

a labor press service

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. 41

December 23, 1966

<u>In this issue</u>	<u>Page</u>
The Bombing of Hanoi	1
Widening Campaign for Hugo Blanco	3
Jean-Paul Sartre's Plea for Hugo Blanco	4
The Letter Hugo Blanco's Comrades Sent to the Supreme Council	5
Glasgow Trades Council Demands Release of Hugo Blanco	5
Debate on Vietnam:	
"La Gauche," the USSR and Vietnam -- by Jean-Marie Chauvier	6
Defend Peace by Defending Vietnam and China! -- by Ernest Mandel	7
In Rebuttal -- by Ernest Mandel	9
Canadian Socialists Campaign Against War in Vietnam	11
The Student Elections in Chile -- by José Valdés	12
Polish Intellectuals Agitated by Kolakowski's Expulsion -- by George Novack	13
Business Week's Blueprint and Wilson's White Paper -- by Dick Roberts	15
Green Berets Reported in Guatemala	17
Documents:	
The SLL Calls the Cops in Ernest Tate Case	18
Text of SWP Letter to Pierre Lambert	22
Text of SWP Letter to Tim Wohlforth	22
Text of SWP Letter to James Robertson	22
YSA Appeals to Young Socialists and Révoltes Group	23
Che Guevara "Alive and Well," Declares Fidel Castro	24

THE BOMBING OF HANOI

Last October, just before the elections in the United States, President Johnson went on a "barnstorming" tour of the Far East that culminated in a "summit conference" with Washington's satellite and puppet powers at Manila where a "peace package" was offered to Hanoi. As was widely concluded at the time, Johnson's "peace offensive" constituted nothing but campaign propaganda to help grease the way for candidates of the Democratic party. It was also predicted that the "peace package" would prove to be nothing but part of the diplomatic preparation for opening a new stage in the escalation of the war in Vietnam.

The accuracy of the forecast has now been confirmed. On December 13 and 14, the Pentagon began bombing Hanoi. This took the war another big stride toward a confrontation with China and still further increased the possibility of the present conflict ending in a nuclear catastrophe.

In accordance with the standard practice of the U.S. government, this ominous advance toward the brink of a world disaster was taken under cover of a smokescreen of evasions, half truths and calculated lies.

In Saigon, U.S. military headquarters coolly denied that any bombs had fallen in

Reba Hansen, Business Manager,

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

New York, N.Y. 10010

WORLD OUTLOOK specializes in weekly political analysis and interpretation of events for labor, socialist, colonial independence and Negro freedom publications. Signed articles represent the views of the authors, which may not necessarily coincide with those of WORLD OUTLOOK. Unsigned material expresses, insofar as editorial opinion may appear, the standpoint of revolutionary Marxism. To subscribe for 26 issues send \$7.50 or £2/15s. or 37.50 francs to: Reba Hansen, Business Manager, P. O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station, New York, N. Y. 10010.

Hanoi in the raids on that "area." According to a special announcement December 16 from the headquarters of Gen. William C. Westmoreland, the U.S. commander in Vietnam, "A complete review of pilot reports and photographs of the 13-14 December air strikes on the Vandien truck depot and the Yenvien railroad classification yard showed that all ordnance expended by U.S. strike aircraft was in the military target areas. None fell in the city of Hanoi."

The State Department sought to give its lies more of a diplomatic veneer at a press conference held in Washington December 14. Robert J. McCloskey, the official spokesman, presented it as a matter of semantics. Only "military targets" had been hit, he claimed. Were these targets "located within the city limits of Hanoi?" he was asked. "I don't know what the city limits are," he responded.

At first he put up a show of ignorance as to the "city limits" of Hanoi. Asked directly, "Have we bombed Hanoi?" he tried a new tack: "We have not. What do you mean by 'Hanoi'?"

Other spokesmen told newsmen that the "problem" lay in the terminology used by the military planners. When they designate "Hanoi," they mean "a specific point near the geographical heart of the city." Anything outside that "specific point" would not be "Hanoi."

On December 15 spokesmen for the Johnson administration began defending the bombings, producing maps drawn up, apparently by the "military planners," showing that the air strikes were not in "Hanoi."

The New York Times reported another version; i.e., that perhaps a "mistake" had been made by American pilots in flying over the city en route to the designated "military" targets, and that this resulted in "damage" to civilian areas.

Perhaps the most cynical bit of propaganda was the "speculation" by "military men" in Saigon that the "damage to civilian areas of metropolitan Hanoi had been caused by anti-aircraft fire and surface-to-air missiles fired by the North Vietnamese as shells fell back to earth."

In line with the Christmas season, this explanation ought to have been supplemented with the news that the planes were clearly marked "Peace on earth, good will to men" and were loaded with gifts and goodies for the children of north Vietnam.

For reliable reports on what happened it was necessary to turn to other sources. The headline in the December 15 issue of the Paris daily Le Monde stated: "For the first time -- American planes bombed the city of Hanoi -- More than a hundred victims reported." Le Monde stated that "the longest and most murderous raid" occurred December 14 and that it lasted for "an hour over the capital and its suburbs."

Le Monde ridiculed the "explanations" offered by Washington. Perhaps the U.S. pilots had made a mistake? "A scarcely satisfying explanation. The Red River is large enough and visible enough so that it is impossible to confuse the right and left banks."

Antonello Trombadori, the Hanoi correspondent of the Italian Communist daily Unità, gave the following eyewitness account of the December 13 "less murderous" raid:

"At 11 A.M. local time the criminal American aggressors carried out an atrocious terrorist bombardment on the center of Hanoi, hitting deliberately two quarters inhabited by 500 workers' families. It was massacre of which it is not yet possible to give the exact dimensions.

"The quarters attacked are no farther than 400 meters from the historic center of the city and from our hotel. We are, thus, eyewitnesses of the criminal raid. There participated in it six large planes, which for half an hour loosed heavy caliber bombs, incendiaries and napalm. Exact figures are still lacking, but one can say without doubt that this new crime, coldly planned and carried out, constitutes a new qualitative rise in escalation."

Confirmation of the accuracy of this Communist account is provided in a cautiously written article in the December 17 New York Times by Hanson W. Baldwin, the well-known military expert. He indicates that "recently" such raids were approved by "higher authority."

"The trend is expected to continue," he declares, "and targets hitherto immune to bombing or naval gunfire will probably be struck in the future though without prior announcement and with no public emphasis."

WIDENING CAMPAIGN FOR HUGO BLANCO

In Lima the press, radio and television have sought to remain completely silent about Hugo Blanco. In order to break through this conspiracy, a crowd of women blocked traffic directly in front of the Channel 5 television station on Arequipa Avenue.

The demonstration was a big success, the narrow street being so completely choked with automobiles that nothing could get through for some time.

The demonstration won a report on Channel 5, but the newspapers remained silent.

* * *

A group of women succeeded in visiting Hugo Blanco in El Frontón on the occasion of his birthday. They brought food and presents for him. They also brought guitars and serenaded him. The inmates in the prison were reported to have been deeply moved by the demonstration.

* * *

At the huge meeting held in Paris November 28 against the war in Vietnam, where Jean-Paul Sartre called for solidarity with Hugo Blanco, a stand was set up to publicize the case. Some 8,000 leaflets were distributed to the crowd by French and Latin-American militants. A huge banner read: "HUGO BLANCO NE DOIT PAS MOURIR!" [Hugo Blanco Must Not Die!]. Folders on the case were issued at the stand and signatures were collected on petitions asking President Belaúnde to issue an amnesty for Hugo Blanco.

* * *

In Paris, the architect Niemeyer sent a telegram together with 30 other architects asking amnesty for Hugo Blanco.

* * *

Ten Latin-Americans working at UNESCO sent a telegram to President Belaúnde appealing to him to act in behalf of Hugo Blanco.

* * *

In Greece, representatives of the United Union tendency, the newspaper O Logos Mas [Our Word], Marxistiko Deltio [Marxist Bulletin], the magazine The Intellectual, the Committee for Peace and the Committee for Aid to the People of Vietnam sent a letter November 10 to Belaúnde Terry, the president of Peru, demanding an amnesty for Hugo Blanco and his comrades. The letter was signed by a number of professors, intellectuals, students, union members and workers.

* * *

On November 28, seventy Peruvian citizens living in Paris cabled President Belaúnde to grant Hugo Blanco an amnesty. A similar telegram was sent the following day by thirty-two Latin-American artists, writers and poets living in Paris. Telegrams were likewise sent by the French Committee for Solidarity with the Peoples of Latin America, the French Committee for Solidarity with the Victims of Repression in Peru, and the International League for the Rights of Man.

* * *

Among the political prisoners staging a hunger strike in Peru in behalf of Hugo Blanco are five guerrilla leaders: Alfonso Arata, Arturo Aranda, Héctor Béjar, Ricardo Gadea (Che Guevara's former brother-in-law), and Dante de la Cruz.

* * *

In Sweden, the government scheduled a ceremony at the university town of Upsala where a royal princess was to officiate in granting \$75,000 to build a school in Peru. But because of the widespread agitation in behalf of Hugo Blanco, the Peruvian ambassador was afraid to show up for the check. He sent an underling. This unfortunate person was met by a huge street demonstration carrying banners that read "Freedom for Hugo Blanco!" The students shouted "fascist" at the Peruvian diplomat. The newspapers published candid photographs of the unlucky princess. She was on the run, with students close behind, shouting in favor of Hugo Blanco.

