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Taking Chinese ideological pronouncements at their face value, one would assume Peking's interest in Latin America to be determined by the assumption that this area is one of "the storm centers of world revolution dealing direct blows at imperialism."\(^1\)

"The anti-imperialist revolutionary struggles of the people in Asia, Africa and Latin America" says the Proposal Concerning the General Line, "are pounding and undermining the foundations of the rule of imperialism and colonialism. . . . In a sense therefore the whole cause of the international proletarian revolution hinges on the outcome of the revolutionary struggles of the people of these areas, who constitute the overwhelming majority of the world's population."\(^2\)

One would thus expect to see a considerable Chinese effort to support the "revolutionary struggles" in Latin America, particularly in the form of material and organizational assistance to the Leftist extremist guerrilla groups operating in several Latin American countries. In actual fact, however, Chinese support for the guerrillas has so far been largely verbal. The real Chinese effort in Latin America has been directed at a very different and far more modest goal: not against the great imperialist foe, the United States, but against Soviet influence in the area.

---


\(^2\) Loc. cit.
Specifically the Chinese have attempted to wean the weak and ineffective Latin American Communist parties from their allegiance to Moscow. Having failed in this, they have endeavored to split pro-Chinese factions off from these parties. It is significant that in the few cases where they have succeeded in doing so, the new pro-Chinese parties have not attempted to set up guerrilla fronts nor have they united with existing guerrilla movements.

In Latin America as elsewhere one is thus struck by the discrepancy between the grandiloquence of Chinese ideological declamations, which give the impression of megalomania and an utterly distorted, totally unrealistic view of the world, and Peking's actual policy, which for all its errors and failures appears to have been devised with a complete awareness of China's very limited means and possibilities.

**Chinese Ideological Pronouncements:**

**The "National-Democratic" Theme**

The formula "national and democratic" appears in Chinese pronouncements concerning Latin America as early as 1960. Reporting a speech by Chu Tu-nan, President of the China-Latin America Friendship Association, *Peking Review*, III, 35, of August 30, 1960, refers to "the vigorous development of the national and democratic movements in Latin America." The Greetings of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party to the Fifth Congress of the Brazilian Communist Party, a document dated August 12, 1960, praised that party for its efforts to develop "a

---

3 Published in *Peking Review*, III, 37, September 14, 1960.
national and democratic united front." It claimed that "owing to the ever increasing strength of the socialist camp and the vigorous development of the national and democratic movements in Africa, Asia and Latin America, U.S. imperialism has become isolated," and wished the Brazilian Communist Party "new successes and achievements . . . in the cause of defending the Cuban Revolution and the national and democratic movements in Latin America . . . ."

An editorial in the Peking People's Daily of December 26, 1960\(^4\) claims that "Today . . . the tide of national and democratic revolution in Latin America is surging to unprecedented heights." The article then defines the "basic objective" of the Latin American peoples in their present revolution as being "to free themselves from every kind of U.S. imperialist domination and control, and to achieve complete victory in their national and democratic revolution by safeguarding their national independence and sovereignty and developing a prosperous economy in their respective countries and improving the livelihood of their peoples."

The term again appears in the resolution of the Chinese Central Committee on the Moscow November 1960 meeting of Communist parties, which was passed on January 18, 1961.\(^5\) This resolution asserts that the "rise of the national and democratic revolutions is a great development second only to the formation of the world socialist system." Later the formula "national and democratic" was modified by omission of the word "and." A


"survey of 1961," "Latin America on the Move," published in Peking Review, V, 2, January 12, 1962, states that "during 1961, the national democratic movement in Latin America has thus not only repulsed repeated U.S. imperialist attacks but broadened and deepened." In these forms, with or without "and," with or without a hyphen, it reappears in general policy statements and in documents referring to Latin American affairs throughout the following years. Thus, the "Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement" of June 14, 1963, states of "the vast areas of Asia, Africa, and Latin America," that:

"The national democratic revolutionary movement in these areas and the international socialist revolutionary movement are the two great historical currents of our time."

"The national democratic revolution in these areas is an important component of the contemporary proletarian world revolution."6

The formula appears again in a report on Chinese support for the "Dominican Peoples Anti-U.S. Struggle" in Peking Review, VIII, 21, May 21, 1965, according to which Mayor P'eng Chen of Peking referred to this struggle as "marking a new upsurge of the national-democratic movement."

It again appears in Lin Piao's article "Long Live the Victory of People's War."7 But this time with an important qualification. As originally used, emphasis had been on the broadness of the national democratic front. "Workers, peasants, intellectuals, petty bourgeoisie and national bourgeoisie--all have had their fill of enslavement, exploitation, and oppression by U.S. imperialism and its lackeys. It is therefore not

---


only necessary but also entirely possible for these classes and social strata to line up in the broadest national democratic united front against their enemies." Lin Piao, on the other hand, stresses the leading role of the working class and the decisive importance of the worker-peasant alliance within the broader united front:

"History shows that during the national-democratic revolution there must be two kinds of alliance within this united front, first, the worker-peasant alliance and, second, the alliance of the working people with the bourgeoisie and other non-working people. The worker-peasant alliance is an alliance of the working class with the peasants and all other working people in town and country. It is the foundation of the united front. Whether the working class can gain leadership of the national-democratic revolution depends on whether it can lead the broad masses of the peasants in struggle and rally them around itself. Only when the working class gains leadership of the peasants, and only on the basis of the worker-peasant alliance, is it possible to establish the second alliance, form a broad united front and wage a people's war victoriously. Otherwise, everything that is done is unreliable like parcels in the air or so much empty talk." \(^9\)

It will be noted that in Chinese usage the term "national democratic" is always employed to describe revolutions, movements, or fronts. It is never used to characterize a state or regime, as in the Declaration of the

---


November 1960 Conference of Communist parties in Moscow and in subsequent Soviet statements.  

We have seen that the Chinese already employ the term "national and democratic" as applied to revolutions, movements and alliances, months before the November 1960 conference. One can only surmise that in the editorial commission which prepared the conference declaration the Russians took up this Chinese formula and twisted it in order to apply it to states and regimes. The "state of national democracy" is described in the Moscow Declaration as "a state which consistently upholds its political and economic independence, fights against imperialism and its military blocs, and against military bases on its territory; a state which fights against the new forms of colonialism and the penetration of imperialist capital; a state which rejects dictatorial and despotic forms of government; a state in which the people are assured broad democratic rights and freedoms (freedom of speech, press, assembly, demonstrations, establishment of political parties and public organizations), the opportunity to work for the enactment of an agrarian reform and the realization of other democratic and social changes and for participation in shaping government policy."


Peking's dislike of this concept is illustrated by the fact that it did not even apply it to Cuba. The Chinese frequently referred to the "Cuban people's revolution," sometimes qualifying it as a "national and democratic revolution." 12

On April 16, 1961, Castro himself proclaimed the Cuban Revolution to be a socialist one, 13 but Peking was remarkably slow in acknowledging this. It was not until September 17, 1962 one and a half years later, that a statement by the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs recognized the socialist nature of the Cuban Revolution. 14 A further Chinese government statement, on November 30, 1962, stated that during the missile crisis, the Cuban people had "defended the honor of a socialist country." 15


13 In his speech on the eve of the Bay of Pigs invasion, reported in Revolución, Havana, April 17, 1961.

14 "The Chinese government once again solemnly assures the Cuban Government that the Cuban people . . . in defense of their socialist revolution, will forever enjoy the all-out support of the 650 million fraternal Chinese people." Peking Review, V, 39, September 28, 1962.

The statement went on to proclaim that "Premier Fidel Castro is worthy of being called a staunch Marxist-Leninist revolutionary fighter." A People's Daily article of December 2, 1962 "Tito and the Cuban Revolution" hailed Cuba as "the first great socialist country in Latin America." In the same article Peking at long last answered a question which it had hitherto left open, namely the question as to the nature of the regime which had first "completed the tasks of a thoroughgoing national and democratic revolution" and then "resolutely embarked on the road of socialist revolution." This was--"the first people's regime in Cuban history." Throughout these years Peking had never applied the terms "national democratic state" or "national democratic regime" to Cuba.

The notion of a benevolent albeit non-socialist, national democratic state is of course profoundly revisionist, i.e. not reconcilable with orthodox Marxism-Leninism. But besides this doctrinaire consideration, there appears to have been a sound practical reason for Peking's rejection of the concept: the term could easily be used as ideological justification for Soviet aid to non-socialist countries. The Chinese are against such Soviet aid. As for their own modest aid programs, they have hitherto avoided underpinning them with elaborate ideological constructions.

One riddle remains to be solved. The Chinese reject the concept of the national democratic state. Why, then, their infatuation with the national democratic formula as applied to movements, fronts, struggles and revolutions--and this specifically in regard to Latin America, while

---

they rarely if ever use the same formula in regard to Africa and Asia?

One might assume from this that Peking attaches special importance to the non-Communist, Leftist extremist guerrilla groups of Latin America who might be classified as national-democratic. But as we have already pointed there is no hard evidence of Chinese material aid to, or organizational links, with these groups. The difference between Chinese operations in Latin America and Africa is that in Latin America Chinese efforts are concentrated mainly on the local Communist parties.

Paradoxically it would appear that the formula of the broad national democratic front or movement was devised precisely with the intention of impressing these parties. The Communist parties of Latin America are, as we shall see, utterly and incorrigibly opportunistic, with a history of unprincipled alliances with the most diverse moderate and even rightist political groups. By stressing the need for "workers, peasants, intellectuals, petty bourgeoisie, and national bourgeoisie" to line up "in the broadest possible national democratic united front," 17 Peking indicated to these parties that it did not demand of them to change their policies. Peking was perfectly willing to condone the opportunism of the Latin American Communist parties. All it asked of them was their vote in the councils of international communism. Only when this approach failed did the Chinese mobilize the dogmatic, sectarian elements of the Latin American Communist parties in order to form splinter parties which have so far in practice been no more militant than the parties remaining loyal to Moscow.

Latin American communism never produced a Mao Tse-tung to lead it out of the cities into the countryside. In practice as well as in theory the Latin American Communist parties have always clung to the orthodox Marxist-Leninist doctrine that the industrial proletariat is the decisive revolutionary force. In consequence they have remained almost exclusively urban groups. In a few cases, they managed to obtain some influence among plantation workers, but their frequent calls for a "worker-peasant alliance" were rarely backed up by any effective measures to spread party influence to the peasantry.\textsuperscript{18}

As a first step in the process of rallying the working class around its vanguard, the party, the Latin American Communist Parties engaged in extensive trade union activities. Today, some three or four decades after their foundation, they have still not progressed beyond this preliminary step. With the exception of Chile, there is not one single Latin American country in which they have managed to win the permanent allegiance of any sizeable fraction of the working class. As a whole, the rank and file members of the unions on which they have concentrated their attentions have proved impervious to the attraction of Marxist-Leninist ideologies. This may be because in most Latin American countries the industrial proletariat is a new social group, privileged in comparison with the rural proletariat from whose ranks it has risen, protected by effective social

\textsuperscript{18} Only in recent years has the strongest of the Latin American parties, that of Chile, assigned cadres to systematic work in the countryside and obtained a considerable measure of success in this work.
legislation, with a relatively high wage level and lacking any militant socialist or syndicalist tradition. 19

Although they have failed to win over the rank-and-file union members and made little or no impression on the sub-proletariat of the shanty towns which ring the big cities of Latin America, the Communists did manage to infiltrate the trade union bureaucracy and thus obtain key positions in the trade union organizations of many Latin American countries. But these successes are impressive on paper only. The Latin American trade union movement 20 is fragmented, hemmed in by legal restrictions, and financially very weak, and what is worse, the bulk of the union members lack any deep sense of commitment to their leaders, and easily acquiesce if these are replaced by the government.

