

# 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. 33

October 28, 1966

### In this issue

Page

A Step Ahead for "World Outlook".....	1
Antiwar Pickets Greet Johnson in New Zealand and Australia.....	2
Puerto Rican Reports Low Morale Among U.S. Troops in Vietnam.....	4
Five Puerto Ricans Refuse to Serve in U.S. Army.....	5
"Bandiera Rossa" Becomes a Biweekly.....	5
Ceylon Trade Unions Face Challenge of Wage Freeze -- by Edmund Samarakkody.....	6
Canadian Professors Join in Appeal for Hugo Blanco.....	8
The Rising Doubts About the Warren Commission -- by Arthur Maglin.....	9
Welcome Prepared in New Zealand for Lyndon B. Johnwater -- by H. Holland.....	12
Scandals Embarrass Sato Government.....	13
How Sectarian Can You Get?.....	13
"Death of a Bureaucrat".....	14
Realignment Toward the Right in Algeria.....	16
Documents:	
Fidel Castro on Moral Incentives in Cuban Revolution.....	18

### A STEP AHEAD FOR "WORLD OUTLOOK"

This issue marks what we consider to be a significant step ahead for World Outlook. As you will have already noted, there is a considerable difference in weight of the paper, size of type, and general appearance. The main aim of these changes is to lower the cost of postage, particularly airmail.

Also, by shifting from the mimeograph to the photo-offset process, we hope to make possible an increase in circulation. For some time we have felt inhibited in circulation-building efforts due to the qualitative difference in amount of labor required in turning out material on a duplicator after a certain point is reached.

From the beginning, World Outlook has been somewhat experimental. We felt that a political need existed for the kind of service we have sought to offer. This judgment has been confirmed beyond our expectations. World Outlook now has an impressive international circulation. Most gratifying has been the way in which many publications utilize the material it offers. In addition we have been both surprised and pleased at the number of individuals who have subscribed. Our attention has been repeatedly called to the fact that those who receive it tend to utilize it for reference and to bind it for permanent use. And we are still getting orders for complete sets of World Outlook, beginning with the first issue. These, we should add, are no longer easily filled. On top of this, biweekly editions are now offered in French and Spanish and we should not be surprised if editions appear in other languages before long.

When World Outlook began in September 1963, we were dubious about the cost.

subscription, particularly for distant countries where airmail costs would be very high, seemed virtually prohibitive. But without advertisers or financial angels, we had no choice -- if the project was to survive -- but to put it on a self-sustaining basis. This has been held to rigorously so that World Outlook is genuinely a collective enterprise. The most eloquent testimony to its usefulness and the esteem in which it is held is, in our opinion, the checks and money orders from far-away countries sent to cover airmail postage. Often this is once again and even three times the subscription cost.

We are turning away from the duplicator not without careful consideration. As old devotees of this process and its variants, we fully appreciate certain advantages which it has that have not yet been superseded. Among its disadvantages, however, is one that we have found to be insuperable despite considerable experimentation on our part. This is the inability of the various brands of machines -- at least the ones we have tried -- to efficiently handle paper of airmail weight.

As you can judge from the current issue, this problem is now solved for us. By combining airmail paper with a certain reduction in the size of type, we are able to compress a full-size regular issue of World Outlook into 24 pages, add an envelope (and a renewal notice!) and still come well under the minimum postal rate. The cost of this process is, of course, higher than mimeographing World Outlook. We are quite confident, however, that this -- with your assistance -- can be met by an increase in circulation.

To those who have sent money to cover airmail postage at the old rates, it will no doubt be welcome news that deposits will be prorated to automatically extend your subscription. And to those who have hesitated to get an airmail subscription, we can report that the cost is in general now about two-thirds of what it was.

For those interested in the technical details, we might add that the present type size is nine and a half point. It is the same size used by certain other publications that feature a type face of this kind. We hope that it will prove to be perfectly legible and that you will not have to invest in a magnifying glass.

As to our editorial policy, this of course remains unchanged. Our aim will continue to be to offer political analysis and interpretation of events from a genuinely revolutionary Marxist point of view.

#### ANTIWAR PICKETS GREET JOHNSON IN NEW ZEALAND AND AUSTRALIA

The American capitalist press, which knows its politicians very well, has aptly described Johnson's trip to the Far East as a "barnstorming" tour; i.e., the customary ritualistic show put on in precincts and hamlets where the office-seeker wears a fixed smile, pumps hands, pats children, kisses babies and stands beside local dignitaries. The most dramatic bits, naturally, are dutifully recorded by press and television cameras for the benefit of history. Johnson carried this so far that it was reported he was suffering from a "painfully sore right hand" when he arrived in Australia after his triumph in New Zealand. The nails of some of his teen-age New Zealand girl admirers were, it seems, unusually sharp.

The tour was timed to come on the eve of the elections in the United States with Johnson playing the role of "peacemonger" in hope of counteracting the adverse effects of his escalation of the war in Vietnam. It was also intended to give his "allies," prime ministers Keith J. Holyoake of New Zealand and Harold E. Holt of Australia, a boost in their own election campaigns which come at the end of November. Both of them are in trouble because of the way they have backed Johnson's war in Vietnam.

A wider aim of Johnson's tour is to provide a smokescreen of "peace efforts" for the next step in escalating the war in Vietnam. The Manila conference will provide the finale for this. At the same time, the conference will be utilized by the accompanying staffs of diplomats and military men to put the finishing touches on coordinating the puppets and satellites for the next move.

This was perfectly obvious to the government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, the immediate target in Johnson's war. President Ho Chi Minh said October 22

that Washington had called the Manila conference "to broaden the war and bring it to a still higher degree of fierceness." He forecast that the Americans would "intensify their intelligence and spying activities, increase their psychological warfare and smuggle more spy commandos into north Vietnam."

The entourage of correspondents reported "huge and enthusiastic" crowds from the day of Johnson's appearance in Wellington October 20. The curiosity is understandable. The American president's special bullet-proof, bubble-top limousine was brought along for the sake of the show. When the car stops, and Johnson gets out like a spider crawling out of a bottle, a shout goes up from the crowd. As Max Frankel of the New York Times describes it:

"'He's stopped!' someone shrieks and hundreds rush toward the spot like iron filings to a magnet. Young fingers clutch at the large, freckled hands, often nipping the flesh with long nails."

Others found a different kind of attraction in the president. In Wellington pickets carried placards welcoming him with such phrases as "Lyndon B. Johnwater" and "Lyndon B. God." [See story on page 12.]

In Canberra, 3,000 pickets assembled outside the Rex Hotel where they waited three hours for the great man to show up. As reported by a New York Post correspondent, "They were drinking beer and singing songs and exchanging good-natured banter with the cops and asking the milling reporters what the hell had happened to the bloody cowboy."

"'I think we've scared the bloke off,' said Keith Heatherington, a 43-year-old laborer. He was standing in front of a blizzard of signs, all of them blue-white in the lights from the TV cameras. Among the choicer items: "We're Not Cattle And This Is Not Your Ranch," "Go Home and Fight Your Own Election," "The King Is A Fink," "Welcome President of Australia," "None Of The Way With LBJ."

The Post correspondent reported Robert Salaggi as saying: "We don't hate Americans here. But we just feel we haven't been consulted. There's been a terrible row over the draft. A lot of us came here to get away from the bloody conscription laws. Now they are saying that not only can you be drafted but they can send you overseas if they like. That means Viet Nam and that's not our fight, mate."

In Melbourne, too, antiwar pickets showed up with their placards and banners denouncing Johnson and his war in Vietnam. Typical ones read: "All Astray with L.B.J.," "Hands Off Australia," and "Tomorrow's Hitler Today's Johnson."

At Melbourne University demonstrators planned to lie down in the street in front of Johnson's bubble-top car. When the police learned about this, they hastily rerouted the motorcade.

It was in Melbourne that demonstrators managed to do a paint job on the famous automobile. Two plastic bags, one filled with green paint, the other with red, landed on the car. The windshield was drenched. One bodyguard was almost covered with green paint, two others with red. The paint was water-based and washed off easily.

In Sydney, likewise, a considerable sector of the crowds proved to be openly hostile to the "bloody cowboy." In the Hyde Park area they shouted antiwar slogans and carried banners denouncing Johnson and his role in Vietnam. In the Paddington district a dense throng of antiwar pickets barred the way. Their banners denounced Johnson as a war criminal and demanded an end to the war in Vietnam. The police called in mounted officers and charged the crowd to clear the way for the distinguished visitor from the U.S. Near the University of New South Wales, the motorcade was again detoured by police to avoid student demonstrators. In one place a woman hurled herself at the president's car but missed and fell to the pavement.

The Columbia Broadcasting System told the American TV audience that the pickets and their slogans were so familiar to the correspondents accompanying the presidential party that they seemed to be "Made in America." They forgot to mention that the war being protested by the demonstrators was also "Made in America." If the banners echoed those to be seen in the U.S., it is simply a case of hands across the sea in opposing a course pointing to the doom of all of humanity in a nuclear catastrophe.

PUERTO RICAN REPORTS LOW MORALE AMONG U.S. TROOPS IN VIETNAM

A young Puerto Rican, who has just returned from combat duty in Vietnam, has some bitter things to say about his experiences there. He was interviewed by Ramón Arbona for Claridad, the weekly newspaper of the Movimiento Pro Independencia [MPI]. At his request, the identity of the soldier was not revealed, and he is identified in the October 16 interview simply as "Roberto."