JEAN-PAUL SARTRE'S PLEA FOR HUGO BLANCO

Jean-Paul Sartre, the main speaker at the huge meeting sponsored by the War Crimes Tribunal in Paris November 28 [see World Outlook December 16] against the escalating war in Vietnam, went out of his way to express solidarity with Hugo Blanco, who is threatened with the death sentence. The following is the text of Sartre's remarks on this point:

"The struggle of the Vietnamese people is the main combat being carried on today against American imperialism. It is not the only one. In Peru, the former student and great peasant leader, Hugo Blanco, is threatened with being shot any day.

"His crime: to have unionized the most poverty-stricken rural area of the country for the first time. Unionized and educated, the peasants began to recuperate the land which the big landowners had stolen from them; and began demanding a better standard of living. Their movement ran up against the 'democracy' of the military -- violence.

"Hundreds of peasants were massacred, and, in the struggle, three policemen were killed. It is for the death of these puppets that Blanco must now 'pay.'

"Imprisoned in 1963, tried in September 1966, condemned to 25 years in prison by a military tribunal, the judgment is being reconsidered right now. A month after the meeting of the heads of the inter-American armies in Buenos Aires -- the armed forces seek his death.

"Hugo Blanco was not an armed combatant -- his movement was purely unionist. He should not have been tried by a military court but by a civilian tribunal. He sought economic development and human advancement for the most poverty-stricken workers in the world. He does not merit death.

"The sentence demanded against Hugo Blanco (and the comrades imprisoned with him who have asked to share his fate) would constitute a series of judicial murders perpetrated against the peasants' and workers' union leaders, and threatens all Peruvians who seek a genuine change in their country."



SOME of Hugo Blanco's codefendants at the trial in Tacna, Peru, in September. Second from right is Tiburcio Bolaños. A landowner, after raping Bolaños' wife and daughter, tried to have the humble peasant imprisoned. Bolaños went to Hugo Blanco for help. This was the beginning of the specific series of events that led to the death of three policemen, the eventual arrest of Hugo Blanco, his trial and condemnation to 25 years in prison. When Hugo Blanco appealed the savage sentence, the prosecution demanded the death penalty. This is now being weighed by the Supreme Council of Military Justice. At the end of the Tacna trial, the court freed Bolaños. He had spent three years in prison under brutal conditions waiting to be tried. Bolaños set out for the Cuzco region not knowing whether he still had a home or even if his wife and family were still alive.

THE LETTER HUGO BLANCO'S COMRADES SENT TO THE SUPREME COUNCIL

[World Outlook reported December 9 that seven codefendants of Hugo Blanco, who were given various terms when he was sentenced to 25 years in El Frontón, had sent a letter to the Supreme Council of Military Justice asking to share his fate if he should be sentenced to death. The text of the letter has been translated below. It will be noted that only six signatures appear. It is probable that the seventh, Pedro Candela, who was sentenced to 22 years in El Frontón is held under such conditions that he could not add his name.]

* * *

El Frontón Prison
November 5, 1966

To the Honorable President
of the Supreme Council of Military Justice

We, the undersigned, codefendants of Hugo Blanco Galdós, have learned that the prosecuting attorney Don Vargas Ruiz de Somocurcio has demanded the death penalty against Hugo Blanco. We are addressing you in order to ask -- in case the Council should actually inflict the death sentence against our leader, who is also the leader of all the peasants -- that we likewise be executed because we believe that the responsibility in the happenings that occasioned the trial does not belong to one individual.

We fought with Comrade Hugo Blanco for the national and social liberation, not only of the peasants but of all the exploited classes in general and we want to bear with him the consequences of this historic combat.

In our opinion the demand of the prosecuting attorney and the sinister objective it seeks reflect the sinister vengeance of the "gamonales" [local foremen tied in with the military] whose social base we had begun to undermine in Peru in order to enable the Peruvian peasants -- the base of the country's economic, political and cultural development -- to open a road toward their emancipation.

If this hated handful of privileged persons want to spill our blood in a vain attempt to slow down the inevitable insurrection of the workers of the cities and countryside and of all conscious Peruvians, let them try it.

The time is near when accounts will be settled before revolutionary tribunals of the people.

"Land or death!"

"We will win!"

Gerardo Carpio Molina
José Zuñiga Letona
Lucio Bengolea Torres
Humberto Carazas Moscoso
Aniceto Muñoz Pinares
Emiliano Cernades Ojeda

GLASGOW TRADES COUNCIL DEMANDS RELEASE OF HUGO BLANCO

The December 10 issue of The Newsletter, the weekly organ of the Central Committee of the Socialist Labour League, reported that the Glasgow Trades Council unanimously passed the following emergency motion:

"This meeting demands that the government of Peru immediately release Hugo Blanco, leader of the revolutionary peasant movement in Peru, and his comrades from prison."

The resolution was to be sent to the Peruvian embassy.

The Revolutionary Socialist League had previously conducted a demonstration at the Peruvian consulate in Glasgow in solidarity with Hugo Blanco. A petition was presented to the consulate at the time. [See World Outlook December 9.]

"LA GAUCHE," THE USSR AND VIETNAM

By Jean-Marie Chauvier

[An interesting exchange of opinion took place in Belgium between the socialist weekly La Gauche (The Left) and Le Drapeau Rouge (The Red Flag), the weekly newspaper of the Belgian Communist party, on whether or not the Soviet government is sending sufficient aid to Vietnam.

[The debate began with an article by Jean-Marie Chauvier, the Moscow correspondent of Le Drapeau Rouge, in the September 9 issue of that paper under the title "La Gauche, l'U.R.S.S. et le Vietnam." Ernest Mandel, the editor of La Gauche, responded with an article in the September 24 issue of his paper entitled "Défendre le Vietnam et la Chine, c'est défendre la paix!" This was met with a rejoinder under the signature of Rosine Lewin in the October 1 issue of Le Drapeau Rouge. A rebuttal to this by Ernest Mandel was published in the October 15 issue of La Gauche.

[World Outlook has translated (1) extensive extracts of the article by Jean-Marie Chauvier; (2) Ernest Mandel's reply; and (3) his rebuttal, which includes the arguments made by Rosine Lewin.

[In opening his article, Chauvier attacks the "strategists" who frequent the "Café de Commerce," a well-known coffee house in Brussels, and who would like the Soviet leaders to follow a course as irresponsible as their own. Chauvier then continues:]

* * *

Without doubt the ideas maintained by La Gauche are not of that type.

Our left socialist comrades pose a difficult, agonizing, even crucial problem when they demonstrate to what a high degree the outcome of the Vietnamese conflict will determine the future of the world, its chances for survival, for progress and thus for socialism.

After all, who will deny them the right to express critical observations with regard to Soviet foreign policy when they are formulated in a fraternal tone and without conceding to the sickly obsessions of a certain "left" anti-Sovietism?

However, if the Soviet contribution to the Vietnamese cause is judged by our friends to be insufficient, it should be stated -- and one wishes that they would not continually hide this fact in their analyses -- that the Vietnamese are of a different opinion. Now, aren't they in a particularly good position to judge this?

We will not cite here the numerous statements on the subject made by the North Vietnamese leaders. But it should be stressed that the assistance granted to North Vietnam by the USSR (of which all the forms are probably not known to La Gauche) corresponds to what is required as viewed by the North Vietnamese themselves in line with their own reasoning and needs. The reports which we have previously made dovetail with many others in confirming that not only has the USSR done everything asked for but that some of its offers of help have been declined for the time being by North Vietnam. And this is something that stands out very prominently -- the way the Vietnamese weigh every one of their moves rather than giving way to an impatience which is sometimes imputed to them by a certain press.

We will add that it appears illogical to us to suggest steps or a course of action going "over the heads of the Vietnamese," when it is agreed that whether it involves a counterblow to the aggression or political solutions, it is up to the Vietnamese people, to the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, to determine this in accordance with their sovereignty.

In considering the as yet unexplored areas of aid for Vietnam, it is not possible to overlook the grave responsibilities of the Chinese government. It is no longer necessary to prove the irresponsibility of its attitude which made impossible the constitution of a united socialist front against the aggression. This, perhaps, is the principal source of encouragement to American arrogance.

Finally, however decisive the responsibilities of the Soviet Union are, they must be taken in conjunction with a given international situation. At present one should visualize the bearing of the political atmosphere in the western hemisphere.

We thus come to the key point. The fundamental error in the reasoning of certain

friends in the left appears to us in truth to consist in considering that the outcome of the tragedy in Vietnam depends primarily, if not exclusively, on the USSR.

There is a kind of resignation, of cowardice, in "folding one's arms" and waiting for "the USSR to do something..."

Contrary to this, the domestic currents in the United States, the positions expressed by General de Gaulle together with their political repercussions in Western Europe, show that public opinion in the capitalist countries, their working-class and popular masses, can be of decisive weight in ending the present impasse.

In addition the left in the West could usefully undertake the task of more carefully considering their own responsibilities. The American aggression is imposing on the Vietnamese people an indescribable martyrdom, and this horrible war is charged with danger for all of humanity. It is not yet too late, but it is high time, in concert with the American pacifists, to consider political steps in the West that could lead to the moral and diplomatic isolation of the government of the United States.

Isn't this, in short, the "counterescalation" that is desired?

DEFEND PEACE BY DEFENDING VIETNAM AND CHINA!

