

a labor press service

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

50¢

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. 5, No. 33
October 20, 1967

A Conversation with Fidel Castro

**The OLAS Conference
and the 'Principles'
of Paul-Henri Spaak**

By Ernest Mandel



PAUL-HENRI SPAAK

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.

a labor press service

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

50¢

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. 5, No. 33
October 20, 1967

A Conversation with Fidel Castro

***The OLAS Conference
and the 'Principles'
of Paul-Henri Spaak***

By Ernest Mandel



PAUL-HENRI SPAAK

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.



PAUL-HENRI SPAAK



PAUL-HENRI SPAAK

A CONVERSATION WITH FIDEL CASTRO

[The following article has been translated by World Outlook from the August 18 issue of Marcha. The author, Carlos María Gutiérrez, represented the Montevideo weekly at the conference of the Organization of Latin-American Solidarity (OLAS) held in Havana July 31-August 10.]

* * *

Twice within 24 hours I had the opportunity to hear Fidel Castro summarize not only the results and the lines of action that emerged from the OLAS conference but also the position of the Cuban leadership on a whole series of questions associated with the continental freedom struggle.

The first time was his speech closing the conference. Given before 3,000 enthusiastic delegates, journalists and spectators jamming the Chaplin theater, it lasted almost four hours. The next was the following day in the Palace of the Revolution in an early morning interview that lasted two hours. The tone of the first speech was (as always with Castro) fiery and resolute, but it clearly followed a rigorous outline, a careful progression in its themes. In the Palace, on the other hand, Fidel was subjected to questioning, responded to almost everything that was put to him, and his style, naturally, was colloquial and more spontaneous.

The reader, after going over both reports (the one dealing with the closing speech will appear in the next issue of Marcha), will find that they are complementary. Fidel Castro knows how to handle himself as a member of a collective leadership and as an individual leader of the revolution. If he was more systematic in the Chaplin theater, perhaps in the Palace he was able to sincerely analyze certain questions which the atmosphere of the closing ceremony did not permit. Whoever reads the text of Fidel's speech attentively, along with this report, will see that it is the same Castro, rounding out some of the conclusions reached at the conference which Carlos Núñez and I sought to express in a precise way in our dispatches, as in those blocking out the process of the anti-imperialist struggle from now on. What Fidel said -- although it is much too weighty to put in the same scales against such cheap goods -- is the best reply to the yelping and snapping which certain journalistic lapdogs have given vent to recently in El Popular.

The formal invitation sent by President Osvaldo Dorticós and Prime Minister Fidel Castro to attend the reception closing the OLAS conference said

that the meeting would end at 10 p.m. But the thousand persons who wandered through the vast salons of marble and crystal in the Palace of the Revolution did not seem to be aware of this. When 10 o'clock came, Fidel Castro had not yet appeared and no one seemed resigned to not seeing him. Some journalists even clung timidly to the idea of interviewing him. Castro himself, much earlier, had undertaken to dispel any illusions.

In Oriente -- after a speech which he gave in the primitive area of Gran Tierra, where ultramodern founding homes and power plants are appearing as if by miracle among the tropical ridges and red flats where things and people are permanently covered with dust -- I took advantage of an unexpected encounter with the jeep he was riding in to ask him what all of us were wondering: when would he give us a press conference? Fidel laughed, placing his heavy hand on my shoulder and, gesturing toward the American photographer Lee Lockwood (the author of the widely circulated reportage in Playboy), said not to give him up:

"Look at this Gringo; he took three months waiting for an interview. Do you have that much patience?"

Of course, upon returning from Gran Tierra he did travel for some days around the island with Stokely Carmichael and K.S. Karol, the representative of Le Nouvel Observateur, who was the only journalist at the conference to enjoy this privilege. But Karol himself said later that almost all the questions were asked by Castro and the topic was China, a field in which the French journalist is one of the world experts.