"Every soldier in the United States Army, when he finds himself in Vietnam, becomes obsessed with a single idea -- to leave, to get out, not to be there. All he thinks about is how to get out of there soon and alive," the Puerto Rican veteran said.

Roberto was assigned to combat duty in Vietnam and was there for six months, until he was wounded.

"If it wasn't for being wounded," he said, "I would have had to stay another six months in that hell."

When he arrived in Vietnam, he received some strong impressions. "The first thing I saw there was the people...you know, hearing about them is not the same as seeing them. They tell you they wear black and things like that, but when you get there it's different. I felt real sorry for them when I saw them, I mean the people in the port; they were poorly dressed and they looked like skeletons, almost dead from hunger."

So how could such people fight so successfully against such a powerful invader armed so heavily?

"Because they are very shrewd and are fighting in their own country and know what they're fighting for. Their morale is very high. They fight with anything at hand, with the same arms as the Americans, with bows and arrows, with bamboo stakes, with old-style arms they make themselves, with anything they find."

The U.S. troops, in contrast, according to the young Puerto Rican soldier, are quite demoralized. The officers tend to handle the troops with kid gloves because they are afraid they might get shot in the back. "Everybody is against everybody else."

In Vietnam, the American soldiers become caught up in hatred against the whole situation. And they take this out against the Vietnamese. Roberto confessed that to his own shame he was not without guilt in this respect. He ascribed it to the nervous tension that builds up from the beginning.

"When I came to Vietnam," he said, "we were met by a band playing marches and things like that. But even the music made us nervous. For example it set my nerves on edge."

"From there we went to a zone to get ready for combat and then we went to the combat zone. We would dig foxholes six feet deep where we stayed for the night -- we stayed because nobody slept. The next day at six in the morning we'd start hiking. We would hike eighteen, twenty, thirty miles to where we were going. We were looking for the so-called enemy. But we never saw this enemy. During these hikes we searched the villages we ran across. At six in the evening, back to a foxhole. And in two or three hours they would begin shooting from here and there -- the so-called enemy, that is. The Vietnamese fired away and made a lot of noise to scare the United States troops so they would give away their positions."

They generally succeeded in this. "The American soldier is so demoralized that he always falls into the trap. He hears a shot and he begins shooting wildly, in all directions, wherever he thinks the shots came from. But each one thinks it's from a different spot. And this plays right into the hands of the Vietnamese. They soon know their position and fire away at a marked target."

"Sometimes our officers calculated on the basis of the ammunition we had used up that we had killed more than 300 Vietnamese. But in the morning, when we went to check the bodies, there wasn't a single one. It's possible that we killed some, although we were shooting wild, but if there were any bodies, they carried them away, to demoralize the American soldiers still more."

As to relations among the troops, the Puerto Ricans and Negroes get along better among themselves than the others do. They also tend to mix together. "This is because we Puerto Ricans don't practice discrimination, because we Puerto Ricans have feelings about this. Besides, while the North Americans don't appear to discriminate, they are guilty of it in practice because they always give the most dangerous missions to Negroes and Puerto Ricans."

Asked about how things were when he was on furlough, Roberto responded: "Very boring. I never left the base. Why leave? The only place you could go was Saigon and I went there only two or three times to see it. But in Saigon sometimes it's more dangerous than in the jungle. They can let an American soldier have it without him ever knowing where the blow came from. Besides in Saigon what you have is warehouses, warehouses, and more warehouses. It's like a big warehouse because that's where the Americans are and they're the ones who keep this business going."

Roberto has strong feelings about the use of Puerto Ricans in Vietnam. "For my part I tell everyone -- no Puerto Rican should join the army; no one should go to Vietnam. It's against our rights. Why should we have to go to Vietnam and commit murder? And we can all be sure that for every 100 Puerto Ricans taken in the army, 98 will be sent to Vietnam right away. I still have four years left in the Reserves and if they call up the Reserves the way they're saying they're going to, I may have to spend those four years in jail, but I'm not going."

#### FIVE PUERTO RICANS REFUSE TO SERVE IN U.S. ARMY

Five young Puerto Ricans -- Anselmo Rosas, Gabriel Ferrer, Rafael Rivera, Juan Benito Dorna Joy and Sixto Alvelo -- all of them members of the Movimiento Pro Independencia [MPI], have been charged with refusing to serve in the armed forces of the United States, reports the October 16 issue of Claridad, the weekly newspaper of the MPI. They object to serving as "cannon fodder" for the U.S. in its aggressions "against peoples who are struggling for their sovereignty and national liberation," according to the Puerto Rican independence paper.

The five are seeking to test the legality of applying the U.S. military conscription laws to Puerto Ricans. The U.S. federal officers are seeking to evade this, however, by claiming that Puerto Ricans are not required to swear an oath of allegiance to the U.S. when they are drafted.

After Sixto Alvelo's stand became known, he was fired from his job at the Puerto Rico Container Company which makes cartons. The company is owned by a millionaire, Luis A. Ferré, who is head of the pro-U.S. Partido Estadista Republicano.

#### "BANDIERA ROSSA" BECOMES A BIWEEKLY

Bandiera Rossa [Red Flag], the organ of the Gruppi Comunisti Rivoluzionari [Revolutionary Communist Group], the Italian section of the Fourth International, became a biweekly, beginning with the October 15 issue. A six-page newspaper, it has been published since April 1950 on a monthly basis. The advance was made possible by the growth of the Italian Trotskyist organization during the past two years. The first number of the new series deals with the war in Vietnam, the trial of Hugo Blanco in Peru and the trade-union struggle in Italy.

In making the change, the editors did not announce what the new subscription price would be. It was formerly 500 lire [\$.80] for one year. The address is Bandiera Rossa, Casella Postale 6158, Rome, Italy.

Besides Bandiera Rossa, the Italian Trotskyist movement publishes a biweekly mimeographed newsletter called IV Internazionale [Fourth International]. A subscription to this publication is 1,000 lire for one year [\$1.60] and the address is IV Internazionale, Via Cavour n. 96 int. 1, Rome, Italy.

CEYLON TRADE UNIONS FACE CHALLENGE OF WAGE FREEZE

By Edmund Samarakkody

Colombo

The question of the inadequacy of existing wage rates in Ceylon was taken out of the realm of controversy when the Wilmot Perera commission, appointed by Bandaranaike in 1957, recommended wage increases for government employees involving the expenditure by the government of Rs 45,000,000 [one rupee = about \$.21]. The urgency of granting increased wages was further recognised by the proposal of the commission that their recommendations be implemented as from 1960 although their report was published in 1961.

The wage increases recommended by the Wilmot Perera commission fell far short of the additional remuneration necessary for wage earners to meet the prevailing high cost of living. The commission had by implication admitted that their recommendations were not based on a realistic cost-of-living index, which in their view should have been computed from a new survey of households and from a new pricing manual. It was thus no surprise that the commission was not unanimous on the fundamental question of the quantum of the new minimum wage. The majority of this commission recommended a new minimum wage of Rs 135 a month for an unskilled worker while the minority (N.S. Perera) recommended a minimum wage of Rs 150 for an unskilled person and Rs 175 a month for a technical worker. And in a situation of disagreement in the commission on the minimum wage, the demand of the trade unions for a minimum wage of Rs 200 a month could not be dismissed as excessive.

With an existing government minimum wage for unskilled workers of Rs 125 a month, what is the picture of prevailing wage conditions?

A random reference to wage levels in the so-called regulated categories of trade is revealing. According to the same commission, "on a Tea or Rubber estate it was exceptional for any worker to earn a monthly income of more than Rs 80 per month even if work was available and given full attendance...the average cash income of an estate worker (Tea and Rubber) was Rs 53.55 per month per worker." And if the monetary value of the so-called free benefits (free housing, free medical services, etc.) which amounts to Rs 8.59 is added, we arrive at the figure of Rs 62.14 as the average income per worker.

The picture is not less depressing in other categories. The minimum wage (without overtime) in the harbour, dock and transport trade could be as low as Rs 58.75 a month and the maximum earnings Rs 90.74. In the textile trade, conditions are worse. It is not unusual to find all workers in a factory paid uniform rates. Depending on the attendance the total earnings of workers in most enterprises are between Rs 35 a month and Rs 60 a month! And in the so-called people's movement -- the cooperative trade, the picture is distressing. Of 4,545 managers of cooperative stores, 3,179 were earning less than Rs 100 a month. Out of 2,815 sales personnel, 2,749 get less than Rs 50 a month.

In a situation of belated recognition by a capitalist government that the wage levels of the large majority of workers and wage earners are insufficient to meet the high cost of living, and with substandard conditions of wage earners in the private sector, what has been the policy of the trade-union movement?

Between 1957 and 1959, the trade unions launched strike action for a special living allowance and on the wage issue generally. Strikes in separate sectors in 1961 even led to a general strike (January 5, 1962). The 1963 movement around the "21 demands" was a step in the direction of a confrontation between the trade unions on the one side and the employers and the government on the other. But this opposition to the wage freeze between 1957 and 1963 was a movement of the rank and file of the trade unions. With the exception of a few trade unions, the leaderships of the large majority of trade unions were not opposed to the wage freeze. From 1957 to 1964, the trade-union movement (with exceptions) functioned within the framework of support of the SLFP [Sri Lanka Freedom party] government. Opposition to the wage-freeze policy of the SLFP government and confrontation with the government on this issue was not acceptable to the majority of the trade-union leadership.

