalcitrant shipowner, who apparently believes in free trade, is fighting the action. He maintains that the ban is unconstitutional and that he intends to challenge its validity before the Greek Supreme Court.

The State Department, of course, is uninterested in whether the decree is in violation of the Greek constitution. It is uninterested in whether the Greek government itself conforms or does not conform with the constitution it has sworn to uphold. The State Department is interested only in tightening the blockade of Cuba in hope of bringing down the Castro government.

SECRET
only authorized personnel

AT HUGO BLANCO'S COURT-MARTIAL

[The following interview with Doctora Laura Caller, attorney for Pedro Candela, Hugo Blanco's co-defendant in the court-martial staged in Tacna, appeared in a recent issue of the Lima magazine Gente under the title "Hugo Blanco, a Copy of Fidel?" Our correspondent failed to indicate the exact date.

[The editors attached the following editorial note: "The Magazine GENTE does not agree with the appreciations made by Doctora Laura Caller in the article below. All the opinions of this outstanding attorney, as well as those of the persons who, for one reason or another are mentioned, are to us opinions worthy of attention which the public should know in order to draw its own conclusions concerning the trial of Hugo Blanco and 27 Cuzco peasants."

[The translation of the interview is by World Outlook.]

* * *

The hacendado [big ranch owner] Angel Paullo raped the wife and daughter of Tiburcio Bolaños, a local union leader. When Paullo also tried to get him jailed, Tiburcio asked Hugo Blanco for help.

This was the beginning of the tragic events that ended with three policemen losing their lives and that have now culminated with Hugo Blanco and Pedro Candela sentenced to jail for 25 and 22 years respectively.

The crushed and outraged Tiburcio Bolaños was released to return home, not knowing yet whether his shack is still standing, whether his wife and daughters are alive, or if other Paullos have assaulted them.

And with Tiburcio another 20 peasants went home, the 20 who were with Hugo Blanco in the jails of Cuzco, Arequipa and Tacna for three years and four months.

"What was never more than a union movement has been depicted as a mass guerrilla action inspired by Peking and Havana," said Doctora Laura Caller, Pedro Candela's attorney.

"Nevertheless those really guilty for this fratricidal struggle, the cunning wolves in sheep's clothing, like the Paullos, the Romainvilles, the Arellanos, were not present at the trial. It was a mock trial from beginning to end, the police sitting as both prosecutors and judges," said Dra. Caller.

The trial attracted national and international attention. Both Radio Peking and Radio Havana broadcast full accounts of the case to the world at large.

Hugo, who is already in El Frontón prison, was the center of attention for the magistrates, journalists, and the public who attended the trial.

He became so popular that the Tacna schoolgirls put on long skirts "to look old enough to get into the courtroom to see him."

Women managed to send him various presents. In some of the packages of cigarettes they tossed to him, they included inspiring letters. A photographer set up a small business, selling pictures of Hugo. And the public fought to get him to autograph them.

"Within days after the prisoners arrived in Tacna, people sent them all kinds of clothing, food and gifts. This included 15 liters of milk a day and 100 loaves of bread. One man came each morning with his quota of milk, bringing it 6 kilometers," the lawyer said.

Vendors in the market place sent large boxes of fruit; and the Hotel Workers union of Tacna paid all of Dra. Caller's traveling expenses.

"Solidarity was very high," she said. "One rainy night, a man stopped me on a corner. He took off his leather jacket and said, 'Please take this to Hugo. He needs it more than I do.'"

The Trade Union Coordinating Committee of the South and the Arequipa Federation of Labor, on learning that Hugo Blanco and his companions were to be tried in Tacna, protested the decision and made a legal move to have the trial transferred to the Misti city.*

(The Mistianos considered it insulting that a trial of such importance should be held in a city smaller than their own.)

But to get back. Why was Hugo Blanco, along with 27 peasants, in the dock of the Third Zone Police Court, facing a military tribunal?

The 140 union locals that Hugo Blanco organized in La Convención offer part of the answer in the following communiqué:

"(a) The hacendado Ramón Marín Moreno, the owner of a tea-processing plant, pays neither a living wage to his workers nor part of the product. He seized the plots of the peasants Rita Tito, Oscar Valencia, Mariano Santillán, Lucila Pastor, Silvestre Villacorta, Andrés Auccapuma, Cancio Paredes, etc., by 'brute force,' without paying them a single cent for the improvements they had made.

"(b) Among many outrages, Anselma Marquez, the owner of the

*Misti, a volcano vying in appearance with Fujiyama, stands over Arequipa.

Hacienda San Lorenzo, ordered the local school bull-dozed and humiliated the teacher by converting her into his cook.

"(c) The chief and boss of all the gamonales [local strong men] of La Convención and Lares, Alfredo Romainville, has committed many crimes, thefts and rape without spending a moment in jail. Among other atrocities, he had the peasant Melquiades Bocangel strung up to a mango tree for an entire day. When he was near death, he had him jailed. Gabino Guzmán, for failing to find a mule, was forced to get down on all fours. Romainville then put a bit and bridle on him, harnessed him to 150 pounds of coffee, made him pull it (like pulling a wagon) and lashed him with a whip.

"He forced Esteban Góngora to violate his aunt doña Justina Góngora, while he enjoyed the scene. Then he violated her, too.

"He submitted Julio Bohórquez to the whip until blood flowed. On others he mangled their arms, feet and fingers..."

"(d) There is no justice for the peasant, there is no law which protects his life or property. We live under the rule of the whip, slavery, humiliation, poverty, chronic illiteracy."

The prosecution points out in its brief: "In 1959, in La Convención, a campaign to unionize the peasants was begun with the object of changing property rights in the land, which, it was claimed, was badly distributed and under the control of a few hundred hacendados, which gave rise to an endless number of abuses against the peasants and tenants, a trade-union movement that operated outside the law and by direct action." This union activity was inspired by Hugo Blanco.

"Far from Chaupimayo, where Blanco was working, the peasant Tiburcio Bolaño Dávalos, the general secretary of a Peasant Union was assaulted by the hacendado Angel Paullo," Dra Caller said.

"Paullo raped Bolaños' wife and daughter. And when he couldn't get at the other daughter, he used a whip on the peasant. Paullo wanted to terrorize Bolaños and he accused him of theft and of threatening to kill him. He placed charges against him at the police post in La Pucyura. When he did not appear, Sergeant Pacheco Bustamente ordered him arrested. The guards Briceño and Fuentes, accompanied by Angel and Alejandro Paullo, went in search of the peasant. On the way, they stopped at Eduviges Morveli's house and sent a boy, Santos Huamán, to notify Bolaños to appear the next day at the police post. On returning from his mission, the boy was stopped by Paullo, who made him get off his horse and fired a shot at him.

"A little later," continued Dra. Caller, "Bolaños appeared in Quillabamba to file a complaint against Angel Paullo for having fired at the Santos boy and to lodge a protest with the Provincial Peasant Federation."

"These facts," said the lawyer, "show that a group of men with the mentality of the Paullos consider themselves masters of both lives and haciendas. And to maintain their reign of terror, they not only utilized the police with incredible audacity, but they waged a silent and sinister struggle against the peasant leaders, who, in spite of everything, have lived and still live, in some areas of Peru under conditions of terror, without protection, the victims of all sorts of abuses."

Bolaños went to Hugo Blanco, who, in this lawless world, had become the protector of the peasants. Hugo called a meeting of the Chaupimayo union locals. They agreed to send a commission to Cayara, to investigate the incident.