That evening in the Palace, the crowd was much too heterogeneous to work out an interview; in addition it was composed of persons that only the Cuban revolution could bring together in one place. Where else could you see Marguerite Duras talking with Comandante Juan Almeida? Or a pop art model (who up to a couple of weeks before had not dreamed of exchanging the Rue Montaigne for El Malecón and who was in Havana thanks to the fact that her husband was one of the painters associated with the Salón de Mayo exhibition) absorbed in a circle in which President Dorticós, the Venezuelan guerrilla fighter Francisco Prada and Peter Weiss were deliberating with Ariel Collazo on political topics? A diminutive Vietnamese heroine, the journalists Marcel Niedergang and Wilfred Burchett, the French sculptor César (who limits himself in an Olympian way to compressing old automobiles into blocks two feet wide, standing them on a pedestal and saying, "Voilà"), the American folk singer

Barbara Dane and the widow of Frantz Fanon, all shared a common intention to wait for Fidel Castro, prolonging the meeting.

When the prime minister arrived, a tight circle of talkers and listeners immediately formed around him. First came the rituals, Jacqueline Lobatón put an indigenous necklace on him which she had brought from Peru; a Vietnamese guerrilla fighter took Fidel's olive-green cap, giving him his own military hat in return, and Fidel wore the guerrilla fighter's headgear the rest of the evening, looking incongruously like a Boy Scout. Then began the conversations that are typical of every social gathering where Castro appears; the questioners get in as best they can by means of their elbows until they push through the group into the first row. Thus Laura Berquist of Look, in her audacious miniskirt, got in; various Latin-American delegates; each with their two or three minutes. Castro responded to all of them, almost always with a humor that is contagious and that manages to evade direct replies.

Few are as able as Fidel to maintain a conversation in an intransigent tone that nevertheless does not disconcert his questioner. Three or four of those most insistent on talking with him "seriously," circled impatiently with the group, which under the permanent exuberance of the prime minister moved through the room without losing its cohesion. At one moment communication was almost impossible when Raúl Castro entered the group, making a path.

"Comandante," we asked him, "would you ask Fidel if he will talk with us?"

"I'm waiting my turn, too," said Raúl Castro with a smile. "I don't know if I can get there."

Those of us who were following the advice about having patience, which Fidel had given us in Oriente, at last had our turn. At one o'clock in the morning, the collectors of verbal souvenirs were talked out, all the photos had been taken, and the waiters were beginning to stop handing out drinks. President Dorticós and most of the ministers had left a little while before. In the two immense rooms of the Palace, linked by a kind of tropical garden, only a dozen sleepwalkers were wandering around and the conference automobiles had left. Freed from his last questioners, Fidel moved toward a private room. Four or five officers and functionaries accompanied him, but we patient ones were standing in the doorway: the Chileans Augusto Olivares, Carlos Jorquera and Víctor Vaccaro and I.

"Comandante," said Jorquera, "you have already talked with everybody.

Aren't you going to talk with the journalists of Chile and Uruguay? He and I are from the magazine Punto Final."

Fingering his beard under the Vietnamese hat, Fidel tried pulling the joke that the final moment had come for him too, but the occasion was too good (no audience, with the morning still ahead, no photographers, and in relative isolation) not to take immediate advantage of it. The first questions called forth others and some touched on matters too sensitive for Fidel to resist the temptation of answering. Until 2:40 a.m., standing all the time, sometimes putting his arm around a questioner, growing excited at times and at other times thinking some seconds before answering, the prime minister talked on all the topics we brought up. From what we had attentively listened to in the speech at the Chaplin the night before and read in the papers the next day, we had drawn certain conclusions and we wanted to verify these. But, especially, both the Chileans and I were particularly intrigued by a sentence printed in the report of the Cuban delegation to the OIAS conference: "To talk about a guerrilla struggle in Chile or Uruguay is as far-fetched and absurd as to deny this possibility in Venezuela, Colombia, Bolivia, Brazil, Guatemala and Peru."

"Are you in agreement with those words?" Olivares asked him.

"Where does it say that?"

"In the report of the Cubans."

"And who wrote that, Chico?"

