

# WORLD OUTLOOK

## PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

*Un service de presse ouvrier*

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

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

Vol. 4, No. 13

April 29, 1966

In this volume

Page

|   |    |
|---|----|
| McNamara Forecasts Further Escalation .....   | 1  |
| Russell Charges U.S.<br>Is Moving Toward Nuclear Attack .....                                   | 3  |
| Vietnam Bombs Escalated<br>to Three Times Korean War Figure .....                               | 3  |
| Bargain-Counter Bombs .....   | 4  |
| Australians Demonstrate<br>Against Sending Troops to Vietnam .....                              | 5  |
| Che Guevara's Brother-in-Law Captured in Lima .....   | 5  |
| Political Climate in U.S.<br>Remains Unfavorable for Witch-Hunters<br>-- by George Novack ..... | 6  |
| The Student Demonstrations at Waseda .....  | 9  |
| Corporal Punishment, A Form of Scholarly Love .....   | 11 |
| Law Proposed to End Teaching<br>of "Anti-Japanese" Thoughts .....                               | 11 |
| Price Hikes Spur Strike Action in Japan .....   | 12 |
| Successful Easter Demonstration in Germany .....  | 12 |
| Peking's New Zealand Showpiece .....  | 13 |
| Algerian Political Prisoners Stage Hunger Strike .....  | 16 |
| Vietnam Week Designated<br>by New French Youth Organization .....                               | 17 |
| French Revolution Still Too Hot for Turks .....   | 17 |
| Documents:<br>Castro's Rebuttal to President Frei .....   | 18 |

### McNAMARA FORECASTS FURTHER ESCALATION

In testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate April 20, Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara forecast further escalation of the war in Vietnam. "I anticipate an increase

Reba Hansen, Business Manager,

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

New York, N.Y. 10010

in the extent and intensity of the conflict," he told the senators.

Under questioning, he revealed that the war is now costing the U.S. \$12,000,000,000 a year. This averages out to almost \$35,000,000 a day, or about thirty-five times the figure given up to now by administration spokesmen!

McNamara also revealed that there are now 245,000 U.S. troops in Vietnam, making a total of "325,000 men assigned to combat operations in Southeast Asia."

In escalating the war to its present height, the Johnson administration has achieved other grim records. Air support of ground operations in Vietnam "is three times the level of support that we had in World War II."

The Pentagon spokesman with the computer brain and gas-chamber heart also proudly announced that 50,000 tons of bombs were dropped in Vietnam in March compared with an average of 48,000 tons a month in Europe and Africa combined in World War II and an average of 17,500 tons a month during the thirty-seven months of the Korean War, which was sufficient to literally obliterate virtually every village and hamlet in that theater of American largess.

McNamara, who must now be listed as one of the greatest war criminals of all time, expressed his pride in the United States. "No other nation in history has ever been so strong," he said. As proof he cited America's capacity to carry "such great military strength with so little burden on its society." Up to now, this top adviser and administrator in the Johnson administration pointed out, the government has not called up reserve forces, has not diverted scarce materials from civilian use, nor imposed wage or price controls.

In addition, McNamara boasted that the U.S. has a stockpile of 331,000 tons of conventional bombs, of which 102,000 tons are stored in the U.S., 61,000 tons in Southeast Asia, and about "four days stock" in Vietnam. [On top of this, McNamara's department announced April 23 that it had "reacquired" 18,000 bombs from its allies, most of them 500-pounders.]

McNamara's aggressive approach apparently led the senators to handle him with kid gloves. Even Senator Morse appeared quite meek in face of the bomb-rattling head of the Pentagon.

Yet the senators had just returned from their annual Easter fence-mending visit to their own states, arriving back in Washington with troubled faces. The war in Vietnam and inflation at home have become top issues among the voters. The conservative Republican Senator Bourke Hickenlooper of Iowa plaintively told McNamara that "most of us got into a hornet's nest over what's happening. It's rather difficult for us to give answers."

McNamara listened politely but seemed to be hearing different sounds than this faint echo of the voices of the American people.

RUSSELL CHARGES U.S. IS MOVING TOWARD NUCLEAR ATTACK

President Johnson's fresh expansion of the war in Vietnam shows that the rulers of the U.S. "know no limits" and are inching toward a "nuclear attack on Vietnam and China," Bertrand Russell declared April 14. In a statement to the press, the noted philosopher said:

"The U.S. Air Force attack on North Vietnam has reached dimensions unattained since the atomic bombing of Nagasaki. Let mankind be warned: the rulers of the United States know no limits. Step by step, they are moving towards a nuclear attack on Vietnam and China.

"They are cornered rats, who lash out because of their defeat by the people of Vietnam. They plan to repeat their attack, employing 1,400,000 pounds of explosives.

"We must stop them. In every country, people must find the appropriate means. Whatever it is possible for men to do to weaken U.S. imperialism -- from Guatemala to Iraq -- must be done.

"Only world resistance can stay the hand of these war criminals."

VIETNAM BOMBINGS ESCALATED TO THREE TIMES KOREAN WAR FIGURE

The story, apparently "leaked" by the Pentagon, about a "shortage" of bombs in Vietnam may well have been partly designed as a decoy to help divert attention from a new jump in the escalation of the war in Vietnam.

Thus, instead of having to argue with critics about the wisdom of increasing the rain of bombs on Vietnam and selecting targets closer and closer to crowded civilian centers, McNamara had the easy job of proving that the American air force faces no real "shortage" of bombs for its murderous forays.

The civilian head of the Pentagon told a press conference April 14 that in March U.S. bombers dropped 50,000 tons of bombs, an increase of 25 per cent over February. This brought the average rate of bombing to three times that used to devastate Korea.

The total "conventional bomb inventory" planned for the calendar year 1966, said this war criminal, is 638,000 tons.

This is 91 per cent of all the bombs used during the 37 months of the Korean war, McNamara said.

BARGAIN-COUNTER BOMBS

When the Pentagon announced April 16 that it had repurchased 5,570 of 7,562 bombs sold as junk to a West German firm more than two years ago, publicists of the Johnson administration explained how clever the deal was and how everyone benefited from it.

The 750-pound bombs, which cost \$330 apiece, were sold for \$1.68 each to the Kaus and Steinhausen Co., who planned to extract the nitrate from the explosives and resell it as fertilizer. By selling the bombs that had not yet been reduced to fertilizer back to the Pentagon for \$20.56 each, they made a quick and handsome profit.

Yet it was a bargain buy for the Pentagon. The production cost today for one 750-pound bomb is \$440.

Moreover the rather sensational purchase gave the more rabid warmongers something to use as "proof" for the recent stories, apparently leaked by the Pentagon itself, about the United States running short of bombs to dump on the Vietnamese. Besides the publicity, the bombs themselves were, of course, perfectly acceptable for Johnson's B-52 jet bombers, each of which can carry about 40 of the missiles in a single "mission" to north Vietnam.

As the Washington Bureau of the New York Herald Tribune put it [April 17]: "In essence, it seems unfortunate the Defense Department cannot buy back more of the bombs it might have sold."

A different way of viewing the "essence" of this bargain-counter deal in bombs was expressed by Robert Escarpit, the sometimes acid-tongued columnist of Le Monde. In the April 19 issue of the Paris daily, under the title, "Nitrogen Cycle," he made the following observations:

"The story about the American bombs sold at auction, then repurchased at a high price can appear both ridiculous and atrocious. But not surprising. The German company that acquired them was figuring, it seems, on extracting the nitrate in the explosives in order to make fertilizer. What were the Americans going to do with it but that? Ense et aratro [with sword and plow] -- the ambivalence of the plowshare and the sword is not new. It is normal to find their modern equivalents.

"Things cannot be kept from their ultimate destination. Whatever the path taken by nitrogen to complete its cycle -- sacks of fertilizer or cannon fodder, fertilizer spray or pure and impure blood to soak the furrows -- the earth finally receives the benefit."

AUSTRALIANS DEMONSTRATE AGAINST SENDING TROOPS TO VIETNAM

Sydney

Three thousand people demonstrated in the center of the city April 15 against the Holt government's policies of conscripting twenty-year-olds and supporting the Vietnamese war.

After beginning the demonstration in Martin Place, the financial center, the demonstrators marched through the city's rush-hour crowds to the naval dockyard at Garden Island where they held a protest meeting.