There were 25 men in the Commission in addition to Hugo and Pedro Candela, who headed it.

According to the prosecution, Blanco and his men attacked the police post at Pucyura. Blanco gives a different version, since his mission was only to investigate. "However, they were forced to defend themselves," said Caller, "and they shot and killed three policemen." A manhunt followed until Blanco was taken one May morning in 1963 in Chaupimayo Chico.

"That was how it happened that Blanco and his men came to be in the dock.

"Thus they were not guerrillas but unionists," Caller explained. "Blanco is not a Trotskyist, not pro-Peking, pro-Moscow, a MIRista [a member of the Movement of the Revolutionary Left]. He is, first of all, an idealist rebelling against injustice. He is 5 feet, 11 inches tall, is 31 years old, was born in Cuzco, in Paruro, studied in Argentina to be an engineer. He speaks Quechua perfectly. He is dignified and energetic and at the same time serene and good-humored, with a profound knowledge of the national reality and clear in what he proposes should be done. He would never agree to lying. For this reason, he called us lawyers together before the trial and told us: 'No lies. Truth only; the bare facts, nothing but the truth.'

"On the first day, at the end of the session, amid tense expectation in the courtroom, Hugo Blanco shouted, 'Land or Death!' and the 27 peasants answered in chorus, 'Venceremos!' [We will win.] The people of Tacna had never heard this slogan before. But on the following day when Hugo shouted 'Land or Death,' the women responded in a resounding chorus, 'Venceremos!'

"Hugo Blanco did not take part in any bank holdups. Nonetheless, the chairman of the tribunal," continued Doctora Caller, "asked Blanco:

"'Tell me, why are you on trial for holding up banks?'

"And his answer was 'Because that's the way justice operates

in Peru.'

"The trial revealed that not one of the peasants had performed military service, nor attended any school. They seemed to have been born and grown up in a different world. (The hacendados issue their own money, levy tolls, set boundary lines, they violate the whole legal code.) None of them speaks Spanish. And in the trial, only a few points in the actual testimony of the peasants was understood by the court, since a faithful translator was not provided. The lieutenant of the Republican Guard who acted as translator omitted everything that dealt with police abuses. For example, 'asaltocuna' means to the peasant 'assault-guards.' The interpreter translated it as 'guards to be attacked.'"

"The police," said Candela's attorney, "arrested a small gamonal along with his peasants. His crime was his name, Quispe. The prosecution asked him once:

"Where were you on the day this happened?"

"In 'New York,' sir."

"The prosecuting attorney repeated the question several times, and the answer was always the same. It turned out that 'New York' is the name of the gamonal's small hacienda.

"They believed that the peasants were intimidated by Hugo Blanco. That they were only his tools; but they themselves took it on themselves to set this straight.

"Because of Hugo Blanco we now know how to get pure water," one of them said.

"Because of him, we know how to build good roads, proper houses and schools," another said.

"Because of him, we know that we are human beings and not animals," a third one said.

"An 18-year-old boy said: 'If it were not for Hugo, I would never have known what a football is.'"

"One of the oldest of the defendants began to weep. We lawyers thought that it was because he was afraid of the tribunal. These people have never been at a trial and have never seen so many overwhelming things.

"Later the man told us that he had wept because during the three years he was in prison, his father and his son had died and he didn't know if his wife was still alive or if he still had a home.

"The prisoners were subjected to such bad treatment," said Doctora Caller, "that the poor men, as soon as they sat down in

the dock, automatically crossed their wrists as if they were handcuffed.

"Some of them replied, 'Manan,' 'Manan,' 'Manan' [no, no, no] to all the questions they were asked, to the point that one was given the name Fortunato Manan and a psychiatric examination was requested for others.

"I wanted to find out why Fortunato said only 'Manan' and I spoke to him in his language. And he told me, 'Because every time I tell them the truth, they string me up. Now, I don't want them to string me up.'

"In the face of violence like this and the violence inflicted on them from one year to the next, Hugo Blanco raised a cry in the region: 'These murderers can never pass themselves off as the judges of the people's defenders.'"

In conclusion Doctora Caller said, her voice choked with emotion, "Do not make the land of Zela and Pallardeli, the heroic capital of Peru, into a hanging ground for the innocent."

CAMPAIGN IN ITALY FOR HUGO BLANCO'S RELEASE

Rome

Despite the silence of the big daily press, the campaign of solidarity for Hugo Blanco and his comrades is developing in Italy and has achieved encouraging results.

In Rome hundreds of signatures were obtained on an appeal demanding that elementary juridical rights be upheld in the case and that the trial conducted by the military tribunal in Tacna be nullified. Some local sections of the Communist party participated in this action as well as members of the PSIUP [Italian Socialist Party of Proletarian Unity] and, of course, the leaders and members of the Italian section of the Fourth International. The appeal with the attached signatures was lodged with the Peruvian embassy in Rome.

A special action was undertaken by the provincial leaders of the Communist Youth and the left-wing Socialist Youth in Piacenza, a town in Emilia. A letter was sent to the Peruvian ambassador demanding the release of Hugo Blanco and his comrades in the name of a large majority of the youth and people of Piacenza. "We deny that the military tribunal, which is a direct expression of the Peruvian regime in the service of imperialism," declared the letter, "has any right to try Comrade Blanco." The Piacenza organizations sent their letter and an appeal for the release of Blanco to all the federations of the Socialist and Communist youth, asking them to join in the campaign.

The Piacenza appeal met with a favorable response in Bari, among other places, and signatures were obtained there among Communist party and youth circles.

In Trieste, a document of protest and solidarity was signed by leaders and members of the PSIUP. The left-wing socialist circle around Mondo Nuovo in Cosenza, in the south of Italy, likewise joined in the campaign as did another left-wing socialist circle in Follonica (Grosseto) in the center of the country.

In Sicily an appeal was sent to the Peruvian embassy by the provincial federation of the left-wing socialist youth of Ragusa and a campaign is underway thanks to the activities of members of a left-wing cultural circle, "Luigi Pintor." In Palermo various university professors, including Giuseppe Montalbano, Ideale del Carpio, Massimo Mineo and Luciano del Chiara, together with students and trade unionists, including a regional secretary of the CGIL [Italian General Confederation of Labor], signed a letter demanding the immediate release of Hugo Blanco.

Among other actions, telegrams were sent by local groups of the Italian section of the Fourth International, including Venice and Campobello di Mazara (Trapani).

Mondo Nuovo, the weekly organ of the PSIUP, published an article on the sentencing of Blanco and his activities as a leader of revolutionary peasants.

MORE ON THE DEATHS OF DAVID AGUILAR AND EUNICE CAMPIRAN

[The following communication appeared in the September 15 issue of the Mexican biweekly magazine Política. The translation is by World Outlook.]

* * *

Mr. Editor:

On various occasions your illustrious magazine has referred to the death of the university students David Aguilar Mora and his esteemed wife Eunice Campirán, brutally murdered by the military dictatorship headed by the "gorilla" Peralta Azurdia and his gang of killers who wore the insignia of colonels. With complete justification the university students of the great Mexican nation and civic, political and cultural associations have protested over the disappearance of their fallen compatriots.

We should like the Mexican revolutionary youth to know that the Guatemalan students, through the Asociacion de Estudiantes Universitarios (AEU), exercised every legal recourse to determine the whereabouts of your two captured compatriots -- personal inter-

views, conversations with Leobardo Reynoso, the present Mexican ambassador in our country and, in practice, the accomplice of the military dictatorship. A talk was even had with President Díaz Ordaz when he visited our country, although he paid no attention to the problem laid before him, an attitude that signified complete identification with the military regime inflicted on Guatemala.