By Ernest Mandel

The courteous tone and good faith of the article by Jean-Marie Chauvier confirm the fact that debate is possible today between Communists and left socialists in Belgium. This debate can bring about political clarification. We are far from the insults and sarcasm which l'Humanité has seen fit to pour on those seeking only to engage the French Communist party in a dialogue, and who are its sole potential allies within the French left.

Before proceeding to the heart of the subject, permit us to add that no one, either at La Gauche or among the left socialists in this country, is waiting with folded arms for "the USSR to do something."

Surely Chauvier is not addressing his reproaches about resignation and cowardice to those who, from the first day of the American aggression, called on the Belgian workers to proclaim their disgust and opposition to this dirty war; to the UGS [Union de la Gauche Socialiste], which initiated and, in fraternal unity with the Communist party, carried out the largest street demonstration in Belgium against the Vietnam war; to our comrade, Pierre Le Grève, the only deputy to call publicly, in Parliament, for a victory of the NLF [National Liberation Front]; to our young comrades of the JGS [Jeunes Gardes Socialistes], who are organizing their national demonstration at Liège on October 15 under the main slogan of "Solidarity with the NLF of South Vietnam!"

With this out of the way, we come to the arguments of J.M. Chauvier. And if in this connection we are led to raise our voice somewhat, it is not out of some "anti-Soviet" sentiment or other; on the contrary, it springs from our growing anxiety over the fate of humanity, over the fate of the workers of all countries and of our own in particular, over the fate of all that remains from former and present revolutions, over the fate not only of the Vietnamese revolution, but of China and of the USSR itself.

We are convinced that J.M. Chauvier is wrong in his general evaluation and that many Communist leaders are similarly in error. Here are the principal grounds for our disagreement with his arguments:

(1) Chauvier states that the working class and popular masses of the capitalist countries can be a determining factor in ending the impasse. Agreed. But it is still necessary for this factor to make itself felt. It must be obvious, however, that apart from such platonic activities as collecting signatures and making routine speeches, most of the Communist parties in the capitalist world have done nothing to bring about an effective and productive mobilization of the working class and popular masses against the war in Vietnam.

Marshal Malinovsky recently compared the war in Vietnam to the Spanish civil war. The comparison seems to us to be a pertinent one; we have even advanced it independently. Despite a completely different world context (at that time, reaction and fascism were on the ascendency on a world-wide scale; today, on the contrary, the relationship of forces in the world is favorable to the anticapitalist side), the parallel is a striking-

ing one: on the result of this civil war may depend the world's course of development for many years to come.

But what did the working-class movement do during the period of the Spanish war? Did it cry "Peace in Spain!" or was its cry "Death to fascism!"? Did it devote its efforts toward negotiations, or did it devote them toward the victory of the antifascist camp (it is something else again whether the policy of rebuilding the bourgeois army inside the antifascist camp, the policy of "win the war first, then make the revolution," did not demobilize the masses in Spain itself)? How does it happen that the majority of Communist parties today continue to act as proponents of "peace" and "negotiations" for Vietnam, instead of mobilizing the masses in favor of victory for the National Liberation Front?

In Belgium, the Socialist Confederation of Workers as well as the Communist party are vanguard formations. The difference in slogans is consequently only a difference on the propaganda level. But in France, Italy, India, Japan, Chile, to cite only five such countries, the Communist parties have a great and even predominant influence over the mass of workers. Where are the protest strikes against the Vietnam war? Where are the refusals by longshoremen, railroad workers, truck drivers to transport arms or supplies for the U.S. troops engaged in the Vietnam war?

(2) In fact, the last paragraph of Chauvier's article is in contradiction with the one preceding it. Moreover, he reveals the secret of the political strategy of the Soviet leaders, of the leaders of most of the Communist parties. "The moral and diplomatic isolation of the government of the United States" is their objective. They believe it possible to "end the impasse" by virtue of this isolation. Their policy is one of applying pressure on the bourgeoisie, not that of mobilizing the masses.

In our opinion they are wrong. We hold that American imperialism is already largely "isolated" in Europe (even "Free Belgium" gives only the weakest kind of support to the Vietnam war). And we maintain that American imperialism is none the worse for it.

For in the last analysis, there is a glaring contradiction in a position in which it is claimed, on the one hand, that the American leaders have become insane enough to be capable of launching a nuclear world war, thereby rushing to certain suicide, and on the other hand, that these same madmen are at the very same time especially sensitive to "moral and diplomatic isolation," to the homilies of General de Gaulle and the crocodile tears of the West European bourgeoisie.

(3) J.M. Chauvier appears to seriously underestimate, even to minimize, the immediate stakes in the Vietnam war. These stakes do not consist solely of the survival of the Vietnamese revolution, of the right of the Vietnamese people to self-determination, to set up an economic and social regime of their own choice (which the foul dictatorships of the Ngo Dinh Diems and the Kys prevented them from achieving through any other means than armed insurrection).

It is also the right of all peoples (above all those of the Third World, but not theirs alone!) to choose the regime they want. Johnson (whom the American CP indicated to the voters as the "lesser evil" -- is a reminder necessary?) has proclaimed that American force will stop liberation movements, which he baptizes as "Communist," everywhere in the world. And as a matter of fact, the United States government has, since 1964, stopped popular movements or revolutions in Brazil, the Congo, Santo Domingo, Ghana, Bolivia, Algeria, Indonesia, and so on and on, either by direct intervention or through plots in which it manipulated the strings.

Against this global counterevolutionary strategy, only a global revolutionary strategy can constitute an effective reply. Fidel Castro understood this and proclaimed it at the Tricontinental Conference. Obviously the United States would have to reexamine the situation if it were compelled to conduct three or four "Vietnam wars" at the same time and at three or four different points on the globe. Such objective possibilities are hardly lacking.

But the USSR and most of the Communist parties refuse to admit the soundness of this strategy. They prefer to grant credits of a hundred million dollars to the military dictatorship in Brazil, which is detested by the whole Brazilian population. They continue to play the game of an "alliance with the national bourgeoisie," despite the terrible setbacks of recent years. And the masses are in danger of paying the price for this incorrect policy.

(4) J.M. Chauvier also underestimates the mounting danger to the entire socialist camp, beginning with China, as a result of the Vietnam war. American imperialism, far from acting in a fit of madness, is advancing prudently and with caution, calculating

and observing the reactions of the enemy camp with each step it takes.

First there was the attack in the Gulf of Tonkin during August, 1964; no reaction from Moscow, save some verbal protests. Then came the first bombing of North Vietnam, under pretext of reprisals for an anti-American episode in South Vietnam: again Moscow did not budge. Subsequently, the bombings were repeated on a daily basis, and there was still no Soviet response. Finally, Hanoi and Haiphong are bombed and no counterblow has yet been dealt to the United States.

For our part we are convinced that far from being "irresponsible madmen," the American leaders are accurately calculating the risks. They are increasing the scale of escalation because they are convinced that neither the USSR nor China will intervene directly in the war in Vietnam. Retreat is possible if they are confronted with the dilemma: retreat or perish; for the balance of terror is such that a nuclear war would destroy the United States just as surely as it would the rest of the world.

The danger lies in the fact that the United States, in the belief that the USSR will remain passive, will soon commit an aggression against China. As for us, we are convinced that the USSR cannot remain a passive spectator of such aggression, if for no other reason than that of military self-defense. But the silence of the Soviet government runs the risk of being badly interpreted in Washington and it could wind up by dragging the whole world into war.

We therefore ask the Soviet government to declare, immediately and publicly, that any attack against China would be considered an attack against the Soviet Union. We call upon all Communist leaders and militants to support this request. It is not a declaration of this kind which contains the risk of provoking nuclear war: on the contrary, it is the ABSENCE of such a declaration which can hurl humanity into the nuclear holocaust, by encouraging aggression upto the point where there would be no other way of opposing it save by the use of extreme means.

Like Chauvier, we deplore the refusal of the Chinese leaders to form a socialist united front against the American aggression in Vietnam. Contrary to Chauvier, however, we attribute the principal reason for this refusal to the incomprehensible silence of Moscow at a time when everyone is already openly posing the question: will the Pentagon attack China?

(5) By asserting that a strategy of this kind "would provoke" the imperialists and runs the risk of precipitating nuclear war, Chauvier really puts himself in an impossible position: the only way to beat aggression is to retreat before it! As a matter of fact, haven't we already heard this same tune previously about resistance to aggression being the equivalent of "warmongering"? Where has it brought us?

But more to the point: if all those who are asking the Soviet government for an energetic response to imperialist aggression are "warmongers" then the Soviet leaders themselves have been guilty of similar "warmongering." For didn't they reply in the most energetic terms -- going so far as to threaten to launch rockets against Paris and London, something we do not at all ask of them! -- at the time of the aggression against Egypt and the American landing in Lebanon?

Why is it that what was valid in 1956 and in 1958 is no longer valid in 1966? Why is it that what was valid for nonsocialist countries is no longer valid for socialist countries? In what way has the situation "changed" since 1958?

That is why we are so anxious. That is why we are so fearful about peace. Failing an energetic response, nothing has a chance of stopping imperialism on the road of aggression, for it will believe itself invulnerable and all powerful.

IN REBUTTAL

By Ernest Mandel

The discussion between La Gauche and the editors of Le Drapeau Rouge on the subject of the most effective way to defend Vietnam is continued by Rosine Lewin in the October 1 issue of the weekly Drapeau Rouge in the form of an answer to the article which appeared in La Gauche on September 24, 1966. The editor of Le Drapeau Rouge presents three arguments against us.