This was the common policy of N.M.Perera [LSSP -- Lanka Sama Samaja party],

Peter Keuneman [pro-Moscow Communist party], Shanmugathasan [pro-Peking Communist party], Philip Gunawardena, Thondaman and most leaders of the leading trade unions. The abandonment in 1964 of the movement of the trade unions for the struggle around the 21 demands was the further working out of their policy of support for the SLFP which led the trade unions into the SLFP-LSSP coalition government. Thus, during the last eight years the leadership of the majority of the trade unions have directly or indirectly supported government policy of enforcing the wage freeze.

The policy of the present UNP [United National party] government on the wage freeze needed no speculation. The opposition of the UNP to a general wage increase remained unconcealed although there is no officially declared government policy of a wage freeze. Moreover their assumption to office has coincided with the deepening crisis of the economy. And especially in the present context of very low prices for the agricultural exports of tea, rubber and coconut, the capitalist class and the UNP government need drastic measures to sustain the economy and capitalist class rule.

These measures can well be the withdrawal of food subsidies, increase of bus fares, postal fares, and increased taxes on the essential commodities of the people. The slashing of government expenditure on social services has already commenced. The devaluation of the Ceylon rupee cannot be ruled out as a course of action that the government may well take in desperation. In this context the continuation of the wage freeze is only incidental to the general assault on the already low living standards of the people. But before the government commences such a frontal attack on the people, they need to strike at, disrupt and destroy the trade-union movement.

What was the reaction of the trade-union leadership to the situation that confronted the working-class movement after the UNP government assumed office? Did the trade-union movement begin to close their ranks? Have the trade-union leaders sought to mobilise the workers and wage earners for their own defence? On the contrary, far from having awakened to the dangers facing the trade-union movement, they continued in their old policies of keeping the workers and wage earners divided and disoriented.

The trade unions led by Thondaman, Philip Gunawardena and the Federal party have, since the formation of the UNP government, been committed to support government policy on the wage question and generally on most issues.

The coalition-led unions (SLFP-LSSP and CP), after about eight months of inaction, led the workers under their influence into a criminally irresponsible action -- the January 8 strike on a communal issue. The workers and wage earners, who were thus exposed to a direct attack by the government, suffered by the physical violence of the army and police and much more by the victimisation that followed. Over 5,000 government workers and wage earners were dismissed from the services, whilst many more suffered fines and other penalties.

And far from taking realistic steps in defence of these workers, the leaders have, thereafter, only further disoriented the workers by strengthening their parliamentary illusions. The hundreds of victimised workers were advised by their leaders to wait for redress till the election of the next SLFP-LSSP coalition government. This was also the perspective held out to wage earners generally on the burning question of a wage rise.

Despite the efforts of the unions led by the LSSP-CP to channelise the growing discontent among the workers and wage earners into a parliamentarist course, the wage issue has become more sharply posed than before. The demands of the wage earners for increased wages have become irresistible and unpostponable.

But the reformist leaders of the trade-union movement still continue to distract the workers from struggle by raising a controversy on the question of demands. Having previously disrupted trade-union unity on the 21 demands in return for a coalition with the SLFP, the LSSP- and CP-led trade-union leaders have now put forward 15 demands, Shanmugathasan has put forward 12. And of course this manoeuvre is not without effect at present. It has helped to obstruct any moves of the workers for united action on their wage demands.

While the trade-union leaders in rival camps compete in displaying concern for the wage earners by referring to their respective list of demands, the workers and wage earners have already moved into action. The general strike called by the bank employees union in support of the strike at Grindlays and National Bank took place despite a state of emergency declared by the government. This strike was followed by

the 45-day strike of the plantation workers led by the Democratic Workers Congress for the special living allowance of Rs 17.50. This strike, affecting over a lakh [100,000] of workers, was spread out in four provinces.

Both these strikes might have terminated with victory for the workers if the entire trade-union movement could have unequivocally and unreservedly supported these strikes. But this is just what did not happen. The hide-and-see policies of most trade-union leaders, their irresponsibility, leading to open treachery in the case of some of them, helped to isolate and weaken these struggles.

What the trade-union movement needs is not a controversy over new demands but a new perspective of struggle. And responsible leaders of the trade-union movement should know that a confrontation with the employers and the government on the issue of wages needs above all united action of the organised working class and wage earners. While separate actions by different trade-union federations or by trade-union centres could no doubt in certain special circumstances win wage concessions, the breaking of the wage freeze affecting the wider sections of the workers, and the defence of the working class from the attacks of the employers and the government call for nothing less than the united action of the organised trade-union movement.

Besides, in the present situation it is not a question of winning some demand or other of a trade union from the employer, but the defence of the existing trade-union rights and the preservation of the trade-union movement that is involved. Continued disunity, disorientation and inaction of the workers and wage earners means the growth of reaction and the eventual breakup of the trade-union movement. In this context the unity of the trade-union movement becomes paramount and imperative. Political differences cannot be permitted to obstruct the achievement of unity. A united front of the trade unions means the forging of a common front for action despite differences on other issues. And in this context the fullest mobilisation of the working class and wage earners could be realised only through a united front of trade unions and political parties of the working class.

Will the trade-union leadership show their sense of responsibility in this situation? The answer depends on whether the rank and file of the trade-union movement can, before it is too late, pressure their leaders to take the correct course of action.

#### CANADIAN PROFESSORS JOIN IN APPEAL FOR HUGO BLANCO

Toronto

A number of prominent figures on the staff of the University of Toronto have added their names to the international list of those who have appealed to President Belaúnde Terry to release Hugo Blanco, the Peruvian peasant leader who was sentenced September 8 to serve 25 years in the notorious El Frontón prison. A codefendant, Pedro Candela, was sentenced to 22 years.

After being held in prison for more than three years without trial, they were accused of involvement in the deaths of three policemen who were killed in skirmishes with peasants in the Cuzco region. The army conducted the trial as a court-martial in which the prosecution also served as judge. The case has attracted international attention, drawing protests and appeals from many prominent figures.

The latest in Toronto to sign the petition included Professor Kenneth McNaught of the Department of History, a well-known commentator and writer; Professor Donald E. Willmott of the Department of Political Economy, who is of similar prominence; and Professor C.B. Macpherson of the Department of Political Economy, author of the internationally known book, Political Theory of Possessive Individualism.

Others included professors Peter Silcox, J.T. McLeod, W.E. Gresham, Sam Hollander, A. Rotstein and C. Lumsden of the Department of Political Economy; Kenneth N. Walker, Shirley J. Cook, William D.H. Johnson, Alan T.R. Powell and Henry Cooperstock of the Department of Sociology; and J.M. Estes of the Department of History.

The appeal was sent to the Peruvian embassy in Ottawa and copies were forwarded to Caretas, Camaná 615, Oficina 308, Lima, Peru; Oiga, Av. Salaverry 674, Lima, Peru; and Dr. Alfredo Battilana, Av. Nicola de Pierola 966, Oficina 215, Lima, Peru.



THE RISING DOUBTS ABOUT THE WARREN COMMISSION

By Arthur Maglin

A spate of new books and articles has increased the widespread doubt about the main conclusions of the Warren Commission's report on the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. A recent Harris poll shows that about three out of five Americans reject the "main thrust" of the Warren Report.

The main thrust of the report is that Lee Harvey Oswald was the lone and unaided assassin. Thus, it is not surprising that when the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals on October 5 threw out the conviction of Jack Ruby for killing Oswald, this tended to arouse suspicions about the Dallas events even further. Ruby will be retried, but he now stands a much better chance of getting off with as little as a five-year prison sentence.

All of this has operated to cast doubt on the workings and methods of the whole American judicial system, on the Federal Bureau of Investigation (which did the bulk of the Warren Commission's detective work), and on the trustworthiness of high government officials.

The new round of controversy over the Kennedy assassination really began to get rolling during this past summer. Books such as Whitewash by Harold Weisberg, Inquest by Edward Jay Epstein, and Rush to Judgment by Mark Lane\* are perhaps the most significant examples of the new literature that has prompted the current interest in reopening the investigation of Kennedy's assassination.

Whitewash examines the whole of the Warren Report in the light of the twenty-six volumes of testimony and evidence upon which the report is supposedly based. The author reaches the conclusion that:

"Hard as it tried to avoid anything tending to show Oswald could not have committed the crime, the Commission could not keep from its record substantial evidence that he did not. How it could accept without question or comment so much nonsense, fantasy, and outright perjury is beyond comprehension. Perhaps the answer is that these were honest men neither intellectually nor emotionally equal to the task set for them."

Epstein's Inquest takes another approach. It examines the working methods of the Warren Commission to find out exactly how it came to its conclusions. Epstein pays special attention to the "underlying purpose" of the Commission. In discussing how U.S. Supreme Court Chief Justice Earl Warren came to be appointed to head up the Commission, Epstein writes:

"The circumstances surrounding the Chief Justice's appointment to the Commission suggest the underlying purpose. Anthony Lewis, then The New York Times Supreme Court correspondent, reported that when Warren was first asked to serve on the Commission 'he flatly said no.' President Johnson then called Warren to the White House and spoke to him 'about patriotism, about the new President's urgent need to settle the assassination rumors, about the special trust people in foreign lands would have in an investigation over which he presided.' Warren thereupon agreed to serve on the Commission. J. Lee Rankin confirmed this account and said that 'Warren accepted, only with the greatest reluctance, because the President had made it plain to him that the nation's prestige was at stake.' These accounts clearly imply that one purpose of the Commission was to protect the national interest by settling 'assassination rumors' and restoring American prestige abroad."