Under these circumstances the union leaders have to rely on government backing in labor disputes, and indeed on government good will merely to hold their posts. Communist union officials do not escape this iron rule. Being desperately anxious to maintain their trade union positions, the Communist party leaderships are thus under constant pressure to reach

19 Only the Chilean working class has a continuous tradition of several generations of militancy. From the first years of the 20th century onwards socialist, anarchist and IWW influence was strong among the workers of the nitrate fields in the Northern deserts of Chile. After the collapse of the nitrate mining industry in the 1920's, the miners flocked south to central Chile where they were finally absorbed into the new industries which sprang up in the late 1930's and 1940's.

20 With the exception of Argentina, where it was built up to considerable strength by the dictator Peron.
some sort of accommodation with the government of the day, whatever its political complexion.

In the case of dictatorial governments, there is in addition the constant fear of police action: lacking strong roots in any sector of the population, the Communists cannot survive in conditions of genuine clandestinity. They are thus forced to come to terms with dictatorial governments even more than with democratic ones. And the dictators, even the most vociferously anti-Communist ones, have frequently been willing to conclude agreements by which the Party, even though officially suppressed, may maintain a skeleton organization, some positions in the trade unions and perhaps even a publication, and be it only a literary journal, in order to propagate Marxist-Leninist ideas. In return open support of the dictator is rarely requested or even desired. The Party spokesman may denounce him in the most violent terms, especially in the pages of the World Marxist Review, a publication of limited circulation in Latin America and well-nigh unintelligible to those who are not familiar with the complicated terminology of Marxism-Leninism. What is asked of the party is merely that it shall not unite with the democratic opposition, and especially that it help to prevent that opposition from obtaining complete control of the trade union movement. The leadership of most Latin American Communist parties has become highly skilled in carrying out these agreements while maintaining a façade of leftist extremism, and also at assessing the proper moment to desert a sinking governmental ship.

The Communist parties have thus managed to survive in spite of their weakness and even to carve out for themselves a modest niche in the Latin
American political establishment. Most frequently their function is to split the opposition to a dictatorial or democratic government, but they also lend their services to moderate leftist governments, such as that of Belaunde Terry in Peru, when these are willing to accept them.

The Communist parties of Latin America thus are small, urban based groups of intellectuals, with some student backing and a minimal working class following, led by professional politicians who hire out their services, not for money but for small political favors such as the permission to hold closed meetings, to publish a newssheet or literary journal, and to occupy a few trade union posts. These men are not venal. Their corruption is of a more insidious kind. They can be bought not by money, but simply by providing the minimal conditions needed to allow them and their followers to maintain the illusion of being the "vanguard" destined to lead the proletariat to victory in its struggle for the liberation of mankind.

Latin American communism thus is far from being the diabolically efficient conspiracy for the conquest of power as which it is habitually depicted by anti-Communist propaganda. Nor is it the anti-imperialist movement of the exploited masses which it ought to be if the canons of Marxist-Leninist ideology were true. In actual fact the Communist parties are mere pawns in the complicated Latin American political game. Time and again they have been used and then cast aside by skillful politicos of the right center and moderate left.
Chinese efforts to draw the Latin American Communists away from the Soviet Union began as early as 1956. After the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Latin American guest delegates to that Congress were invited for a prolonged stay to China, where they were received by Mao Tse-tung and Liu Shao-chi.

The Brazilian guest delegate was Diogenes Arruda, at that time the chief aide of party leader Luis Carlos Prestes and virtually in control of the party machine. In his book O Retrato, Osvaldo Peralva, who had been the Brazilian representative on the staff of the Cominform newspaper "for a lasting peace, for a people's democracy," relates how he met Arruda in Moscow in July 1956, after the latter's return from China.

"The fellow was delighted with China and full of resentment against the Soviets," Peralva relates. "Like so many other delegates to the 20th Congress, it was only in China that he had heard of the existence of Khrushchev's secret speech and been told some of its salient points. Angry about this and seeing that the situation was changing, Arruda decided to change himself, and in a radical manner. . . . One afternoon, stretched out on his hotel bed, cleaning his nails with a pen knife, Arruda related to me his list of grievances against the Soviet bureaucrats. He compared them unfavorably with the Chinese. Proudly he told me how he,

---

together with the rest of the Latin American Communist delegation, had been received by Mao Tse-tung, who had talked with them for two hours and even asked whether they wanted to continue the conversation. In the Soviet Union on the other hand, he said, he had never had the honor of being received even by the most obscure member of the Central Committee. 22

Arruda also informed Peralva about an off-the-record meeting between the Latin American delegates and Liu Shao-chi, at which the latter had complained of the insufficient Soviet aid to the Chinese Communist forces in 1945. After the defeat of the Japanese Kwantung Army by the Russians, said Liu Shao-chi, "it would have been sufficient to leave the arms on the ground to be picked up by the soldiers of the Chinese People's Liberation Army. But instead of this, the Russians took even old rifles with them in order not to leave them in our reach." 23

Working on the Cominform staff, Peralva had become aware of the existence of Chinese-Soviet differences and rivalries long before 1956. There was, for example, the fact that the Chinese Communist Party was not a member of the Cominform. Peralva relates that after coming to power in 1949, the Chinese were officially asked to send a representative to that organization, and that they never even replied to the invitation. Peralva gives the following reasons for their refusal: 24 if they had joined the Cominform, they would either have had to maintain their own ideological

22 *Retrato*, pp. 24-25.


theses, thus inevitably occasioning violent clashes with the Soviets, which at that time they still wanted to avoid; or they would have had to acquiesce to the Soviet line, thus relinquishing their aspirations to hegemony over the Communist parties of the semi-colonial countries.

The main ideological points at issue between Moscow and Peking before 1956 were according to Peralva, (a) the problem of the patterns of revolution, with the Russians insisting (at least until the summer of 1955) on the Russian October 1917 pattern as the only valid one for all Communist parties; and (b) the problem of post-revolutionary development. To the Russians, the Chinese formula of peaceful integration of the rural and urban bourgeoisie in the socialist society smacked of Bukharinism. Peralva gives a summary of a lecture on this subject which he had heard in 1954 while in Moscow for a course in indoctrination. The Soviet lecturer pointed out that the liquidation of the bourgeoisie by the "Chinese comrades" in reality was anything but peaceful; he stated that in Shanghai alone, in the first five years of the revolution, 80,000 counterrevolutionaries were arrested, and thousands executed, and then described in detail the methods of coercion employed in the campaign against "the five evils" to force the capitalists into the "mixed enterprises."

The 20th Congress of the Communist party of the Soviet Union greatly weakened Russian authority and in consequence enhanced Chinese prestige among the Communist parties of Latin America as in other parts of the world. Thus soon after the Congress, a group of Brazilian Communist party cadres was sent to China for a six-month course of indoctrination.

---

26 Op. cit., p. 120.
The removal of Arruda and of the conservative group of João Amazonas, Pedro Pomar and Mauricio Grabois from the Brazilian party leadership in 1957 was a setback for the Chinese, but their influence among the cadres remained strong.

Blas Roca, the secretary general of the Cuban Communists (PSP, Partido Socialista Popular) was another Latin American Communist leader who visited China in 1956, when Soviet prestige in the international Communist movement was at its nadir. Three years later, after Castro had come to power in Cuba, Blas Roca publicly proclaimed his enthusiasm for Mao in the pages of the party newspaper, Hoy. In an article entitled "The Human Qualities of Mao Tse-tung," he hailed the Chinese leader as "a true sage who has contributed to the development and enrichment of Marxism-Leninism."

Two other members of the Cuban Communist Politburo, Juan Marinello and Anibal Escalante, and several other party representatives visited China in 1959.

The secretary general of the Communist party of Chile, Luis Corvalan, also visited Peking in 1959. Years later, in a plenary meeting of his Central Committee in June 1963, he admitted that during his talks with

---

Hoy, Havana, September 4, 1959. For this and numerous other details on the relations between Cubans, both Communist and Castroite, and Red China, I am indebted to Dr. Andrés Suárez' valuable study on Castro and the Communists, shortly to be published by the M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Mass.
Chinese leaders, he had "noticed different appreciations of certain problems, as that of the Cold War, which the Chinese comrades considered as having the virtue of stirring up the nations and contributing to their political awakening. I also noted that the Peaceful Road did not enjoy any sympathies with them." At the time he had assumed that "these different ways of looking at certain problems found their explanation in isolation, an insufficient knowledge of the international scene, a tendency to generalize their own experience."

This perception had not prevented Corvalan, on his return, from using "certain Chinese formulas ("the East wind prevails over the West wind," "imperialism is a paper tiger," etc.) without fully realizing their significance. Furthermore, in my case, in a press interview given precisely on the occasion of my return from China I praised Comrade Ma Tse-tung in exaggerated terms." 28 Nor did it prevent Corvalan from sending Chilean Communists to China as "Spanish language teachers and literary specialists" on request of the Chinese Communist Party, a practice that was not suspended until 1963. 29

The Chinese thus had reason to be disappointed when in the 1960 Moscow Conference and later international Communist gatherings, the Latin

Americans took a solidly pro-Soviet stand. Mere financial pressure is not enough to explain this swing. In one way or the other, the Latin American Communist parties are indubitably dependent on Soviet aid.\textsuperscript{30} By 1960 the Chinese would doubtless have been willing to pay some subsidy to any Latin American Communist party willing to come over to their side. Since the parties concerned, with the exception of that of Chile, are very small, the sums involved would not have been beyond Peking's limited financial capacity.

The basic reason for the revival of Moscow's authority with the Latin American Communists was of course the change in the international situation that had occurred that very year.

\textsuperscript{30} Osvaldo Peralva gives the following account of the means by which the Russians financed the Brazilian Communist Party: (1) the money of the Peace Prizes, which the recipients, if party members, were obliged to hand over to the Party; (2) payments for the Brazilian edition of the Cominform journal (until April 1956) which were far higher than the actual expenses incurred; (3) payments for the organization of Peace and other fellow-traveling congresses, also regularly higher than the actual expenses incurred; (4) payments in money or gifts in kind to the Brazilian Communist party delegates to various Soviet Party and other congresses (\textit{O Retrato}, pp. 262ff). There does not, on the other hand, appear to have been any regular subsidy to the Communist party of Brazil.
The Rise of Castroism

In February 1960, Anastas Mikoyan had come to Havana to sign a commercial treaty with Castro's revolutionary government. In April of that year the first shipment of Soviet aid arrived in Cuba. At the end of June the refineries of Texaco, Shell, and Standard Oil, which had refused to process Soviet oil, were confiscated. In July Khrushchev declared the Soviet government's readiness to buy the sugar which had been refused from the American quota, and that same month Castro announced the arrival of the first Soviet bloc arms in Cuba.\(^{31}\)

For a simply geographical reason, the Latin American Communist parties had always played a very minor role in the international Communist movement. Their countries were much too far from the Soviet Union for the Red Army to come to the aid of a revolution; they had had no prospect of maintaining themselves in power if ever they became strong enough to seize it. Now for the first time, the Soviet Union was strong enough to establish a base in Latin America, in open defiance of the dominant power of the Hemisphere. It would have been sheer idiocy on the part of the Latin American Communists to choose this moment for a break with the Russians.