The police, varying their tactics, showed no desire to stimulate and prolong the demonstration by starting mass arrests as has been their previous practice. They went to the extent of releasing without arrest the secretary of the Vietnam Action Committee, Bob Gould, after they had dragged him off the roof of one of the dockyard buildings from which he had been addressing the crowd.

Basically it is the conscription issue which is causing all the political ferment in Australia.

Opposition to the sending of conscripts to Vietnam comes from a great variety of sources. These include large sections of the trade-union movement, the Australian Labor party, the various peace organizations, two bishops of the Church of England, many of the clergy of protestant churches, and the Melbourne Catholic papers, The Advocate and The Catholic Worker.

A Gallup poll taken last December showed 37% in favor of the government's policy. By February, according to another poll, this had fallen to 32% in favor, 11% undecided and 57% against.

On the basis of this 57% and the historic opposition of the masses in two world wars to conscription, the federal leader of the Labor party, Arthur Calwell, has come out against conscription and has declared that he will fight this year's election on the issue.

If the Australian Labor party wins and withdraws the conscripts, it will effectively put an end to Australia's intervention in Vietnam, as the regular forces do not have nearly enough replacements, and the casualty rate is high.

CHE GUEVARA'S BROTHER-IN-LAW CAPTURED IN LIMA

The Lima police said April 14 that they had captured Ricardo Gadea Acosta, the brother of Che Guevara's first wife, Hilda Gadea. Ricardo Gadea was the leader of a group of guerrilla fighters operating in the central zone in close connection with Luis de la Puente Uceda, who was killed by the Peruvian army last October.

POLITICAL CLIMATE IN U.S. REMAINS UNFAVORABLE FOR WITCH-HUNTERS

By George Novack

It would appear logical, as the example of France during the Algerian conflict suggests, that the official launching of war against a colonial revolution would at first give considerable impetus to the most rabid jingoistic elements within the imperialist aggressor country. This has not so far happened with the U.S. intervention in Vietnam.

In fact, the opposite has taken place. The escalation of military operations has been met by an escalation of opposition to the war and an upsurge of radicalism. The initiative has been taken by the critics of the Johnson administration from the left.

The leadership of the Republican party, which should normally set the pace for the more conservative wing of public opinion, is split three ways over the question of the Vietnam war. Its chief spokesman in the House of Representatives, Gerald Ford of Michigan, accused the administration April 19 of "shocking mismanagement" of the war, blamed the political crisis in south Vietnam on the Honolulu conference, and called on the president to use more aid and sea power against north Vietnam. His line has been that of ex-Senator Goldwater.

On the other hand, Republican Senate leader Dirksen of Illinois backs Johnson's policy. Still other prominent members of the party such as Senators Cooper of Kentucky and Aiken of Vermont advocate moves toward negotiations to bring about peace and the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam.

Both of the capitalist political machines are divided from top to bottom by the war issue. This absence of unity in governing circles has handicapped the countermobilization of the prowar camp against the antiwar movement.

This deadlock is due to the widespread unpopularity of the war which is shared for differing reasons by many strata of the American people. Unlike the French colonialists, the American war-mongers and superpatriots have no traditional sentimental ties between the mother country and colonies to exploit. No one in the U.S. believes that remote Vietnam is "part" of its dominions and should by right be possessed by it. The present intervention is justified on very different military or ideological grounds. It is supposedly required by a global strategy to contain the spread of international Communism and the influence of Red China, thereby protecting "freedom" and "democracy" in Southeast Asia. But these rationalizations keep losing persuasiveness as the south Vietnamese display their dislike for the Saigon military regime.

Another factor that has weakened the ultraright in the present situation was the stunning defeat of Goldwater's presidential

bid in 1964. This setback was all the more demoralizing because it deflated the great expectations aroused by his nomination at the Republican convention. It has taken time for the hosts of reaction to recover from this shattering blow.

Nonetheless, the John Birch Society, the most influential, "respectable," and fast-growing spearhead of the ultraright forces, is not idle. On the contrary, it has been stepping up organizing activities and expanding its recruitment in preparation for the next opportunity to move forward on a national scale.

According to an article in the April 20 New York Times, the society now has nearly 100,000 members. Its stronghold is California which boasts of 12,000 to 15,000 members. The John Birchers are heavily financed by rich businessmen like its founder Robert Welch and has seventy-five full-time field coordinators at work around the country.

Its Eastern center is in New Jersey, an industrial state with a large Catholic population. Membership there is reported to have quadrupled in the last twelve months and it now ranks second in growth to California. There are an estimated 4,000 to 5,000 Birchers in New Jersey, grouped in about 400 local chapters or cells.

The Birch movement is based and built on a program of extreme procapitalist and semifascist reaction. It is against welfare legislation and for no restrictions on "free enterprise." It is savagely anti-Communist and covertly anti-Semitic and segregationist. It opposes the United Nations and sees the "international Communist conspiracy" burrowing into the highest echelons of the U.S. government all the way from Eisenhower to Chief Justice Warren of the Supreme Court. Its undisputed boss, Robert Welch, pictures the U.S. as a vast "insane asylum" over which the "worst inmates" are in charge.

Fed on such delirious teachings, local John Birchers conduct sustained attacks from the right on local authorities, libraries containing "seditious" literature, progressive school boards, parent-teacher associations, mental health programs, fluoridation of drinking water, UNESCO, and the moderates in the Republican party.

They have made gains among Irish and Italian Roman Catholics in New Jersey and even recruited a few priests. Some Catholic Birchers want to impeach Pope Paul as well as Justice Warren on the ground that the Ecumenical Council was "a Communist sellout."

The Birchers have assiduously enrolled members among police forces from New York City to Southern California. They have appointed themselves public defenders of the "forces of law and order" against Negro complaints of police brutality and demands for civilian review boards of cases of mistreatment of citizens. Their slogan, blazoned on posters and auto bumper stickers, is "Support Your Local Police."

Some Birchers in New Jersey and California train with the

Minutemen, a small paramilitary force that is preparing to lead guerrilla warfare in case the Communists take over the U.S. But the majority of the members come from well-to-do suburbanites and small property owners who are alarmed by the least signs of liberalism or social welfare which they regard as forerunners of socialism and communism.

The Birchers do not represent a formidable force or any imminent threat to the status quo. The economy is booming, McCarthyism is out of favor, and witch-hunting does not receive the response and official support it enjoyed during the Korean war and its aftermath. Its activities serve rather as a reminder that the organized forces of ultrareaction remain intact, despite their electoral rout in 1964. They stand as an auxiliary reserve, ready for action with a new turn of the tide. As it is, they are tolerated but not encouraged by the capitalist rulers.

Their incapacity to take the offensive on the war question even in New Jersey was highlighted by the first anniversary celebration of the "teach-in" at Rutgers state university April 19. Last year History Professor Eugene Genovese set off a furious academic and political controversy by denouncing American intervention in Vietnam and declaring his solidarity with the National Liberation Front. The demand for his dismissal became the central issue in the 1965 gubernatorial campaign in that state. The Democratic incumbent who refused to accede to this pressure won by a wide margin.

This year before an audience of 3,000 students, Genovese boldly repeated his stand: "I said here a year ago, and say now, a Communist ascendancy in Vietnam is not to be feared but welcomed."

He went on to say: "The American people have nothing to gain from Johnson's Hitlerian foreign policy" which "bordered on genocide."

He demanded that the U.S. get out of Vietnam. His words were warmly applauded.

In an aside to the hundreds of young men dressed in sweat-shirts and jeans, Dr. Genovese said: "Last fall several thousand of you signed a petition supporting Johnson's policy. I do not notice that any of you who signed the petition left the campus to volunteer for service." This, too, was applauded.

Outside the gymnasium, a lone member of the local Catholic War Veterans walked back and forth carrying a sign that said: "Rid Rutgers of Reds."



THE STUDENT DEMONSTRATIONS AT WASEDA

About twenty persons were injured at Waseda University in Tokyo April 17 when club-swinging hired guards clashed with rock-throwing students.

During the previous night, as part of their efforts to block scheduled examinations, the students had roped together great piles of chairs and desks to serve as barricades in front of the School of Political and Economic Sciences and the School of Education buildings. In the morning the guards clubbed the students and began dismantling the barricades. The students retreated to the street where concrete blocks had been piled for construction purposes. Using these as missiles, they forced the guards to flee and then they rebuilt the barricades. University authorities were forced to cancel the examinations, already postponed a number of times.