The Fuerzas Armadas Rebeldes kidnapped the then chairman of the Supreme Court of Justice, Romeo Augusto de León, and the secretary of the presidency, Baltasar Morales de la Cruz, as a way of putting pressure on the "gorillas" to produce the two Mexican students and 26 other persons, including workers leaders of the stature of Víctor Manuel Gutiérrez Garbin, general secretary of the Confederación General de Trabajadores de Guatemala and secretary of the World Federation of Trade Unions and Leonardo Flores, general secretary of the Confederación Nacional Campesina de Guatemala.

When the military government turned over command to the so-called "third government of the revolution" on July 1, the AEU made various trips to the southwest of our country in order to locate the bodies of victims of the Peralta tyranny, and discovered that more than 500 peasants had been murdered by the Guatemalan army.

David Aguilar Mora was shot at the military base in the department of Zacapa after being subjected to terrible torture. Those guilty of this murder were the Second Lieutenant Carlos Cruz y Cruz, alias "Serrucho" [hack-saw], who was helped in his criminal work by G-2 members César Guerra Morales and Rigoberto García, alias "El Gato" [the cat].

The heroine Eunice Campiran, after having been violated by army officers and troops, was murdered by a criminal ax-blow in the head by the bailiff Raúl Ogaldea Sánchez. This butcher is now working for the present government as chief of the mobile police in the department of Escuintla. The two Mexican patriots were buried in the cemetery at Puerto Barrios in a place called "La Ladera."

The journal El Estudiante, faithful defender of the just causes of the people, joins in the demand of the Mexican comrades to have the bodies of Eunice and David brought home so that due honor can be paid them as revolutionary fighters killed for the sole crime of seeking a Latin America freed some day from the imperialist yoke that weighs on our peoples today.

With fraternal greetings from the staff of El Estudiante,

Amado Sanz

Guatemala

VIETNAM CENTER OF CURRENT POLITICAL TOPICS IN ITALIAN LEFT

By Sirio Di Giuliomaria

Rome

After the summer pause, the political situation in Italy is again stirring. The big topics under discussion in the workers parties are Vietnam and the unification of the Social-Democrats.

Vietnam is becoming an increasingly hot subject and the Communist leaders find it more and more difficult to convince the rank and file that the Soviet policy of playing dead is correct. In any local of the PCI [Italian Communist party] where the issue comes up on the agenda, left-wingers and right-wingers clash, with the left wing showing steady progress. The editorial that appeared in Sartre's magazine Les Temps Modernes [see World Outlook September 9], calling on the Soviet leaders to initiate a "counterescalation" to deter Washington in Vietnam, has aroused great interest among militants in spite of the attempts of L'Unità, the PCI organ, to criticize it under the signature of its associate editor.

Closely connected with Vietnam are the events in the People's Republic of China. So far, the PCI has been unable to come up with a satisfactory analysis of what is going on. Many Communist militants wonder about the significance of the events and criticize their party for confining information to sources in the bourgeois press. The pro-Mao tendency in the PCI, at least the one not tied to pro-Mao groups outside the party, is growing more and more critical of the Mao government, particularly in regard to their rejecting an anti-imperialist front to aid Vietnam.

During August, a minor incident affected Mondo Nuovo, the official weekly of the PSIUP [the leftist socialist party that split from Nenni's party]. While General Secretary Vecchietti was "vacationing" in the USSR, a member of the editorial staff published a rather pro-Chinese article on the front page. The paper likewise published some Chinese documents ignored by the Communist press and other interesting documents ignored by L'Unità such as the editorial in Les Temps Modernes.

As soon as Vecchietti got back he hastened to issue an extremely pro-Moscow statement, to assure the Soviet leaders that the pro-Chinese article was but an incident. However, he was unable to move against the author of the article, since he had to take into account the unusually favorable response which that particular issue of Mondo Nuovo had evoked among its readers.

But the warmest topic is the Social-Democratic unification. In the PSI [Nenni's party] and the PSDI [the party founded by Saragat, the incumbent president of Italy, out of a split from Nenni's party], the delivery is taking place with no birth pains.

A relatively small group of PSI left wingers have refused to go along. But the top left-wing leaders, including Lombardi and Scanti, have stated that they will join the new party, while reserving the right to issue public statements against the leadership when the situation warrants such action.

It is reported that Lombardi got in touch with the PCI to find out whether they would let him publish his own magazine as a tendency organ if he should join. Naturally the Communist leaders, despite all their talk about a united party of the Italian workers, would not agree to endanger their bureaucratic grip by granting such tendency rights. In the present situation in the party it would set off a chain reaction of similar demands.

Thus Lombardi and his followers were left with the alternative of joining the united Social Democratic party where they can at least maintain their label while disappearing from view in the quicksand.

The document sealing the unification -- once it is approved by a very formal congress set up by the two parties - is one of the thinnest to appear in Italy in many years. The capitulation of the PSI is complete. The document tells us, for instance, that the workers are undertaking "a long march towards the leadership of the state," while the state is "being transformed more and more from an instrument of oppression in the service of capitalism into a potential instrument for the freedom of the workers, to the extent that the workers participate in the management of public power." Thus socialism becomes "a collective and conscious effort, a laborious and gradual one, of a civilization to be built step by step within democracy and freedom."

But if the unification is causing no great embarrassment to the PSI and PSDI, among the Communists it is likely to become a bone of contention. The PCI leadership is formally criticizing the operation; at the same time it is preparing to open a dialogue with the new united party instead of fighting it politically.

In an editorial in the September 6 L'Unità, Luigi Longo, national secretary of the PCI, concluded his criticism of the unification by stating: "Actually we do not know what reforms the Socialists propose or the order and tempo acceptable to them in implementing them. Let them make these points clear. If they are for implementing real reforms and not engaging in empty talk as a cover for giving up and doing nothing, we are always ready to consider any proposal. We are even ready to modify our own viewpoint, if necessary, and coordinate our actions with those of others, including, of course, the Socialists."

This soft attitude has its own history. For instance, in the CGIL [the General Confederation of Italian Labor], the Communist tendency leaders have always bid for compromises with the Socialist leaders, often at the expense of the PSIUP tendency. The same pattern holds for the municipal councils where the Communists

have often yielded to blackmail from the PSI to exclude PSIUP representatives as a condition for collaboration. The collaboration usually has not lasted long, in many cases succeeding orders from the top have given the signal for the Socialist members of municipal councils to divorce the Communists and begin honeymooning with the Christian Democratic party, the largest bourgeois party.

Another item involved in this is the PCI position toward the government plan known as the Pieraccini Plan, in honor of a Socialist minister. According to a statement issued by the Third Commission of the Central Committee, the PCI is interested in a "serious struggle to modify the line and contents of the draft plan." The parliamentary debate on the plan is seen as "an important occasion...for a real convergence of democratic and socialist forces around a perspective of economic and political change."

The commission further stated: "The criticism the Communists are making on the character and contents of the Pieraccini Plan does not start from non-acknowledgment of the validity of some of its aims and instruments, but tends to single out the central points of a policy of planning around which the political determination of leftist forces -- socialist, lay and Catholic forces -- could be centered strongly."