In addition to this, Soviet action in Cuba clearly made nonsense of the Chinese accusation that the policy of "peaceful coexistence" was one of capitulation to imperialism. This indeed may well be the main

\(^{31}\) They were Czechoslovak arms.
reason why Khrushchev embarked on the Cuban adventure. By coming to the assistance of a government of an underdeveloped country which was asserting its independence against the United States, he was demonstrating the readiness and ability of the Soviet Union to espouse the cause of "national liberation" even in a far-away country in close proximity to the shores of the arch-imperialists, the United States. What followed was unforeseen and accepted with reluctance by the Soviets: Castro was not satisfied with the status of a mere "national democratic ally" of the Communist bloc, since this appeared to him to offer insufficient protection against his American foe. He insisted on entry into the socialist camp. But even after he proclaimed his revolution to be a socialist one\textsuperscript{22} it took him two years to achieve official Soviet recognition of Cuba as a nation that was "building socialism."\textsuperscript{33}

Already in 1960, Soviet support of Cuba greatly improved the position of the Latin American Communist Parties not only in the international Communist movement but also in their own countries. They were now the unofficial ambassadors of a great power which was able to make its weight felt in the hemisphere, and for this reason they were regarded with a new respect by the non-Communist governments. But apart from these advantages the Communist parties were also presented with a new and serious problem: Hitherto

\textsuperscript{22} In his speech of April 16 on the eve of the Bay of Pigs invasion. See Revolución, Havana, April 17, 1961.

\textsuperscript{33} In the slogans for the Moscow May Day parade of 1963, published in Pravda on April 8, 1963.
these parties had virtually monopolized the position of the extreme Leftist opposition in Latin America. Now this monopoly was challenged by the Castroite groups which sprang up in a number of Latin American countries as a consequence of developments in Cuba.

On July 26, 1960 Castro had called on the peoples of Latin America to follow the Cuban example and rise against the imperialists and their domestic lackeys.34

Earlier that year the ideologist of the Cuban Revolution, Che Guevara, had published his Guerrilla Warfare. In this book he formulated the three basic theses of Castroite political theory:

"(1) The people in arms can win a war against the regular army.
(2) It is not necessary to wait until all conditions for revolution exist; the insurrection any nucleus can create them.
(3) In the underdeveloped areas of the Americas the countryside must be the basic terrain for the armed struggle."35

34 In his speech of the July 26 celebrations of 1960, which was staged in the Sierra Maestra, the mountain range which had been Castro's stronghold in his two-year guerrilla struggle against the Batista dictatorship, Castro said: "Here face to face with the unconquerable mountain range face to face with the Sierra Maestra we vow to continue making our Fatherland the example which shall convert the Andes Mountain Range into the Sierra Maestra of all the Americas." Revolución, Havana, July 27, 1960.

Guevara also asserted that "the guerrilla fighter is above all an agrarian revolutionary. He interprets the desire of the great peasant masses to be masters of the land, masters of their means of production, of their animals, of everything they have aspired to for many years." And Guevara inveighs against those who "insist dogmatically on centering the struggle of the masses in urban movements, completely overlooking the immense participation of the rural population in the life of all the underdeveloped countries of the Americas. The struggles of the organized workers' masses are not to be despised, but we must realistically analyze their possibilities in the difficult conditions of the armed struggle, when the guarantees which adorn our constitution are suspended or ignored. In these conditions, the workers' movements must operate clandestinely, without arms, in illegality, and faced with enormous dangers. The situation in the countryside is not so difficult, for there the inhabitants are supported by the armed guerrillas in localities out of reach of the repressive forces." 37

At first glance, Guevara's position would appear to correspond to that of the Chinese. He even invokes the example of Mao, albeit with characteristic Latin American inexactitude: "Mao's China began as an outbreak of workers' groups in the South which is defeated and nearly annihilated. It establishes itself and begins its rise only after the long march to Yenan when it bases itself on rural areas and bases its program on agrarian reform." 38

36 Ibid., p. 16.
37 Ibid., p. 13.
38 Ibid., p. 16.
On closer examination, however, one finds that Guevara's political outlook is incompatible with Marxism-Leninism in both its Russian and its Chinese interpretation. Lenin's central concept of the Party as the vanguard of the proletariat and the leader of the revolutionary struggle is missing from Guevara's book. 39

Guevara admits that the "civilian organization of the insurrectional movement is very important." 40

Nevertheless, for him the guerrilla band and not the "civilian organization" is "the fighting vanguard of the people" 41 which carries on the struggle; the urban masses, alerted by the civilian organizations, merely throw their weight on the scales at the decisive moment. 42

Marxist-Leninists hold that revolutionary action may only be begun when the masses of the people are ready for it--the masses of the proletariat, according to Lenin, or the masses of the peasantry, according to Mao. In Guevara's opinion, on the other hand, "it is not necessary to

39 This alone is sufficient to disprove the persistent claims that Guevara was "an agent of international communism" infiltrated into the Castro movement in order to bring it under Soviet control. No trained Communist would commit the dreadful sin of forgetting the leading role of the Party. Besides, no factual evidence has so far been produced that before the victory of the Cuban revolution, Guevara had ever been a member of, or in any way associated with, a Communist party or one of its affiliated organizations. Guevara is a free-lance revolutionary of a specifically Latin American type.

41 Ibid., p. 14.
42 Ibid., p. 123.
wait until all conditions for a revolution exist; the insurrectionary nucleus can create them." Revolution can thus be started by a minute group: "The minimum number with which it is possible to initiate a guerrilla war can be mentioned. In my opinion, considering the inevitable desertions and weaknesses, one must count with a base of 30 to 50 men; this number is sufficient in any country of the hemisphere where the conditions of good operational terrain, hunger for land, repeated violations of justice, etc., are fulfilled.  

In 19th century France, Auguste Blanqui had advocated revolutionary action by a small armed band which would seize the vital centers of command in the capital cities. Guevara advocates action by a small armed band which is to establish itself in sparsely populated areas of the countryside, gradually draw the peasant masses over to its side by preaching the revolutionary redistribution of the land, and achieve final victory by wearing out and demoralizing the regular army in a series of guerrilla skirmishes. Guevara's concept might thus perhaps be classified as "agrarian Blanquism," but this would only serve to obscure its originality and its specifically Latin American character.

Guevara himself claimed that his theory of guerrilla warfare was based on the practical experience of the two-year guerrilla struggle of Castro and his followers against the Cuban dictator Batista. He may have sincerely believed this, but in that case he was deluding himself. For Castro's guerrilla campaign was patterned on the model of the Cuban independence war initiated by Jose Marti in 1895.

---

43 Ibid., p. 160.
Martí fought for a political aim—the liberation of Cuba from Spanish colonial rule—which appealed to all classes of Cuban society; in the same way Castro's stated aim—the restoration of the 1940 constitution set aside by the dictator—was also of universal appeal, and he obtained financial aid from such sources as the millionaire politico Prio Socarrás, representative firms of the tobacco, rum and construction industries and indeed from sugar mill, plantation, and cattle ranch owners. Only towards the end of the struggle did he issue an agrarian reform program.

The modesty of this program has since been explained by an authoritative source as resulting from Castro's reluctance to alienate the big foreign and domestic land owners and sugar industrialists. In an article in the *World Marxist Review*, Vol. 8, No. 10, October 1965, the Cuban Communist Carlos Rafael Rodríguez, at the time of this writing still a Minister in Castro's cabinet, stated that "over considerable areas in Oriente, and also in Las Villas province, the owners of sugar refineries began paying taxes to the Rebel Army as the new revolutionary government. Some of the latitundists sugar planters and cattle men offered the revolutionary forces material aid in various forms. Under these circumstances it would have been a mistake to introduce an agrarian law which would have dealt a direct blow at the local and foreign latitundists; this would only have made them rally around Batista again and would have disclosed the aim of the revolution to imperialism before power had been won."

Besides giving a highly romanticized, incorrect interpretation of the Cuban guerrilla war, Guevara in his book would appear to have greatly overestimated the revolutionary potential of the Latin American peasantry. Since 1959, attempts to launch a guerrilla war
have failed in Argentina, Paraguay, Santo Domingo, Ecuador, and Peru. In Venezuela guerrillas maintain themselves in some mountain regions with only the scantiest peasant support. In Colombia peasant support for the guerrillas is confined to certain restricted areas in which the Communists established themselves during the civil war of the early 1950's. The only country where the guerrillas enjoy the support of an appreciable part of the peasant population is Guatemala, where the ground was prepared by the agrarian reform of President Arbenz in 1953-1954 and the subsequent revocation of this reform by the counterrevolutionary government of Col. Castillo Armas.

The Social Origin of the Castroite Groups

The Latin American peasants failure to respond to the Castroite call to arms is probably due to the industrialization process in the cities. The most energetic members of the peasantry and rural proletariat—those most likely to resort to revolutionary action—are constantly being syphoned off to the shanty towns which ring the big cities. Conditions in these slums may appear intolerable to foreign tourists, but they are considerably better than in the rural areas; there is the possibility of employment in factories, construction, services and household work. Sociological field studies have established that the political views of the average shanty town dweller are not revolutionary. Recent election

---


45 Frank Bonilla, in his study of the shanty town dwellers of Rio de Janeiro, "Rio's Favelas," American Universities Field Staff reports service, East Coast South American Series, Vol. VII, No. 3 1961, comes to the following conclusions: "Thus the favelado, however unrealistically, does not feel hopelessly trapped in the favela. He sees the chances for escape of his children as good. But the apparent faith in the possibilities for economic and social
results in a number of Latin American countries have borne out these findings.

All this may of course change quite rapidly if the pace of industrialization slows down sufficiently to block the road of escape to the cities, and to create mass unemployment in the shanty towns. At least one Latin American country, and the largest one at that, -- Brazil -- appears to be in some danger of this. But as of this writing, Castro still holds no appeal to the rural masses and the urban sub-proletariat of unskilled workers.

The social base of the small but extremely active Castroite movements is to be found elsewhere: in the universities. Few of the detailed sociological surveys of the Latin American student population have yet been made public. It may however be stated as a fact that student elections invariably show the extreme left--in which Castroism is today the dominant trend--to be considerably stronger in the state universities, where tuition is free or inexpensive, than in the private universities frequented by the sons and daughters of the wealthier sectors of the middle class.

Castroism is certainly not a mere movement for the financial betterment of a certain stratum of the population. It is a totalitarian movement of young middle-class and lower middle-class intellectuals aiming

advance is not matched by the belief in the potential benefits to come through political actions. Nearly half of the favelados said there is nothing to be gained by political activity . . . ; about the same proportion of skilled workers said they attach little or no importance to their political opinions and activities. Thus neither the skilled worker nor the favelado is highly politicized; the skilled worker differs politically from the favelado chiefly in his participation in an organization (his union) that is set up to defend his interests."
to supplant and annihilate the old established ruling political and economic oligarchies. And it is violently anti-American; the close links between the domestic oligarchies and American business enterprises have caused it to regard the United States as the mainstay of the prevailing political and social system in Latin America.

The emergence of an alternative élite of middle class and lower middle class intellectuals intent on the conquest of power by violent means is nothing new or unusual. It has occurred in numerous countries, including 18th century France, Weimar Germany, and pre-revolutionary Russia and China. These middle class revolutionaries do not, however, fit the Marxist-Leninist concept of what a revolutionary should be. The only term that correctly qualifies them from the Marxist-Leninist point of view is that of "petty-bourgeois adventurism." And while the Communists are not adverse to occasional collaboration with middle class elements in general, they distrust and despise these "adventurers" addicted to violence, and would not dream of following their lead and adopting their tactics.

Communists and Castroites

The conflict between Castroites and Latin American Communists arose with the very birth of the Castroite movement and has continued unabated to this day.

---

46 As always in such cases, some sons and daughters of the ruling oligarchy also fall under the spell of the movement.

47 Since Guevara's book was first published in 1960, the Castroites have made certain ideological concessions to the Communists. Following Castro's lead they have proclaimed their adherence to Marxism-Leninism. And in the second declaration of Havana Castro conceded that "the peasantry . . . requires the revolutionary and political leadership of the working class and the revolutionary intellectuals." See the Second Declaration of Havana, Leaflet, Havana, February 4, 1962. But in practice they have maintained their own, separate organization, never submitting to the leadership of the Communist parties and to their strategy of peaceful "mass struggle."
In some countries, such as Chile, the Communists openly advocate "the peaceful road to socialism." They admit the eventual inevitability of violent revolution but stress that "the masses" are not yet "sufficiently mobilized" and the other conditions for armed struggle as laid down by Lenin are not yet fulfilled.