"Ernest Mandel," she says, "blames the Communists for attaching too much impor-

tance to action by the popular and democratic masses in the capitalist countries as a method of ending the Vietnamese impasse."

Posed in this way, the question obviously does not coincide with what we wrote. Action by the laboring masses of the imperialist countries would be genuinely useful in Forcing American imperialism to withdraw from Vietnam....provided it was genuinely effective action.

If longshoremen and railroad workers in all the capitalist countries refused to transport American arms, munitions and soldiers to Vietnam; if there were strikes and continuous demonstrations in all the big capitalist countries in support of the Vietnamese revolutionists; if there were tens of thousands of volunteers coming to Vietnam from Japan, Great Britain, France and Italy, to support the struggle of the NLF; if this swelling movement threatened to overthrow the capitalist regime in let us say two or three key countries in the world...then, obviously, the Pentagon, which coldly evaluates the developing situation in terms of power and of social forces in motion, would say to itself that taking everything into consideration, a retreat from the Vietnam wasps' nest would be less costly than continuation of its war of aggression.

But to pose the question in these terms is equivalent to answering it. For it is impossible realistically to foresee any struggles of such scope taking place in the coming months. However, it is precisely in the coming months that imperialism will cross new thresholds in escalating its aggression. It is against this extension of its aggression -- which includes the danger of direct aggression against China -- that the most effective response must be found.

Certainly the struggle to mobilize the laboring masses of Western Europe in behalf of the Vietnamese revolution must be pursued and amplified. We will do it in Belgium, too. But we most seriously doubt that the "pressure" of a de Gaulle, or a petition campaign "for peace," or one kind of diplomatic initiative or another, can possibly be adequate to halt imperialism on its road of aggression.

"How can it [the USSR] fulfill its promise, practically, if Americans and Chinese become militarily engaged tomorrow...? How will the USSR be able to bring aid to China? Not by sending it conventional arms, planes, tanks, soldiers, since Peking refuses all collaboration with the USSR." This is Rosine Lewin's argument against our invitation to the CP to add its voice to ours in appealing to the USSR to solemnly warn the United States that any attack against China would be considered an attack against the Soviet Union itself.

The arguments seem very weak to us. In the first place, it would be ridiculous on our part to try to advise the General Staff of the Soviet army. But no one can convince us that the latter sees no way of responding, in Asia and in the Pacific, to an aggression against China, other than on Chinese territory alone. After all, there are submarines and long-range bombers. There are American troops in a great number of places in Asia. Is a diagram necessary?

Furthermore, why isn't it obvious to Rosine Lewin that such a declaration by the Soviet government would remove the main argument of the Chinese leaders, who are talking about a secret Soviet-American alliance against China? When this commitment will have been honored, the Chinese leaders will not keep on talking this way, for obvious reasons of self-defense. Faced with a materializing American attack, the Chinese leaders would very quickly propose a way of bringing in Soviet aid to China...

But the real question lies elsewhere. The point which we stressed was that the escalation of aggression by imperialism is planned with the utmost care, step by step, and with careful testing at each stage of its adversary's response.

Aggression against China is no more inevitable than is the landing of American troops on the shores of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. It will take place only if Washington believes it can make these moves with impunity.

It is highly probable that a solemn warning by Moscow, backed up by a demonstration in force to show that the Soviet government is serious in its commitment, would prevent an aggression against China and would prevent a new phase in the escalation of American aggression.

The great danger now confronting humanity is that Washington might believe that the USSR would not intervene in a war between the U.S. and China; that it might learn too late that such a hypothesis is without foundation; that this will occur at a time when it will be too deeply committed to be able to withdraw. Under these conditions we would be rushing directly into a world war. To speak up loudly and clearly now means, in

a large measure, to avoid this danger.

Rosine Lewin's final argument: our proposal would place the Soviet Union at the mercy of a provocation -- since it would be compelled to make its response by means of nuclear weapons.

Obviously we have never advanced such a monstrous proposal as to call on the USSR to take the initiative in a nuclear war. We have proposed -- together with Fidel Castro, Jean-Paul Sartre, Bertrand Russell, and many more -- that the USSR should reply to the imperialist escalation with a counterescalation. That is all. The counterescalation must be cut to the measure of the escalation; there can be no question of taking the initiative in using nuclear weapons.

Quite the contrary. Our proposal is, in the last analysis, the sole way of avoiding nuclear war -- by launching a response at a time when aggression can be contained by conventional arms and methods. It is only if the response to aggression is delayed until the moment when imperialism resorts to its final weapons -- until the final phases of escalation -- that we keep on increasing the risks of nuclear war.

Our proposal was not made as a means of "ending the impasse in Vietnam." It was concerned with the defense, in the immediate period, of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the People's Republic of China, threatened by a new American aggression. To guarantee the victory of the revolution in South Vietnam, it would be necessary to amplify the revolutionary struggle in other areas of the globe, so as to compel imperialism to spread its forces thinner and, in the end, to strip its Vietnam front. But this is another controversial subject to which we shall return shortly.

CANADIAN SOCIALISTS CAMPAIGN AGAINST WAR IN VIETNAM

Toronto

While Canada's labor party, the New Democratic party [NDP], has now, according to the latest Gallup poll, the support of 26% of the electorate -- equal to that of the official capitalist opposition party, the Progressive Conservative party -- it is continuing to leave the important arena of municipal politics to the practitioners of the Liberal-Tory shell game.

In the center of its strength in the country, Toronto, it failed to present a slate in the December 5 elections and it is presenting only a partial one in the December 14 elections in Vancouver, British Columbia, where it has been the official provincial opposition for decades.

The Toronto branch of the League for Socialist Action boldly stepped into the gap there by running its organizer Arthur Young for Board of Control. The Young Socialist Forum, Canada's most widely read publication of the student left, entered its editor John Riddell in the Board of Education contest in one of the central wards. Both candidates were backed by the Workers Vanguard, which is edited by Ross Dowson, the executive secretary of the League for Socialist Action.

In Vancouver, Jean Rands, another editor of the Young Socialist Forum was endorsed by the youth magazine and the League for Socialist Action as a candidate for mayor.

In the Toronto contest, Arthur Young polled some 10,000 votes. This compares with 88,036 votes cast for the highest of the four candidates who won. Only 35.4% of the electorate went to the polls. Despite this low turnout, the "Youth for Riddell" campaign generated considerable enthusiasm among students and was endorsed by 7.1% of those who voted.

In Vancouver, the campaign waged by 21-year-old Jean Rands has aroused widespread interest. Her two opponents are both millionaires. The incumbent Mayor Rathie has declared that public housing is "like creeping socialism."

Columnist Bud Elsie of the Vancouver daily Province commented: "It is odd, perhaps, that she is a better speaker than either Mayor Rathie or Alderman Tom Campbell. But it is what she says, not how she says it, that they are more likely to remember."

A similar comment about Arthur Young was made in Toronto by the Globe and Mail which grudgingly admitted that he "delivers in terms of oratorical style some of the best speeches in the present campaign." The Globe and Mail nevertheless joined with the other two dailies and the management of the government-owned Canadian Broadcasting Cor-

poration in blacking out Young's message.

All three candidates centered their campaigns against the war in Vietnam. Arthur Young charged that the inflationary pressures that are causing prices to escalate reflect the escalation of the murderous war against the Vietnamese people which is supported by the Canadian ruling class.

In urging a vote for the three youthful candidates, the League for Socialist Action declared in a leaflet, of which 60,000 copies were distributed: "A clear identity of the city administration with the anti-war movement in Canada could lead to the end of Canadian collusion in this dirty war and strengthen the forces in the U.S. urging withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam."

"Strong support by city council to the protest launched by housewives against mounting food costs, which have already forced modest cuts in prices, firm identity with their call for a Prices Review Board, the moves to build consumers' co-operatives, and the developing demand that the books of the corporations be opened to public scrutiny, would result in bigger price cuts, and more lasting results."

The British Columbia president of the New Democratic party, stung by the interest in the dynamic campaign for Jean Rands, told an all-candidates meeting that in the next election the NDP will run a full slate. His comment that the "21-year-old Marxist mayoralty candidate Jean Rands should be running after boys instead of after the mayor's office" aroused considerable hostility.

THE STUDENT ELECTIONS IN CHILE

By José Valdés

Santiago, Chile

The elections held during October and November in the FECH [Federación de Estudiantes de Chile] came out as follows:

<u>Santiago</u>		<u>Concepción</u>	
	<u>Votes</u>		<u>Votes</u>
Democracia Cristiana	5,096	Democracia Cristiana	1,015
Partido Comunista	2,629	Movimiento de Izquierda	
Partido Socialista	1,137	Revolucionaria	744
Partido Radical	869	Partido Radical	575
Partido Nacional (Rightist)	502	Partido Socialista	291
Movimiento de Izquierda		Partido Comunista	275
Revolucionaria	465	Partido Nacional	185
 <u>Valparaíso</u>		 <u>Antofagasta</u>	
Movimiento Universitario de		Movimiento Universitario de	
Izquierda	1,011	Izquierda	305
Democracia Cristiana	701	Democracia Cristiana	200
Partido Radical	122		
Partido Nacional	114		

These results show that the Christian Democrats are losing influence, although slowly, in the student movement. The elections also show that the left could have won in Concepción and perhaps in Santiago if a common slate had been run against the Christian Democrats.