He was told that it was an official publication and someone added that as Chileans and Uruguayans we felt a little put out over such a flat statement.

"Well, I didn't write that," Fidel said. "Don't feel bad."

The joke made a good introduction to the subject. Later in our hotel, the four of us reconstructed everything possible from our notes, and from this reconstruction I have extracted the following questions and answers, the main themes of which deal with armed struggle, the new relation of forces in the socialist camp and the tragic case of the Venezuelan Communist party.

"It can't be denied," Fidel said, "that in Chile and Uruguay mass movements exist. But in addition geographical conditions are needed. Chile has them."

"Then a guerrilla focal center is possible in Chile, too?"

"Look, the thesis about a guerrilla focal center holds for any country. Even

for Western Germany. Even there a guerrilla focal center can be created. The question is to know when this guerrilla focal center is opportune."

"Hence, in Chile?"

Fidel relieved the tension of the question with another joke:

"Chico, that depends on you. Look, if I were in Chile, I would rise up. But I believe they are still carrying on down there with this stuff about elections."

"You would make a good candidate for the presidency," vowed one of the Chileans.

"First you would have to let me enter Chile. Do you think they would give me a visa?"

"And Uruguay?" I asked. "Do you believe that armed struggle is impossible there?"

"Your country lacks the geographic conditions for armed struggle. There aren't any mountains. There aren't any jungles. You couldn't develop guerrilla war there."

"Do you mean that the concept of armed struggle signifies only rural guerrilla war? Don't you think it's theoretically possible to carry out an armed urban insurrection, or a sudden coup, like the Bolshevik model?"

"Well, theoretically it's possible."

"Do you think it's possible in the big capitals with a very dense population and concentration of services?"

"In Uruguay you have militant and politicized masses. I believe, in view of this, that you possess certain conditions. But an armed insurrection, at present, would not last two days in your country. You are between two colossal countries; they would immediately make a sandwich out of you. No, in Uruguay this can't be done."

"So, then, we accept the Cuban thesis of OLAS?"

"Well," Fidel smiled, "if you want to carry on guerrilla war, some guerrillas are nearby in Bolivia. Look, guerrilla war in all the Americas is the same; every place it always has the same objective. When the conditions don't exist in a country (and here he turned to the Chileans), you also have to support the struggle where the conditions do exist."

"And in Brazil?"

"Ah, there guerrilla war is a picnic; all the conditions exist there. Look, three months after the guerrillas triumph in Brazil, the Uruguayan oligarchy will fall by itself. I wouldn't exclude some country in Latin America, one or two, not having to undergo this trial, so bloody, so painful, of armed struggle. It's clear that when the majority of countries have made their revolution, imperialism and the oligarchies won't last long in the rest. Everything depends on what the revolutionists in these exceptional countries think; if they decide to wait, with their arms folded until those in the other countries fight and win, or if they feel ashamed and therefore support the other guerrilla fighters. What I maintain is that it's a single struggle, in all of Latin America."

Olivares and Jorquera returned to the case of Chile and more questions followed. Once more they discussed the subject of electoralism.

"You can't play with the word revolution," said Fidel. "Frei used this word too much with the masses. The election was conducted to decide between the socialist revolution and his revolution in freedom. And what happened? There was no revolution, but the idea of a revolution no longer scares anyone. The same people that go to mass talk about revolution as an objective possibility, as a possible program. When the revolution comes, they will already know what it's about."

"But can they make the revolution via elections?"

"I don't know. I don't know about that. I think not. It would be very good if they could, but no. I can tell them about my own case. In another epoch here, I ran for parliament. But I didn't believe that this was a revolutionary road. I did believe that a seat would open a road for me. Do you know what I was thinking of doing? That when I was in parliament, I would immediately present a revolutionary program to the people, four or five really revolutionary laws, not to get them passed, but to offer a program for a revolution. I knew that the masses were suffering in Cuba, that they would understand this program."

"And you would have stayed in parliament?"