Time and again in their debates with the Castroites, the Latin American Communists have pointed to the three conditions which, according to Lenin, must be fulfilled before "the decisive battle is at hand" and "revolution is indeed ripe." These are:

1. All the class forces hostile to us have become sufficiently entangled, are sufficiently at loggerheads with each other, have sufficiently weakened themselves in a struggle which is beyond their strength; . . .
2. All the vacillating and unstable, intermediate elements -- the petty bourgeois and the petty-bourgeois democrats, as distinct from the bourgeoisie -- have sufficiently exposed themselves in the eyes of the people, have sufficiently disgraced themselves through their practical bankruptcy, and . . .
3. Among the proletariat, a mass sentiment favoring the most determined, bold and dedicated revolutionary action against the bourgeoisie has merged and begun to grow vigorously. Then revolution is indeed ripe." 50

Guevara's assertion that "it is not necessary to wait until all conditions for revolution exist; the insurrectionary nucleus can create

---

them" is clearly in direct contradiction to Lenin's thesis.

It would be beyond the scope of this study to deal with the details of the conflict between the Latin American Communists and the Castroites. Suffice it to say that practically every Latin American contribution to the World Marxist Review, the organ of the international Communist movement, from 1960 to this day, as well as many speeches by Fidel Castro, bear witness to its existence. Even when the two groups are forced into an alliance by circumstance, relations between them are invariably tense. The Communists are, of course, greatly hampered in the debate by the fact that Castro is an ally of the Soviet Union and can thus only be attacked indirectly, without mentioning his name.

The Soviet attitude towards the conflict has been ambiguous. On the one hand, Moscow has in general supported the Communist parties' line of stressing the primary importance of what they euphemistically call 'mass struggle,' i.e. peaceful trade union activity. On the other hand, the Russians have tolerated Cuban encouragement of guerrilla activities on the Latin American continent although it would certainly be in their power to put an end to this. And since the summer of 1964 their support of "the peaceful road" policy espoused by the majority of the Latin American Communist parties has weakened. At the Havana Tricontinental Conference of January 1966, the Soviet representative Rashidov espoused the Castroite line of armed struggle.

---

51 For this see Herbert Dinerstein, Soviet Policy in Latin America, Memorandum RM 4967, Santa Monica, The Rand Corporation, May 1966.

52 According to the Tass International Service of January 6, 1966, Rashidov stated "that the Soviet people supported peoples' wars, and the struggle of oppressed peoples for freedom and independence."
Peking and the Castroites

But what of the Chinese position? One would have expected Peking eagerly to take the side of the Castroites. In March 1960 a Chinese-Latin American friendship association was founded in Peking.\(^53\) in the following years, a constant stream of visitors from Latin America came to China under the auspices of the Association. They ranged from representative figures of Latin American political life such as Mexican ex-President Portes Gil \(^5^4\) and Brazilian Vice President João Goulart\(^5^5\) to fellow-traveling student delegations and groups of "cultural workers". Among them there were doubtless many Castroites. Some of these may even have stayed in China for military training. But there is no evidence of large-scale Chinese military or financial aid to the Castroite movements of Latin America, nor of the establishment of organizational links with them. In other words: the Chinese refrained from any serious effort to bring the Castroite "national democratic revolutionaries" under their control, as they have attempted to do, with some measure of success, with the extremist wing of nationalist movement in Africa.

To the best of their limited abilities, the Chinese have competed with the Russians in giving economic aid to Cuba, a field in which they could not hope to be victorious. Diplomatic relations between China and Cuba were established in September 1960. But as we have seen Peking was tardy in recognizing the socialist nature of the Cuban revolution and admitting Cuba to the ranks of the nations which are "building socialism"


In September 1961, 5 months after Castro had solemnly proclaimed the socialist nature of the Cuban revolution, Cuban President Osvaldo Dorticos arrived in Peking on an official visit. At the airport he greeted Liu Shao-Chi with the words "Comrade President Liu" and in his turn was welcomed by the latter with the words that Cuba was "the first Latin American country which has fully accomplished its national democratic revolution," a statement that constituted a rebuff to the Cuban regime's desire to be recognized as socialist. Three days later, at a celebration in honor of the Cuban guests, Dorticos spelled out that "Comrade Fidel Castro has proclaimed the socialist nature of our revolution." The communique issued on the occasion of the visit admitted that "the heroic Cuban people, under the able leadership of the revolutionary government headed by Prime Minister Fidel Castro, has chosen the part of socialist development," an intermediate formula similar to that used by the Russians until 1963, and not yet admitting that Cuba was actually engaged in "building socialism." In his farewell speech Liu Shao-Chi addressed his Cuban guest as "His Excellency President Dorticos" and mentioned Castro as "His Excellency Prime Minister Fidel Castro," while Dorticos, in his final words, obliquely insulted the Chinese by stating that he attributed the vigor of Sino-Cuban friendship to "the friendly and cordial stimulus provided by the Soviet Union.

56 NCNA, September 23, in SCMP, No. 2588. These and the following quotations from the NCNA bulletins and the newspaper Hoy, Havana, are given as reproduced in Dr. Andres Suarez' above-mentioned manuscript.

57 NCNA, September 25, in SCMP 2590.


59 NCNA, October 2, in SCMP 2594.

60 Idem.
Peking had been unsparing in its words of praise for the Cuban Revolution and its assurances that 650 million Chinese were willing to aid and protect the heroic Cuban people. But on this one occasion when Peking could have rendered Castro a tangible political service by backing his demand to be received into the "socialist camp" it failed to give him adequate support. This may well have been decisive in determining Castro's unenthusiastic attitude towards China. Castro's position on such important issues as "peaceful coexistence" and violent revolution is akin to that of Peking and not of Moscow, and he has refused to sign the test-ban treaty. Yet for years he was vociferous in praise of Khrushchev while avoiding ever to mention Mao or any other Chinese leader in his speeches. He has skillfully exploited the Sino-Soviet split to extort concessions from the Russians without ever wholly committing himself to their side, and this apparently is the main function of China in his scheme of things.

The Chinese were also tardy in giving full ideological support to the Cuban doctrine of revolution by guerrilla warfare. In February 1962 Castro issued the second declaration of Havana which called for a guerrilla war of continental dimensions. The declaration included one concession to Marxist-Leninist doctrine:

But the peasantry is a class which because of the ignorance in which it has been kept and the isolation in which it lives, requires the revolutionary and political leadership of the working class and the revolutionary intellectuals. Without that it cannot alone launch the struggle and achieve the victory.62

But this did not mean acceptance of the leading role of the Communist parties, nor acceptance of their current moderate policies. The declaration

61 The second declaration of Havana, leaflet, Havana, February 1962.
62 Idem.
made this evident in an admonishment clearly aimed at these parties:

    The duty of every revolutionary is to make revolution. We know that in America and throughout the world the revolution will be victorious. But revolutionaries cannot sit in the doorway of their homes to watch the corpse of imperialism pass by. The role of Job does not behoove a revolutionary.

Peking hailed the declaration of Havana with apparent enthusiasm. There were newspaper reports and editorials, messages in support of the declaration by "Chinese literary and art circles" and "Chinese jurists," and even a mass rally in Peking to acclaim the declaration. At the rally, Vice Premier and Foreign Minister Ch''en Yi declared that 'the Chinese government and people warmly welcome and firmly support this declaration." But on examination of the key People's Daily editorial, one is struck by its extraordinary distortion of the meaning of the declaration. The word "armed struggle" is only mentioned once in the article; the fact that the declaration calls for a guerrilla struggle based on the broad masses of the peasantry is completely suppressed, and the declaration is presented as being, in essence, an appeal for the formation of 'the broadest possible national democratic united front.'

Havana of course also postulates a "united front" but there is a marked difference between Chinese and Cuban opinion as to how broad this united front should actually be. The People's Daily quotes the Havana Declaration statement according to which the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal struggle unites "the working class, the peasantry, the working intellectuals, the petty bourgeoisie and the more progressive sections

---

63 See SCMP February 3, 8, 10, 12, 15, 19, 1962.

of the national bourgeoisie." 65 But in direct juxtaposition with this
the People's Daily gives its own formula which includes the entire "national
bourgeoisie", not only its "more progressive sections."

Workers, peasants, intellectuals, petty bourgeoisie
and national bourgeoisie--all have had their fill of
enslavement, exploitation and oppression by U.S.
imperialism and its lackeys. It is therefore not only
necessary but also entirely possible for these classes
and strata to line up in the broadest national democratic
front against their enemies."

In view of the fact that they themselves had come to power through
20 years of rural guerrilla struggle, the Chinese communists' failure to
mention, let alone to applaud the Cuban formula of revolution by peasant
guerrilla war was indeed remarkable. Peking Review tried to make up for
this omission by publishing, in its issue of April 27, 196266 an article
"Latin American Peasants on the March." But this article also fell far
short of an endorsement of the Cuban thesis. It dealt mainly with peasant
seizures of land in various Latin American countries. Guerrilla war with
the political aim of overthrowing the government was only briefly mentioned
at the end. And the article ended with an alleged quotation from the
Havana Declaration which was apocryphal and surely constituted a
deliberate distortion of the Declaration's message:

the Second Havana Declaration has pointed out that
the peasantry in Latin America is 'a potentially
strong force which will have decisive significance
in the struggle for national liberation so long as
it is led by the workers and intellectuals'"

65 Actually the People's Daily translation is incorrect. The
text of the declaration reads: "Los sectores mas progresistas..."
This is the superlative, i.e. the most progressive sectors, and
it is indeed rendered in this form in the official translation of
the declaration.

On September 17, the Chinese government issued the statement which at long last recognized the 'socialist' nature of the Cuban revolution. This move would appear to have been prompted by Peking's desire to curry Cuba's favor at the time when the Russians were actually installing missile bases on the island. But mere words do not offset nuclear warheads. In Autumn 1962 the gesture which one year earlier would have been of considerable value to Castro, was an empty one.

Then came the missile crisis, in which Soviet prestige received a shattering blow.

**After the Missile Crisis**

The long-term effect of the missile crisis was a considerable loss of momentum for the revolutionary Left of Latin America, for it now transpired that the Soviets were not, after all, strong enough to defy the United States in that area and to afford effective protection to a Latin American revolution, but would back down in a confrontation. There was thus little prospect that the Cuban experience could be repeated in another country.

The decline in prospects for a revolution negatively affected the entire Latin American extreme Left including the pro-Chinese sector. But within this general development several factors favored Peking at the expense of Moscow. These were:

1. A severe crisis in Cuban-Soviet relations. Castro openly protested against the withdrawal of the missiles and ridiculed Khrushchev's claims to have saved Cuba by forcing Kennedy to give a promise of nonaggression. At the East German Party Congress in January 1963, Castro had himself represented by Armando Hart, a member of the 26th of July Movement and not of the old established Cuban Communist Party

---

PSP. Hart refused to join in the condemnation of China's ally Albania voiced by the Chilean guest delegate Orlando Millas in the name of most of the Latin American Communist parties. At previous European party congresses Cuba had always been represented by an "old guard" Communist (Blas Roca) who spoke out against Albania in accordance with the Soviet line. Castro's visit to the Soviet Union in April-May 1963 brought about a brief reconciliation, but the rift was soon opened anew by his refusal to sign the test-ban treaty.

2. A temporary increase in the militancy of the Castroite groups. At the time of the missile crisis, the Venezuelan Castroites launched a campaign of terrorism and guerrilla warfare in "defense of Cuba." The Communist Party allowed itself to be dragged into this venture, and a joint command of the "armed forces of liberation" (FALN) was set up. Through this, a radical pro-Castro wing gained control of the Venezuelan Communist Party and led it out of the Soviet orbit. In Guatemala the Communists also rashly joined in an alliance with the Castroites, a step which they were later greatly to regret.