The MIR [Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionario -- Revolutionary Left Movement] appealed for the formation of a united front to meet the main enemy (the Christian Democrats), but the bureaucratic leaderships of the Communist and Socialist parties were opposed to it. The Socialist youth had agreed in principle to work together with the MIR, but the leadership succeeded in blocking the wishes of the rank and file.

In Concepción, if the Socialist party had agreed to a united front with the MIR, the Christian Democrats could have been defeated and for the first time the chairmanship would have been held by a member of the MIR. But the Communist and Socialist parties prefer to block the MIR, even if it means playing into the hands of the bourgeois, pro-imperialist Christian Democrats. Communist party representative Carlos Cerda went

so far as to ask the Christian Democrats to drop the slate of the MIR from the ballot. (El Mercurio, October 27.)

The Communist party joined with the Christian Democrats in not counting votes cast for the MIR. Members of the MIR impounded the ballot boxes in some of the universities in order to gain assurance of a correct computation. Despite this bold action, it was estimated that in Santiago some 250 votes for the MIR were not counted.

In commenting on how the Christian Democrats had stolen votes from the National party, the October 24 issue of El Diario Ilustrado said that "something similar happened to the MIR which is petitioning for cancellation of the results due to acts committed this time by the Communist youth. 'We're going to knock out the votes for the Nationals one by one,' a Communist youth told a member of the Christian Democrats. 'In a few minutes it will be the turn of the MIR.'"

In the October 21 issue of Las Noticias de Ultima Hora, Dantón Chelén of the MIR stated that "in the Instituto Pedagógico 200 votes disappeared."

In those places where an honest count was made and no frauds were perpetrated, the MIR vote stood proportionately higher.

The student elections were of national interest, considerable attention being paid to them on the radio, television and in the press. In all these forums the candidates of the MIR explained their revolutionary Marxist positions.

Dantón Chelén, the MIR's candidate for the presidency of the FECH, declared in a press interview: "The preparation for an insurrection, the conquest and consolidation of proletarian power, are phases of an uninterrupted and permanent global process. The decay of capitalism is the objective condition. Man's capacity in this revolutionary transitional epoch to transform reality through theoretical and practical action, confers on the so-called 'subjective factor' a decisive, creative role of primary magnitude." (The magazine Punto Final, No. 16, November 1966.)

POLISH INTELLECTUALS AGITATED BY KOLAKOWSKI'S EXPULSION

By George Novack

In 1956 Gomulka's government was swept into power on the crest of popular indignation in Poland against Stalinist domination while Kadar's government was installed in office in Hungary when the associated uprising of the Hungarian masses was crushed by Soviet troops and tanks. Yet neither of these Communist regimes saw fit to hold elaborate national ceremonies to commemorate the tenth anniversaries of their differing origins this fall.

Both thought it politically advisable not to stir up the memories of the masses about the momentous experiences of a decade ago. And Gomulka did not wish to give offense to the leaders in the Kremlin with whom he has long since made his peace.

However, the Polish premier did mark the tenth anniversary of his accession to office in his fashion by expelling from the party the noted Communist dissident, Leszek Kolakowski, professor of philosophy at the University of Warsaw. The developments following his expulsion indicate that the critical ferment among the advanced intellectuals and student rebels which stimulated the "little revolution" of October 1956 continues to assert itself despite the restrictive measures of the regime.

Kolakowski was ousted from the Communist party because of the opening speech he made at a meeting held October 21 at the University of Warsaw to draw up a balance sheet of the accomplishments of Poland over the last decade. The meeting was organized with university permission under the auspices of the Union of Socialist Youth.

The scholar is reported to have told the students and faculty members who jammed the lecture hall that there was no reason to rejoice at the anniversary, despite the gains made since the pre-October days. There is still no genuine democratic freedom in Poland, he declared.

Advances were made in 1956, Professor Kolakowski conceded, but the political liberty of the Poles remains severely restricted. There has been no change in the way Poland selects her leaders, he said, and the right to free assembly and public criticism are greatly circumscribed.

The consequences are grave since such conditions make for a ruling group that is inefficient and devoid of a sense of responsibility to the people. Those who have the responsibility for making things work in Poland are frustrated by those who provide political leadership, he said. The lack of a real relationship between the experts and administrators and the party leaders is destructive for the country.

He said that the Communist government had achieved a major success in assuring universal public education. But he criticized conditions that he said hampered creative work in the humanities.

Some progress has been made in literary freedom but he declared that in literary criticism, sociology and modern history the situation had worsened. The theater, too, is hampered by censorship and suppression.

The constitution and criminal code of Poland still leave room for harsh and arbitrary applications, Professor Kolakowski said, although he granted that such cases occurred far less frequently than before 1956.

His half-hour talk, which evoked a wave of applause, was the prelude to even bolder criticisms by a number of students. One student at the meeting proposed the adoption of a resolution quoting from 1956 speeches by Gomulka pledging political and cultural freedom. Another student was reported to have called on older men to step down from leadership of the country.

Party and state authorities were especially incensed by the submission of an unscheduled resolution demanding the release from prison of two young Communists, Karol Modzelewski and Jacek Kuron, who were jailed last year for openly expressing their disagreements with party policy.

Modzelewski is the son of a well-known Communist who was the first foreign minister of the Polish People's Republic. He was one of the leaders of the Warsaw university youth during the turbulent days of October 1956 and organized a discussion group at the university where he became an instructor. Kuron, a graduate student, is also the son of a veteran Communist.

They are serving terms of three and a half and three years, respectively, for having circulated an open letter to the party membership and Communist youth analyzing the situation in Poland and presenting their revolutionary political views. (This remarkable document has been translated into French with an introduction by Pierre Frank and is obtainable from Editions de la Quatrième Internationale; 21, rue d'Aboukir; Paris 2. A forthcoming English edition has been announced by Merit Publishers of New York.)

Kolakowski was one of the prominent Communist intellectuals who protested the imprisonment of Modzelewski and Kuron which has become a test case in the struggle for political freedom in Poland. The three-and-a-half hour meeting was stormy and these students who sought to defend today's Poland were shouted down by the majority. But no votes were taken on the controversial resolutions.

The 39-year-old Kolakowski, who has also been a Communist since his youth, has been a bone in the throat of the CP officialdom for the past ten years. He took a prominent part in the events leading up to the Polish October and was an editor of the left-wing weekly Po Prostu which was shut down in 1957. He was singled out as a dangerous revisionist by Gomulka himself as early as May 1957 at a plenary session of the party's Central Committee.

The following October the party newspaper, Trybuna Ludu, denounced him as an adversary of the party who wants "to substitute pious dreams for activity and moral principles for revolutionary strategy." It is true that, in revulsion against Stalinist dogmatism, Kolakowski has come to question some basic tenets of scientific socialism. But this iconoclastic Communist is being excluded, not for his heterodox philosophical views, but for his courageous opposition to the party's malpractices.

The regime had refrained from proceeding against him up to now because of his wide following among university youth and his international reputation. His best-known writings abroad are The Individual and the Infinite in the System of Spinoza, Responsibility and History, and The Individual Without Either-Or: On the Possibility and Impossibility of Being a Marxist. This versatile scholar has also written The Keys to Heaven, a collection of rationalist tales cast in the form of biblical parables, and several plays. One of these is said to have been barred from the Polish stage.

Ironically, an article by him, entitled "Personality in a Vision of Society",

appears in the current issue of Poland, an official magazine published in six languages. It contains such sentiments as "we should excoriate concentration camps even in the event that we should be convinced of their usefulness from the point of view of economic growth."

Kolakowski has retained his chair at the university and is appealing his expulsion.

Meantime his expulsion has aroused alarm and anger in student and intellectual circles. When Mieczyslaw Rakowski, editor of the weekly Polityka and an alternate member of the party's Central Committee, spoke on the problems of world communism at a November 3 meeting at the university, students turned it into a debate during the question period. The editor was forced to reply to political criticisms in the form of questions.

Party authorities are said to have demanded disciplinary action against fourteen students who spoke at the meeting Kolakowski addressed and six are reported to have been suspended from their studies pending decision on their status by a disciplinary commission.

Twenty-one Polish authors, all members of the CP, signed a letter to party authorities which, without mentioning Kolakowski's case, repeated his criticisms of the party's attitude toward writers and other intellectuals and the restrictions imposed on artistic creation and freedom. The signers have been pressured by party bodies, including the Control Commission, to retract their statements but without success.

According to an unconfirmed report in the Polish-language exile magazine Kultura, published in Paris, thirteen of the twenty-one writers have also been expelled from the CP.

The action of the Polish authors matches that of the sixty Soviet writers who last spring appealed for the release of Sinyavsky and Daniel, the two Russian authors sentenced to long terms at hard labor for sending their writings abroad for publication.

The neo-Stalinist regimes in the Soviet bloc have had little success in winning the allegiance or confidence of the finest minds and talents in either the older or the younger generations. The dissident intellectuals are demanding far more freedom of expression and latitude for criticism than the bureaucratic leaderships are willing to concede. The friction between them intensifies with each passing year.

BUSINESS WEEK'S BLUEPRINT AND WILSON'S WHITE PAPER

By Dick Roberts

On November 22, British Prime Minister Harold Wilson submitted a White Paper explaining the details of the Labour government's economic policies for the first six months of 1967 (see World Outlook, December 9). His message was unequivocal: The "deflationary" policies -- wage freeze, high taxes, cuts in consumer credit, bank advances and domestic government spending -- would be continued. This has already raised British unemployment from 317,000 (1.4% of the labor force) in August, to 541,585 or 2.3% in October. It promises to raise this unemployment rate much higher, with predictions ranging up to 1,000,000. And it means those workers who do have jobs will have steadily declining real incomes, because their wages will be frozen while prices continue to rise.