Such a political stand on the part of the PCI leadership is intolerable to the PSIUP rank and file who have been opposed to the Social Democracy from the beginning. And not only them. The Ingraoists hold similar views. (The Ingraoists are the left wingers who emerged at the eleventh congress of the PCI.) Up to now, Ingrao himself has not made any move. On the contrary, he is said to have discouraged some of his followers who wanted to open an attack.

But the situation inside the PCI and the working class as a whole is such that if the recognized left-wing leaders don't do something, others will come to the forefront. The most advanced sectors of the PCI are looking forward to two important events - the next session of the Central Committee, called for October 10, and the first issue of a new magazine named La Sinistra [the Left], which is scheduled to appear October 15. The publishers are Samonà and Savelli, a Communist publishing house. The editor of La Sinistra will be Lucio Colletti, a Rome university professor who belonged to the PCI until recently.

At the same time it is reported that a fight is going on in the top circles of the PCI among the most influential leaders. Luigi Longo, Togliatti's successor, has proved very inept in handling this. A colorless figure, he is losing more and more prestige. Longo has been trying to overcome his natural handicaps by creating a fresh image of himself as a "leader." In many situations he is now showing up personally. The results, however, have not proved particularly dazzling.

As an example of this, he granted an interview to the German weekly Der Spiegel at the end of August. He tried to create

the impression of being a sincere fellow and did not catch on that his interviewers were slyly pulling his leg.

"You don't use the clenched fist salute?" he was asked.

"Our party has never asked its militants to use any specific form of salute," Longo answered. "Every Communist has always been free to salute as he likes."

"There are Communists who go to church regularly?" the Der Spiegel men asked.

The Communist leader hastened to respond. "Our party does not require any militant to follow religious practices and does not prevent him from doing so."

"But don't you consider religion to be the opium of the people, as Marx once put it?"

Longo recalled his remarks at the eleventh congress where he had said that "during the Vatican II Council and in particular as a consequence of the new way the Church deals with the essential problems of the modern world, we see an overcoming of the conservative positions, just of those positions which made religious ideology 'the opium of the people.'"

Turning to other political problems, the interviewers referred to Longo's statement that "The conception we have of the process of socialist transformation of Italy's society centers on the limitation and progressive elimination of the power of the big monopolies." They asked, "Only of the monopolies and furthermore only the big ones?"

The answer they received was very vague. They followed up with another one: "You therefore want to nationalize only the big industries?"

Longo said that the PCI is not out to nationalize the barber shops.

"And what about FIAT?" (FIAT recently signed a big contract with the Soviet government.)

"Within a plan of socialist transformations FIAT cannot fail to come under the measures concerning the big monopolies," said Longo. Then, probably thinking that this would make the PCI flag look embarrassingly red, he qualified his statement. "Today we do not pose the problem of its immediate realization. We ask for measures that might allow a direct participation of the workers in the organization and policies of production in relation to the general interests of the country."

After some more probing questions and enlightening answers, the dynamic general secretary of the Italian Communist party offered

his German audience some educational statements on the essence of Marxism and brought the interview to an end.

SHAKE-UP REPORTED IN STAFF OF CUBAN NEWSPAPER

The Reuter news agency reported from Havana October 12 that five of the main members of the editorial staff of Granma had been removed. Granma is the official daily newspaper of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba.

Among those shifted to other posts was the secretary of the section of the Communist party to which the staff members belong. According to Reuter, the five journalists were accused of "ideological errors."

What these errors were, the agency did not specify. It reported that it had learned from "generally well-informed sources," that they were apparently removed from the staff because "they opposed Fidel Castro's policy favoring an independent orientation for Cuban Communism and remained faithful to the Soviet Communist line."

The report and explanation offered by Reuter have not yet been confirmed. It has long been apparent to close observers, however, that the Castro leadership has sought to maintain its own independent orientation.

ANOTHER WAR HAWK TALKS OF USING A-BOMBS IN VIETNAM

Another influential voice joined the war hawks headed by such figures as former President Eisenhower, in suggesting the use of nuclear weapons in Vietnam. In a nationwide television program October 9, Senator John Stennis, a Democrat of Mississippi who heads the Senate preparedness subcommittee declared:

"If we are committed to a landlocked war with great hordes of men, we may have to use tactical weapons and I would use them rather than see our men suffer undue loss."

Stennis was not merely talking about the next step in escalating the war in Vietnam; he was alluding, he said, to the possible entry of China and a massive land army into the conflict.

Stennis' advocacy of the use of "tactical" nuclear weapons fits in with the line of thinking of a sector of the Pentagon and the Johnson administration who want to make a "pre-emptive strike" against China, even though this may signal the opening of a third world war and a nuclear holocaust in which all of humanity might perish.

THE CONTINUING CRISIS IN CHINA

By Livio Maitan

The events of the past two months have shown in the clearest possible way the dramatic character of the situation inside the Chinese Communist party. The Central Committee plenum which took place in the first half of August was a crucial episode in the factional struggle which is becoming ever more open and vehement.(1)

Because of the bureaucratic customs of the Chinese leadership, it is impossible to know under what circumstances and with what real aims the plenum was called after a hiatus of four years. Did the group around Mao think that the victory was already won and that the Central Committee would confine itself to formally ratifying the decisions already adopted and approving the changes in the official hierarchy? Did they, on the contrary, call the plenum to launch an attack on members of the Political Bureau who opposed the Cultural Revolution or even advocated a turn in the party's general line? For the time being, there is no material that could provide answers to these questions. Nonetheless, it is clear that a very intense struggle took place at the end of July and beginning of August and that the Mao-Lin Piao group won their new victory by a narrow margin.(2)

Various factors have operated in such a way that far from subsiding after the vicissitudes of the April-June period, the struggle is continuing and even growing more intense. First of all, the action initiated by the partial mobilization of sectors of students, by its very nature produced defensive reflexes and engendered discontent extending beyond the persons and social strata against which it was directly aimed.(3)

(1)An analysis of these events up to the middle of July is contained in a previous article entitled, "Stormy Internal Conflicts in China." See World Outlook October 7 and 14.

(2)An article appearing in Red Flag No. 11, explained that "An error on questions of orientation and an error in line appeared for a short time." It was only Mao's intervention that reportedly corrected them. A whole series of texts, and in particular the sixteen-point document of the Central Committee, speak of serious differences and of "rather strong resistance," of "a struggle which will have its ups and downs." The length of the plenum -- twelve days -- is in itself symptomatic. (The 1962 plenum lasted only four days.) Furthermore, this last plenum seems to have been broadened much more than the previous one.

(3)See in this regard, for example, the sixteen-point document (p.7). "The heads of certain educational institutions, bodies, or work groups organized counterattacks against the masses who criticized them..." See also the Red Flag article reproduced by Pékin Information, No. 34, p. 21.

In the second place, the isolation of the Chinese CP, which had already incurred the serious liabilities of the Indonesian defeat and the political break with Cuba, deepened further after the break with the Japanese CP, the cooling off of the North Koreans, and the refusal of the Vietnamese to associate themselves in any way with the denunciations of the USSR as "an accomplice" of American imperialism.(4) But it was, above all, the evolution of the international situation with the new stepping up of the criminal escalation against the Vietnamese people which must have put into question a line whose results were turning out to be more and more disappointing.