3. Meanwhile the leaders of most Latin American Communist Parties have drawn the correct conclusion from the missile crisis, namely that revolution was postponed indefinitely and that it was time to reaffirm their

---

68 See Griffith, The Sino-Soviet Rift, p. 100.


70 The PTG, Partido Guatemalteco Bel Trabajo

71 See the Guatemalan party statement in World Marxist Review Vol. VIII, No. 4, April 1965.
accustomed policies of moderation.\textsuperscript{72} This led to an increase of tension inside the parties, and in some cases to the emergence of a radical, pro-Chinese wing.

4. Widespread disillusionment with the Soviet Union in those sectors of the non-Communist Latin American Left which had adopted a pro-Soviet attitude as a result of Moscow's policy of support of Cuba. Many of these Leftists, including the Castroite groups in Venezuela, Guatemala, Peru and other countries and a sector of the Chilean Socialists now developed strong sympathies for China.

Peking was thus encouraged to intensify its efforts in Latin America. From March 1963 onward a Spanish language edition of \textit{Peking Review} was published under the name of \textit{Pekin Informa}. Its distribution in Latin America was handled by a firm, Espartaco Editores Ltda, set up for this purpose in Santiago de Chile and operated by a small group of pro-Chinese members of the Chilean Communist Party, the Spartacus group, who were expelled from the party later that year.\textsuperscript{73}

The appearance of \textit{Pekin Informa} on the newsstands of Santiago de Chile, Lima, Caracas, Mexico City, Rio de Janeiro, Montevideo, Buenos Aires and other Latin American cities had instant repercussions in the Latin American Left. The pro-Soviet Communist Party leaderships were now forced to declare themselves openly to their own memberships and to the general public of their countries. They had been perfectly aware of the significance of the Sino-Soviet conflict as early as 1960 at the very least.\textsuperscript{74}

\textsuperscript{72} In the 1963 presidential elections in Peru the Communists, who had put up a radical candidate of their own in the previous election, supported the moderate candidate Belaunde Terry; in Argentina the Communists broke with their Peronista allies in order to give qualified support to President Illia, also a moderate. For this see Halperin, \textit{Nationalism and Communism in Chile}, pp. 85-86.

\textsuperscript{73} See \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 94ff.

\textsuperscript{74} See, for instance, the highly revealing report to the Chilean Central
but they had kept discussion of the matter on a Central Committee level, while publicly denying the existence of the conflict or presenting it as a matter of no significance and avoiding all public condemnation of the Chinese. Now this was no longer possible. Already at the end of March the largest and most powerful of the Latin American Communist Parties, the Communist Party of Chile, felt it necessary to warn its membership against the "ostensibly Marxist-Leninist documents attacking the international communist movement as well as several brother parties."\textsuperscript{75} In June 1963 a central committee meeting was called to hear a speech by Secretary General Luis Corvalan on "the differences with the Chinese comrades" and contrary to previous practice the text of this was published in the party press and later as a separate pamphlet.\textsuperscript{76} On September 29, a Communist sponsored public meeting in a Santiago park heard a savage attack on Peking by Pablo Neruda who besides being Latin America's foremost poet is a member of the Chilean Politburo. In his speech, which was obviously intended for a larger public than just a Chilean one, Neruda said:

\begin{quote}
It seems to me that the Chinese errors in their violent internal and foreign policies stem from one sole fount: the cult of personality, internally and externally. We who have visited China have seen the case of Stalin repeated. Every street, every door, has a portrait of Mao Tse-tung. Mao Tse-tung has become a living Buddha, separate from the people by a priestly court that interprets in its own manner Marxism and the story
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{75}Quoted from Halperin, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 95-96.

\textsuperscript{76}See Halperin, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 102.
of our times. The peasants were obliged to bow, to genuflect before the picture of the leader. Recently Comrade Chou En-lai publicly congratulated a young Chinese because he had himself sterilized voluntarily in order to serve the cause of the Chinese Republic. . . . 'This event has given the entire world an excellent example, especially since it is the husband who took the initiative. This example should be a great example to emulate,' declared Chou En-lai.

It naturally occurs to us that if Comrade Chou En-lai's father had had this idea Chou En-lai would not exist. Is this Communism? It is rather a cult, ridiculous, superstitious, unacceptable.

Comrades, every railroad, every bridge, every factory, every airplane, every modern road, every agricultural cooperative in China was built by Soviet engineers and technicians. When I was there and spent some days at a resort on the Yellow Sea, 2,000 Soviet technicians generously lent by the socialist state were resting in one single hotel.

And this state is accused by the Chinese leaders of not assisting the growing forces of socialism. Those who owe everything are accusing those who gave everything.

These leaders are sending letters to every intellectual in Latin America, inciting them to collaborate in the division of the socialist world. This incitement may lead to many errors and help to weaken the national liberation front.

But the personality cult in China itself leads to the same tragic occurrences as in the past. Speaking only of those whom I know personally among my Chinese writer comrades, I will tell you that the foremost Chinese novelist, Lenin prize, ex-president of the Union of Chinese Writers, Ting Ling, has disappeared. First she was condemned to wash dishes and sleep on the ground in a far away peasant's commune. Then we did not hear of her again. I knew her very well because she was president of the committee nominated by the ministry of culture to receive Ilya Ehrenburg and me when we traveled to Peking in order to hand the peace prize to Sung Ch'ing-ling, Mrs. Sun Yat-sen. Why was she sentenced? They found out that 25 years ago she had had a love affair with a supporter of Chiang Kai-shek. Yes, this was true, but they did not say that the great writer, with her child in her arms, barefoot, and with a rifle on her shoulder, made the entire long march from Yenan to Nanking with the guerrillas of the Chinese Communist Party.

And the poet Ai Ch'ing, whom we all know in Chile, the best poet in China, an old Communist, who visited Chile on the occasion of my 50th birthday, where is he? Accused of being a rightest because he knows the French language, and for other ridiculous accusations, he has been banished to the Gobi Desert, to an inhuman altitude, and forced to sign his poems with another name. That is, he has been morally executed.

The Chinese leader who gave me this information smiled with an icy smile.77

---

77 Quoted from Halperin, op. cit., pp. 111-112.
At the same meeting Secretary General Luis Corvalan declared: "There is no danger of a split in the party. They will not be able to split one single cell, one single one of our 3,000 basic organizations." 78 This was true. The Communist Party, composed mainly of workers, showed little interest in the ideological diatribes of Peking Review. The Communists' allies in the People's Action Front (FRAP) alliance, on the other hand,--Socialists, independent leftists, and even the representatives of the left wing of the non-Marxist Radical Party--were greatly attracted by the Chinese line. A Communist ultimatum was necessary to prevent a number of the most prominent socialist and independent leftist personalities of the FRAP alliance from attending a meeting, sponsored by the Spartacus group, in celebration of the 14th anniversary of the victory of the Chinese Revolution. 79

At this stage Chinese propaganda was equally or even more effective in other Latin American countries. It seemed not only more in keeping with Lenin's teachings but also quite simply more coherent, logical and intelligent than the Soviet ideologists' muddled and long-winded attempts to explain away the difference between the interests of the Soviet state and those of world revolution. Chinese propaganda was by no means limited to demands for Marxist-Leninist ideological orthodoxy; it cleverly exploited the Cuban missile crisis to refute the charge that China wanted to plunge the world into a nuclear holocaust. The Chinese government declaration of September 1, 1963 pointed out that it was the Soviet government--not the United States--which was responsible for the development of the situation in the Caribbean into a nuclear crisis:

78 Quoted from Halperin, op. cit., p. 110.
79 See Ibid., pp. 107 ff.
The Soviet leaders never weary of asserting that there was a thermonuclear war crisis in the Caribbean Sea which was averted only because the Soviet leaders firmly pursued the policy of peaceful coexistence.

But the facts are there for everyone to see. Although the tension in the Caribbean Sea stemmed from the U. S. imperialist policy of aggression in Cuba and although there has been a continuing danger of an invasion of Cuba by the U. S. imperialists, nevertheless, before the Soviet Union sent rockets into Cuba, there did not exist a crisis of the United States using nuclear weapons in the Caribbean Sea and of a nuclear war breaking out. If it should be said that such a crisis did arise, it was a result of the rash action of the Soviet leaders.

The Soviet leaders slanderously accused China of having hoped for a head-on clash between the United States and the Soviet Union. The question is, did we ask you to transport rockets to Cuba? The label of adventurism cannot be pinned on us. If the Marxist-Leninist line we always follow had been acted on, there would never have been a question of shipping rockets to Cuba and the so-called nuclear war crisis would never have existed. How could the question of adventurism have then arisen?

We should like to ask the Soviet leaders, since the transport of rockets to Cuba was a matter of such great importance, did you ever consult the Soviet people, or the other socialist countries, or the working class in capitalist countries about it? Without consulting anybody you willfully embarked on a reckless course and irresponsibly played with the lives of millions upon millions of people. The errors were of your own making, and so what ground is there for you to blame others?

There is no need whatsoever to transport rockets to Cuba in order to support the Cuban revolution. That was what the Soviet leaders said in the past, and it is also what they are saying now, and in very beautiful language. For instance, the Open Letter of July 14 of the Central Committee of the CPSU's said that 'in case of aggression by American imperialists, we shall come to the assistance of the Cuban people from Soviet territory, just as we would have helped them from Cuban territory. True, in this case the rockets would take slightly longer in the flight, but their accuracy would not be impaired by this.' That being so, why did you have to ship rockets to Cuba? Was your purpose really to defend the Cuban Revolution? Would it not be more correct to say that what you did in the name of defending the Cuban revolution was in reality political gambling?

Anyone with common sense will ask: Since the rockets were introduced, why did they have to be withdrawn afterwards? And inasmuch as the rockets were withdrawn afterwards, why did they have to be introduced before? . . .

The Soviet leaders have said that China was opposed to the withdrawal of the rockets from Cuba and to the efforts of the Soviet Union to avert a nuclear war. This is a completely groundless statement. As we were totally
opposed to your sending rockets in, why should we oppose the withdrawal? It is understandable you should have tried to extricate yourselves from difficulties of your own creation. But we were resolutely opposed to your acceptance of the completely unjustifiable and humiliating terms which the U. S. imperialists advanced. 80

The Chinese Communists "Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement" was another document which met with a very favorable reception in the Latin American non-Communist left. The statement: "If the leading group in any party adopt a non-revolutionary line and convert it into a reformist party, then Marxist-Leninists inside and outside the Party will replace them and lead the people in making revolution,"81 was obviously a salute to Fidel Castro, a belated recognition that he had been a true Marxist-Leninist in making the Cuban revolution while the Cuban Communist leaders had fallen into the mire of reformism. And it also seemed to open vistas towards a Peking-inspired greater revolutionary movement open to all those Leftists who had refused to submit to the mental shackles of Communist Party discipline. These hopes were strengthened when in January 1964, Peking Review reprinted an article on guerrilla warfare by Che Guevara which had originally appeared in a Cuban periodical. In this article, Guevara made only superficial concessions to Marxist-Leninist doctrine. He quoted the passage from the Havana Declaration in which the need for "leadership of the working class and the revolutionary intellectuals" was stressed, and he insisted that "the leading Marxist-Leninist party" must be "capable of mobilizing the masses to the greatest extent possible, and leading them to the correct path of solving the fundamental contradictions."

80Quoted from Griffith, op. cit., pp. 382-384.

81Quoted from ibid., p. 270.
But he made it clear that this "correct path" in Latin America was guerrilla warfare, and then went on to reaffirm his own concept of a revolution in which the guerrilla army, and not the Party, was the striking force. He further mentioned the Party only in order to criticize and admonish the Communists:

The only thing history does not permit is that the analysts and the executors of proletarian policies make mistakes of judgment. To qualify for the role of vanguard political party is not like qualifying for a university diploma. Such a party must lead the working class in the struggle for state power and know how to guide it to seize power, leading the struggle to the quickest victory.