Three days before Wilson's White Paper was announced, Business Week, one of the favorite magazines of American business executives, carried a 23-page supplement on the "Economic Battle of Britain" advocating precisely those policies which Wilson proclaimed. The timing of this special supplement is not entirely coincidental. American corporations have a deep interest in the economic situation in Britain and they are 100% behind Wilson's antilabor program; in fact, to take Business Week at face value, the American ruling class dictated the terms of the recessionary policies which Wilson is following.

The key factor which inextricably ties the fortunes of American capitalism with the future of the British economy is the major role Britain plays in the international capitalist market. "One-third of the world's trade is conducted in sterling," Business Week states. "If the economic underpinnings of the British pound come apart, the least that could happen is a world money crisis. The worst is a collapse that would wrench apart the trade of the industrialized nations, stifle the limited progress of the devel-

oping lands, and poison relations among the countries of the free world."

Britain's economic problems directly influence the stability of the world monetary system because they have resulted in a severe shortage of British gold reserves. Foreign governments, at present, hold \$7 billion of their reserves and working balances in sterling, and corporations and individuals hold another \$5 billion. But to back up this \$12 billion in outstanding sterling balances, Britain holds less than \$3 billion in gold reserves. And at the same time, Britain has been faced year after year with the problem of importing more than it exports, meaning that the few billions in reserves which Britain holds have been continually drained off into the pockets of more competitive capitalist nations.

At first glance, this might seem to be more a problem for the City, than the financial capitals of the other nations involved. After all, it means that Britain is providing an excellent market for foreign goods and that other nations are reaping the profits this implies. But the story doesn't end there. There is one way the British capitalists could cut down on the outflow of their gold reserves which might cause serious problems for other capitalist countries. Britain could devalue the pound. It is chiefly the worry that Britain might take this step which makes some international financiers -- particularly those in New York -- feel that a fatal slip on Britain's part could "poison" the friendly atmosphere now existing between allied nations.

"None of the foreign governments want to be tagged as the one that broke the 'bank' by starting a fatal rush to pull out of sterling," Business Week suggests. "Equally, none wants to be damned too sharply for losing a part of the value of its sterling reserves through failure to move before devaluation. Simultaneously, those countries with the largest sterling balances -- those with the most at stake -- know that the moment any one of them pulls out, it will probably bring down the whole structure."

Concern about devaluation of the pound in this country, however, goes deeper than concern about the immediate effect on sterling holdings. Financiers in New York and politicians in Washington see devaluation of the pound as a serious threat to the dollar itself. It cannot be ignored that the U.S. is also faced with serious balance of payments problems. (In his recently published reminiscences of the Kennedy administration, the late president's top adviser Theodore Sorensen reveals that the Kennedy administration devoted more time and worry to the problem of the international balance of payments than any other economic question.)

The U.S. balance of payments deficit is not the result of an unfavorable trade balance. It is caused by the joint ambitions of the American ruling class to maintain far-flung investments in the world capitalist market while supporting a vast military machine to protect these investments. And Washington has not placed any limits on this perspective in the foreseeable future -- as is evidenced by the bloody escalation of the war in Vietnam. Thus it is not out of any newly arisen benevolence that each time the British pound has come under serious "attack," Washington has rushed to the rescue, along with other nations, to lend Britain gold. "If a British devaluation came right now," Business Week states, "there would be trouble. Central bankers...would probably start dumping dollars for gold."

But at the same time, a continual bailing out process can ultimately only exacerbate the U.S. gold deficit. Washington is not planning to solve British financial crises in the long run by bringing a worse one down on Wall Street.

And this is why, according to Business Week, Johnson demanded terms: "As Britain's financial position worsened, President Johnson, according to insiders, pulled out what is referred to in the U.S. government as 'the list' -- the things the British had committed themselves to do to restore health to their economy and their balance of payments. These had been spelled out in tough bargaining in the fall of 1964, when the British pound reeled under the impact of another crisis that came just as the Wilson government took office. The U.S. then helped bail out Britain and demanded quid pro quos. This mid-summer, Johnson insisted that Britain take the actions it had promised if it wanted U.S. support....Deflation came with a vengeance on July 20, when Wilson announced the details of a package of policies that are designed to give the British economy its strongest deflation since World War II. Nine days later, Wilson was on his way to Washington to talk with the President. During one crucial part of their discussion, Johnson and Wilson talked alone; none of their aides was present."

Deflation, the Business Week staff suggests, is only the first step in the U.S.-favored program for retooling the British economy. The immediate effects of deflation would be salutary, they allege. It would reverse the balance of trade deficit and thereby begin to reduce the outflow of gold from British coffers.

But the long-run problem is the British economy itself which could only suffer stagnation under prolonged deflation.

The basic problem is how to make British industry more competitive in the world market, and for this, Business Week insists "the most important need is for greater productivity. One example shows the dimensions of the problem. In the steel industry, to turn out what 100 U.S. workers can produce, Britain needs 230 men..." And from here on, Business Week's advice might be said to depart from the norms of diplomatic etiquette, but it has the virtue of being plain spoken: "No single group of laggards is to blame for the rigidity that leads to this kind of performance. The culprits are the inflexibility of trade unions, the lack of professionalism in management, the archaic educational system, the hidebound ways of many segments of society."

Noteworthy in its absence from Business Week's "list" is technological improvement. The big problem from Business Week's standpoint boils down to what it sees as "archaic" relationships between British management and British workers. Business Week's advice to British management is to soften up the trade unions and speed up the assembly lines: "Indeed, where individual companies in Britain have made sharp changes in their way of operating, they have achieved some solid results. For instance, Aluminium Corp., Ltd., an aluminum fabricator in Wales, decided five years ago to go after higher productivity. It launched a series of studies to measure normal working time for every job on the shop floor. Then it set up a system of bonuses for workers who produced above the norm. Says a company official: 'The effects have been startling. Production has increased threefold on one blanking press, with the same men operating the same machine as before.'"

A speed up? Not quite. Just friendly business advice. Here is where Business Week sees another important effect of deflation. The American magazine's staff concedes that the conversion from "hidebound" trade unionism to "20th Century" labor-management relations may be resisted by the British workers. And if it is so resisted, British management might not respond with the aggressiveness called for in Business Week's perspective. "Thus, a prior dose of deflation is needed as a spur to management, and as a brake on the wage spiral."

Should the British worker accept wage cuts so that it costs U.S. imperialism less to napalm-bomb Vietnamese peasants? That is the implicit doctrine in Business Week's "Economic Battle of Britain."

The Wilson Labour government has proved to be a highly effective vehicle for transmitting the needs of U.S. imperialism into the economics and politics of Britain. This is due to the fact that on the one hand it is subservient to the whims of international capitalism while on the other hand it is still capable of holding the allegiance of the workers and thereby block them from going into action.

How long this loyalty will last is another question. There have already been sporadic strikes in a number of industries being closed down by the deflationary policies. These show that the "spirit of Dunkirk" is not as omnipresent in the British working class as American capitalism would like to believe -- and this is only the beginning. There is much that the British workers can do in the months of deflation that lie ahead which is not accounted for in Business Week's blueprint. And in the last analysis, it is in the plants and not in private meetings between Johnson and Wilson that the most important exchanges will take place.

GREEN BERETS REPORTED IN GUATEMALA

In a report about the Guatemalan guerrilla group led by César Montés since the death of Luis Turcios, Georgie Anne Geyer states that the guerrillas claim that more than 1,000 U.S. Green Berets are already in Guatemala. "Their presence was confirmed to us by one Guatemalan police official," she continues. "We cannot confirm numbers, but we did see several Green Berets on the streets of the capital." Her account of a three-day visit to the guerrilla camp was published in the December 13 New York Post.

U.S. officials, naturally, have denied that any Green Berets have been sent to Guatemala. Nevertheless, as Miss Geyer points out, "American involvement would not be surprising. The U.S. backed the Guatemalan invasion which overthrew the pro-Communist government of Col Jacobo Arbenz in 1954."

According to Miss Geyer, the Rebel Armed Forces are growing in size and boldness. One guerrilla told her that they were followed by 20,000 persons in the southern regions of the country alone.

THE SLL CALLS THE COPS IN ERNEST TATE CASE

[The following four letters concerning the latest developments in the Ernest Tate case were made public by Farrell Dobbs, national secretary of the Socialist Workers Party. For more information on the case see World Outlook, December 2, 9 and 16.]

* * *

December 15, 1966

National Committee
Socialist Labour League
186 Clapham High St.
London, S.W.4, England

Dear Comrades,

As yet we have not received a reply from you to the November 21 letter of our National Committee asking you to place on trial all those in your organization responsible for the beating inflicted on Ernest Tate in front of your public meeting at Caxton Hall on November 17, and, specifically to expel your general secretary, Thomas Gerard Healy, for his role in this shocking assault upon a member of the revolutionary socialist movement.

Instead, it would appear that the victimization of Comrade Tate is being compounded by a move on the part of the top officers of your organization to resort to bourgeois law and the bourgeois courts.