The new flare-up was only the latest in a long series that began last January when the university announced an increase in tuition and enrollment fees. Since then Waseda has stayed on the front page of the nation's press.

With an administrative and teaching staff of 3,500 and a student enrollment of 35,000, Waseda is one of Japan's oldest and most illustrious private universities (about seventy per cent of the universities in Japan are private). A degree from Waseda carries considerable prestige.

The trouble began when the administration announced that tuition fees were to be increased for literature students from 50,000 yen to 80,000 yen and for science students from 80,000 yen to 120,000 yen [362 yen = \$1] effective April 1. In addition, the students would not be permitted to manage a newly built student hall.

On January 20 a movement began to boycott classes and block examinations. Protest rallies and snake dances were organized to publicize student demands.

At first the university officials sought to mobilize "loyal" students. These were beefed up with members of the athletic club, hired, it is alleged, for the purpose. A squad of 300, some of whom wore steel helmets and carried clubs, attacked picketing students February 11. About 2,000 students rallied to the defense of the pickets and drove off their attackers with showers of stones.

The administration then shifted tactics, proposing acceptance of a "mediation" plan offered by alumni members in the Diet. This included four points: (1) Cutting down the planned boost in fees by 10,000 yen. (2) Student operation of the student hall. (3) Assurance that students involved in the dispute would not be expelled. (4) Increasing by 500 the number of students eligible for scholarships.

The plan was rejected by the students. They demanded no

increase whatsoever in fees. To show their determination, they staged a rally involving about 1,000 students in front of the administration building February 20.

In reply Nobumoto Ohama, president of the university, called the cops. On February 21 about 2,500 policemen invaded the campus. They evicted boycotting students, tore down their barricades, arrested one of the student leaders, 23-year-old Hiroshi Abe, and sought four more whom they called "ringleaders."

This was the first time since 1952 that such a large "task force" had invaded the campus. Their mission accomplished, about 1,500 police were withdrawn, leaving 1,000 to "guard" the campus.

The students responded with a "sit-in," organized that same night. The police were ordered in the next morning. They drove out 1,000 squatters and arrested 203 of them who ignored orders to leave. This constituted a postwar record. During the big 1960 protest demonstrations against the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty which brought world-wide fame to the Zengakuren movement, the largest number arrested [June 15, 1960] was 193 persons of whom 143 were students.

These two spectacular police raids in one of Japan's most famous centers of learning made a big sensation, inspiring endless observations about the condition of the educational system, particularly since the protest movement was spreading to other schools faced with similar problems.

Commenting on the prolonged strike, Mainichi Shimbun said: "The uncompromising attitude of both students and school authorities resemble those of the United States and North Vietnam." The protest movement, said the big Tokyo daily, was touched off by the hikes in tuition fees, but the cause of the student unrest goes much deeper. "The students deeply distrust the school administrators and are increasingly dissatisfied and disillusioned over conditions at the university. The students want a real education as human beings but this is denied them because every class is packed to the walls. Waseda was originally conceived as an independent entity to pursue ultimate truth, but today, the students feel, it is only serving the wishes of industry. Students refuse to become mere commodities wanted by business circles. Waseda's problem is a national problem."

Several events connected with the conflict were highlighted by the press. An American missionary, 31, appeared at the university April 17. He said he expected trouble and he came with the intention of convincing students not to use force.

"I was hit by a stone in my head," he later told reporters. "I suffered a cut in my head which required five stitches but it is not serious."

On February 21 a student named Kazuo Yamanaka, a sophomore, jumped off the roof of a ten-story building. But police could find no note, so they were not sure if the suicide had anything to do

with the turmoil on the campus.

On the same day, a young police officer who took part in the operation on the Waseda University campus, Masaaki Goto, 22, went berserk. He was found brandishing a samurai sword on the third floor of an apartment building and shouting disgust at the Waseda students. Said Kazuo Kuroda in the February 26 Japan Times: "The mad policeman's behavior certainly represents one type of national reaction."

#### CORPORAL PUNISHMENT, A FORM OF SCHOLARLY LOVE

Members of the Diet heard testimony April 15 about the use of corporal punishment by the president of Kokushikan University, Tokyo [200 teachers and 4,100 students], on professors and by professors on students on the campus.

Professor Sojiro Kajima, who was recently dismissed by the president, said a large number of persons including himself had witnessed corporal punishment inflicted on professors and students.

It was also brought out in testimony that university authorities refused to permit students to sit in examination unless they bought an "anti-Communist" book written by the president.

The president of the university, Hikosane Yokoyama, defended the use of corporal punishment. It was, he said, an expression of love for the students.

He gave a long lecture on yamato damashii, the "Spirit of Japan." This evidently includes a strong sadistic streak like its Nazi counterpart.

One of the goals of graduates of Kokushikan University is to go to the United States as instructors of judo, karate, aikido and similar arts that have increasingly become a part of the American Way of Life in recent years.

#### LAW PROPOSED TO END TEACHING OF "ANTI-JAPANESE" THOUGHTS

The ruling Liberal-Democratic party is seeking to eliminate the teaching of "anti-Japanese" thoughts in foreign schools in Japan, according to Kakuei Tanaka, the party's general secretary. This is the intent of a bill in the Diet empowering the Education Minister to order changes in curricula and facilities, discontinuance of school activities and even the closing of foreign schools. The Japan Socialist and Communist parties charge that the proposed law is "designed to oppress North Korean schools in Japan" and are fighting passage of the reactionary measure.

## PRICE HIKES SPUR STRIKE ACTION IN JAPAN

Japan's unions are girding for a big round of strikes. New gains are sought in the standard of living for the workers but the main grievance is losses sustained in 1965 due to the stiff rise in prices of basic commodities.

Inflation continued in Japan last year despite a recession. Government statistics show that consumer prices rose 7.6 per cent in 1965 while disposable income of wage earners in cities larger than 50,000 in population declined by 0.3 per cent.

Thus the unions, advancing the demand of "Seikatsu Boei," protection of livelihood, are demanding an increase of seven to eight thousand yen a month [362 yen = \$1].

This would amount to a 12 per cent increase -- 8 per cent to offset higher prices and 4 per cent as a real gain.

Employers are sticking tough under the slogan of "Kigvo Boei," protection of enterprises, although the slogan is quite hypocritical in the case of the big corporations, which boast lucrative profit records despite the recession.

The rise in the cost of living has been so sharp that housewives are now becoming even more concerned about price tags than about the escalating war in Vietnam. During 1965 the U.S. aggression in Vietnam caused great worry among the Japanese masses, provoking huge demonstrations again and again.

Prices of vegetables have been changing daily and in grocery stores housewives find goods marked up as much as ten to fifteen yen each time they go shopping.

Sukiyaki, which requires a good quality meat, has become a luxury for ordinary Japanese families, and even fish is becoming out of reach.

## SUCCESSFUL EASTER DEMONSTRATION IN GERMANY

### Frankfurt

The Easter demonstrations against nuclear arms were significantly larger this year than last. Some 145,000 persons in thirteen German cities participated -- 30,000 more than in 1965.

At mass meetings during the three-day period, Joan Baez, the American singer, was a popular attraction. At Essen, in the heart of the Ruhr, 6,000 turned out to hear her. In Frankfurt a hall that seats 2,000 was filled to the walls and thousands had to be turned away with the words, "No more room!"

The protest songs sung by Joan Baez, Dieter Süverkup and Franz Josef Degenhardt drew especially heavy applause.

In Frankfurt on Easter Monday, a crowd of 10,000 was taught by Joan Baez to sing, "We shall overcome."

She got a big response from the crowd when she said: "I came to Germany with great apprehension. The people of both countries are among the most disliked in the world. But I believe we have now won the contest with the war in Vietnam!"

This example of practical internationalism -- Americans and Germans joining in common protest against war and rearmament -- was a huge success.

### PEKING'S NEW ZEALAND SHOWPIECE

Christchurch

Since the Communist party of New Zealand [CPNZ] first supported the "Chinese line," the Peking Review has given a great deal of publicity to statements by General Secretary V.G. Wilcox. This is intended to indicate, no doubt, that the CPNZ has a meaningful base of mass support, that it is unanimous in its support for Peking, and that this support is valuable on an international level.

But the CPNZ has probably less than 300 members throughout the country; and a considerable proportion are inactive. The Communist party is ignored by New Zealand voters; it is ridden with dissension over the Sino-Soviet dispute; it talks only to itself. It is incapable of saying anything, or doing anything which the New Zealand worker can relate to the economic and social problems of which he has everyday experience.