Nothing more about the Party was said in the article; nothing about how it should exert its leadership in actual practice, nothing about its relationship to the guerrilla army and the guerrilla command.

Guevara also acknowledged that objective and subjective conditions had to be right in order to make revolution. But this also was a merely verbal concession: he claimed that:

there exist everywhere in this continent the objective conditions which compel the masses to oppose the government of the bourgeoisie and the landlords by violent acts, and that many other countries face a government crisis and there the subjective conditions are present, too.

The revolutionary struggle in Latin America would therefore sooner or later take on "a continental character."

The article implicitly rejected a concept dear to the Chinese, namely that of the "national democratic" revolution in which the "national bourgeoisie" would side with the revolutionaries: "There is a complete polarization of the various forces, with the exploiters on one extreme and the exploited on the other. . . ." And:

The majority of the national bourgeoisie are in league with U.S. imperialism and want to throw in their lot with it in every country. . . . The polarization of the hostile class forces is far more rapid than the development of the contradictions among the exploiters in the division of spoils.

Hence the revolution would pass into its socialist stage immediately
after its military victory:

...the phenomenon of polarization of forces which is appearing in America and the clear division between the exploiters and the exploited in the future revolutionary wars indicate that once the armed vanguard of the people rises to seize state power, the country or countries where state power has been seized will eliminate the oppressors, both imperialists and domestic exploiters, at the same time. The first stage of the socialist revolution will be realized; the people will set out to heal the wounds and embark on socialist construction.

The Guevara article was clearly unorthodox not only from the Russian but also from the Chinese point of view. The publication of this heretical document in Peking Review, a journal dedicated to the propagation of the ideology of Maoism, was a most unusual concession to the Cubans. It seemed to augur a period of close cooperation between the Chinese and the Castroite movement on a continental scale. In view of the looseness of the ties between Cuba and the Castroite groups on the continent, and of Castro's own success in maintaining his freedom of movement in spite of his material dependence on Soviet aid, such collaboration seemed entirely feasible.

The Formation of Chinese Splinter Parties

The Chinese, however, had decided otherwise. Peking did not take advantage of the strong pro-Chinese sentiment of the Latin American Castroites by establishing ties with these groups. In publishing the Guevara article, Peking apparently merely intended to embarrass the Latin American Communist parties by creating the erroneous impression that an alliance with the Castroites was in being or about to be formed. This also seems to have been the purpose of a letter by the Chinese Central Committee to the Central Committee of the Chilean Communists, stating:

---

In Latin America the 'peaceful way' which you advocate stands in sharp contrast to the revolutionary way of Fidel Castro and other comrades who led the Cuban people to victory.

In actual fact Peking persisted in concentrating its attention on the Latin American Communist Parties. Its attempt to draw entire Parties away from the Soviet Union had failed. In accordance with its worldwide policy, it now proceeded to split the Communist movement in Latin America by setting up rival Parties.

One such pro-Chinese splinter Party had in fact come into being much earlier. In February 1962 a group of functionaries expelled from the Brazilian Communist Party (Partido Comunista Brasileiro, PCB) had founded the rival Communist Party of Brazil (Partido Comunista do Brasil, PCdoB). Osvaldo Peralva's honest and remarkably reliable book, O Retrato, contains valuable information on the events leading to the split and on the personalities of the leaders of the new party.

According to Peralva the Brazilian Communist Party had been plunged into a severe crisis by the events of the year 1956. In the first half of 1957 the Stalinist leadership group of Diogenes Arruda, João Amazonas, Mauricio Grabois and Pedro Pomar had defeated the revisionist opposition factions of Agildo Barata and Osvaldo Peralva. But later that year the secretary general of the party, Luis Carlos Prestes, who had hitherto left the management of party affairs to Arruda and Amazonas, emerged

---

83 The date of this letter is not known. The above passage was quoted by Luis Corvalán in an article in World Marxist Review, Vol. V, December 1964.

84 A resolution of this party of August 1964, quoted in Peking Review, Vol VIII, No. 22, May 28, 1965, says that the Communist Party of Brazil "was rebuilt in February 1962." A Prensa Latina (Havana) dispatch from Montevideo, dated March 14, 1962 reports that the founding convention of the party was held in São Paulo.
from retirement to remove the Stalinists from their positions and to replace them by a new "centrist" leadership. The Stalinist group had, however, been in control of the party machine since the 1940's, and their influence remained strong even after their fall from power. Amazonas, Grabois and Pomar were finally expelled from the party in 1961 after the return of Prestes from Moscow, where he had attended the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. They thereupon formed their own splinter Party, set up a publishing house, brought out a Brazilian translation of Che Guevara's *Guerrilla Warfare* and founded a fortnightly newspaper *A Classe Operaria*. They apparently received both Chinese and Cuban funds for these undertakings.

Peralva relates that in the long period during which the Stalinist group was in factual control of the Prestes party, it had assiduously cultivated the old anti-intellectualist tradition of the Brazilian Communists. Peralva gives numerous instances of the humiliations which the Stalinist leadership inflicted on prominent intellectuals who had been drawn into the party's orbit by the magic name of Prestes.

---

85 Arruda had taken over the factual leadership of the party as early as 1940. See Peralva, *O Retrato*, pp. 203-204.

86 The most dynamic of the Stalinists and the only one of them with real leadership qualities, Diogenes Arruda, had retired from political activity and refrained from joining the splinter party.

87 According to an East European diplomatic source in Havana, whose identity I am not at liberty to disclose, Luis Carlos Prestes, during his visit to Cuba in March 1963, managed to persuade the Cubans to stop their subsidies, thus making the dissident Party dependent on Chinese aid alone.

88 For this tradition see also Jorge Amado's three-volume novel, *Os Subterraneos de Liberdade*, 10th ed., São Paulo, Livraria Martins, 1964. At the time when he wrote this novel, Amado was a fervent and disciplined Communist, who accepted the constant slights and insults aimed at the intellectuals by the party leadership in a spirit of contrition, apparently regarding them as entirely justified.

89 Through his military exploits at the head of a column of insurgents from 1925 to 1927 Prestes had become a legendary figure and one of the
To this day the influence of the Communist Party and of Marxist-Leninist doctrine on intellectual circles is greater in Brazil than in any other Latin American country, and perhaps than in a number of Iron Curtain countries. By failing to exploit this advantage, and repelling many intellectuals who were attracted to communism, the Stalinist bosses of the Communist Party machine doubtless contributed greatly to the rapid decline of the Party from the position it had reached in 1945, when it laid claim to a membership of 200,000 and for a brief period was a force to be reckoned with in Brazilian politics.

It was thus the most sterile, rigid and ineffective elements in the Brazilian communist movement who were won over to the Chinese cause.

The pro-Chinese Communist Party of Brazil came into being at a time when Peking had not yet decided to split the Communist parties on an international scale. The foundation of the new Party was not reported by the Chinese press. In March 1963, a two-man delegation of the new Party arrived in Peking; 3 weeks later, they were received by Mao Tse-tung. But in the English version of Peking Review, which may be considered Peking's great names of Brazilian history years before he became a Communist.

90 For this, see Fernando Pereira: 31 Marco, Civis E Militares No Processo Da Crisis Brasileira, Rio de Janeiro, Jose Alvaro, Editor, 1964, pp. 167-179. A striking example of this influence is the latest book by Brazil's leading economic historian, Caio Prado Junior, A Revolução Brasileira, São Paulo, Editora Brasileira, 1966. In this book, Caio Prado, himself a rigid Marxist, devotes an entire chapter of 82 pages to a detailed analysis and criticism of certain theses contained in the 1928 program of the Comintern, a 1933 declaration by the South American Bureau of the Comintern, the 1954 program of the Brazilian Communist Party and other Party documents. In what other country do leading intellectuals take old Communist party programs so seriously? And even the works of authors like Celso Furtado and Helio Jaguaribe, whom it would be asinine to regard as Communists, abound in terms lifted from Communist party leaflets, which these writers treat with the respect due to accepted scientific categories.

official organ as far as Chinese activities in the international communist movement are concerned, they were described as a delegation of the "Brazilian Communist Party", thus omitting the official name of the Party, "Communist Party of Brazil."

On August 24, 1963, the Albanian newspaper Zeri i Popullit published the full text of an anti-Soviet resolution passed by the Communist Party of Brazil, excerpts from which were also circulated by the New China News Agency. But it is significant that the resolution was not published by Peking Review. An article by one of the leaders of the splinter Party, Mauricio Grabois, which had originally appeared in A Classe Operaria, was reprinted in Peking Review, Vol. VI, No. 35, August 30, 1963, but neither the author nor the newspaper were identified as being of the Communist Party of Brazil, a clear indication that that party had not yet been officially recognized by Peking.92

The decision to split the Communist Parties on an international scale was announced by Chou Yang in a Peking speech on the theme, "Everything tends to divide into two,"93 which was not however published until December 27, 1963.94 The first officially recognized pro-Chinese splinter party in Latin America was founded in January 1964, when an unauthorized "national conference" of the Peruvian Communist Party allegedly convened

92 Recognition appears to have been afforded in the course of 1964. On October 1964 Peking Review Vol. VII, No. 42, published a resolution by the Communist Party of Brazil denouncing the Soviet decision to hold a world meeting of the international Communist movement.


94 See The People's Daily of that date.
by a majority of the Central Committee members and representatives from 13 out of 17 regional committees and attended by observers of the Communist Youth League gathered in order to pass a resolution which "condemned the revisionist theories of Tito and his followers, and laid emphasis on the correct stand of the Chinese Communist Party in the ideological controversy with the revisionists." In direct contradiction to the Guevara article published in Peking Review only a few days before, the resolution called for "the founding of a strong anti-imperialist national front uniting all forces which can be united, including the bourgeoisie." The conference then proclaimed the expulsion from the party of its entire leadership headed by Raul Acosta, Jorge Del Prado and Juan Barrios, who were denounced as "corrupt elements" who had committed "acts of betrayal" and "had degenerated politically and morally to an unheard-of extreme".95

The following month, the Spaitacus group in Chile published the first number of its theoretical organ, Principios Marxista-Leninistas. This contained a highly revealing report on a meeting of the group held in Santiago "at the end of January" and allegedly attended by some 60 Marxist-Leninists of the Chilean Communist Party.96 In a resolution the meeting, "Salutes the Communist Party of China, True Heir to the Revolutionary Organization which should never be abandoned." A further resolution condemned the Chilean Party leadership for its alleged abandonment of Marxist-Leninist principles and went on to state: "We reject with equal firmness the Trotskyite stand and all pseudo-Marxist forms of revolutionary struggle."


96 A summary of this report was later published in Peking Review, Vol. VIII, No. 18, May 1, 1964.
The anti-Trotskyite theme was elaborated in a speech by one of the participants who said that there was a "paradoxical identity" between the Trotskyites and revisionists on the question of Stalin. "They put the blame for all the errors committed in the U.S.S.R. on Stalin." He further declared:

The presence of Trotskyites in the party organization is also harmful because they are liable to putschist adventurism and political adventurism and would in the upshot create the constant splits which we have seen. . . . I think we must adopt the firm stand of not having anything to do with the Trotskyites.

Beware of the Trotskyites whose factional activities are still the best ally of the bourgeoisie in preventing the working class from closing its ranks under the banner of Marxism-Leninism.

The significance of this document published in the Spartacus organ is that it clearly reveals the conditions laid down by the Chinese for membership in the new Communist Parties they were sponsoring in Latin America: Unconditional acceptance of the Chinese Communist Party as the "heir to the revolutionary organization which should never be abandoned," that is, as the leader of the international communist movement in the same role and with the same powers that the Communist party of the Soviet Union had held in the days of the Comintern; acceptance of the Chinese line in all its details, including the defense of Stalin and the rejection of Trotskyism. The condemnation of "all pseudo-Marxist forms of revolutionary struggle" and of "putschist adventurism and political adventurism" also implied, of course, a rejection of Guevara's theories. This then is what the Chinese wanted in Latin America: puppet parties securely tied to strings manipulated in Peking. Such a program was unacceptable to the only groups that were actually conducting an armed revolutionary struggle in Latin America: the extreme nationalists of Castroite persuasion.