We call your attention to the following items which should sufficiently indicate the emerging pattern:

(1) In response to the pamphlet Healy "Reconstructs" the Fourth International, which made public a number of documents exposing the antidemocratic practices that featured the April 4-8 international conference sponsored by the SLL, your Political Committee issued a statement which was published in the August 20 issue of The Newsletter. This statement contained the following clear indication of the course of action decided upon with regard to the pamphlet Healy "Reconstructs" the Fourth International:

"We shall not hesitate to deal appropriately with the handful of United Secretariat agents who hawk it around the cynical fake-left in England."

What was this if not a confession of incapacity to give any kind of effective answer, political or otherwise, to the exposure contained in the pamphlet? What was it if not a public threat directed against individuals designated by your Political Committee as "United Secretariat agents," specifically those who might "hawk" the pamphlet in England?

(2) At a meeting in Paris November 4 at which your general secretary, Thomas Gerard Healy, was the featured speaker, members of the audience who asked to take the floor to answer accusations made by the speaker were set upon by the sergeants at arms.

The November 29 issue of Voix Ouvrière reported that the sergeants at arms "beat and threw out a member of the JCR who wanted to take the floor because his organization had been attacked and reviled throughout the meeting."

The same issue of Voix Ouvrière reported in addition: "The sergeants at arms also set upon distributors of Voix Ouvrière."

The incidents at the Paris meeting were reported in the November 12 issue of The Newsletter as follows: "The Pabloites and Voix Ouvrière...attempted to provoke incidents at the meeting. These, fortunately, did not get very far. They demanded the right to speak at 11:30, when the meeting was closed. The chairman refused them."

It is clear from the account in The Newsletter itself that the "provocation" consisted of asking for the "right to speak." The Newsletter left out what happened to the comrades who asked for the democratic right to answer a public attack. But the entire working-class vanguard in France knows what happened. At least one revolutionist was beaten and thrown out at a meeting where your general secretary was the featured speaker. Other revolutionists were attacked.

The most shameful and reprehensible aspect of this is that The Newsletter did not

denounce the attacks. Instead it approved! And The Newsletter went so far as to accuse the victims of attempting to "provoke" what happened.

That sounds like the standard formula used by the cops when they work someone over. The victim, it is well known, always "provokes" the beating he receives; and the cops are always merely defending themselves and acting in the line of duty.

(3) On November 17, some two weeks after the "incidents" at the Paris meeting, Ernest Tate, a "United Secretariat agent," was in front of a meeting sponsored by the Socialist Labour League at Caxton Hall in London.

This "agent" was there exercising his democratic right to "hawk" the pamphlet Healy "Reconstructs" the Fourth International and copies of the magazine International Socialist Review.

He was not alone. Representatives of other socialist groups were likewise there to hawk socialist newspapers, magazines or pamphlets.

Comrade Tate was on the pavement in front of the hall. He was not inside the hall. He was not guilty of the provocative crime of demanding the right to take the floor at 11:30.

But at a certain moment, it appears, Thomas Gerard Healy came from inside the hall to the entrance.

We have no way of divining what was going on in his head. We do not know what duties you as the National Committee might have assigned to your general secretary that required him to come from inside the hall to the entrance at that precise moment. We do not even know if it had any connection with carrying out the line laid down in your Political Committee statement published in The Newsletter of August 20:

"We shall not hesitate to deal appropriately with the handful of United Secretariat agents who hawk it around the cynical fake-left in England."

Thomas Gerard Healy would best be able to answer, we would suggest, whether his appearance was purely coincidental or in line with obscure official duties pertaining to the highest post in your organization.

We understand that he has averred that what he was engaged in was giving directions to members of the SLL on clearing the pavement so that people arriving in coaches could walk directly into the meeting without any inconvenient obstructions. If this report is wrong -- and it does seem incredible that you would assign your general secretary to the task of regulating the flow of traffic in front of a meeting sponsored by the SLL -- perhaps you may have a correction to offer.

The fact remains that at that precise moment, Comrade Tate, the only one hawking Healy "Reconstructs" the Fourth International was set upon by a gang. Nowhere have we seen any denial that they were members of the SLL. Indeed, they appear to have been acting directly under your general secretary in whatever functions they were engaged in.

This gang beat Comrade Tate. They beat him severely, knocking him down and kicking him in the head, kidneys and genitals. He had to be hospitalized.

Let it be noted well -- the beating occurred in the very presence of the general secretary of the SLL, as if the gang felt that what they did would meet with no censure. Perhaps they had good reason to believe that it would even meet with approbation, as was the case with the sergeants at arms at the meeting in Paris, and that was why they went to such lengths even after their victim had been knocked down!

It may be contended that this is perfectly normal procedure in the SLL; that this is the way the SLL always clears the pavement in front of its meetings in order to facilitate the coming and going of coaches.

Comrades! The Political Committee of a Trotskyist party would have placed charges at once against every single member involved in such an assault; and, in face of the evidence, would have expelled them forthwith -- no matter what their posts.

Still more, comrades, the Political Committee of a Trotskyist party would at once have instituted the most searching examination of the organizational pattern that had made such an occurrence even conceivable.

The Political Committee of a Trotskyist party would have taken the severest mea-

asures against all the key officers responsible for such degeneration of the organization.

And, if the Political Committee defaulted in its obvious duties, the National Committee of a Trotskyist party would have called an emergency meeting to consider the grave situation and to undertake the appropriate measures.

So far as we are aware, you have not followed this course. Instead, something still worse followed.

(4) It was decided to resort to the bourgeois courts in a legal action against Comrade Tate!

The legal basis sought for this action, it appears, is a phrase or two in a letter which Comrade Tate wrote to the labor and socialist press describing what happened to him in front of your meeting as he witnessed it.

Despite the great injury done to him at the time of the beating, he did not call the cops. Despite the gross violation of his democratic right to hawk socialist literature on the pavement in front of an SLL meeting, he did not go to any representatives or institutions of the class enemy. Instead, he appealed to the labor and socialist movement.

Why did not your top officers follow that principled example if they disagreed with Comrade Tate's account of the circumstances under which he was beaten by a gang in front of an SLL meeting while he was selling socialist literature?

The answer would seem self-evident. In a court of working-class opinion, before an impartial body of unionists, Labour Party members, socialists or partisans of proletarian democracy, the SLL executive officers reached the conclusion that they had a losing case.

On the other hand, if a sharp lawyer could be hired to comb through the open letter of this working-class militant beaten up by a gang in front of an SLL meeting, phrases might be found that could be presented in such a way in a bourgeois court that a sympathetic bourgeois judge would hand down a decision in favor of the SLL and against the victim. What a triumph that would be for the SLL!

(5) This course does, naturally, offer the top leaders of your organization the vision of an immediate gain of the most opportunistic character. Perhaps this was sufficient to sway the balance in their calculations. By instituting legal proceedings against the victim of the beating administered in front of an SLL meeting, a plausible pretext was provided for not reporting the assault in the columns of The Newsletter. It has now become a legal matter, you know. And the following sentence actually appears in the December 3 issue of The Newsletter:

"The issues raised in the Nov. 21st letter by Farrell Dobbs, Secretary of the Socialist Workers Party, about what happened at Caxton Hall on the night of November 17th, we cannot discuss at this stage for legal reasons."

In addition, by bringing in bourgeois "law and order," other publications may be intimidated into saying nothing about the beating inflicted on a well-known Trotskyist in front of an SLL meeting.

This has the same happy effect as a conspiracy of silence in the bourgeois press -- workers are kept in ignorance of an important development. Above all the members and followers of the SLL are kept in ignorance of the scandal.

That the news about the beating inflicted on Comrade Tate is known to the entire vanguard in all other countries where a Trotskyist movement exists is of small importance to the top leaders of the SLL. They are not internationalists. They are nationally minded. They are concerned about their own bailiwick.

In this way, they unexpectedly reveal once again how far they have departed from the principles of Trotskyism.

(6) Comrades, please consider more closely what is revealed by this action:

(a) Your executive officers either did not think of appealing to working-class opinion or ruled it out. They decided to appeal to the class enemy. What then is the inescapable conclusion as to their class instincts? What does this say in turn about the nature of the class pressures to which your top leaders are responding? They have more confidence in pettifogging lawyers, shyster lawsuits and bourgeois courts than in a

working-class court of honor. It is more natural for them to appeal to the bourgeoisie than to the workers. It is in accord with their principles -- strange principles! -- to ask the class enemy to deal with a working-class political opponent.

(b) From the moral point of view, the SLL ends up in an even worse light. The open letter of a working-class victim of a beating inflicted by a gang in front of a public meeting of the SLL, the open letter of a revolutionary socialist who tells how he was set upon and who his assailants were, is studied from the viewpoint of bourgeois law to see in what way it can be turned against the victim in order to damage him still further; and especially to block him from voicing his outrage.

Even more, the open letter appears to have been studied to see if it could not be utilized in the bourgeois courts so as, with a favorable ruling from a sympathetic bourgeois judge, to bring down a curtain on the whole matter and even prevent any further hawking of literature damaging to the pretension of the SLL leaders that they are authentic spokesmen for Trotskyism in Britain.

Doesn't this call for the addition of a chapter to Trotsky's Their Morals and Ours -- a chapter on the morals sometimes to be found in ultraleft sectarian groups as they degenerate?

(c) Note the background against which this action occurs. As the heroic Trotskyist Hugo Blanco faces a possible death sentence in Peru under the workings of bourgeois law and the bourgeois courts, the SLL leaders set in motion an appeal to the British bourgeois cousins of the Peruvian dispensers of class justice -- and the action is directed against one of Hugo Blanco's most ardent defenders in England, a "United Secretariat agent" like Hugo Blanco himself.