The sixteen-point document which was published during the plenum of the Central Committee provides rather clear indications on at least some of the differences in the party and the leading group itself. And, in a certain sense, it appears to be a reply to arguments advanced by the opposition; though, of course, it avoids giving any objective information about this opposition to the party membership and to the international working-class public.(5)

To judge from this document, those who opposed the student movement -- the so-called Cultural Revolution -- offered the following arguments: The mass mobilization was dangerous because of the immaturity of the students, and because it might result in widening the gap between the different tendencies and groups in the party.(6) Party cadres and leaders might be pilloried by personal attacks, in particular in wall bulletins. Certain extremist attitudes on questions of culture might hinder scientific work; and, more generally, the movement as a whole might create difficulties in normal production.

The reply of the majority group was the mobilization of the masses was a prime necessity, that the masses would educate themselves in the course of the movement, that production, in the last analysis, would be stimulated by the Cultural Revolution. At the same time, however, certain guarantees were given, and there was an attempt to quiet some fears: All personal criticism in the

(4)It was precisely during the session of the Central Committee when the open break with the Japanese CP occurred with the crisis in the Gensuikyo (the Japanese committee against the A and H-bombs).

(5)According to official sources, a "centrist" tendency also exists. See the Red Flag article already cited which appeared in Pékin Information, No. 34, p. 22.

(6)A common accusation against oppositionists and those who might be characterized as "conciliationists" was fear of the mass movement. See, among other sources, HNA [Hsinhua New Agency] July 7, pp. 8-9; and August 8, p. 3.

press was placed under the control of the party bodies at the various levels. As for the army, all power of decision was left to the Military Commission of the Central Committee and to the general Political Department of the People's Army. A policy of caution toward "men of science, technical personnel and ordinary personnel" was envisaged, and the method of persuasion through rational argument was recommended as the solution for differences and conflicts.(7)

At the same time, the polemic continued, growing sharper on other questions already debated in the preceding months. It was probably not by accident that the day the Central Committee plenum opened, the Liberation Army Daily published an important article once again criticizing the thesis of the primacy of the technical factor over the political factor and drawing in particular a balance sheet of the major struggles that took place in the army following the war in Korea up until recently.(8) Attacks were again opened likewise against "revisionist" concepts in the economic field, Sun Ken-fang being indicated as the main spokesman of this tendency.(9) In addition, in the ambit of the struggle against the danger of revisionism, they insistently advanced an idea attributed to Mao Tse-tung and characterized as an "epoch-making development of Marxism-Leninism," according to which from now on the traditional division of labor can now be more or less overcome, the workers engaging also in military affairs, the field of culture, in commerce and, if possible, in agriculture and the peasants also going beyond their specific activities.(10)

(7)With regard to science, the attitude of the ruling group in general seems to be prudent; at the very height of the Cultural Revolution, some articles and speeches stressed the importance of Western scientific contributions and the duty of learning from the experience of other countries with modesty. (See HNA [Hsinhua News Agency], July 23, p. 16 and July 24, p. 5.)

(8)See HNA, August 2, p. 4, and August 21, p. 4. The article cited speaks of three fundamental struggles: at the end of the war in Korea, in 1959, and "not very long ago." The third struggle enabled them to strike the "representatives of the bourgeoisie who had got hold of important posts in the army."

(9)See HNA, August 10, pp. 4-5. Sun Ken-fang was said to have diffused his "poisonous" ideas for ten years, particularly between 1960 and 1962 "when all kinds of monsters in China came out into the open." Sun Ken-fang's theses must have been even more far-reaching than those of Liberman. See also in HNA, August 13, pp. 31-33, an article that takes up the ideas of the leading Chinese group on major economic questions of the transition period.

(10)See HNA, August 4, p. 11: "In such an army of workers, all are all-round people who make work in industry their main task but who also engage in other trades and occupations. They are both red and expert, fighters and civilians, workers and peasants. With hammer

The official documents make only rather rare and indirect allusions to differences on the most pressing current problems of international policy. There is no doubt, however, that it was in this area that the most violent polemics developed at the time of the plenum of the Central Committee. There is no doubt, too, that this is where they are continuing to develop.

It is highly probable also that, in face of the continuing escalation and the increased danger of aggression against China by American imperialism, the ruling group has become still more profoundly split. On the one hand, what one might call the Mao-Lin Piao tendency may hold that the situation requires a hardened attitude toward the USSR, whose "treachery" demands all the greater denunciation, as well as within the country (in order to avoid any possible split at the time of a major test). On the other hand, the opposition tendencies may have advocated a more realistic appraisal of the military potential of the country and a serious effort to establish, if only partially, an anti-imperialist united front with the USSR.(11) An ardent reflection of these polemics was the noisy reappearance of the paper tiger thesis, and the resurrection of certain propaganda themes accompanied by attempts at an analysis of the causes of the weakness of American imperialism in the present stage.(12)

in hand they are able to do factory work, with plough they are able to do farming, with the gun they are able to fight the enemy and with the pen they are able to express themselves in writing." By applying such a concept, "it will be possible to promote the narrowing step by step of the gap between workers and peasants, town and countryside and mental and manual labour, prevent abnormal urban and industrial development." (HNA, August 2, p. 7. See also August 7, p. 3, where the Army's exemplary application of Mao's concepts is stressed.) The "voluntarist" aspect of ideas of this kind is clear. In reality it is impossible by means of this kind to overcome the unripeness of objective conditions and actually open a passageway to the higher stage of a socialist society. But all this can have a rather concrete bearing if the aim of the ruling group is to prepare the country for a prolonged war in which they may be compelled to reconstruct the productive apparatus by exploiting all the possibilities above and beyond the "normal" division of labor.

(11)An article that appeared on the eve of the plenum attacked "certain persons" who proposed a "joint action" with the USSR, a new version of "united action," according to the People's Daily. (See HNA, July 31, p. 7.) This allusion unquestionably concerns the leaders of certain Communist parties, but also the domestic proponents of such an orientation.

(12)The official articles emphasized in particular the deepening inter-imperialist divisions and the unproductiveness of the escalation of the war in Vietnam. (See especially HNA, August 25, 28, and 30; and September 1, 4, and 8.)

The rejoinder of the Mao-Lin Piao group to an opposition which, far from surrendering, continued to fight with increased vigor, was outlined in the Central Committee session and filled out in the days immediately following.

After giving guarantees to those who feared the consequences of a line pushed to the extreme (that was the meaning, as I indicated, of several directives contained in the sixteen points), the majority operated simultaneously on various levels. First of all, despite the silence of the official communiqués in this respect, they reorganized the leading bodies, probably removing Peng Chen from the Political Bureau and the candidate members Lu Ting and Lo Jui-ching, from the Secretariat, and promoting Kang Shen to full membership and to membership in the Secretariat. Undoubtedly of still greater importance, the hierarchy was changed at the highest level with the demotion of Liu Shiao-chi in particular and the consolidation of Lin Piao's position as No. 2 man and Mao's unchallenged heir. (13)

They decided, furthermore, to launch a new wave of the Cultural Revolution, appealing to the masses, and establishing the subsequently celebrated Red Guards. Thereby, they sought to strike harder blows, to intimidate their adversaries, and to create situations of irreversible accomplished facts. At the same time, they intensified the campaign against the Soviet leaders, going so far as to engage in threats. They organized a huge demonstration in front of the Soviet embassy with the obvious objective of deepening the already very deep split. Another wave of the cult of Mao, pitched in the most frenetic language, crowned all these operations. Mao himself participated in giant meetings in Peking. (14)

(13)As for Kang Sheng, it should be recalled that he was already a special member of the Political Bureau before the 1956 congress. Finally, without exaggerating the importance of questions of precedence, attention should be paid to the difference between the list of figures present at the August 18 demonstration and the list of those present at the demonstration of August 31. In the second list, Chen Po-ta, previously presented as "head of the group in charge of the Cultural Revolution under the Central Committee" (HNA, August 18, p. 3 and August 28, p. 4) no longer appears. And after the names of Chou En-lai and Tao-chu appear the names of Nieh Jung-chén, a member of the Central Committee, deputy prime minister and vice-chairman of the Council of National Defense, and Chiang Ching, Mao's wife, introduced as "deputy head of the Cultural Revolution group under the party CC." (HNA, August 18, p. 3, and September 1, p. 3). Chen Po-ta's name appeared again in the list of August 18 in the report on the September 15 demonstrations. Nieh Yung-chen's name came further down, while Chiang Ching appeared in the list of less important figures. (See HNA, September 16, p. 3 and 5.)