After the Brazilian and the Peruvian, only one more pro-Chinese splinter Party was officially recognized by Peking in Latin America.
In July 1965, the pro-Chinese faction of the Colombian Communists met in an unauthorized "Tenth Congress of the Communist Party of Colombia" at which it condemned the party leadership headed by Gilberto Vieira as "renegades who, as leaders of a proletarian party, peddled bourgeois ideas." A resolution passed by the new party claimed that:

revisionism has always represented the infiltration of bourgeois ideologies into the other parties of the proletariat... this imperialist policy has already extended to the socialist countries... Yugoslavia is the most outstanding case in point, where the people have been robbed of the fruits of their revolution and subjected again to capitalist exploitations... We shall not speak about the Eastern European countries here, but in the Soviet Union certain features of capitalism have already begun to appear as a result of modern revisionism."

And "Whether or not the working class has assumed power, it is necessary to eliminate the revisionists as a political force."

The resolution also declared that:

China's nuclear capabilities are a substantial contribution to the cause of world peace. They have smashed the monopoly of atomic weapons, frustrated the imperialist blackmail and filled the people's fighters who are waging an intense struggle against U.S. imperialism with hope.

The resolutions passed at this Colombian splinter congress no longer use the formula "national democratic" and do not demand incorporation of the "bourgeoisie" or "national bourgeoisie" in a united front. Instead it is stated that "that there can be no peaceful coexistence between the exploited and the exploiters and between the oppressed nations and their oppressors in any country or area." "The only way out for the Colombian people," says one of the resolutions,

is to seize state power by revolutionary means, or in other words, to destroy the state machinery and replace it by a people's political power to be formed on the basis of the Patriotic Front for Liberation and with the support of the armed people.

In regard to the armed struggle the resolution stated: "In the present
conditions on our continent, the village is the natural battleground for a people's war and "The struggle will be mainly in the countryside and it will be waged by relying on the strength of the people. Sooner or later it will spread to the whole of the country and involve all social strata." 

These are substantial concessions to the theories of Che Guevara. It would seem that Peking had at last begun to regret having alienated the Castroites by its insistence on a dogmatically correct "national democratic" revolution. One must also keep in mind that the Peking inspired Colombian resolutions were formulated shortly before the publication of Lin Piao's new thesis of world wide war of the countryside against the cities. Declarations by the Peruvian pro-Chinese Communist party dating back to September-November 1965 but only published by Peking Review, Vol. IX, No. 2, January 7, 1966 and Vol. IX, No. 12, March 18, 1966, also avoid the terms "national democratic" front and "national democratic" revolution, using instead such terms as "revolutionary united front" "patriotic liberation front" and asserting: "The first stage of our revolution is anti-feudal, anti-imperialist, democratic and national liberation revolution." Of the "national bourgeoisie," a resolution of "the 5th national conference of the Peruvian Communist party" on November 15-16, 1965 says:

\[\text{the national bourgeoisie which has a dual character may participate in the revolution under certain conditions, but because of its ties with imperialists and landlords, it may betray the revolution.}\]

The formula "national democratic revolution" does, however, reappear in an article "The People Fight Ahead" in Peking Review, Vol. IX, No. 5

\[\text{97 Quoted from Peking Review, Vol. VIII, No. 34, August 20, 1965.}\]
January 28, 1966. This time stress is laid on the armed character of the revolution: "One of the salient features of the Latin American national-democratic revolution in 1965" says the article, "was that the idea that salvation lies in armed struggle was taking root in the hearts of an increasing number of people."

None of the three pro-Chinese Communist parties has so far been able to make any headway. The Peruvian and Colombian parties are racked by internal strife, with various personalities contending for leadership. The Brazilian party suffered a severe setback through the military coup of March 31, 1964, by which it was caught completely unprepared, and has been exceedingly slow in recovering and adapting itself to conditions of clandestinity.98

A lengthy editorial in the Peking People's Daily of April 30, 1964, "Lessons from the Reactionary Military Coup in Brazil" failed to mention the Brazilian splinter Party and pointed out as one of the lessons of the coup:

The peasant question is a key question in the national democratic revolution of the Latin American countries . . . Brazil's national democratic revolutionary movement has suffered a setback precisely because it did not have a broad united front with a strong leadership. It has not truly aroused and organized the broad mass of peasants and other sections of the peoples. Hence it could not organize a powerful counterattack in face of the armed rebellion organized by imperialism and its lackeys.99

This article may well have been meant as an expression of dissatisfaction

98 After the victory of the coup the seven members of the Chinese trade mission and two Chinese newsmen were arrested in Rio de Janeiro; they were only released and repatriated 9 months later. No convincing proof of their participation in the activities of the pro-Chinese splinter Communist party of Brazil has been made public by the military authorities who conducted the investigation against them.

with the Brazilian splinter Party, which had failed to establish a working with Francisco Julião's Peasant Leagues or indeed with any other non-Communist organization.

The Peruvian and Colombian pro-Chinese Parties have also been unable to win a foothold among the peasantry or to engage in effective cooperation with the Castroites; nor have they been able or willing to engage in guerrilla activities of their own. The reason for these failures of the pro-Chinese Communist Parties of Brazil, Peru and Colombia is obvious. The original stem from which these splinters derived is weak, without influence on the political life of its country, doctrinaire at the same time opportunistic. Since Chinese policies only attracted the most sterile and Stalinist elements from these Parties, the new organisms inevitably had to be even less effective.

Pro-Chinese splits occurred also in several other Latin American countries. In Ecuador the secession was confined to a group of intellectuals from Quito. In July 1963, the sum of $25,000 found on the person of one of the leading pro-Chinese dissidents, José Maria Roura, was confiscated at the airport on his return from a voyage to Europe. The bulk of the Ecuadorian Communist Party under Pedro Saad, who controls the Ecuadorian trade union confederation and has a following among the workers of the country's main port and industrial city of Guayaquil, has remained loyal to the Soviets.

In Santo Domingo a pro-Chinese group, the MPD (Movimiento el Pueblo Dominicano) Dominican People's Movement, attempted a guerrilla rising in 1963 and was again active in the ranks of Col. Caamaño's constitutionalists during the troubled events of 1965. This group has also never been officially recognized by Peking. At a Peking Meeting of
solidarity with the Dominican People on April 26, 1966, the Dominican's speaker was a representative of the Castroite July 14 Movement, not of the MPD. 100

In Bolivia a split of considerable proportions took place in the summer of 1965. A statement by the pro-Soviet party leadership in the World Marxist Review, Vol. VIII, No. 7, July 1965 admitted that 9 of the 14 members of the Central Committee were involved in the secession, that the secessionists had considerable strength in 3 departments and had been able to set a parallel organization in 6 of the 14 departments where the party has regional committees. 101 Peking Review has failed to report this split.

In August a pro-Soviet "Commission for the Defense and Reorganization of the Paraguayan Communist party announced that the majority of the party leadership under Secretary General Oscar Creydt had left the Soviet fold, held a meeting with the leadership of the Chinese Communist party, [and] gone over to the enemy territory of calumny and insult against the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and to acts of provocation."

The split in the Paraguayan Communist party--actually a party in exile, with its headquarters and most of its membership in Argentina--is the most interesting of the new splits which at the time of this


101 See also World Marxist Review, Vol. VIII, No. 8, August 1965, where the secessionists were attacked as "fanatics who see in armed forces of struggle the only way of winning power" and as "ultra left dogmatists."

writing, in the summer of 1966, have still not been officially recognized by Peking. The point at issue between the party leader Oscar Creydt and the pro-Soviet factionalists led by Obdulio Barthe is not as one might assume, armed struggle, with the pro-Chinese Creydt adopting a more revolutionary line. Both factions are adamant in contending that the Stroessner dictatorship can only be toppled by force. In actual fact the question is academic; there has been no guerrilla activity in Paraguay since 1963, and its resumption is highly unlikely, since past failures have demonstrated the loyalty of a large part of the peasantry to the Conservative Party, which is sympathetic to the Stroessner regime. Both Creydt and Barthe are doubtless aware of this. The reason for the break appears to be Creydt's refusal to cooperate with the Cuban Castroites, i.e. the most radical, Leftist extremist faction of the Febrerista party. The above mentioned statement by the pro-Soviet group of Obdulio Barthe condemning Creydt for his "vulgar and brutal treatment, his methods of imposition and disintegration" in his relations with "the allies" and for his "calumnies" not only against the CPSU, but also against "the United Party of the Socialist Revolution of Cuba, against Comrade Fidel Castro."

It is significant that it was the pro-Soviet faction of Obdulio Barthe which pronounced itself in favor of Castro and the Castroites. For the Russians, displaying more skill and elasticity in their Latin American policies than the Chinese, had made a concerted and temporarily successful effort to appease the Castroite movements in Latin America.

---

103 This is rivalry of long standing. Already early in 1956 the Russians, according to Osvaldo Peralva (op. cit., p. 163) tried to replace the independent minded Creydt by Barthe, who appeared "more loyal and pliant than Creydt to the bureaucracy of the CPSU." At that time the maneuver failed because of the slackening of discipline in the international Communist movement and the dissolution of the Cominform.
And Paraguay was one of the countries in which according to a resolution passed by the Soviet-sponsored conference of Latin American Communist parties held in Havana in November 1964, the struggle of the persecuted patriots was to be actively supported by the Communist parties. 104

Creydt's secession from the Soviet side would thus appear to have been in protest against the new Soviet policy of encouraging cooperation between the Latin American Communist parties and the Castroites.

**Soviet Wooing of the Castroites**

As Herbert Dinerstein has pointed out, 105 the change in Soviet policy was heralded as early as August 1964 in an article in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union's theoretical organ Communist which specifically approved armed struggle. Then came the Havana Conference of Latin American Communist parties, from which the pro-Chinese splinter parties were excluded. 106 In the following year, the Russians gave propaganda support to at least one important Castroite venture not supported by the local Communist party: throughout the second half of 1965 the guerrilla campaign launched by the Peruvian Castroite organization (MIR) in June 1965 was enthusiastically hailed by Radio Moscow in its broadcasts in Spanish and in Quetchua, the main Indian language of Peru.

In March 1965, Cuba attended the Moscow consultative meeting of 18 Communist Parties, which was opposed by the Chinese. That same

---

104 See the communique of the conference in Pravda, January 15-19, 1965. The other countries named were Venezuela, Colombia, Guatemala, Honduras and Haiti.


106 For this see the Albanian Communist Party newspaper, Zeri i Popullit, February 16, 1965.
month, Castro expressed his disapproval of the "Byzantine" polemics of the Sino-Soviet dispute in a public speech. On September 14 of that year, Castro and President Dorticos summoned the Chinese chargés d'affaires to their presence in order to protest against the distribution of Chinese propaganda materials to Cuban army officers and government officials. In earlier years Peking Review and Chinese ideological pamphlets had been freely on sale in Havana bookshops while the pro-Soviet World Marxist Review was obtainable only in the Czechoslovak House of Culture.

Meanwhile Chinese disenchantment with Cuba was indicated by the increasing scantiness of reports on that country in the Chinese press. In October 1965 Castro announced that his collaborator Ernesto "Che" Guevara had left Cuba and given up his Cuban citizenship in order to devote himself to the cause of revolution in other parts of the world. Guevara had actually vanished from the scene as early as April of that year.

At the time of this writing the mystery of his disappearance is still unsolved.