Mark Lane's book Rush to Judgment, which has been on the best-seller list for

---

\*Harold Weisberg. Whitewash: The Report on the Warren Report. Published by Harold Weisberg, Hyattstown, Md. 20734. 224 pp. \$4.95.

Edward Jay Epstein. Inquest: The Warren Commission and the Establishment of Truth. New York, Viking Press. 224 pp. \$5.

Mark Lane. Rush to Judgment: A Critique of the Warren Commission's Inquiry into the Murders of President John F. Kennedy, Officer J.D. Tippit and Lee Harvey Oswald. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston. 478 pp. \$5.95.

several weeks, is written essentially as a defense brief for Lee Harvey Oswald. Lane principally utilizes the material available in the Report's twenty-six volume supplement of evidence and testimony. However, Lane also brings in a considerable amount of well-documented additional evidence. After all of this, Lane comes to the following conclusion:

"The Commission said that it viewed the Executive order by which it was established 'as an unequivocal Presidential mandate to conduct a thorough and independent investigation.' Its task was to dispel the 'numerous rumors and theories' which Oswald's murder had fostered and intensified. Among those were rumors of Oswald's innocence and of efforts to frame him, and of his participation, to a greater or lesser extent, in a conspiracy. Many of these were stilled by time, the Commission and a bidable press. After a critical reading of the Report, however, rumors must revive, for, to the previously unsubstantiated imaginings of those who for one reason or another disliked the Commission's case against Oswald, much documentation has been added.

"The Commission did not acquit itself of its mandate; it failed to conduct a thorough investigation; it failed to ask the relevant questions if their likely answers promised discomfort. Its failure shall in time, I believe, be complete, for half answers do not for long dispel rumors and contain doubts. I believe the final failure of the Commission to be that it has prepared a fertile ground for the cultivation of rumor and speculation."

Added to the powerful stimulant to public doubting about the Warren Report was the reopening of the case of Jack Ruby. The decision of the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals to throw out the murder conviction and death sentence of Jack Ruby and to order a retrial "came as added fuel to the fire" to the "apparently growing number of skeptics about the Warren Commission's explanation of the assassination," according to the "News of the Week in Review" section of the Sunday New York Times of October 9.

The Times goes on to say that, "Ruby's expressed motive for killing Oswald -- to revenge 'our beloved President' and spare his family the pain of a trial -- had seemed odd to many critics, since Ruby had not bothered to attend the Presidential motorcade." Ruby's reputation as the associate of underworld characters also tended to cast doubt on his asserted purity of motive.

The Times comments on "the persistent tendency for doubts about the assassination to spread as its aftermath unfolds." The Texas Appeals Court certainly acted in a way that would not reverse this trend by barring the testimony of police sergeant Patrick T. Dean as its grounds for setting a retrial for Ruby. The Times reports that "The three-judge court ruled unanimously that Judge Brown should have excluded from evidence testimony that Ruby had told a Dallas police officer shortly after Oswald's shooting that he had planned for two days to kill Oswald if the chance arose."

This may mean that Ruby will get off with a very light sentence. "District Attorney Henry Wade," continues the Times, "who prosecuted Ruby in 1964, said he would ask for the death penalty again at the next trial, but Phil Burleson of Dallas, one of Ruby's lawyers, said the Appellate Court decision had knocked out all the evidence of premeditation by Ruby. This would permit only a conviction of murder without malice, which carries a five-year sentence."

The books critical of the Warren Report, critical articles appearing in such liberal journals as The Nation and The New York Review of Books, and the new turn in the Ruby case have all resulted in numerous calls for an official reopening of the investigation of the events surrounding Kennedy's assassination. A former aide to President Kennedy, Richard N. Goodwin, has suggested that an independent group, supported by Congress, should check into whether or not the Warren Commission's investigation was adequate.

Representative Theodore Kupferman, a New York City liberal Republican, has introduced a resolution into the U.S. Congress for a joint congressional committee to re-examine the assassination case with a view to launching a new legislative investigation.

In an editorial-page column in the September 25 New York Times, Tom Wicker argues strongly in favor of reopening the Kennedy assassination case. Of the Warren Report he says that "the atmosphere has changed in the two years since the massive report and its 26 volumes of supporting testimony and evidence were published. In this country, the Warren Commission theory then was accepted widely, almost without ques-

tion, although doubt continued to prevail in Europe with its history of political assassinations and conspiracies.

"Now a number of impressive books -- and even more that are not so impressive -- have been published, all raising questions of the most serious nature. The Warren Commission's procedures, its objectivity and its members' diligence have been opened to doubt. Its major findings have been called everything from conjecture to prejudgment to error. The damaging suspicion has been planted, here as well as abroad, that the commission -- even if unconsciously -- was more concerned to quiet public fears of conspiracy and treachery than it was to establish the unvarnished truth, and thus made the facts fit a convenient thesis.

"From the day of publication, for instance, Gov. John Connally of Texas has publicly denied the commission's contention that the same bullet passed through President Kennedy's body, then through Mr. Connally's chest and wrist to lodge in his thigh. The published analyses of the ballistics and autopsy evidence that have followed the Warren Report have tended to support the Governor, not the commission.

"Again, reporters who were present in Dallas that dreadful Friday afternoon clearly remember that the doctor who attended the dying President, in his first public statement, tentatively described a bullet hole in the front of the throat as having had the appearance of an entry wound. That this opinion was changed in testimony before the commission, which rested its findings partially on the idea that the hole was an exit wound, cannot erase the memory of what was said at first hand on Nov. 22, 1963.

"The point is not that the doctor necessarily was wrong the first time, or the second; perhaps there was sufficient reason for the changed opinion. Nor is it really possible to accept Governor Connally's judgment or vice versa, or to decide certainly any number of other points that have now been placed in dispute.

"The point is that the Warren Commission has not, after all, even quieted public concern about who killed John Kennedy, or why, and even less has it presented an ironclad and unarguable case that Lee Oswald, alone and without rational motive, was the assassin."

All of these calls for a reopening of the assassination case have elicited a reaction from members of the Commission and members of its staff. Arlen Specter, a key member of the Warren Commission's legal staff, stated, "There has not been a scintilla of new evidence disclosed in any of the books."

Former CIA director Allen Dulles, a Commission member, said, "If they have found another assassin let them name names and produce the evidence."

Normally, American judicial proceedings are supposed to follow the principle that a man is to be considered innocent until he is proved guilty. Here we have Dulles, one of Lee Harvey Oswald's judges, putting forth the demand that to question whether the Warren Commission established its case it is necessary to prove someone else's guilt. As for Specter's criticism about no new evidence being produced by the books, it too obviously misses the point. The books and articles critical of the report have generally charged that the Commission disregarded evidence that it already had when such evidence tended to hurt its case against Oswald as the lone and unaided assassin.

Outside the United States the revived controversy over the Warren Report has been different. In general, the foreign press was more skeptical of the official story from the beginning. The new wave of criticism has only tended to make the skepticism about the report more widespread.

A typical European reaction is to be found in the July 29 issue of the London New Statesman, which says:

"By its very composition the commission was almost certain to produce an inadequate report. The members all reached their rank and status in the U.S. by closing doors, eliminating doubts, shoring up the American mythology. The commission had a political job to do, to establish one more or less plausible version of the assassination events as an official 'truth'."

The New Statesman raises another side of the question:

"So far there is evidence for only modest revisionism. But even so, if the Warren commissioners are exposed as merely hapless dupes, other doubts about American history over the last two decades become more pertinent. Was the Rosenberg case also a fraud? The FBI's role then was every bit as curious as it is in the Oswald business. Was the whole U.S. position on the origins of the cold war fraudulent? John McCloy [another Commission member] and Allen Dulles had the same job in feeding the national mythology then as they did by 'wiping out' the 'dirty rumours' in the assassination investigation and preventing 'damage' to shining images."

The concern in high government circles and the editorial offices of the most influential newspapers in the United States over the current delayed reaction to the Warren Report, is clearly due to worry over the "shining images" of the American judicial system, the FBI, and the public honor of outstanding government figures. For if the American public loses its faith in the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, what government official will they ever believe and trust again?

WELCOME PREPARED IN NEW ZEALAND FOR LYNDON B. JOHNWATER

By H. Holland

Wellington

When the itinerary of President Johnson's visit to New Zealand was announced, Barry Mitcalfe, chairman of the New Zealand Committee on Vietnam, stated that orderly protest demonstrations would be staged.

This provoked an appeal from Prime Minister Keith J. Holyoake. "However much the Committee on Vietnam is opposed to American policies in Vietnam," he said, "I sincerely hope its members refrain from demonstrating on this occasion." Holyoake has followed a policy of supporting Johnson and involving New Zealand in the dirty war. The prime minister described as nonsense the statement by Mitcalfe that Johnson's visit was akin to the Emperor Nero visiting far-flung Gaul or Britain.

What is interesting in this situation is that for the first time in New Zealand's history an appreciable grass-roots protest movement has formed on a foreign policy issue. The Committee on Vietnam has fourteen chapters and more than 5,000 active members. It has printed considerable material against the war, demanding the withdrawal of New Zealand's troops and helping to make the war a sharp issue in the elections scheduled for November 26.

The fact that the prime minister deemed it expedient to make an appeal not to demonstrate is a measure of the committee's strength. Mitcalfe, taking a gamble it seemed, offered to call off the projected demonstrations if President Johnson would receive a deputation of eminent persons.