The ideological dispute did not improve matters. Given the bureaucratic centralism of the party, it led inevitably to a split. In fact, the CPNZ has had several splits.

The first began with the expulsion, early in 1964, of two leading members of the Canterbury District Committee. Their crime was factionalism. Following the expulsions, fully one-third of the membership in Canterbury province resigned in support of those expelled. This split was unusual in that the substantial numbers who left the party were opposed to the leadership, not because it supported Peking, but because they felt, rightly, that their support for Peking was merely verbal and that the leadership refused to put its militant words into practice. There was, of course, a tendency towards adventurism among those who resigned.

New Zealand has been described, quite aptly, as the "paradise of the Second International," and there is certainly no strong movement of an explicitly socialist character here. Any adventurist and

sectarian "gimmicks" are doomed from the start. This is one reason for the voting strength of the right-wing Labour party in spite of its lack of good cadres and grass-roots activity. Nevertheless, the group of Canterbury expellees and resignees, with their supporters, formed the euphemistically named "Workers' Action Movement," which bases its program on the theory that since the revolution has not yet arrived it must first be necessary to prepare and work for a national democratic revolution, wherein an alliance will be formed between the industrial workers, the farmers, and the national bourgeois and petty-bourgeois classes. This alliance will achieve New Zealand's independence from the English monarchy and English capitalism by effecting the economic and political and cultural independence before and separate from structural social change within New Zealand.

Obviously, the members of the "Workers' Action Movement" have not forgotten everything they learned in the Communist party. But the lesson of Indonesia, let alone every revolution since 1917, remains, whether they choose to regard it or not.

This myopic concern with the (usually) superficial aspects of New Zealand's relations with Britain has made the "Workers' Action Movement" disinterested in opposing imperialism elsewhere. It is, for example, unconcerned with the broadly based opposition here to New Zealand's support, albeit token, for the American war against Vietnam.

It is apparently unaware that industries in the secondary sectors of the economy of New Zealand are coming increasingly under control of the American monopolies, for its demonstrations are aimed at Royal Visits, not at imperialist actions in Vietnam. Indeed, its sectarian members do not even take part in such activities, unless to disrupt them. This attitude of sectarianism endears the "Workers' Action Movement" to no one in other groups on the left from which it might otherwise be expected to recruit.

The second split, also in Canterbury, followed almost immediately. Directly after the supporters of the "Workers' Action Movement" walked out, the Communist party sent one of its National Executive members to take charge in Canterbury, and to "investigate and resolve questions of disunity in the District."

After investigating and resolving for a fortnight, the result was that over one-half of those who had remained in the party when the first wave of resignations occurred, resigned in protest over the party's sectarian attitude towards the rank and file of the Labour party and its general support of the Moscow version of "peaceful coexistence."

Leading this second exodus was F. McNulty, one of the CP's best-known functionaries and the national secretary of the New Zealand Freezing Workers' Association, one of the most militant trade unions in the country, strategically placed because the economy heavily depends on the export of frozen meat to obtain the overseas funds necessary to provide a large proportion of the raw

materials for our secondary industries and a great amount of our consumer goods.

Shortly after this, the National Executive dissolved the party in Dunedin, New Zealand's fifth largest city, on the grounds that in its support for Moscow the Dunedin party had broken discipline. Once again a leading member of the National Executive was sent to reform a province of the party. And once again, unsuccessfully. The Dunedin expellees were led by B. Skilton, a past National Executive member of the Communist party and its organizing secretary.

Then came the biggest walkout of all. In Auckland, New Zealand's largest city, where the Communist party has its greatest strength, a large group of prominent members left the party. This group was led by G.E. Jackson, a past national chairman; A. Drennan, also a past national chairman, who has been a national vice-chairman of the New Zealand Waterfront Workers' Federation as well as chairman of the Auckland District Trades Council of the Federation of Labour. Drennan is currently on the Executive Committee of the Brewery Workers' Union. This Auckland group also included G.H. Andersen, a National Executive member who is also secretary of the Northern Drivers' Union; E.J.S. Miller, secretary of the Taranaki District Trades Council of the Federation of Labour and a national councillor of the Federation of Labour; E. Ayo, a prominent shop steward of the Engineers' Union; T. Curphey, secretary of the Auckland Seamens' Union; and K. Douglas, secretary of the Wellington Drivers' Union.

This powerful Auckland group has been endorsed by a member of the Management Committee of the Transport Workers' Union; the chairman of the Engine Drivers' Union; the vice-chairman of the Boilermakers' Union; and a national councillor of the Railway Workers Union who is also chairman of the Auckland Committee on Vietnam and the Hiroshima Day Committee.

From this it is evident that the CPNZ has lost what was a strong position, given its small membership, in the workers organizations. The Auckland and Dunedin groups, along with the Canterbury group under McNulty have now formed a "Socialist Unity Party," an unfortunate choice of name, to say the least.

This new party is unlikely to make any noticeable impact on the political scene in spite of its impressive list of trade-union backers. It is concerned too much with support for the positions of Moscow to gain the adherence of many New Zealanders. It seems unable to recruit any youth. In fact, it is little more than an extension of the USSR Friendship Society.

Considering the record of the CPNZ, one would think that the Chinese would find support from this quarter to be more embarrassing than useful. But, on the contrary, such publications as Peking Review seem to regard the support that the Chinese line gets from the CPNZ as a confirmation of the Chinese view.

Never very strong, the CPNZ is rapidly disintegrating, and

while the Vietnam issue might permit it to recruit enough new blood to maintain the appearance of meaningful activity on a national scale, the party is effectually dead. So desperate has it become that it is shrilly announcing its leadership in many fields where it has been a late starter, if a participant at all. A recent issue of Communist Revue, for example, has provided the left with this month's funny story -- the CP has claimed that it initiated and leads the activity on Vietnam.

This is blatantly untrue, but does provide the Tory press with smear campaign ammunition to use against the protest movement. Once again, support from the CP has proved to be double-sided. But whereas this statement would have effectively discredited a protest movement in the past, this time it is so patently ludicrous that its detrimental effect on the opposition to the government's support for the U.S. has been hardly noticeable.

More important than the CP and its splinter groups at the moment are the changes in the Labour party. This year there is a general election, and the Labour party seems likely to withdraw New Zealand combat troops from Vietnam if it becomes the government. It does not, of course, support the National Liberation Front, but it does not like fascism either, and it depends on the Federation of Labour for finance, and the FOL is strong for withdrawal.

#### ALGERIAN POLITICAL PRISONERS STAGE HUNGER STRIKE

The Paris daily Le Monde reported April 21 that it had learned from "private sources" that a number of Algerian revolutionists, held in Boumedienne's prisons, had ended a hunger strike.

Fourteen began the protest action at Lambèse on March 23. They were followed by sixty-two others at El Harrach on April 1. Among the hunger strikers were Hocine Zahouane, Mohamed Harbi and Bachir Hadj Ali. The prisoners decided to go on a hunger strike to call attention to the illegal nature of their detention and the lack of competent medical attention which many of them require after undergoing sustained torture.

Although they are political prisoners, in opposition to the Boumedienne regime, they have been denied the status normally given persons imprisoned because of their views. Moreover, no charges have been placed against any of them.

The exact condition of the prisoners is not known, since Boumedienne keeps them incommunicado. Le Monde reported April 15 that the hunger strikers at El Harrach had been transferred to an "unknown" destination and that six had been hospitalized. A government official claimed those in the hospital had given up their hunger strike but this was denied by relatives of the prisoners.



VIETNAM WEEK DESIGNATED BY NEW FRENCH ORGANIZATION

Paris

The week of May 16-21 has been designated by the Jeunesses Communistes Revolutionnaires [Revolutionary Communist Youth] as a week of action against the war in Vietnam and of solidarity with the National Liberation Front in south Vietnam.

The decision was made at a national conference held in Paris April 2 which set up a provisional leadership for the new organization. More than 120 delegates, representing fourteen cities and five schools in Paris were present. They spoke for groups that had been expelled from or who had resigned from the Union des Etudiants Communistes [Communist Student Union], groups still remaining within that organization, which is dominated by the French Communist party, and other youth groupings in various parts of the country.

The conference elected a National Committee of thirty-three members, a National Bureau of Coordination, and scheduled the first congress of the organization for the end of October.