(14)More or less grotesque examples can be found in all Chinese publications of the period in question. Note especially the campaign to sell Mao's books -- the publication of which, to believe the

Let us come back to the Cultural Revolution and Red Guard movement. The objectives of the Cultural Revolution have not been clearly stated from the beginning, and there are still variations in defining both ends and means. In the first phase, the movement was directed rather -- so it seemed -- at improving a situation in the cultural sector, in the universities and schools which was dangerous for the ruling group. Progressively, however, it broadened in scope and it became more openly an instrument of struggle against the oppositionists in general. According to its partisans, this movement would sweep away all the residue of the past, blocking the way to the revisionists and, in the last analysis, would contribute to expanding the productive forces.(15)

In a more general way, furthermore, they introduced the perspective that the Cultural Revolution was the beginning of an economic and political revolution. (HNA, August 30, p. 4.) And Lin Piao stated on August 18: "The great proletarian Cultural Revolution is aimed precisely at eliminating bourgeois ideology, establishing proletarian ideology, remoulding the people's soul, revolutionising their ideology, digging out the roots of revisionism and consolidating and developing the socialist system."

More concretely, the sixteen points state that "the movement in progress is directed primarily against those who hold leadership positions in the party and follow the path of capitalism," (point five). If one takes into consideration the fact that according to the Chinese leaders all those who do not share their views and support their present policies, "follow the path of capitalism," it is perfectly clear that the Mao-Lin Piao group launched the Cultural Revolution and created the Red Guards in order to provide themselves with an organizational structure which could be used to defeat all resistance to their line and to apply pressure to the state and party apparatus, which was itself divided.

They, therefore, considered it necessary to set going a mass mobilization. But they addressed themselves in fact to a quite limited sector of the masses; namely, the young students. This choice was made for several reasons. First of all, since the first phase of the struggle was centered in the area of culture, it was easier to get the attention of the students. Secondly, a mobilization of students was necessarily limited; it thereby implied less danger for the bureaucracy, and did not appear likely to involve serious negative effects on production. In addition, the ruling

official sources, had previously been sabotaged! -- and the extreme declarations of the Red Guards: "We Red Guards, we are the most resolute in following Chairman Mao's teachings. We do whatever he says." (HNA, August 30, p. 18.)

(15)The Cultural Revolution movement is officially linked to the movement for socialist education launched in 1963. (See HNA, August 13. See also on the Cultural Revolution HNA, August 8 and September 10.)

group had the possibility in this to establish ties with those who would be the party and state cadres in the more or less proximate future; and the Cultural Revolution could represent a kind of synthetic substitute for the youth for experience in the revolution which they lacked due to their age. (Elsewhere I have emphasized how much the ruling group seems to be preoccupied with this particular gap distinguishing the youth from the generations of the revolutionary war period.)

In order to facilitate the desired mobilization and to arouse the enthusiasm of the youth, Mao and Lin Piao had to utilize certain themes and a tone which would enable them to appear as the most radical wing of the party and the one closest to the democratic demands of the masses. This is why they resorted to the constant exaltation of the indispensable role of the masses; in the sixteen points, they codified the necessity of democratic debate and minority rights; they invoked the democratic revolutionary tradition of the Paris Commune with regard to the system of electing leading bodies of the Red Guards.(16) This is why they tried to give the movement the appearance of a struggle against the vestiges of capitalism and against all the bulwarks of conservatism and privilege.

If the news transmitted by various sources from Peking is true, and if one may so interpret the repeated words of caution voiced by the ruling group, the movement, or a part of the movement, slipped beyond the control of its promoters. The destruction of old symbols, the change in the names of streets, localities, public buildings, etc., are well-known, as well as the excesses, extending from altering haircuts to the pulling down of ancient monuments.(17) This probably entered into the plans of the leaders; and it is also possible that they made allowance from the beginning for attacks against the representatives of the former possessing classes, and more especially against the "national" capitalists, who received considerable compensation for their expropriated properties.(18) But the blows delivered by the Red Guard often fell

(16)See especially HNA, July 30, p. 3; August 12 and 19, pp. 3 and 9, on the role of the masses. On "the confrontation of different opinions...inevitable, necessary and beneficial," and on respect for minorities, "because sometimes the truth is on their side," (see point six of the sixteen points. On invoking the Paris Commune, see point nine of the sixteen points.)

(17)On acts of this sort by the Red Guards, see, among other sources, HNA, August 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, and 30 passim.

(18)In several instances, the Chinese press itself alluded to places frequented by the privileged. (See, in particular, HNA, August 25, p. 11 and 25.) As for the former capitalists, American sources estimate that the indemnifications were rather substantial (five percent per year on the value of the confiscated properties). These

on bureaucrats also -- houses were ransacked, cars blocked by crowds, and the incursions into certain luxurious places did not affect only the survivors of the past -- the habitués of these same places were by preference highly placed dignitaries of the regime and their foreign guests. When you make extensive use of equalitarian slogans, as the Chinese leaders have done, you cannot, in the long run, avoid the eventuality that some will take you at your word and attack privileges of all kinds, above all if the masses are mobilized. On the other hand, if a constant propaganda barrage explains that capitalists have infiltrated party bodies and established their dictatorship there, it is inevitable that the party itself, at various levels, will become subject to accusations and real attacks. (19)

The Mao-Lin Piao group is again faced with a difficult choice -- either to permit the movement to continue, with all the dangers this would imply from the point of view of bureaucratic power, or to restrain it, giving respite to their adversaries. As of this writing, they seem to have chosen an intermediate solution: The movement continues, its essential goals are confirmed; but some measures and directives of a limiting character have been introduced. Thus, the students were urged not to search state and party functionaries, to leave in peace workers and peasants, who "constitute the principal force of the revolution" and whose productive activities must not be hindered; to avoid all acts of compulsion, including any directed against elements considered to be the most hostile to the party. At the same time, the Red Guards have been requested to participate in agricultural work, and their influx into Peking is regulated in the most precise way in order to prevent the gatherings from building up too much. (20)

It is difficult to say how much truth there is in the reports of serious incidents which have been widely circulated, including by the press services of the USSR and the other East European countries. According to these reports, the gamut of incidents is

benefits reputedly went to some 90,000 families. (See the September 16 New York Herald Tribune published in Paris.)

(19) According to the press services, some wall bulletins of the Red Guards attacked Li Hsueh-feng, who replaced Peng Chen in the leadership of the party in Peking. Yang Hsin-feng, the chairman of the Supreme Court, is also said to have been subjected to a session of criticism, (See Le Monde, September 16.)