The prime minister rejected this offer -- which in the opinion of some of the committee's supporters should not have been made in the first place -- and the way was cleared for demonstrations against the visit. Placards were being prepared with such welcoming signs as "Lyndon B. Johnwater" and "Lyndon B. God."

Some of the more politically backward supporters of the committee proposed to carry banners such as "Robert Kennedy for President." The reasoning behind displaying such a slogan is (1) that it would get publicity overseas, (2) that it would constitute a subtle rebuke to Johnson for electioneering in support of the ruling party just before New Zealand's parliamentary elections. Thus if Johnson is canvassing in New Zealand for support for a partisan group in the November 26 elections, then New Zealanders have a right to do the same in the USA.

The only trouble with this line of thinking is that it blatantly ignores the fact that Robert Kennedy is in reality as much a warmonger as Johnson. Besides that, he is not at present campaigning for the presidency.

Still the times are changing and the torpor that has affected these islands has come to an end. The long sleep has been of approximately thirty years duration; but now we are beginning to rejoin the human race.

### SCANDALS EMBARRASS SATO GOVERNMENT

A series of scandals involving malfeasance in office have embarrassed the Sato government. The Japan Socialist party, as a result, has demanded the resignation of the cabinet en bloc or dissolution of the House of Representatives and the holding of new elections. Other opposition parties have added their voices to the clamor.

The most spectacular case was that of the Liberal-Democrat Shoji Tanaka. He was charged with using his position in the Diet to gain huge personal profits through fraud and blackmail. As a result he was ousted from both the Diet and the party.

Another case involved Transportation Minister Seijuro Arafune. Among other things he ordered express trains to stop at a small town within his constituency. He was also involved in irregularities in a restaurant at a railway station. Arafune's defense reflected the prevailing atmosphere of corruption in the Japanese government. "This much should be condoned," he argued. "Everybody else is doing it," he added. And he topped this off with the declaration, "I did nothing wrong!"

As a result, Sato decided to let Arafune go. When former Defense chief Sensuke Fujieda returned from a trip to Eastern Europe October 13, Sato gave him Arafune's post. However, he made up for this move by giving Arafune another important position, presumably due to the factional situation inside the Liberal-Democratic party.

The public reaction to the scandals was such that Kazuo Kuroda, writing in the October 15 Japan Times noted "a danger" that they may lead some people to believe "that Gen. Tojo's Japan or Mao Tse-tung's China is cleaner."

### HOW SECTARIAN CAN YOU GET?

Freudians interested in the rather rare phenomenon of a recurrent nightmare suffered by an entire group collectively might well investigate a case reported in the October 1 issue of The Newsletter, the weekly organ of the Central Committee of the Socialist Labour League, a British ultraleft formation that imagines itself to be Trotskyist. In an article bearing the signature of Michael Best, dealing with the problem of "hooliganism" in the Soviet Union, the author comes to the following remarkable conclusion:

"Our only fear -- and many a Trotskyist has been awakened at night in a cold sweat by this nightmare -- is that the bureaucracy, wishing to court popularity among the workers, might one day declare themselves to be the real Trotskyists.

"Then, indeed, our name would become mud.

"I only hope that no Stalinist bureaucrat reads these lines -- as, of course, no well brought up bureaucrat ought to -- and get this idea about the way really to discredit us.

"But so long as they attack us, distort our views so that they sound absurd, we shall be safe and will increasingly gain more workers to our cause."

Since the author is obviously not a Freudian, perhaps it would help him to learn that his anxiety dream -- a common enough infantile disorder -- really is nothing but the expression in negative form of a deep-seated wish that has been excluded from consciousness because of its moral inadmissibility and which must thus take this strange way of signaling its existence. The deep-seated wish, of course, is to believe in the utopian fantasy that the Soviet bureaucracy might reform itself and of its own volition restore proletarian democracy. The forbidden wish is realized in sleep and the sufferer wakes, in the usual way, in a cold sweat over the horror of it all.

By way of medical advice, we suggest to the author that it may not be necessary to resort to the psychoanalytic couch to overcome this agonizing inner conflict. Serious study of the material available in Lenin's works on the subject of ultraleftism could prove to be just what the doctor ordered.

"DEATH OF A BUREAUCRAT"

[The following interview with Tomás Gutiérrez Alea, the director of the Cuban film, "Death of a Bureaucrat," was conducted by Mario Rodríguez Alemán and published in the July 24, 1966, issue of the English-language edition of Granma, the official organ of the Central Committee of the Communist party of Cuba. The discussion, we think, is indicative of the impulse given to creative activities in Cuba by the revolution -- and also the sensitivity of Cuba's artists to one of the problems that has arisen in their country and which they, too, are seeking to help solve.]

\* \* \*

Tomás Gutiérrez Alea has two film productions to his credit; both noteworthy contributions to the development of full-length Cuban film-making. I refer to "The Twelve Chairs" and the new film, "Death of a Bureaucrat."

While reserving the right to make comments on this new Cuban film at a later date, I sought replies from the director before his departure for the Karlovy Vary Film Festival to a series of questions posed in recent days by Cuban film critics, to provide our readers with some knowledge of the nature and importance of this new production.

What is the essence of the "Death of a Bureaucrat"?

Answer: It is, as the title suggests, a satire of bureaucracy and also of many other unfortunate and mediocre things that we must often live with. However, I wish to make clear that I don't have much faith in satire as an "historic force." One can make a film and think he is ridiculing the bureaucrats. But then along come the bureaucrats themselves and not only laugh with the film but at it, as well. Some of them, because they don't recognize themselves as portrayed on the screen, and others because they are crass opportunists. It is relatively easy for them to wave the flag of "anti-bureaucratism" and continue living as parasites on society. Major evils can only be corrected by major solutions. In this film, the protagonist has to reach the point of violence in order to solve the problem involved. It is individual violence that can not resolve the problem permanently. But, I believe that it can serve as an example. Or at least, as a kind of catharsis...

Is the theme in "Death of a Bureaucrat" based on real events?

Answer: Actually, everything in the film exists in reality. However, I'll have to go into detail about whether the story is taken from real life, or not. I think it was Roberto Fandiño, in a meeting with Julio García Espinosa, who first spoke about someone who was buried with his official worker's identification card in his pocket and how much trouble his widow had when she tried to claim his pension. Although I don't believe it happened exactly like that, the story gave me the idea and I later rounded it out.

It is true that I heard this tale after I had already conceived the idea of making a film on the problems of bureaucracy, which would end with the death of a bureaucrat, that is, violently. I decided on this ending because I believe that the exasperation an ordinary citizen can experience because of bureaucracy can lead him even to the point of murder; or, if not murder, at least to just retribution. That is to say, he might be driven out of his mind.

What do you think of your new film? Would you modify it in any way?

Answer: Generally speaking I like the film. I feel that it states what we had in mind. I would change one of the important actors and many "extras," I would shoot the scene of the antibureaucratic campaign over again and place it in a different sequence; much earlier in the film. I would remake the opening scenes, in which we had a good idea based on good elements, but technical defects spoil the total effect.

I think it's a minor film with no great pretensions, but I believe it achieves what was intended.

"Death of a Bureaucrat" will be shown at the Karlovy Vary International Film Festival. Do you think that all the scenes in the film, which may be very clear to us

in Cuba, will be understood at the festival?

Answer: Well, yes. Bureaucracy is a very old phenomena. It's no new invention, but was inherited and, in some cases, developed by the socialist countries, where it seems to be a thoroughly oppressive stage, that must be traversed. The mechanism of bureaucracy as it is presented is very elemental and can be understood anywhere by anyone. Perhaps some Cuban details will not be understood. But these are few. The central theme of the film -- that of a dead person who cannot be taken from his house to be buried because of lack of the proper documents -- is a sufficiently violent situation for anyone to understand. The whole film rests on this.

Your films have shown a great deal of humor. In "The Twelve Chairs" the treatment was popular rather than intellectual, but, in "Death of a Bureaucrat" you have used both elements. What can you tell us about this?

Answer: Humor interests me very much as a theme. There is something of "black humor" in the film.

(One critic, Roberto Branly, interrupted and described the new film as "black humor" in the Mexican sense. "The concept of joking about death is a very Mexican one," he stated, "while in Cuba this idea of joking about death hardly exists.")

Gutiérrez Alea replied: "It was time to introduce this type of humor. In Cuba we have been playing with death for some time now. I think that this type of humor is more Spanish than Mexican. The Mexicans carry the concept to an extreme that is not characteristic of this film."

What is your opinion of Salvador Wood as an actor? I happen to think he's exactly right for the part.

Answer: I wouldn't say he is the best actor, since not all actors are suited to all parts. But he is one of the best and it's extremely interesting to work with such a fresh talent. It was easy to work with him on this film, because he's an actor who throws himself into a part. We know each other well and have worked together before, and so communication was relatively easy.

Was the background music expressly composed for the film?

Answer: It was composed for the film, although a few spots are from records. I believe it is very good at times, and occasionally very effective, although I'm not sure whether there is sometimes over-effect. It's the only thing that worries me.

Callejas, a critic, interrupts to state: "There is a lack of unity in this music by Leo Brouwer, something he has achieved in other films for which he has composed the music."

Gutiérrez Alea replies: "I would say that such diversity of style exists also in the visual work. It is part of the spirit of the film, that is, the very free use of every available resource. The following example will prove there was such an intention. In the opening scene, when Uncle Paco's bust emerges from the machine to appear later at the cemetery, the background music has an angelic, fantastic quality. Leo Brouwer could very well have written it, but we decided to use the music from The Robe which, in my opinion, creates a comic effect.