The Jeunesses Communistes Revolutionnaires consists for the most part of members of the Union des Etudiants Communistes and the Jeunesses Communistes [Communist Youth] expelled for criticizing the line of so-called "peaceful coexistence," and the bureaucratic character of the organizations favoring that line.

In France the "peaceful coexistence" line led the Communist party and the organizations favoring its policies to support the candidacy of Mitterand, a capitalist politician, in the recent presidential election. The "peaceful coexistence" line has likewise led them to refuse to conduct any kind of real struggle against the war in Vietnam. When the youth put these policies into question, they were answered by expulsions.

The new youth organization plans to publish a newspaper, the Avant-garde Jeunesse [Vanguard Youth].

FRENCH REVOLUTION STILL TOO HOT FOR TURKS

Two Turkish translators, Vedat Gunyol and Sabahattin Eyuboglu, and a publisher, Aziz Nesin, were found guilty in Istanbul April 19 of translating and publishing "Communist propaganda"; i.e., extracts from the correspondence of François-Emile Babeuf, one of the prominent figures of the French Revolution, who was condemned to the guillotine in 1797. The Turkish prosecuting attorney demanded sentences of from seven to fifteen years in prison. The judge will hand down his verdict next month.

CASTRO'S REBUTTAL TO PRESIDENT FREI

[Two developments in the Cuban political scene continue to trouble sincere defenders of the Cuban Revolution -- Che Guevara's disappearance from public life together with the continued silence about him, and the Stalinist-type attack made by Fidel Castro last January 15 against "Trotskyism." What is feared among these partisans of the Cuban Revolution is that the two happenings might prove explainable only in the light of a great shift by Fidel Castro away from a revolutionary course.

[Other disquieting facts are noted indicating the strengthening of bureaucratic tendencies in Cuba due to multiple causes extending from the imperialist blockade, the reign of scarcity and resulting scramble for special privileges, to the Stalinist influence of Moscow and the capitals of Eastern Europe. In Latin America a series of defeats of revolutionary movements have occurred, particularly the one in Brazil in April 1964, which must affect morale. Two questions therefore arise: (1) Is not a rightward drift occurring in Cuba internally? (2) Isn't this reflected in the field of foreign policy?

[The ultralefts do not stop here. The theoreticians of the Socialist Labour League in England, for instance, maintain that their view has been confirmed that a workers state was never established in Cuba, that Castro heads a "capitalist" state and is seeking ways and means of "betraying" to the State Department. The Latin-American Posadas group argues that Castro has gone over, lock, stock and barrel, to the line of "peaceful coexistence," that he has reduced Cuba to being little more than a satellite of Moscow, and that Cuba is not far from being as undemocratic as the East European countries. As hard evidence, these ultralefts point to the Tricontinental Conference. Adolfo Gilly, who reflects the views of Posadas on some questions, contends that it was "a conference without glory and without program." Michael Banda of the SLL claims that its "main purpose" was "to provide a safety-valve for middle-class charlatans like Cheddi Jagan and upper-class demagogues like Allende to blow off steam against imperialism, neocolonialism and what-have-you."

[World Outlook has published the well-reasoned answer of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International to Castro's slanderous attack against Trotskyism as well as the strong statement of the editors of the Monthly Review on this subject. World Outlook has also indicated its agreement with the editors of the Monthly Review on the injury done the cause of the Cuban Revolution by the continued silence concerning Guevara. However, World Outlook has at the same time insisted on the need for more substantial evidence before coming to such sweeping conclusions concerning Castro's major policies as those deduced by the ultralefts from their long-held concepts of the character of the state in Cuba and the political outlook of its principal figure.

[In seeking conclusive proof as to whether or not Castro has made a major shift, one of the areas to watch is Chile, as World Outlook pointed out during the strike of the copper miners there. (See our March 25 issue.) Castro's March 13 remarks on the Chilean revolution, which we published in our last issue, were thus of considerable interest from this point of view. There was no indication in this speech of any major change in foreign policy as compared, for instance, with the line expressed in the Second Declaration of Havana. Castro specifically spoke of the need for socialist revolutions in Latin America as against the concept of revolution by stages. (This concept, promulgated by Stalin, holds that first comes a bourgeois-democratic revolution in which the bourgeoisie play a progressive role in the underdeveloped areas of the world, and only after that...The "after that" turns out to be a catastrophe as in the recent case of Indonesia.) Castro also attacked the concept that "peaceful coexistence"; i.e., giving up the class struggle, offers any road to a socialist victory.

[This particular speech by Castro, in which he expressed solidarity with the striking copper miners, was at once attacked by President Frei of Chile (March 14). The American bourgeois press gave front-page publicity to Frei's attack, although they did not provide the complete text. When Castro offered a rebuttal, the same venal press handled this in typical style. The following, for instance, is the full report that appeared in the New York Times of March 21, headline and all:

["Castro Denies Insulting  
Chile or President Frei

["Special to The New York Times. MIAMI, March 20 -- Premier Fidel Castro seems to be trying to ease his dispute with President Eduardo Frei Montalva of Chile.

["In a statement broadcast today on Cuban stations and last night by shortwave to Latin America, Mr. Castro denied he had insulted Mr. Frei or Chile.

["In a speech last Sunday, however, the Premier called Mr. Frei a 'reactionary,' a 'liar' and a 'coward,' arousing strong nationalistic feelings in Chile.

["Mr. Castro denied in today's statement that Cuba had anything to do with the recent strike in Chile's copper mines."

[We invite comparison between this slanted report and the text of Castro's rebuttal which we have provided below. The Miami dispatch offers a good example of the kind of reporting that led radicals decades ago to change the slogan of the New York Times from "All the News That's Fit to Print" to "All the News That's Printed to Fit."

[The issues in the dispute between Castro and Frei involve nothing less than which example will be followed historically by the peoples of Latin America -- the one set by Cuba, or the one by Chile

under Frei, which the Times among others has been painting up as a real alternative. From this point of view, it would seem important to weigh the relative merits of the arguments of the two main protagonists. The editors of the Times, however, are perfectly aware of the strength of Castro's case. They are also perfectly aware of the function of the Times as a major propaganda organ of American imperialism and so they preferred to provide their readers with a combination of silence and distortion.

[As evidence indicating the real aims of Cuban policy at present, we call special attention to those parts of Castro's declaration that indicate determination to follow an independent course -- not to be anyone's satellite. Whatever their errors, this has been the obvious aim of the Cuban leaders since the beginning of their revolution. If Castro's March 13 speech and his rebuttal to Frei are any indication -- and we think they are -- this aim has not changed.

[We have utilized the English translation provided by the March 27 Weekly Review of Granma, the official organ of the Central Committee of the Communist party of Cuba, correcting obvious typographical errors. Granma does not give the date of Castro's rebuttal; but if the Times can be trusted in this, it was March 20.]

Sr. Eduardo Frei, President of Chile by the grace of his great demagoguery, abundant Yankee and German financial backing and, according to him, by the grace of God as well, speaking at a meeting before the governmental palace, said that he would not reply to my March 13 speech, "because he had too much respect for his country, too much respect for the position he occupies, and too much respect for himself to engage in this tournament of insults, which one day attacks President Kennedy, today China, and tomorrow Chile." Summing up later, he said: "We do not consider it acceptable that anyone put his hands into our affairs, and (if it happens) we will crush them."

He said this, in spite of the fact that he had personally announced to the press a few hours prior to the meeting that the government would issue an official reply and, in fact, he did issue a reply shortly afterward through the Governmental Secretariat.

I have taken from the dispatches of various cablegraph agencies the actual words of Frei's speech in the meeting at the Governmental Palace, as well as the following paragraphs of the reply delivered to the Governmental Secretariat shortly before his speech, which were transmitted by those agencies and which say literally:

"Since Fidel Castro has been in power, he systematically and periodically insults one nation or another. President Kennedy knew his diatribes, as well as many other governments. Countries of the socialist camp, such as Yugoslavia and China, have not escaped. The latter country was referred to with extraordinary violence in the same speech in which he attacked Chile. This is his way of concealing internal difficulties.

"Chile's government has never attacked him.

"Sr. Castro's attitude confirms the alternatives of the Revolutionary process in Latin America: either his system, based on the capricious dictatorship of one man, without elections and without a parliament, with only one party, an official press, no liberty, thousands of firing-squad executions and with satellite-type political and economic dependence abroad; or the revolution with freedom elected by Chile in 1964, which is being carried out with the voluntary participation of the people, with free elections and an open parliament where all currents of opinion are represented, with a free press and radio, with freedom within unions, and with an active political opposition.