(20) According to the reports in the press, attacks against the houses and cars of party and state cadres were forbidden under the pretext that secret documents might fall into indiscreet hands. As for the directive to avoid violence, see HNA, August 30, September 1 and 6. The other directives were set down, in the main, in the first half of September.

extremely varied, extending from scuffles in hairdressers' shops to conflicts between Red Guards and local party leaders, from brawls between students and workers or peasants, to a veritable assault on a party headquarters in Shanghai. What is certain is that resistance to the policies of the group that has been in the majority up to now has been vigorous in the most diverse sectors -- and clashes have no doubt occurred on several occasions. The official sources themselves support such a hypothesis.(21)

In fact, the forces at work are by no means homogeneous, even if certain tendencies predominate on both sides of the barricades. The front commanded by Mao and Lin Piao is polarized essentially around a sectarian bureaucratic tendency, but in the movement which it has created for the indicated objectives, there are unquestionably sectors of the youth motivated by revolutionary demands and aspirations. Among the oppositionists, tendencies of a Khrushchevist type very probably have the preponderant weight and, for obvious reasons, they represent the most serious danger for the Mao group at the present time; nonetheless, even the official documents mention the existence of left-wing elements,(22) and it is entirely plausible that many cadres and party members side with the oppositionists who reject merely the excesses of the majority policies. As for the resistance to the Red Guard movement, its origin may be different. There are probably some whose reaction is confined to instinctive self-defense. There are probably actual representatives of the former ruling classes. There are probably intellectuals revolted by a grotesque neo-Zhdanovism, and even workers and peasants who refuse to accept strictures or to waste time on incessantly repeated rituals.(23)

The struggle is still undecided, and no one can exclude the possibility that spectacular changes will occur, above all in view of the explosive international situation in Vietnam. The Mao group itself, forced to the wall, might try to execute a turn. In any case, the Chinese leadership as a whole will emerge from this test with its capital considerably reduced in the eyes of the party membership and the masses who will have a more critical attitude toward them from now on. The time of the myth of a monolithic party united around prestigious leaders of the revolution has gone forever.

September 16, 1966

(21)See HNA, September 6, p. 6, and also point seven of the sixteen points.

(22)See HNA, August 23, p. 4: "The resistance has come mainly from the counter-revolutionary revisionists at home and abroad and from all kinds of 'left' and right opportunists in the party."

(23)Some articles have explicitly noted conflicts between students and "a minority of workers and peasants." (See, among other sources, the articles in the People's Daily, August 23, cited by Pékin Information, No. 36, pp. 15-16.)

MEXICAN STUDENTS PROTEST GOVERNMENT REPRESSION

[The following declaration in opposition to the current repressive moves of the Mexican government was issued jointly in Mexico City by a number of student organizations, which are listed alphabetically. The text from which World Outlook made the translation appeared in the September 1 issue of the Mexico City bimonthly magazine Política.]

* * *

On Friday, August 12, a number of squads of police and troops jailed 46 persons. When the arrests were carried out, homes were broken into, furniture smashed and valuable objects stolen -- all this without a search warrant. In addition to many political opponents who live in the Federal District, oppositionist trade-union leaders were detained in Tlalnepantla, Mexico, and peasant leaders in Durango. Many of them were indicted by the authorities. The basis for this was confessions extracted under torture from people held incommunicado. Additional evidence consisted of assertions by the police and arms which were allegedly "found" by the police in the home of one of those arrested, a home that was neither frequented nor lived in by the main defendants.

This occurrence was not something isolated, but part of a policy of repression applied by the government which had already led to political jailings last March and April and in previous years. It once again testifies to the fact that the government continues to repress any genuine political opposition, including union and peasant opposition. Such facts expose the talk of the regime about freedom, democracy and the constitution as designed only to cover up the repression.

Once more the repression demonstrates how easily the government forgets its oath to "abide by the constitution and the laws based on it." Thus the government:

- Violated Article 6 of the constitution proclaiming freedom of expression.
- Violated Article 9 of the constitution proclaiming freedom of assembly and association.
- Violated Article 16 of the constitution which states that "no one can be molested in his person, family, home, papers or possessions" without a court order.
- Violated Article 19 of the constitution which states that no one can be detained more than 72 hours without a formal order citing proofs of guilt.
- Violated Article 20, paragraph II, of the constitution,

which states that no one under accusation "can be compelled to testify against himself so that holding a person incommunicado, or any other means tending to achieve this, is strictly forbidden."

● Violated Article 129 of the constitution which states that "in times of peace no military authority can exercise functions outside of those strictly in connection with military discipline."

The student organizations that have signed below condemn political repression of any kind and demand the immediate release of the political, union and peasant prisoners, including Vallejo and his comrades, Gilly and his comrades and now Rico Galan and Ugalde and their comrades, as well as the others who have been detained throughout the country under analogous conditions.

STOP THE GOVERNMENT REPRESSION!

Alianza de Izquierda Revolucionaria de Economía (UNAM*).

Brecha Estudiantil (Normal Superior)

Comité Pro-Reforma Universitaria (Medicine, UNAM)

Estudio y Lucha (Normal de Maestros)

Fracción Estudiantil del Partido Mexicano de los Trabajadores (e.f.)

Fracción Estudiantil del Partido Obrero Revolucionario

Frente Revolucionaria de Acción Democrática (Ciencias Políticas, UNAM)

Grupo Miguel Hernandez (Filosofía, UNAM)

Grupo Progresista de Ingeniería (UNAM)

Grupo Revolución (Escuela Nacional Preparatoria)

Grupo Ruben Jaramillo (Escuela Nacional Preparatoria No. 3)

Liga Obrero Estudiantil (Ciencias Políticas y Sociales, UNAM)

Partido Estudiantil Progresista (Derecho, UNAM)

Partido Estudiantil Socialista Revolucionario (Ciencias Políticas, UNAM)

Unión de Lucha Estudiantil de Ciencias (UNAM)

*Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México -- Autonomous National University of Mexico.

WHY MAGAN DESAI JOINED INDIAN TROTSKYIST MOVEMENT

[In our June 24 issue, we reported that the Socialist Workers Party of India had formed a state unit in Gujarat, electing Magan Desai of Baroda as its secretary. The designation of Desai was something of a sensation, since he had been a prominent leader of the Communist Party of India (Marxist).

[Magan Desai, who is now 35, joined the Communist movement in the early fifties as a student of architecture, soon becoming a full-time organizer for the party. When differences developed following the Sino-Indian border dispute, he joined the left faction and became one of the founding members of the Communist Party of India (Marxist) when the pro-Peking grouping decided to launch a new organization in September 1964. Arrested and jailed, together with many other leaders of the left-wing party, he did considerable reading while in prison. As a result of his studies, he announced his resignation from the party, stating that he had serious differences with the "Stalinist methods" of the top leadership.

[He explained his position in a 40-page letter of resignation which he made public. A summary of this letter appeared in the July issue of Marxist Outlook, the monthly magazine of the SWPI. From this we have taken the following extracts.]

* * *

His basic difference with the two CPIs is the question of the strategy of the Indian revolution. He rejects the theory of a "four-class bloc" (alliance of the proletariat with the national bourgeoisie) enunciated by the Right CPI in the name of a "national democratic revolution" and also by the Left CPI in the name of a "people's democratic revolution." He maintains that the character of the revolution in India in the present epoch is "anticapitalist" and "socialist." The original letter is in Gujarati and is being published by the Gujarat Unit of the Socialist Workers Party because of the significant discussion it has raised on the problems of the international Marxist movement.