Was the scene of the fight at the cemetery deliberately exaggerated?

Answer: It was. When a fight like that one starts, it reminds us of Laurel and Hardy in the 1920's. It is a completely absurd fight, and the characters are also absurd, as is shown when the cemetery manager begins to kick the automobile headlights.

What is your opinion of Ramón Suárez' camerawork?

Answer: It is a professional job, the best Ramón has done, and it maintains the same high level throughout the film. Something very important, in my opinion: it is comedy camerawork, because there is camerawork that is very impressive in its subtlety or in its use of chiaroscuros, overexposing, or out-of-focus shots, done expertly, but -- in the case of this film -- all of that would have been useless and prejudicial affectedness. In comedy, everything, every detail must be seen. For example,

at a given moment important things may be happening on one side, but should not keep the viewer from observing what is going on all around. This type of photography is not tendentious but, as it should be, it is objective photography, which allows the viewer to pick up what he cares to. As far as technical resources are concerned, this type of camerawork is much harder to achieve than "effectivist" techniques which can convert a technical error into a very expressive effect. In this film, we had to avoid this sort of thing at all costs. In other words, this is professional, high-level camerawork.

### REALIGNMENT TOWARD THE RIGHT IN ALGERIA

By Pierre Clerbaut

[The following article appeared in the October 1 issue of the Belgian socialist weekly La Gauche (The Left). The translation is by World Outlook.]

\* \* \*

The recent regroupment of the Boumedienne government provided fresh proof of the hostility in practice of the June 19 crew toward workers self-management and its democratic and socialist content.

In 1963 at the height of the development of self-management, Aldenour Ali Yahia, former deputy from Tizi-Ouzou, went over to the opposition constituted by the Front des Forces Socialistes [Front of Socialist Forces] headed by Mohan Ou El Hadj and Ait Ahmed.

A few weeks after the March 1963 decrees that converted self-management into an institution, at a time when the Ben Bellist leadership was mobilizing the masses and throwing all its weight (in an empirical and improvised way, naturally!) toward socialist solutions, the FFS opposition, in failing to give critical support to the positive measures of the government, had to move toward a sterile rightist opposition lacking any perspectives.

Today, three years later, Ali Yahia is replacing Ali Mahsas, an old comrade of Ben Bella, at the head of the Ministry of Agriculture.

This is a reminder of the long struggle that Ali Mahsas, who was a partisan of solutions along bureaucratic lines and particularly alarmed over the effectiveness of Mohamed Harbi -- former editor of the weekly Révolution Africaine now in prison because of his opposition to the Boumedienne regime -- in advocating a rigorously democratic application of the "March Decrees" which sought to give maximum voice and power to the workers on the farms and in the plants.

The fact that the elimination of Ali Mahsas represents a shift to the right testifies to the extent of the overall recession of the Algerian Revolution.

Because, despite the highly germane criticisms which the nonbureaucratic left levelled at the Mahsas tendency, he was ousted as a defender of the collectivization of the land and consolidation of the nationalized sector of agriculture.

Less spectacular, but of similar significance, was the recent shift of Omar Ouzegane to the opposition. Despite his obsession over Islam, this former minister of agriculture in the first Ben Bella government was considered by his political foes to be a man of the left.

He remained editor of Révolution Africaine for a few weeks after the June 19 coup d'état, becoming a member of the Boumedienne government. This did not prevent the former secretary of the Algerian Communist party\* from calling attention to

---

\* In his interesting book Le Meilleur Combat [The Best Battle], Omar Ouzegane explains the motives that led him to break with the Algerian Communist party and to join the nationalists of the Front de Libération Nationale.



himself during the summer of 1965 through several spectacular declarations sharply attacking the feudalists and big landowners.

This year in April and May feelings ran high in Algeria when first the trade unionists and then the students denounced the restoration of land in the self-managed sector of agriculture, particularly in the Orléansville region, to some private owners, former collaborators with the French. The opposition was such that Boumedienne was obliged to return the land to the self-management committees.

And the main slogan at the 1966 May Day celebration was the struggle to defend the gains of the Revolution and to safeguard self-management.

But in other regions, in Oranie, particularly in the Sidi Bel-Abbès and Mohammedia areas, some land was returned to private ownership.

The liquidation of self-management had begun. In the absence of a popular reaction it was not widely known and the government took a "hands off" attitude.

Under pretext of doing justice to the former moudjahidines [fighters] who were not satisfied upon returning to civilian life, land held by self-management committees was taken for conversion into "cooperatives" headed by a committee of former moudjahidines.

But these former fighters who want to take over millions of hectares of good land are small proprietors in the bud. Their move is a camouflaged way of strengthening the private sector at the expense of the nationalized sector.

The government is conducting a propaganda campaign for the "agrarian revolution" and swears that self-management will remain a fundamental principle of the Revolution; but in practice what is being born in Algeria is an agrarian counterreform.

The ministerial regroupment and the reorganization of the functions of the Ministry of Agriculture parallel the recent projects to "enrich" the texts on self-management.

The responsibilities of the Ministry of Agriculture have been limited to the level of production. All prerogatives have been taken away in such matters as the industrial transformation of agricultural products (oil presses, cooperatives handling fruits, vegetables, fruit juices, jams, etc.), marketing of agricultural products and training of cadres in agriculture. Thus the possibility has been eliminated for agricultural workers and self-management committees to constitute a united bloc against the capitalist circles and the private sector and to control all the stages of the circuit of production, transformation and marketing of products.

Thus self-management has been dislocated!

In addition, the projects for decentralization and for increasing the power of the basic economic units (farms and plants) are turning the latter over to the free play of the market economy.

The recently created National Bank of Algeria now has the right to look over the accounts of the existing self-management committees and, if it considers them to be running a deficit, to cut off all finances to a self-managed enterprise.

To nibble away, dismantle, smother self-management -- this is the policy in practice of those who claim to be applying the principles of the March Decrees in an efficient way.

#### UNDERSTATEMENT OF THE WEEK

"World opinion has never shared the enthusiasm of the White House and State Department for Premier Ky." -- From an editorial in the October 20 New York Times.

FIDEL CASTRO ON MORAL INCENTIVES IN CUBAN REVOLUTION

[The following extracts are from a speech given by Fidel Castro September 28 on the sixth anniversary of the creation of the Committees for the Defense of the Revolution.]

\* \* \*

There is something that distinguishes revolutionaries from nonrevolutionaries, and that is their attitude toward the future, their attitude toward the great goals and the great objectives to be achieved. I will say that anyone who does not have an attitude of combat, of confidence in the revolution and its strength, of confidence in the people and their enormous capacity for struggle, work and creativity, will never be a revolutionary. (Applause.)

(Shouts from the audience: "Shake the tree, Fidel. We still have a few rotten oranges left.")

Some remain, some remain. But we must be able to recognize the "rotten oranges." (Applause.)

(A comment from the audience.)

Who says he's unemployed?

I was saying that it is man's attitude before obstacles and difficulties, his attitude toward effort, that serves as a yardstick to gauge the mettle of a revolutionary. The optimistic, revolutionary ideas that we defend will no doubt be challenged by calculating critics, by those whose attitude toward life is entirely metaphysical, who add and subtract, but come out wrong on the total -- which is the sum of willpower, courage and determination. (Applause.) It is the sum total of the moral factors with which the peoples have always undertaken -- and accomplished -- the great tasks in the history of mankind. (Applause.)

Those who resign themselves to a minimum effort will always take fright, be intimidated. When there is talk of great tasks, great projects and great goals, when there is talk of giving something to the people, these weak-hearted men will never be able to give the peoples anything but small advantages, small successes. They take fright simply because they are unable to comprehend what the people are capable of doing. They simply are frightened by the huge task of organization required, by the enormous push that the work of organization requires, by the enormous push that the work of the revolution demands. These puny men remind us of those who, in the past, faced by the struggle required to attain the extremely difficult goal of overthrowing that system of exploitation and tyranny, said that it was impossible and that it was only a dream of adventurers and madmen.

There are often some who vacillate when faced by great tasks, but among the vacillators we will find the first opportunists. (Applause.)

We have not the slightest doubt that with the effort made by the people, with the effort we have been making and are making today, with the ever greater effort that we must make in the coming year, the people, with its strength and with its sweat, will be capable of creating riches incomparably superior to whatever financial implications may be involved in the fact that the people stop paying rent in 1970. With the other criterion we would never have arrived at any rent cut, and one of the first things the revolution did was to reduce rents -- in many cases as much as fifty percent.

Everyone is familiar with the anguish, the bitterness and the feeling of insecurity that existed under the former system, the suffering of having to pay rent -- in many cases as much as half the salary earned -- for a small house or a small apartment. Everyone remembers the common dream: to one day have a home of one's own. We all remember those commercial firms that, in order to sell soap or newspapers, raffled off a small house each month; and how many in the country and in the cities saved those soap coupons or newspaper coupons in the hope that, as one out of every thousand, or one out of every million, he would be lucky enough to win a house.

A "financier," a pure economist, a metaphysician of revolutions would have said,

"Careful! Rents shouldn't be lowered one cent. Think of it from a financial standpoint. Think of the pesos involved."

Such persons have peso signs in their heads and hearts. (Applause.) But if we want a people who remove the peso sign from their minds, who remove the peso sign from their hearts, we must have men who have gotten rid of their own mental peso signs.

Those persons would have said, "No." And they would have added up accounts.