"Those Chileans who wanted Castro's system were crushingly defeated by the people in secret vote in 1964, 1965 and 1966.

"The Chilean people are not about to let their country become the toy of a temperamental man or a battleground in the cold war. We are building a country in which we will free ourselves of all kinds of imperialism, without becoming the slaves of anyone.

"There are groups in Chile who have not accepted their defeat, who want to destroy the country's economy, who ignore the authority of the law, who are now inciting to violence, trying to capitalize on the difficulties which they themselves provoked.

"Our country now knows where those groups receive their inspiration, and how much respect they feel for Chile.

"Castroism lost its opportunity to be the guide to the left for Chile and Latin America. Its lack of freedom, its economic failure, which has led to extreme rationing, and its submission to foreign interests have deprived it of all significance.

"The government of Chile will not move one iota from its revolutionary course, nor from its duty to serve a people who express their adherence freely, not in terror. Sr. Castro's insults serve only to confirm his desperation. Sr. Castro doesn't know Chile, nor its history, nor the dignity of its people. Chile has never accepted, and will never accept foreign interference in its internal problems. His insults only serve to unify our nation." Amen!

With his excellency's permission

On my part, I am not going to create a scandal by shouting that I am insulted. But, will his immaculate excellency allow me?... Will their lordships of the Christian-Democrat parliamentary majority, who are also in solidarity with his offended excellency, allow me to answer those niceties they dedicate to us without saying afterwards, pharisaically, that it is an insult to Chile?

The poor bourgeois in Frei turns inside the sack of his own contradictions. His role is to avoid a revolution in Chile, but he

has taken a liking to being called a revolutionary, he swears and forswears that he is making a revolution and, at the same time, nothing frightens him so much as revolution. Ah! if what he is doing in Chile were revolutionary...but it is not revolutionary!

Should we perhaps understand that the Governmental Secretariat, when it makes these declarations, has nothing to do with Frei? And if not, how to explain that he later says he will not answer because he feels too much respect for his position, for himself, etc., etc.? Is it that the Government can lower itself to answer, but not Sr. Frei, who at the same time lowers himself to answer while saying he does not answer? If all this is to let us know the great attachment he feels for his position and for himself, that is no secret for all of us who know how vain, self-loving and attached to their positions bourgeois politicians are.

It is also curious that Frei, as well as his Governmental Secretariat, his parliamentary majority, his official press, and all the bourgeois, oligarchic and reactionary newspapers of the capital, coincide in qualifying as insults to Chile my words in reply to the unfounded and calumnious insinuation that the strikes in their mines were the result of plans drawn up in the Tricontinental Conference of Havana.

Identifying themselves as the nation, which they govern on behalf of the exploiting classes, instead of answering with arguments to the reply provoked by an unjust accusation, they adopt airs of offended vestals and call to their aid the spirits of chauvinism, screaming to the four winds: "The nation has been insulted! A serious intrusion has been made into the internal affairs of Chile! National unity!"

### Poor anguished devils

Poor anguished devils! To what old, demagogic and discredited trickery must they turn to extricate themselves from their dilemma. What bustle, what clatter, what scandal they have worked up!

At bottom, what they seek with this hysterical screaming is that the people forget the bloodshed and the dead.

But they are wrong if they believe that they will have no answer. As Lincoln said, you can only fool all of the people part of the time.

I did not insult Frei. I simply answered, explained and qualified his accusations. Much less did I insult Chile. Frei, in any event, is not Chile. Chile is also the workers and the women injured and dead in the mine massacre, with whom our working people are wholeheartedly in solidarity, whose orphans and families, left destitute and forsaken by the crime, know that they can count on their Cuban class brothers. Chile is also its heroic workers, its exploited peasants, its progressive intellectuals, its awakened masses of revolutionary militants.

But this considerable part of the people of Chile means nothing to the imperialist monopolies, the landowners, the big bourgeoisie and their spokesmen, and the other interests which put Frei in power. To them, Chile is Frei.

Our cause is not dishonored but ennobled by the comparisons Frei makes between the Cuban Revolution and his laughable political pantomime, which can only be qualified as revolutionary by the enemies of the revolution.

Between the two processes there is the same difference that exists between the true and the false: the heroic and the ridiculous; the fact that will pass into history and the farce that will pass into the wastebasket of historians. Frei achieved power with the help of imperialist money and with the almost total support of the press, the radio, the television and other media, which are the weapons employed in legal political struggles and which, in Chile, as in any other capitalist and oligarchic society, are owned by the rich.

Bourgeois freedom of the press, which is the freedom Frei refers to, is the freedom of the rich to own the greater part of the media for divulging ideas, which they use to defend their class interest against the exploited.

On the other hand, it is the lack of freedom of the poor and dispossessed to own such instruments, which imply ever more fabulous investments, except within very narrow and quantitatively inferior limits, beyond any possible comparison with the means available to the rich exploiters.

All of the resources of imperialism, the oligarchy and the bourgeoisie, their political, social, cultural and religious institutions, their lies, their prejudices, their fears, were mobilized to make Frei's triumph possible. A part of the people was miserably fooled by instilling psychological terror in them at the danger of a real revolution, and they were offered instead a beatific "revolution" which could be carried out by the bourgeoisie supported by the imperialists.

If the case of Chile has served any purpose, it is not precisely to show a new road to the revolutionary masses, but to plant squarely before all the revolutionaries of this continent with even greater force, whether the peaceful triumph of the Revolution is possible, when faced by the exploiting classes which, led by imperialism, retain all the gold of society and the monopoly of the weapons which are used in this type of struggle, even when they are prepared to grant some crumbs of legality to the revolutionary forces within their bourgeois institutions. The road of Cuba has not served to justify the experience of Chile but, precisely the contrary: the experience of Chile will serve to justify more the road of Cuba before the revolutionaries of the continent.

## Pride of Cuba

Certainly in Cuba, and we are very pleased about it, private ownership of the means of thought-dissemination which used to belong to the exploiters and now serve the cause of the revolutionaries, has ceased to exist, just as imperialist or capitalist ownership of our mines, our banks, our foreign trade, our public utilities, our factories and our large agricultural plantations has ceased to exist. The soil, the subsoil and even the air, the water, and the sunlight shining upon us belong wholly to our people and produce for them. This is what Sr. Frei, a pet of Yankee imperialism and guardian of its interests in Chile, calls being an economic and political satellite.

Certainly in Cuba -- and we are not ashamed of it, but on the contrary, we are proud of it and it is consistent with our principles -- no landowner, no banker, no mine-owner, no lawyer of imperialism, no Frei can govern, because, in fact there are no oligarchical, bourgeois, pro-imperialist, reactionary parties, nor are they needed now because their property has been socialized and their economic, political and social system, that is, capitalism and its bourgeois parliamentary republic or, in its place, the oligarchic and pro-imperialist strong-man governments, have been eradicated, proscribed, eliminated forever.

Good proof that Frei and company are not concerned about bourgeois elections, or bourgeois parliaments, or bourgeois liberties, but rather about the economic and class interests protected by this form of government, is that while he refuses to maintain diplomatic and commercial relations with Cuba, he maintains excellent relations with those military dictatorships which have found it expedient to abolish such bourgeois political forms in the majority of Latin-American countries, the better to serve the interest of imperialism, the oligarchy, and the bourgeoisie itself, and to confront with blood and fire the just and inevitable rebellion of the exploited.

It is true, and we are also proud of it, that our Revolution did not triumph as the result of an election, but rather through the revolutionary armed struggle of the people, which was the only possible road. We knew how to understand the potential power of the exploited masses, the historic necessity and possibility of the Revolution, and beginning with a few rifles, unleashed the immense energy stored up within the people which in its irresistible drive swept away a numerically big army which had been equipped and trained by the United States, an army that defended the interests of the imperialists, the big landowners, the bourgeoisie, and their parties and properties. That war would never have been won without the resolute and combative support of the masses of oppressed workers, peasants and students.