"No, that wasn't it. I would have presented a revolutionary program and immediately opened up a struggle. A revolutionary politician mustn't get his rear end caught in a seat in parliament. Look, a revolutionist must keep his eye on conjunctural events, must take advantage of all the conjunctural events. At the time I was reading Marxism and I knew

a lot of things, although I still had a rather romantic conception. But I already understood the needs of the masses and I saw that the struggle, the episodes in the struggle, could mobilize them. At the funeral for Chibas, fifteen thousand persons attended. And I said to the leaders of the party then, I said to Pardo Llada: Let's take the body to the Palace and these people will bring down the government. In face of this crowd, the government will fall. There, in a single hour the revolution could have triumphed because the masses were revolutionary. But the professional politicians were scared."

Later he talked about the assault on the Moncada barracks, about the concept behind this episode. "One of our ideas at the time," Fidel reflected, "was wrong -- the idea that we could confront the repressive apparatus in the cities. I was born in the country and I have always tended to feel more comfortable outside of the cities, but we didn't have any concept on rural guerrilla war. Intuitively, we felt something, because our plan, if we failed, pointed to hiding out in the mountains. But I myself had never been in the Sierra Maestra. We did have the idea of creating situations that would mobilize the masses. When we left in the Granma, we left fifteen rifles hidden in Mexico. If we failed, we would return by plane with these arms and parachute into the mountains. And we had to go on learning; the hard way, you see, a very hard way.

In the first battle, they trapped us in some rocks on the mountain. We were a dozen yards from a post of soldiers, and the planes were buzzing us. Then the men lost their heads and waited for the planes without paying attention to the soldiers. Only seven of us in my group were able to get out. A revolutionist pays very dearly for lack of experience; in armed struggle, lack of experience can't exist.

"Comandante," said Jorquera, "this is a more theoretical question, but very important, in the light of your speech yesterday [at the Chaplin theater August 10] -- do you feel that the moral attitude of a revolutionist must remain the same when he is in power?"

"Well, give me an example."

"In power," added Olivares, "is it possible to maintain the same principles as in the revolutionary struggle?"

"There is a revolutionary ethics," said Fidel, "which is the same in either case. It's a matter of principles. You can't have one ethics as a revolutionist and different ethics in power."

"And does this apply in relations

among states?" asked Olivares.

Fidel caught the turn which the conversation was taking, but he let the two continue clarifying the point further. We were going to speak, it was clear, of a delicate theme: the condemnation that had been voted for in Commission III of the OLIAS conference of the technical and economic assistance which the socialist countries were granting to certain anti-Cuban governments and oligarchies in Latin America.

"In what way might this resolution affect future relations between OLIAS and the socialist camp?" I asked.

There are times when, in making certain statements, Fidel appears to change abruptly almost in his physical attitude. He was silent for some seconds, narrowing his eyes, evaluating the intent of the question, and then putting his arm across Olivares, he took me by the shoulder, as if to underline his reply.

"Look, we're not going around hunting for problems, but we're not afraid of them either."

And he repeated:

"Look, we're not afraid of them, eh!"

One of the others brought up the second resolution of Commission III, which, in condemning the CP of Venezuela, had induced a division among the delegations (El Salvador, Bolivia and Uruguay voted in both cases against these condemnations). In his speech at the Chaplin theater, Fidel for a solid hour had pilloried the Venezuelan CP; he had listed their betrayals, had called their leaders "imposters," had said that in the case of the death of Iribarren Borges they had become Leoni's "police dogs"; had branded them as "fingerers of the Cuban revolution." Now we questioned him precisely on the conduct of the CP's or the political groups that had placed themselves in such an untenable position as defending the Venezuelan party or its attendance at the conference. One of these votes was the Uruguayan and, naturally, I asked Fidel for his opinion.

The prime minister did not evade answering. He responded with complete frankness ("This is a conversation among friends," he said); but he asked beforehand that it not be published. Then I took up the question from another angle:

"Weren't you afraid that to condemn a CP, derelict in its revolutionary duty, could injure the image of other Communist parties that are really in the vanguard politically, or in the struggle, in other countries of the Americas?"