We could have asked them then, "For what reason do you ask the people to make a revolution? By chance for purely metaphysical reasons? For what reason are you going to ask the people to struggle and even die in defense of the revolution?"

Could we expect the people to believe, to be simple a priori believers in all of that? Or was it necessary, in the first place, to demonstrate that the revolution was on the side of the people, that the revolution was against the interests of the rich, that the revolution was against the interests of the exploiters, that the revolution, with no hesitation whatsoever, sacrificed and hurt the interests of the privileged minorities for the sake of the interests of the people?

There wouldn't have been even one law in the name of those principles. They would have proposed to go on charging the farmers rent. In the name of the same principles they would have continued to charge the farmers interest on loans. They would have charged for medical and hospital care. They would have charged school fees. They would have charged for the boarding schools that are now completely free -- all in the name of a metaphysical approach to life.

They would never have had the people's enthusiasm, the masses' enthusiasm, which is the prime factor, the basic factor for a people to advance, for a people to build, for a people to be able to develop. And that enthusiasm on the part of the people, that support for the revolution is something that can be measured in terms incomparably superior to the adding and subtracting of the metaphysicians.

Of course the revolution was unable to give the people all that they needed. The people could not be given what the revolution did not have to give. But the revolution did give the people all that it could. The revolution has sought to give the people all that it had to give. It has sought, above all, to create confidence among the people and a sense of security in their own future.

We have spoken in the name of socialism, we have spoken in the name of communism, but we will never create socialist consciousness and much less communist consciousness with a storekeeper mentality. (Applause.)

We will never create socialist consciousness and communist consciousness with a peso sign in the minds and hearts of the men and women of the people.

And if we ask ourselves the reason for the attitude of the people in all parts of the country -- in the cities and in the rural areas, in the loneliest mountain -- the reason for their firmness in support of the revolution, it is because the revolution has created confidence and a sense of security among the people. It has created the conviction that everything may be accomplished by work and struggle.

It is not because the revolution has filled all the material needs of the people. No. But a great part of the moral needs of this people have been filled by the revolution.

Many people wonder why there's such enthusiasm among the masses; why such reactions arise in individuals everywhere. And there's something that can't be calculated mathematically simply by multiplying and dividing, by adding and subtracting, and that's the moral benefits that the revolution has meant for the people, what feeling for the first time like human beings, like men and women in the fullest sense of the word has meant for every man and woman in this country, what it has meant for millions of men and women in this country -- what it has meant to cease being nothing in order to become something. For in that old society where just a handful were everything, millions of human beings were nothing; millions of human beings didn't count for anything. (Prolonged applause.)

Was there any hope for the family in the face of illness, death, unemployment, poverty? None. If someone got sick, what was to happen to the family? In the case of

a farmer with eight or ten children who was struck down by illness, what was to happen to his family? If he were to die, what was to happen to his wife and children? If he were out of work, what was to happen to his wife and children? If he had a house but didn't have money at the end of the month, what was to happen to his meager furniture? What was to happen to his relatives? What hope did he have that his children would have a better life? None. Was there any hope of learning to read and write? None. Was there any hope that his children would reach the sixth grade? None. That they would reach an institute? None. Or a university? Out of the question. (Applause.) And today throughout the length and breadth of the land there's not one father, there's not one mother who doesn't feel justified, confident in saying, "Which one is going to study such and such? The other one is going to study something else." And they say it with absolute confidence.

There's not one family, one farmer, one single worker, one common man, in our country that doesn't feel that security in the face of death, accidents, illness, in the face of anything. And all this has been creating in our citizens a sense of their own worth. This has been creating in them a sense of their own dignity.

Today in the rural areas of our country, you no longer see pairs of rural guards with their machetes, with their big horses. No, you no longer see a single man or woman in the countryside who sees power as a thing apart, authority as a thing apart, the state as a thing apart. For today these men and women are the authority. They are the ones who have the weapons in their hands -- more and better weapons than those rural guards had. Today they are the power. But not just in words or in theory, but in fact, in reality. There's no farmer, regardless of age, who doesn't have his weapon there in his company or in his battalion. There's no farmer who doesn't have there the means for defending his rights, for defending his revolution. And this has created a moral fortitude in the men and women of this country, a moral fortitude that cannot be measured in terms of numerals. For those are the things that have made the people mobilize to carry out every task, to answer every appeal of the revolution, of any kind whatsoever.

This shows how men are capable of responding conscientiously, how men are capable of responding to moral factors. The people have received many material benefits, but they have also received great moral benefits. I am sure that if many simple people of this country were to be asked, "What are you most grateful to the revolution for? Your low rent? Your steady job? What are you most grateful to the revolution for? The material benefits you've received or the moral benefits that you've received?" I'm sure that many, perhaps the great majority, would say, "What I'm most grateful to the revolution for, and the reason I'm willing to die for the revolution, is that since the revolution, I've felt like a human being. I've felt like a man of dignity. I've felt that I amount to something among my people, that I am somebody in my country. I've felt as I never felt in the past."

And we have to encourage these feelings of social worth in our people. We have to encourage these moral factors in the people, besides making an effort to satisfy their material needs.

We are making a revolution, but we're only halfway along the road in that revolution. We've advanced a great deal since the first day of this revolution. People have divided into revolutionaries and reactionaries, depending on whether they hung on to the past or looked toward the future. And the people kept moving ahead, kept growing in awareness, kept raising their political level.

Difficult struggles have to be waged against reactionary ideas. And we've been moving forward from that stage.

But we have new stages before us. And once more, we will find reactionary ideas in our way, ideas that might have been revolutionary tens years ago, yet can be perfectly reactionary today. The ideological positions of yesterday may not be sufficiently advanced when confronted with the ideological positions of today. Today we see beyond them; we are not satisfied with drops in the bucket; we are not satisfied with a revolution by halves. We believe in the people. We believe in man. (Applause.)

And these things that the revolution does, these ideas in relation to housing, medical services, education, in relation to everything that is given the people -- without the need for payment, without the need for a peso sign in the hand and bills in the pocket -- tend to gradually create a more advanced social consciousness in the people, tend to create different property values in the people, a different regard

for material possessions, a different regard for man's work.

We do not believe in utopia. We do not believe that this can be done overnight. We do not believe that this consciousness can be developed in just a few years, but we do believe that it will never be created if we do not struggle unceasingly, if we do not advance incessantly on this path.

We wish to call ourselves revolutionaries, but the term "revolutionary" encompasses more and more; each day it has new facets. Dialectics should also be applied to the conception of a revolutionary. We cannot call ourselves revolutionaries if we do not truly and consistently aspire to a better society.

And not a few things conspire against the struggle of the peoples, the struggle of men to attain a superior organization of society.

We have not the slightest doubt that everything that is being done is superior to the past. We have no doubt that all the possibilities that have been developed, that all the rights that the people have been receiving, and all the benefits obtained, are superior to what existed in the past. But we cannot be satisfied.

Of course, it is far easier to appeal to the selfish interests of men than to appeal to their feelings of solidarity, to their feelings of generosity; and, clearly, many things can still be solved with money. Clearly, even now, a factory can "hijack" workers from another factory, by offering money. With higher wages, any work center can lure workers from another center in what is truly a piratical action.

In the reality of matters as they stand, many men and women -- for a series of reasons, economic, social, or from lack of conscience -- still cannot bring themselves to turn down the opportunity to receive something more for themselves. But those who wish to solve problems by appealing to personal selfishness, by appealing to individual effort, forgetful of society, are acting in a reactionary manner, conspiring, although inspired by the best intentions in the world, against the possibilities of creating a truly socialist spirit, a truly communist spirit in the people. He will be conspiring against the effort to create an awareness in the people of the possibility of a way of life in which men, acting and working in unison, will be able to give each individual member of society much more than he could ever attain on a solitary path, left to his own resources.

There are always those who pander to the selfishness of others. But those of us who call ourselves revolutionaries should never relax the fight against such individualist tendencies. We must always encourage the generosity and solidarity of the men and women of our nation. (Applause.)

Those who believe that in every Cuban there is a potential "Sancho Panza" forget the lesson that the revolution has taught us -- that among the people there are many more "Quijotes" than "Panzas." (Applause.) They forget what the revolution has taught us about our people.

And as for those who never believed in the people, who had no faith in them in the past, how can we expect them to believe in the people today, or to begin believing in the future? Those who have no faith in the moral virtues of the peoples of the world can never be leaders, can never lead a people forward. For man does not live by bread alone.

And if we recall those moments in the past that were difficult and perilous for us, we must also recall the people's attitudes. It was clear on those occasions that the people were prepared to die rather than surrender. To die before giving up. (Applause.) And willingness to die rather than surrender signifies that a human being is motivated by much more than mere biological instincts; that a human being is motivated by something higher than simple "animal appetites."

And those who think that man is more animal than human are offending the memory of those who in every epoch of Cuban history have taught us what a human being really is. They offend the memory of the countless heroic men who have fought for this country, from the time of the war of 1868 -- whose centennial we will soon celebrate -- when tens of thousands of Cubans went forth to the battlefields. They offend the memory of the many revolutionary combatants who have given their lives for this country. (Prolonged applause.)

Consider those who fought in the difficult days of our own revolutionary struggle (the times we know best, since we experienced them); those in the cities who risked their lives daily during those difficult days, ruthlessly persecuted; those in the mountains, sweaty and hungry, their clothing tattered, weighed down by heavy packs, who marched day after day, month after month, and year after year to fight and to die. What were their motivations? Were "animal appetites" by chance behind their struggles? Were they motivated by selfish instincts? Or did an idea, a cause, a moral factor lie behind that strength, that capacity for finding followers, that quality which was able to arouse a whole people when the day arrived?