What infamy your top leaders have brought upon the SLL!

(7) Finally, we ask you to consider what this course of action signifies as to the sincerity of the headlines to be read with monotonous frequency in The Newsletter about organizations or figures in the labor movement with whom you have differences who are charged with "calling the cops."

In the light of what happened at the Paris meeting on November 4 and in front of the SLL meeting at Caxton Hall on November 17, what conclusion can be drawn except that the editors of The Newsletter are guilty of the most disgusting hypocrisy. The SLL itself calls the cops!

A suspicion arises. If the leaders of the SLL can with such singular lack of compunction and in such gross violation of their professed principles resort to calling the cops themselves, can it be possible that they are guilty of the very crime they have charged against the comrades at the Paris meeting; i.e., "provoking" incidents leading to fisticuffs? Is it a pattern now for the SLL to "attempt to provoke incidents," as The Newsletter put it, that will cause inexperienced political opponents to call the cops?

We would not like to believe this of the SLL, comrades; but we are duty bound to call your attention to the fact that such conclusions may well be drawn by wide circles of the vanguard in light of the course of action being followed by your top leaders.

We hope that you will again read the November 21 letter which our National Committee sent to you and that you will act on its recommendations at once without further damaging delay.

Fraternally,

Political Committee
Socialist Workers Party

Farrell Dobbs, National Secretary

TEXT OF SWP LETTER TO PIERRE LAMBERT

December 15, 1966

Pierre Lambert
Informations Ouvrières
39, rue du Faubourg du Temple
Paris 10, France

Dear Comrade Lambert,

Enclosed is a copy of a letter sent by the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party to the National Committee of the Socialist Labour League.

The letter concerns a new grave development in the Ernest Tate case; i.e., the decision of the top officers of the SLL to resort to the bourgeois courts in a desperate effort to bring down a curtain of silence on the beating inflicted on this Trotskyist by a gang at the entrance of the SLL meeting at Caxton Hall on November 17.

Up to now we have not received a reply to the November 21 letter we sent you concerning this assault. Is your silence to be taken as a sign of approval of such methods? We hope that this shameful silence will not be extended to the SLL's latest move of appealing to the class enemy to rule on the protests lodged by the victim of the beating.

Fraternally,

Farrell Dobbs, National Secretary

TEXT OF SWP LETTER TO TIM WOHLFORTH

December 15, 1966

Tim Wohlforth, Editor
American Committee for the Fourth International
339 Lafayette Street, Room 305
New York, N.Y. 10012

Dear Comrade Wohlforth,

Enclosed is a copy of a letter sent by the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party to the National Committee of the Socialist Labour League.

We note that the latest issue of your paper echoes Healy in intimating "legal reasons" for saying nothing about Healy's calling the cops against Ernest Tate. This can have no other meaning than approval of the victimization of this revolutionary socialist and Healy's subsequent action of seeking to drag him into the bourgeois courts.

It is to be hoped that you will carefully consider, in the light of the attached letter, whether you are not morally bound to change your attitude concerning this case and to lodge a public protest against Healy's methods.

Fraternally,

Farrell Dobbs, National Secretary

TEXT OF SWP LETTER TO JAMES ROBERTSON

December 15, 1966

James Robertson, National Chairman
Spartacist League
Box 1377, G.P.O.
New York, N.Y. 10001

Dear Comrade Robertson,

Enclosed is a copy of a letter sent by the Political Committee of the Socialist

Workers Party to the National Committee of the Socialist Labour League.

If you have taken a stand on the issues raised by the SLL's actions around the case of Ernest Tate, this has not yet been called to our attention.

We trust that you will not further delay taking a public stand in solidarity with the victim; and, in particular, that you will clarify why you continue to offer political support to Healy.

Fraternally,

Farrell Dobbs, National Secretary

YSA APPEALS TO YOUNG SOCIALISTS AND REVOLTES GROUP

[The following letter was sent by the National Executive Committee of the Young Socialist Alliance, the American revolutionary socialist youth organization, to the National Committee of the Young Socialists in London and the leadership of the Révoltes group in Paris.]

December 17, 1966

Dear Comrades,

In the past few weeks, two extremely serious incidents have occurred, one in France and the other in England, which compel us to speak out and to write you requesting that you also make your attitude clear.

On November 17, at Caxton Hall in London, Ernest Tate, an internationally known Trotskyist, was attacked and severely beaten by a gang while he was selling literature at the entrance to a public meeting of the Socialist Labor League. According to those who witnessed this incredible attack, Thomas Gerard Healy, the general secretary of the SLL, was present while the gang carried out the beating.

On November 4, the Organisation Communiste Internationaliste sponsored a meeting in Paris at which the same G. Healy was the main speaker. When a member of the Jeunesse Communiste Revolutionnaire asked for time to answer the charges that had been made against his organization during the course of the meeting, he was physically attacked and thrown out of the meeting. Others in the audience who objected to the use of such methods to prevent differences of opinion from being expressed were also attacked.

The Young Socialist Alliance is writing you because you are a youth group publicly associated with the political organizations which sponsored these meetings, and we hope you will make clear where you stand on the key question of the role of violence inside the working-class movement. We are sure you realize that unless you indicate you are in total disagreement with the methods employed by the leaders of the SLL and the OCI at these meetings, your youth organization will also be implicated.

It is particularly important to have clarity on this issue at the present time when there is so much ferment among the radical youth in Europe. We have the best opportunity in decades to influence those who are beginning to break with Stalinism and the Social Democracy and who are finding their way to revolutionary socialism, especially around the struggle to build a united front defense of the Vietnamese revolution.

The demonstration in Liège, on October 15, was a striking proof of this fact. A significant number of Communist party youth from Belgium, Germany and Denmark came to that demonstration because they felt the need to publicly express their support to the Vietnamese revolution, and because they felt the CP itself had defaulted by not calling an international demonstration like the one that took place in Liège, or by not supporting the Liège demonstration once it had been called. These CP youth were willing to work with other socialist and communist youth on the key political question of today. The same was true for a good number of youth influenced by the social democracy.

In every European country there are thousands of youth like those who came to Liège, and they can be won to the forces of revolutionary socialism. But, they will be lost if they see those they believe to be revolutionaries practice the same organizational methods which have disgusted and disillusioned them with Stalinism. Such methods do nothing but weaken the working class in its struggle against the main enemy, the

capitalist class.

At the Liège demonstration you decided to carry a banner defending the Hungarian revolution. Although the organizers of the demonstration and most of the participating organizations felt this tactic only lessened our opportunities to take advantage of the openings we have to influence the Stalinist youth who are beginning to break with their leadership on the Vietnam issue, there was never at any time a threat or an attempt to use physical violence, or force, to remove that banner. You should compare this with the treatment given the member of the JCR, who merely asked for the floor at a public meeting and Ernest Tate who was simply selling literature at the entrance to a public meeting.

As revolutionary socialists we should be particularly sensitive to the use of physical violence against working-class opponents, as it is against ourselves that such methods have frequently been employed by the Stalinists in the past. We must demonstrate to the youth we are trying to win away from the Stalinists and Social Democrats that we are unconditionally opposed to the organizational methods, as well as the political betrayals of these organizations, and that we will never be party to them. Only by doing so will we be able to win for revolutionary socialism the forces that will be needed to abolish capitalism on a world scale and assure the future of mankind.

As a new generation of revolutionary youth we have a tremendous challenge to meet. We will be successful only if we demonstrate to the world working class the correctness of our ideas and the integrity of our organizations. It is for this reason that we appeal to you to disassociate yourself from the physical attacks on Ernest Tate and the member of the JCR, and publicly state your unconditional opposition to the use of violence by any working-class organization against members of other working-class political tendencies.

Fraternally,

Mary-Alice Waters

for the

National Executive Committee

of the Young Socialist Alliance

CHE GUEVARA "ALIVE AND WELL," DECLARES FIDEL CASTRO

In the course of a long and very interesting interview published in the January [1967] issue of the Chicago magazine Playboy, Fidel Castro was asked: "There has been widespread speculation in the American press, since Guevara's mysterious disappearance last year, that he was executed at your orders. Is this true?"

Castro answered: "Those who write such stories will have to square their accounts with history. The truth is that Che is alive and well. I and his family and his friends receive letters from him often. We do not have anything to say about his whereabouts at this time, however, because it would be unwise, possibly unsafe for him. When he is ready and wants it to be known where he is, we will tell it first to the Cuban people, who have the right to know. Until then, there is nothing more to be said."

Besides special points like this one, the interview contains an excellent account of the gains made by the Cuban people through their revolution. Likewise very good, under the persistent questioning of the interviewer, Lee Lockwood, is Castro's estimate of his own development from a rebel to a Marxist-Leninist.

On the question of proletarian democracy in Cuba, Castro is found on the defensive. He, of course, has no difficulty in proving that the Cuban people enjoy freedoms today that were inconceivable under the domination of U.S. imperialism and the puppet Batista. But on the question of specific institutions through which proletarian democracy can be exercised in accordance with Leninist norms and procedures, Castro could only point to progress in structuring the Communist party.

The editor of Playboy did not play around in making clear that he is no Castro-ite. He introduced the interview with a long editorial and throughout Castro's remarks he inserted his own propaganda in brackets. The display of his capacity to hew to the State Department line is quite convincing.