Those masses which yesterday were oppressed and today are armed and victorious, have made possible the much more difficult and historic task of defending and upholding revolutionary power against the ferocious siege of the Yankee empire lying barely 90 miles from our coast. The political and cultural level of these masses becomes increasingly higher. Organized, trained and armed in the Party, in



the Rebel Army and other branches of the armed forces, in the Militia, in factories, in the mountains and on the plains of our farmers and agricultural workers, at secondary and university centers, these masses constitute the invincible force of the Revolution. In any of the large provinces of Cuba we can gather in a mass rally more citizens who are ready to lay down their lives for the Revolution than the total number of votes obtained by Frei with the help of the imperialists, oligarchs and bourgeois in the election which took him to power. And this can be verified by Frei himself if he so wishes.

### In Cuba the people are the power

A revolutionary people does not see the power of the state as something distant, out of reach and opposed to it. It identifies fully with that power because it is itself the power.

In Chile, logically, there could be many people who do not understand the tremendous difference that exists between one political system and another. But in Cuba, our people laugh at the paeans intoned by Sr. Frei to elections and other bourgeois institutions, because our people know only too well all the lying and fraud that these conceal.

Once every so many years our citizens had the theoretical right to decide in bourgeois elections which bourgeois candidate or oligarch, which bourgeois or oligarchic party, would govern the state and the bourgeois and oligarchic institutions, these being, of course, the only parties and institutions conceived of or permitted by bourgeois laws and constitutions. Among all the rights held sacred by such laws and constitutions, private property, of course, has always been the most sacred.

For more than half a century, our people felt repugnance at the frequent Yankee interventions, electoral frauds and coups; the customary thing in the rest of Latin America during a century and a half, with all of their consequences of political vices, corruption, demagoguery, shady businesses, misuse of funds, privileges, abuses, bribery and deceit. For the oligarchic and bourgeois parties, elections were auctions for the highest bidders among those who had the most money for propaganda and vote-buying.

In the country zones, particularly, the large landowners invested millions of dollars in each election. Thousands of political sergeants would meet to agree upon the amounts of money that they would receive for the votes of their relatives, cronies, beneficiaries and political protégés.

I witnessed such things in my childhood and in my adolescence, because I was born into a family whose land-holdings were surrounded by the immense territories of three great Yankee sugar companies. The poverty-stricken, illiterate and ignorant rural population was the systematic victim of such procedures. Naturally the individuals "elected" by such methods were not going to construct any school, or pass any revolutionary laws.

The Revolution has rid the country of that rotten society and its degrading procedures once and for all. Frei accuses me of not knowing Chilean history; the fact is that he does not know the laws of history, nor has he a theory for understanding the development of human society. He is not capable, nor is any bourgeois, of seeing the bourgeois parliamentary republic as a political form resulting from the historical development of a society which corresponded to the realities and interests of an era and of a class recently liberated from the chains of feudalism and aspiring to incarnate the ideals of all humanity.

For Frei, as for all bourgeois, capitalist society with the bourgeois parliamentary republic as its political form -- the philosophy of which determines each one of Frei's arguments and opinions to such an extent that when he speaks about revolution he can only mean bourgeois revolution -- constitutes the ideal in economic political and social organization. He feels that all society is governed by immutable and eternal laws, that the laws which govern bourgeois society are therefore eternal and immutable and that bourgeois society is simply the perfected product of human reason.

We Marxists, beginning with a different conception of things, see revolution as a great leap towards superior forms of human relationships which, envisioned in terms of necessity plus possibility, must arise as the inevitable result of the historical process.

#### Anything but revolutionaries

Those who proclaim political and social forms that today curb the development of man and his means of livelihood cannot be called revolutionaries. For this reason, it is impossible to expect Frei and company to understand the Cuban process. They judge it on the basis of their prejudices, their narrow-mindedness and their myopic eyes of bourgeois politicians.

How could Frei's mentality be reconciled with the communist idea of a classless society in which even the State ceases to exist as a coercive force and, together with it, all those institutions that distinguish it as a State?

Since its historic inception, the State has been an instrument of domination of certain classes over other classes.

The State does not lose that character in the transition from capitalism to communism. It stops being the instrument of exploiters against the exploited, and becomes the instrument of exploited against exploiters.

What a beautiful day it will be, Sr. Frei, when force is no longer exerted upon society but also ceases to exist within human society! Then no one like you in Chile would have to give the order to fire upon the workers in a copper mine, the property of a Yankee monopoly, and nobody such as we would have to execute thugs who kill thousands of revolutionaries, or spies, saboteurs and criminal agents

of the imperialism that wants to destroy us, because there would be no exploiting monopolies in any part of the world, not even in the United States, counterrevolutionaries, nor executions.

It is hard to have to shoot anyone who, product of a society and of an era, serves the most evil interests of the enemies of our country, but it is even harder, and in no way morally justifiable, to massacre workers in defense of those evil interests.

The reactionaries have always been very quick to massacre the people in order to protect their interests, but there is nobody quicker than the reactionaries when it comes to accusing the revolutionaries of cruelty.

Even without going back to the time of the crucifixion of tens of thousands of revolutionary slaves under the leadership of Spartacus along the Appian Way, the whole history of colonialism and imperialism, and the modern social upheavals, from the Civil War in France in the middle of the last century and the Paris Commune in 1871, to the ferocious repression recently seen in Indonesia in which almost 100,000 communists were assassinated within a matter of days, and including in this period the atrocities committed in this world by the fascists and the Nazis -- all of this history shows that the reactionaries and the counterrevolutions in victory are a thousand times more cruel than revolutions.

Nothing is more cruel in this world than imperialism; nobody is capable of more atrocities; nobody is capable of more atrocities and bloodshed than Frei's protectors have shown themselves to be in Viet Nam. Frei borrows the arguments of these bloody mentors in order to accuse the Cuban Revolution of harshness.

We will not let ourselves be defeated by these bloody imperialists and we will defend ourselves with all the force necessary, without any vacillation, not only to survive as a nation and as a people, but to struggle unceasingly for the most humane society toward which humanity can aspire: the society in which man ceases to be a wolf in order to become a brother.

And even though the Socialist State is only a transition to that superior form of society, nevertheless it is much more democratic than the Bourgeois State, because it serves the interests of the exploited majority.

The word "democracy" has meant something different in each one of the historical epochs. When the word was first used in Ancient Greece, it was the word which denominated the prevailing form of government in a class society in which, coexisting with a land and slave-owning minority who discussed the problems of government publicly and "very democratically," were great masses of slaves, working on the lands and in the interests of the minority, deprived of all rights, unable to participate in the destiny of a society whose material wealth they themselves made possible.

Bourgeois democracy is also based upon a class society and, although this may not please Sr. Frei, it expresses the rule of the capitalists over the laborers, who, just as the slaves in ancient times, create the society's material wealth.

If the socialist state is a new social and political formation with great practical and theoretical tasks before it, and with the goal of constructing for the first time in history a classless society based upon the modern productive forces developed by man, it is also called upon to create the freest social formation that has ever existed.

Each country will develop in its own way toward that better society and will contribute its experiences. We develop in our own way. We have not rushed toward the forms, because we want these to correspond to reality and not vice versa.

The conditions peculiar to our process were what determined the uniting of all revolutionary forces in one Vanguard Party. But that wasn't the only determining factor: the other was the counterrevolution, directed and organized by the imperialist government of the United States. The militants of our party are elected and renewed through the constant participation of the masses of workers and fighters. It is a homogeneous and disciplined vanguard which, in representation of the workers, governs the country, leads the development of the Socialist economy and the struggle against the imperialist enemy. It is not a heterogeneous conglomeration like the Christian Democrats, where among youth elements who sincerely want revolutionary changes and represent the most healthy and progressive wing of the organization, old and conniving reactionaries rule the roost, openly supported by Frei, who would sell their soul to the devil before they'd pass a revolutionary law.

### Vulgar bourgeois reformist

In economic, social and political matters, Frei, who likes to call himself a revolutionary, will never exceed the limits of a bourgeois reformist whose program tends precisely to consolidate a capitalist regime of production in Chile which doesn't interfere with the interests of imperialism.

Frei dreams of the impossible chimera of conciliation between opposing classes. He thinks that the workers' interests can be reconciled with those of imperialism and the bourgeoisie; those of the bourgeoisie with those of imperialism; those of the petty bourgeoisie with those of the big bourgeoisie; and those of the peasant with those of the oligarchy.