And when we are asked how we won the war, we can answer like Ignacio Agramonte: "With pride, with honor, with morality." (Prolonged applause.)

And these factors are the ones which mobilize our people today throughout the entire nation. They will enable us to win today's battles and to reach tomorrow's goals.

The number reckoners will find that such factors, which they have never taken into account, have more force than all their calculations, more force than all their figures. The number reckoners -- and there are those who act in good faith and those who do not -- must also one day recognize this reality; for our people are on the march, our people are advancing.

We may not reach every goal now, nor tomorrow, but we are getting nearer and nearer to the time when the facts will show exactly what our people are capable of producing even though faced with difficulties which the imperialist enemy forces upon us; even though faced with difficulties which underdevelopment bequeathed us, such as the widespread illiteracy and great ignorance that existed in our country; even though faced with any number of adverse conditions, any number of reverses stemming from our enemy or from nature itself.

\* \* \*

Great tasks confront us, but I can assure you that there is enthusiasm for these tasks. I can assure you because I have seen it; I have encountered enormous enthusiasm for these tasks throughout the length and breadth of the country. And that must be our attitude. Ours as well as yours.

Whenever you hear someone say, "I don't know," look upon him with suspicion. Whenever you hear someone say, "I cannot," look upon him with suspicion. Whenever you hear someone say, "It is too much," look upon him with reservations; because what we all have to say is:

"Yes, we can do it. And whatever we don't know, we'll learn." (Applause.)

We must say that nothing is too much for us. Experience has taught us that whenever we think we are doing too much, we can still do a little more. Many past experiences have shown us that when we have said, "This far," reality has proved that we can go much further.

And that is the only revolutionary attitude. And the revolutionary, by his character, influences events. The nonrevolutionary, the resigned, the conformist, the defeatist, plans ahead for ten or fifteen years. But not all are like him.

Why ten years if it can be accomplished in three? If we can solve many, many problems within three years, why take ten? That is the right attitude -- a fighting attitude, a challenging attitude towards obstacles, towards the tasks to be fulfilled.

And this type of man is coming to the fore everywhere. Some of our comrades have great ability for choosing cadres. And already we find here and there what they call the "little cadres," many of them young men with a tremendous -- tremendous -- determination to face problems and solve them, men who never stand still. And this is the type of man we must promote.

Sometimes we find people who are good, refined, decent, and who don't want to hurt anybody. Well...I'm not saying this is wrong, a man should not be cruel; an administrator, a man with responsibilities, must not be cruel. Of course he must find it painful to hurt anyone. I agree we must feel sorry for individuals, but we must feel sorrier for the people. (Applause.) We must feel sorrier for the people.

What is one to do? Nobody enjoys having to replace a man in a job; it is always a painful thing to do. Nothing is more painful or unpleasant but a man must be told, "You are not doing a good job; you must be replaced."

Because very few people recognize the truth, very few. Out of every ten persons you may meet one who will say, "That is true."

How difficult it is for man to maintain a spirit of self-criticism and really understand when he is doing things wrong and, in general, it is necessary to replace people who are functioning badly, even when they really think they are doing well. And this is painful. But we are not revolutionaries if we do not know how to overcome our reluctance when faced with embarrassment that must be suffered; because, in its essence, it is a cowardly attitude. It is painful to have to tell someone, "You are not working properly, you will have to be replaced."

And it is absolutely necessary, comrades; it is the duty of the revolution to promote all who work well. By promoting all who work well, I do not mean that everyone is to be replaced, because there will always be twenty to say, "This one is no good." And quite often it is the one who is least useful who says that no one else is any good. We should not compromise, but we must have the good sense to be able to evaluate work done and to select capable cadres who can carry forward this militant, aggressive, dynamic policy, people who are tireless, indefatigable, who, at any time, day or night, are ready and willing to face problems. (Applause.)

And, fortunately, we already have a number of comrades of this type: serious responsible, constant workers. Ah, but we must carry this policy to the last furthest corner of the country, promoting the most capable. Society requires that the most capable be placed in charge of all tasks. This is what society needs and this is what the revolution needs (applause) so that they may respond to this style, so that they may respond to this drive. Because this thing is growing every day; it is becoming stronger every day; it is becoming more devastating every day.

Men who are tired cannot follow this rhythm. Those who lack enthusiasm, who are lukewarm or cowardly, cannot follow this pace. The revolution causes considerable wear and tear. There are what may be termed people who are "worn out." Some say, "This one has burnt himself out." Another will remark, "This one has fizzled out." And there are others who have simply exhausted their capacity.

Well, the revolution can retire anyone. What is more, the revolution can offer generous retirement to any revolutionary who has become tired. It is better to have a retired revolutionary than a tired man trying to act like a revolutionary. (Applause.)

And the truth is that we should be very clear about this. If someone is tired, let him retire; but he must not be permitted to become a brake, an obstacle, a hindrance. There is much to be done, and this is work for revolutionaries. (Applause.) It is not enough to have been a revolutionary yesterday; we must know how to be revolutionaries today. (Applause.) And how to be revolutionaries tomorrow. (Applause.) And it is even possible to be revolutionary merely by not being an obstacle.

Let the new cadres come forward. Let there be room for the new generation of men.

Promote the most capable. Let no one cling to honors, to responsible posts, for this has always proved to be very costly to the peoples. Let new generations come, better than we. (Applause.) Let new generations come, more apt than we, and we shall gladly hand them the vanguard posts. But what we will never do is stop being revolutionaries. (Applause.) We will never be content with half a revolution. (Applause.) We will never resign ourselves to the minimum, but will always demand the maximum. (Applause.) We will never stop halfway along the road.

We believe that we have the right to call ourselves revolutionaries, but we will not have this right the day that we abandon the march forward.

The conformists may be satisfied with the minimum; we seek the maximum.

The revolution moves forward; but it has scarcely begun. The work of the revolution has scarcely begun. But our people will have the historic right to call themselves revolutionary. History will give them this right because they won't be satis-

fied with the minimum, but will fight for the maximum. They will fight to advance as far as possible. Of that, we are absolutely confident.

Our confidence in the people didn't arise today, when the people have more than proven what they are capable of, when they have more than proven that we were not mistaken. Before any of this had happened, before a rally like this -- and like all the others that have been held in the Plaza de la Revolución -- had ever taken place here, we believed in the people, we trusted the people, we knew the people. And we know that we can ask anything of our people. We know that they will go as far as any people can go, and that they are as revolutionary as any people can be. Our people will make their revolution. Their revolution (applause) which is also our revolution, our road. This does not mean that we disparage the experiences of others. That we underestimate the merits of any other people. But we have deep convictions about what we have, and what we must do. And the only revolutionary thing to do is to make our revolution. (Applause.)

There are servile spirits. There are people here who become offended when we say, "Make our revolution." They become offended when we say that the people will make their revolution. (Applause.) They consider it a kind of sin, a kind of Marxist-Leninist sacrilege.

But we won't waste time on such elaborate discussions, because we'll be making our revolution, because it's a law of universal history and it's a law of our history.

And those who don't want us to make our revolution will share the fate of all pseudorevolutionaries or counterrevolutionaries or reactionaries. Because some of those submissive, servile, tamed spirits get together to make the same criticism of the revolution as those made by the counterrevolutionaries. They use the same arguments against the revolution as those used by the counterrevolutionaries. There was a saying in Rome that "There is only one step from the capitol to the Tarpeian rock." Of course, we don't need any Tarpeian rock, because any little stream of water will carry away the rubbish. That is, the rubbish exists -- let's call a spade a spade -- but it will meet the same fate as the backsliders and the pseudorevolutionaries and even -- if they go too far -- the same fate as the counterrevolutionaries. (Applause.) We'll make our Marxist-Leninist revolution (applause), our socialist, our communist revolution. (Prolonged applause.) We don't say we'll reach socialism, but rather, via the path of socialism, we'll reach communism. (Prolonged applause.) And we'll reach communism by the road of Marxism-Leninism. (Applause.) We'll reach communism through a revolutionary and scientific interpretation of reality. We won't reach communism by the road of capitalism; because nobody will ever reach communism by following the road of capitalism. (Applause.) Nor will we always take the easiest road. Sometimes we'll take the hardest roads. We won't sacrifice our aspirations to reach communism by looking for the easy way. As builders of a new society, we know that any construction is difficult, especially when it has to be erected on the debris of a still recent past.

We know that any historic work, any work of historical creation, is difficult. We know that it is a steep climb. That the going is hard on the way up. And we shall head for the highest peak, along difficult paths; not always looking for the easy way, because at times the easy way leads to failure.

We shall march forward, fighting all the way, because without fighting nothing is achieved, nothing is created. We shall march forward making great efforts, because without effort no goal is reached. With effort we have come this far, and with effort we shall go much farther. And we shall arrive with energy, with enthusiasm, with fervor, with security, with confidence, with the same confidence as yesterday, as in the very first years of the revolution, because if we had faith then, we have much more reason for faith today. We shall go forward with the people, with the masses, with their revolutionary vanguard, with their party in the vanguard (applause), with the best, the most resolute, the most capable, the most revolutionary. And the question of deciding who is the most revolutionary will not be up to us; it will be left to the people to say, the people, always. (Applause.)

And the decision of the people will be based on deeds and not on words, and the people will decide because only they can judge. Only the people will be capable of taking that step, of carrying forward this work.