Guevara was not a Chinese stooge or sycophant. There was only one brief mention of Mao's contribution to the theory and practice of guerrilla

\[\text{References}\]


109 Personal observation during visits to Cuba in 1961 and 1963.

warfare in his book, *Guerrilla Warfare*, and none at all in his 1963 article reproduced in January 1964 in the *Peking Review*. To omit the name of the greatest living theoretician of guerrilla warfare from an essay on that subject may well have struck the Chinese as an act of discourtesy. Nevertheless Guevara was much closer to Peking than to Moscow in his views on both world affairs and domestic policy. Not only his vision of an armed anti-imperialist struggle encompassing the entire continent, but also his rejection of "material incentives" as advocated by the Russians as a spur to industrial and agricultural production, coincided with the Peking line. And on his last voyage to Africa, in December 1964 to March 1965, Guevara had made a number of statements which were clearly critical of Soviet and Yugoslav economic policies, and of Soviet reluctance to supply arms to "liberation movements" free of charge and in the quantities needed. Whether or not his removal is to be attributed to his anti-Soviet and pro-Chinese views, it certainly signified a definite decline of Chinese influence in the Cuban government.

In 1965 Castro also sided with the pro-Soviet Guatemalan Communists in their conflict with the pro-Chinese guerrillas of Yon Sosa's November 13 movement. The Guatemalan Communists had, however, to agree to sponsor a guerrilla movement of their own under the command of a Castroite, Luis Turcios, in order to obtain Castro's backing. In his closing speech at that *Havana Tricontinental Conference*\(^{112}\) of January 1966 Castro denounced the November 13 movement as having fallen under the influence of Trotskyites.\(^ {113}\)

---


\(^{112}\)See *Granma*, Havana, January 18, 1966.

\(^{113}\)The accusation is probably based on fact. The Latin American
At the Tricontinental Conference, the new Soviet policy of collaboration with Castro proved completely successful. The conference was attended by delegates of Asian, African and Latin American nationalist organizations as well as by Latin American pro-Soviet Communists. The Russians had no safe majority, but thanks to Cuban backing and skillful tactical maneuvering, they managed to isolate the Chinese and to prevent them from making the conference a platform for their customary denunciations of revisionism. The price which the Russians had to pay to Castro consisted of verbal concessions to extremism and of agreeing to permit a coordinating committee for the Latin American revolution to be formed in Havana. The pro-Soviet Latin American Communist parties were more or less dragooned into membership of this committee.

In maneuvering to isolate the Chinese, Castro was able to make use of a serious tactical blunder which they had made sometime before the conference. In November of the preceding year, Cuban Ministry of Foreign Trade officials who had arrived in Peking for discussions on a trade agreement for 1966 had been notified of a cut in Chinese rice allocations: instead of the 250,000 tons delivered in 1965, and of the 285,000 asked for, China would only be able to provide Cuba with 135,000

Trotskyites emphatically claimed the November 13 movement as their own, and the movement's grandiloquent "Declaration of the Sierra Minas" published in the mimeographed journal, Revolucion Socialista (organ of the November 13 movement) January 1965, is phrased in Trotskyist terminology. Thus the Communist dominated countries are termed "workers' states" [Estados Obreros], an expression habitually used by the Trotskyites alone.
tons in 1966.\textsuperscript{114} The cut was officially motivated as resulting from the increased needs of North Vietnam, but it was quite obvious that the measure was actually a reprisal, and might be retracted if Castro consented to turn back from the pro-Soviet course which he had pursued since the end of 1964. Peking later admitted as much by stressing that the trade talks in the course of which the cut had been announced were only "preliminary discussions" and that the matter could have been taken up again at a higher level.\textsuperscript{115}

Both Washington and Moscow could have told the Chinese that this was not the way to handle Castro. He seized the chance to put the Chinese in the wrong; on the eve of the tricontinental conference in a speech on January 2, 1966 he announced the Chinese decision to the public. In doing so he cleverly feigned to accept and even approve the Chinese explanation that the cut was due to the Vietnam war.\textsuperscript{116} This of course deceived no one, but made it difficult for the Chinese to raise the issue at the conference in order to defend themselves. They were thus at a disadvantage from the very start of the conference.

One month later, on February 6, 1966 the official newspaper of the Cuban Central Committee, Granma, published a statement


\textsuperscript{115} See Peking Review, Vol. IX, No. 6, February 4, 1966: "If the Cuban side . . . genuinely hoped that China would export more rice to Cuba in 1966 it could very well have raised the matter in negotiations at a higher level as it did in the past."

\textsuperscript{116} See Granma, January 3, 1966.
by Castro which constitutes the strongest public attack on Peking yet made by any Communist leader. Castro accused the Chinese government of "having in fact joined" the economic blockade of Cuba by the "Yankee imperialists" and regretted "having believed in the Chinese government's spirit of internationalism." He denounced the Chinese measure as "a criminal act of economic aggression" and expressed his contempt for the "Byzantine battles" the "academic chatter" of the Sino-Soviet polemics. He complained of the distribution of Chinese propaganda materials among Cuban officers and civil servants, calling it "a flagrant violation of the elementary norms of respect which must exist between socialist countries and even between non-socialist ones." He related that as long ago as September 14, 1965, he had told the Chinese chargé d'affaires that

...these methods and practices were exactly the same as those employed by the U.S. Embassy in our country in its attempts to interfere in the internal affairs of Cuba and in one form or another impose its will on this nation; that our country had liberated itself from that imperialism 90 miles away from our coast; that our country would not accept similar practices being imposed on us by another powerful country 20,000 kilometres away; that we frankly considered the attitude of the representatives of the Chinese government to be an encroachment on the sovereignty of our country and harmful to the prerogatives that exclusively belonged to our government within our frontiers; and that whatever the cost, our government would not tolerate such things.

And finally he posed the question

whether there will also prevail in the world of tomorrow, which revolutionaries are struggling to establish, the worst methods of piracy, oppression and filibustering that have been introduced into the world ever since the emergence of class society, ever since the rule of slavery, feudalism, absolute monarchy, the bourgeois states, and in the contemporary world,
the imperialist state.\textsuperscript{117}

Peking's prestige with the Latin American Left was certainly severely damaged by Castro's revelation that it had indulged in "imperialist practices" in its relations with little Cuba. One might assume that Castro was now totally and irrevocably committed to the Soviet cause. But this was not the case.

The Shadow of Vietnam

In the same statement which condemned China so harshly, Castro also mentioned the missile crisis of October 1962. He did this in a manner most inconvenient to the Russians, by confirming, in an official statement made in his capacity as Prime Minister, that Cuba had only "agreed to" -- not asked for -- "the installation of thermonuclear weapons on our territory" and that it had done this not only in the interest of self-defense, but "for the sake of strengthening the Socialist Camp" -- a phrase which in this context could only be interpreted as meaning: in order to change the balance of nuclear power in favor of the Soviet Union. He then reminded the Russians of a painful fact: "and besides not only did we agree to have them [the missiles] brought in but we did not agree to have them taken out!"

Having thus stressed the revolutionary determination and spirit of sacrifice of the Cuban people, which "did not hesitate to risk the dangers of thermonuclear war, nuclear attack on us", he went on to demand massive military engagement in favor of Vietnam, thus clearly condemning the cautious policy of the

Soviet Union.

Our position is one! We favor that Vietnam should be given all the help necessary!
We favor that help should be given in weapons and men! We favor that the socialist camp should run the necessary risks for Vietnam!
We are very much aware that in case of any serious international complication we will be one of the first targets of imperialism but we are not worried by it and it has never worried us.\footnote{Quoted from the English translation of the Castro statement in \textit{Peking Review}, Vol. IX, No. 9, February 25, 1966.}

On March 31, 1966 Castro's spokesman Armando Hart demanded drastic action against the American bombing raids on North Vietnam -- action which could of course only be taken if sufficient Soviet aircraft, missiles and "volunteers" to man them were sent to that country.

In the present situation of the war in Vietnam the necessary tactical measure at this point is to develop a military force aimed at paralyzing the bombings on the Democratic Republic of Vietnam -- that is to put out of action the Yankee aircraft which bomb the territory of this country. It is of transcendental importance for the victory over imperialism in Vietnam to liquidate, with the means available and assuming the necessary risks, the criminal aggression represented by the bombers over the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. It is indispensable to carry out definite efforts and give decisive help in order to convert the territory of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam into a graveyard of Yankee aircraft. It is necessary if circumstances demand to be prepared to fight in Vietnam in the defense of the integrity and life of that country. The battle in Vietnam involves an essential question of principle, as have been set out in this congress, for the whole Communist movement, and especially for the socialist countries.\footnote{Translated from \textit{Granma}, Havana, April 1, 1966.}

The significance of this speech lies in the fact that Hart made it in Moscow at a session of the 23rd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which he attended as the Cuban guest.
delegate. The representative of a small nation of 7 million, a late comer and maverick in the socialist camp and in the international communist movement, was using a Soviet party congress to demand a drastic change in Soviet foreign policy -- this was indeed a unique and unheard of occurrence!

It is probably these open demonstrations of Castro's dissatisfaction with the Soviets that have persuaded Peking to halt its polemics against him. The Chinese are not likely to have forgiven him his harsh words, but it is to their advantage not to force him totally into the Soviet camp by continuing hostilities. In May of this year a trade protocol for the fiscal year 1966 was signed by the head of the Chinese trade delegation to Cuba and the Cuban Vice Minister of Foreign Trade. The quantity of rice to be delivered by the Chinese appears to be somewhat, but not significantly higher than the figure of 135,000 tons proposed by the Chinese in November 1965. The 1965-1966 work plan for scientific cooperation between the Chinese Academy of Sciences and the Cuban Academy of Science was also signed in Havana on the same day. 120

With his usual tactical skill, Castro has thus managed to maintain a certain freedom of maneuver between Moscow and Peking. But that does not mean that his criticism of Soviet policy is based purely on tactical considerations. He has every reason to be genuinely dissatisfied with Soviet policy in Vietnam and indeed with the policy of the entire 'Socialist Camp.'

120 See Granma, Havana, May 27, 1966.
From 1961 onward he had insisted on joining the "Socialist Camp" because he believed that as a member, he would enjoy the protection of the Soviet nuclear umbrella while spreading his revolution to continental Latin America. The missile crisis proved that this was an error: the Russians were not prepared for a showdown with the United States over Cuba. He was officially admitted to the "Socialist Camp" in 1963, but by that time, the distinction appeared to be of doubtful value. The "Camp" was racked by dissensions which were clearly far more serious than he had hitherto assumed. And the continuous bombing of North Vietnam from the spring of 1965 onward has since demonstrated that mere membership in the "Camp" without a defense treaty, which Castro has not been able to obtain from the Soviets, was not enough to provide him with military security.

The failure of the "Socialist Camp" to retaliate against the bombing of North Vietnam has undoubtedly seriously weakened the influence of the Soviet Union and the attraction of communism in general in Latin America. The most desperate elements of the extreme left, those who might be described as "Guevaristas" are determined to carry on an armed struggle without the prospect of Soviet aid. These elements might well have fallen under Chinese sway if Peking's policy in Latin America had been more flexible.

\[\text{121}\] The Moscow May Day Slogans of that year for the first time listed Cuba among the countries actually "building socialism," see Pravda, April 8, 1963.
Conclusion

A substantial body of opinion on the Latin American Left, mainly among intellectuals, is receptive to Peking's doctrine of guerrilla war, and to its rejection of all forms of "peaceful coexistence" with the United States. The Chinese, however, have so far made no effort to give organizational form to this trend. They have concentrated their organizational efforts on the small and sterile Communist Parties of Latin America while neglecting the far more dynamic "Castroite" groups.

From this one may draw the conclusion that for all its talk of a world wide anti-imperialist struggle, Peking is not really interested in such a struggle in far-away Latin America. It appears to regard this region simply as one more battlefield in its struggle to wrest the international communist movement from Soviet control, or failing that, to wreck it in order to make it ineffective as an instrument of Soviet policy.