In a country ridden by foreign debts, sacked by the monopolies, with a feudal regime of ownership of the land and a barely developed economy, with social needs that have been accumulating for decades and where there is really very little to distribute, it would be necessary to sacrifice the interests of the imperialists, oligarchs and big bourgeoisie in order to relieve somewhat the situation of the

peasants, workers and middle strata of the population. Frei wants to compensate the oligarchs, enrich the monopolies and gratify the bankers, the great industrialists and the merchants.

If the imperialists, oligarchs, and bourgeoisie keep the lion's share, including the scraps with which Frei expects the Yankees to help him to develop this pseudo-revolutionary creature, what will remain to increase the workers' income, to give technical and economic aid to the peasants, to improve the level of the middle strata and in addition to service the foreign debt, develop the economy and have enough resources at hand for housing, schools, hospitals, roads, waterworks and streets?

It is clear that the cord holding this "midsummer night's dream" policy together can only break at the weakest spot in the system: the workers. You cannot demand sacrifices from the workers in order to perpetuate the interests of the bourgeoisie and imperialism. The workers in Chile, as well as anywhere else in the world -- it is not necessary to know too much about local history to recognize this -- would only make a sacrifice when these sacrifices are demanded in the name of the future interests of their class and not of their exploiters.

Workers in Chile, therefore, refuse to give up their hopes of better salaries. This is the only real and objective explanation for strikes; to consider this a product of the Tricontinental Conference is either the result of great ignorance or malicious intent, or both things at once.

There are still other matters on which we have not yet commented.

It is not true that the government of Chile has never attacked Cuba. Its entire political campaign had an anti-Cuban base, resting on the most contentious and unjust interpretations, as well as on the crudest kind of lies and calumnies written by the imperialist detractors against our Revolution. These include the use of a recording by a near relative of ours, whose actions are wholly directed by the CIA and whose declarations are written and publicized by the same organization. These were broadcasted widely just before the elections, in order to culminate, with this shocking propaganda, the psychological campaign of terror against the Chilean people, thus influencing the results of the elections.

This was the crudest type of intervention by the CIA and the government of the United States at the very moment when the future government of the country was to be decided upon, and one more repugnant method of the imperialists to create a political effect. On that occasion, our Pontius Pilate washed his hands after reaping, with pleasure, the fruits of such dirty politics.

Less than a month ago the representative of the Chilean government in the United Nations, adding his voice to that pack of lackeys among whom are to be found persons as democratic as Stroessner,

Castello Branco, Castro Jijón, Peralta Azurdia, the puppet, García Godoy and other such ruffians -- about whom Sr. Frei does not have the least scruples, neither Christian nor democratic -- this representative endorsed the document on Cuba sent to the Security Council of the United Nations. This amounts to adding fuel to the fire of aggressive plans against Cuba entertained by the U.S.

Is it by chance possible that this does not constitute one of the worst and most treacherous attacks since it incites to armed aggression against our people?

That is why it does not surprise me greatly -- to go just one step further -- that he insinuates that Cuba was responsible for the Chilean strikes.

### Chile, accomplice in the blockade

Is the present government of Chile, on the other hand, far removed from the imperialist policy towards Cuba? Following an agreement imposed by the United States on the OAS, which is, as Frei himself has pointed out on certain occasions, an anachronistic institution, the former government of Chile broke off commercial and diplomatic relations with Cuba, carrying out like sycophants the imperialist orders. Food products from Chile, which we exchanged for sugar, were no longer sent to Cuba. The imperialists added another triumph in their criminal blockade of Cuba. In seventeen months of government, Frei has not had the courage to rectify that capitulating and humiliating action against Chilean sovereignty. Under these circumstances it is shameless that Frei uses the argument of rationing against Cuba, while he, in fact, participates in the inhuman blockade which this imperialist power maintains with all its economic and political resources against a small and economically underdeveloped country.

Cuba faces up to Yankee imperialism with a fortitude and integrity that one day even the grandchildren of Frei will admire. The Cuban Revolution does not move forward with the blessing and applause of Yankee imperialism, as the "make-believe revolution" which the Frei government is proclaiming. They are saying that they wish to liberate themselves from all imperialisms, but what they are doing is getting on the "Alliance for Progress" merry-go-round and accepting as a blind man's guide the ideology of Yankee imperialism. And a revolution run by the imperialists is like the Catholic Church in the hands of Luther. Yet in spite of the blockade and the rationing of some articles which this comic-opera revolutionary throws up to us, any humble family in Cuba receives more goods and services than his class brothers in Chile. As a result of the laws and the measures taken in the Revolution, the great majority of the population receives free housing. The advances made in educational and in medical attention in only a few years will have surpassed all the other countries of Latin America. There are no longer illiterates in our country. All children, whoever they are and wherever they live, have teachers. Almost a million adults attend cultural and technical educational improvement classes; approximately 150,000 young people in our educa-

tional centers receive lodging, meals, clothing and shoes gratis; unemployment has been eradicated, family incomes have been augmented, directly or indirectly, by more than one billion pesos. Under Agrarian Reform, more than 100,000 farming families ceased to pay rent, and became owners of their land. The country extricated all national resources, and fundamental means of production from foreign control. In spite of all the difficulties inflicted by the blockade, and Yankee threats of aggression, which obliges us to invest great quantities of men and materials towards the defense of our country, we are progressing in the development of our economy.

Does Sr. Frei perhaps believe that he can settle accounts with these realities by utilizing a few Yankee clichés to describe the supposed failure of the Cuban Revolution? It would be interesting to know what a Frei with his shining Christian Democracy would have done had he had to pass the test of fire of a real revolution like that of Cuba, just 90 miles from the U.S.

In Chile, true, the rich lack nothing, and are not rationed, but the poor lack everything, rationed without a ration card by their miserable salaries, and by the pitiless exploitation of the imperialists, oligarchy, and capitalists.

In order to leave none of his nonsensical ideas, lacking in political consistency and fair argument, unsaid, Sr. Frei finds me temperamental. And this because I felt the necessity to answer his attacks and intrigues against the Cuban Revolution.

However, when I publicly praised on May 1, 1965, Chile's initial position regarding Yankee intervention in Santo Domingo, and our country expressed a similar attitude regarding several of his other attitudes which appeared positive to us -- simply because we follow a political line based on principles -- Sr. Frei didn't then call me temperamental.

A revolutionary temperament doesn't necessarily mean a temperamental revolutionary in the same way that a bourgeois spirit does not necessarily mean a spiritual bourgeois.

We are not intimidated by anybody

It comes as a surprise to Frei that the Cuban Revolution should unmask the intrigues and attacks of the Yugoslav press against Cuba, and at the same time that we should be able to denounce, in all dignity, the economic aggression which the Chinese government carries out against us in an act of political blindness and stupidity, and that we indicted Kennedy opportunely and as he deserved for his crimes against our country.

This means that, although we are a small nation, nobody intimidates us or makes vassals of us.

What is shameful, on the other hand, is that Sr. Frei tries to sanctify Kennedy, instigator of the economic blockade against our

country, promoter of counterrevolutionary bands who massacred Cuban peasants, teachers and students, confessedly responsible for the Playa Girón invasion that cost more than 100 lives of revolutionary fighters, organizer of piratical incursions into our waters, directed from Central American bases, and other nefarious activities of this type.

This Kennedy, initiator of what is today the bloody Vietnamese War, was an unscrupulous servant of imperialism. The fact of his death and the contemptible way it came about does not release him from blame.

When I see the saints that Frei worships, I understand his political beliefs.

And I warn him that Mao Tse-tung will not like to be classed together with Kennedy and the Yugoslav Communist League.

Lastly, Frei declares that whoever puts a hand on Chile will have it crushed. This would deserve applause if it were true; but why doesn't he crush the interventionist hands which, ignoring the Chilean Government and disrespectful of the country's sovereignty, tried to put the Camelot Plan into action there?

And -- most fundamental of all! -- why doesn't he decide to crush the imperialist hands which for so long now have been wringing the Chilean economy and exploiting the sweat of thousands of the best sons of the Chilean people? Is it perhaps that for you, Sr. Frei, the talons of imperialism do not exist? When I see that the workers must shed blood because they protest in order to better somewhat their miserable lot, to claim some of what the foreign monopolies tear out of the entrails and the sweat of Chile, and when there is the threat of more bloodshed, I cannot believe that you are really capable of crushing the only hands that intervene in and dominate the life and the destiny of your country: the hands of Yankee imperialism.

It is logical that your uneasy conscience should find relief in false patriotism and try to see in Cuba the spectre of an enemy.