"After almost two years of serious thinking and reading in jail, and on the basis of my past experience and observations, I have come to the conclusion that there exists irreconcilable ideological differences between me and the party and I do not see any possibilities of overcoming these differences in the near future," writes Magan Desai in his letter to the party. He says: "I have still unshakable faith in the ideology of Marxism-Leninism but cannot digest the degeneration it has undergone in the hands of Stalin and subsequently of Khrushchev and Kosygin. Nor do I accept the interpretation of Marxism-Leninism by 'radical' Mao Tse-tung. Since Lenin's death, Marxism has been reduced to a sect under the leadership of Stalin and his blind followers."

The author of the letter appears to have reexamined his own

"Stalinist" past in the light of his study of some of the fundamental works of Leon Trotsky. Isaac Deutscher's trilogy on Trotsky along with the literature of the Fourth International profoundly influenced his recent ideological orientation.

Magan Desai sets out to discuss the degeneration of the Communist movement in the post-Lenin era on an international canvass. He refers to the peculiar historical conditions in which a bureaucracy emerged in the Soviet Union, the first workers' state, economically backward, isolated by civil war and interventionist war and failures or betrayals of socialist revolutions in different countries.

He explains how the Stalinist bureaucracy which usurped the leadership of the Comintern betrayed the revolutions in China (1925-28), Spain (1935-37) and Greece (1943-47) and contributed to the emergency of Nazism in Germany (1930-33) by its anti-Marxist sectarian or opportunist policies.

He traces the root cause of the bureaucratic degeneration of the Communist parties to the Stalinist theory of "socialism in a single country" which led to the subordination of the world movement to the diplomatic needs of the Soviet bureaucracy. This also led to the liquidation of Soviet democracy and suppression of inner-party democracy in the Communist party in the USSR and the ultimate physical liquidation of the Bolshevik Old Guard.

In this context while explaining the Leninist concept of proletarian democracy, the author refers to Lenin's "Last Testament" and the struggle Lenin put up in his last days against the dangers of a bureaucracy consolidating itself in Soviet society. Magan Desai maintains that in none of the "socialist countries" (workers states) does real soviet democracy exist today. He therefore stresses the need for political revolutions in all these countries to restore soviet democracy.

He cites the Hungarian Revolution (1956) to illustrate how the workers in "socialist" countries can struggle against their bureaucracies to restore soviet democracy. He says that Khrushchev -- egged on by Mao -- ordered the Red Army to suppress the Workers Councils in Hungary. An important question is posed: "How can the Soviet and the Chinese bureaucracies permit soviet democracies in other socialist countries when they do not permit soviet democracy in their own countries?"

About the Chinese revolution he states that Mao and colleagues led it to a victory in spite of Stalin's opposition; but notwithstanding the Maoist theory of a "four-class bloc" and "people's democracy," the Chinese revolution could not be contained within the framework of a so-called "people's democracy" and it uninterruptedly developed into a socialist revolution, confirming the Marxist (Trotskyist) theory of "permanent revolution." While the Chinese have resuscitated some Leninist principles in the struggle against Khrushchevism, he points out that Mao, like Stalin, has denied soviet

democracy to the Chinese proletariat and has liquidated his political opponents inside China.

Says Magan Desai: "It is regrettable that the Chinese are vociferously repeating the old discredited Stalinist slanders against the old Bolsheviks (Trotsky, Zinoviev, Bukharin, etc.) and are thus injecting poison into the minds of the new Bolshevik generations of Asia, Africa and Latin America."

About the drive for so-called de-Stalinisation in the USSR and Khrushchev's revelations in 1956 of Stalin's crimes, Magan Desai points out no light had so far been thrown officially on the circumstances in which the phenomenon of Stalinism emerged in the Soviet Union.

He has linked the history of the CP of India and various twists and turns in its policies with the ever-changing shifts in the short-sighted diplomatic manoeuvres of the Soviet bureaucracy with the capitalist powers. He discusses how the CPI played the role of supporting the imperialist war and sabotaging the anti-imperialist mass movement in 1942. He says: "In the name of defending the Soviet Union, the CPI exhibited an opportunist and escapist policy. With the result that it was completely isolated from the toiling people and had to pay a heavy price for it."

He says that both the Soviet and the Chinese CPs pursue opportunist policies which subserve their own "bureaucratically conceived national interests." While the Soviet CP had openly given up the concept of class struggle in the capitalist countries in the name of peaceful coexistence and peaceful transition to socialism the Chinese CP kept mum on class struggle in capitalist countries, especially in countries that are friendly to China.

He says that in India, as in other countries, the reformist and left CPs tail-end the Soviet or the Chinese CPs and are not prepared to learn from the mistakes of the Soviet and Chinese CPs.

Magan Desai rejects the Chinese criticism that Yugoslavia has ceased to be a workers state and become a bourgeois state, although he does not agree with Tito's revisionist concepts of Marxism.

In the Sino-Indian border confrontation he thinks that both the Soviet and Chinese leaders repudiated their internationalist obligations to the world proletariat. He, however, stands for the defence of the workers states.

The letter lays a great deal of stress on the great moral qualities and humanist appeal of Marxism which has been destroyed by Stalinism. He says: "Marxism-Leninism as a scientific ideology is based on clarity of thought and truthfulness. Marxism was a great source of inspiration to millions. After Lenin's death its decline began at the hands of Stalin and the blind followers who have converted it into a sect." He believes that the younger gener-

ation of Marxists in India should accept the challenge posed by Stalinism and endeavour to revive the revolutionary as well as the humanist values of Marxism-Leninism.

Magan Desai has also criticised the bureaucratic functioning and absence of internal democracy in the Left CP. He had demanded that his letter be circulated and discussed among party members but it was rejected. But his resignation and the issues raised by him have provoked a major discussion among the ranks of the Right and Left CPI in Gujarat. The document deserves the serious attention of the Communist ranks in the country.

GRIM PROOF OF THE NATURE OF VIETNAM CONFLICT

A statistical study of American ground casualties in the fighting in Vietnam offers striking indirect confirmation that the conflict is primarily of a civil nature, involving largely guerrilla forces. The study, reported in the New York Times of October 7, compares the character of wounds inflicted on American troops in World War II, the Korean war and Vietnam.

About 61% of the killed or wounded in 1944, a typical year of the second world war, were caused by fragments from artillery and mortar shells. Only 18% were due to bullets from rifles, machine guns and other small arms.

In Korea about 50% of the wounds were caused by artillery and mortar shells. Some 27% were due to bullets.

In Vietnam, on the other hand, only 18.9% of a sampling of American casualties were victims of mortar shells while 34.7% were wounded by bullets.

"Military analysts," reports the Times, "believe the contrast between the Vietnam casualties and those of the earlier wars directly reflects the fact that the American soldier in Vietnam faces a guerrilla-type enemy rather than a conventional armed force."

The radically different nature of the fighting in comparison to a "conventional" war is shown in other ways, too. In World War II, about 1.6% of American casualties were caused by grenades. In Korea the percentage was about 8%. In Vietnam it is 15.7%.

Similarly, in World War II only 3.1% of American ground casualties were caused by mines and booby traps. In Korea the figure was 3.9%. In Vietnam it is 20.6%.

The statistics also indicate that the arms used by the Vietnamese freedom fighters are by and large seized from the foe or are home-made. Whatever equipment is being received from sources like China and the Soviet Union would also seem to consist mostly of small arms.