"If they are in the political vanguard," said Fidel, "this will not affect them. They will be saved, not because they are Communist parties, but because they are in the vanguard of the struggle. The struggle measures the force and vitality of a vanguard. Look, the Soviet Union is the only one that can survive its errors, because it is an objective fact, because it has made the revolution. It is a power factor; it is a revolutionary fact. It is the others who are not going to survive; because they are outposts and they have not made the revolution. It is not enough to be theorists; what is in dispute today is not Marxism. The question today is not Marxism, but the interpretations of Marxism. The Venezuelan people will never forgive the rightist leaders of the Venezuelan party."

Here, the politician gave way to the guerrilla fighter, furious over the betrayal of his brothers in the struggle:

"They can picture Douglas [the guerrilla leader expelled from the Communist party] everywhere like a man breathing smoke and fire. It's the same Mafia as the one in Guatemala skimping on arms -- three rifles here, three rifles there -- so the irritating groups would be exterminated. But in Venezuela the people will never forgive them, because in Cuba -- if we adopted the attitude of backing the fingermen -- the people would never forgive us either. There you have it, a party that's a nest of fingermen. They're the same ones who practically joined the cops in the Iribarren Borges affair. And still you find people that defend them."

"Can't you have an identity in ideology that rises above these errors in behavior?"

"Do you believe in churches? I don't believe in them."

A long time was spent on the sub-

ject. The Venezuelan betrayal is a matter that has deeply preoccupied Fidel; it was, in addition, the gauge in a certain sense for the definitions in the OLAS conference, and Castro said a lot more things that night.

When at a certain moment, after a digression, he asked us what he had just been talking about, we became aware of how tired this man was who had been talking for hours after finishing a day of fabulous activity. He had to rest; we, too, overcome by this flood of answers and dizzying web of references.

I put one last question to him: "In the OLAS the idea was advanced that the contradiction of our times is no longer 'imperialism-socialist camp' but 'imperialism-Third World.' What's your opinion on that?"

"The classical contradiction 'imperialism-socialist camp' cannot be left out. It has been a fundamental dialectical factor, in the propagation of the revolution as well as in supporting it and in the struggle for peace. It is an objective fact, too, and no one can deny it. But I also believe that the other contradiction 'imperialism-Third World' has appeared, and it is now the most important, the one bearing the weight of the struggle. We are within the latter process. I would say that we have to include both contradictions, but that the latter one is now the most important."

Then he began leaving, although the dialogue continued step by step toward the door. Before his officers took him away to rest, he shook hands with all of us, with a sly reproach included in his warm smile:

"You are revolutionists, but also journalists and you have your professional one-sidedness; you made me talk too much."

BRAZILIAN CP ATTACKS OLAS CONFERENCE

The Brazilian Communist party has come out officially against the decisions of the OLAS [Organization of Latin-American Solidarity] conference held in Havana at the beginning of August.

The party's stand was announced in the September issue of Voz Operaria [Worker's Voice]. The underground publication of the banned organization also reported that Carlos Marghela had been expelled. Marghela had represented the party at the OLAS conference.

Voz Operaria affirmed that the party "did not send any representative to

the OLAS conference in Havana."

The Brazilian CP, with its class-collaborationist policies in past decades, played a key role in paving the way for the generals who seized power in April, 1964, and imposed today's military dictatorship on the country.

The party leaders still advocate "peaceful coexistence," hold that the "progressive" sector of the national bourgeoisie can play a leading role in the struggle against imperialism, and maintain that it is possible even in Brazil for socialism to be won through the electoral process.

ALAS FOR THE CANADIAN CP ON OLAS

[The Communist party of Canada reacted to the revolutionary orientation of the Havana conference of the Organization of Latin-American Solidarity (OLAS) exactly as was expected. It lined up solidly with the right-wing opposition.

[For example, as reported in the August issue of Combat, the French language publication of the Canadian CP, General Secretary William Kashtan, in a speech in Québec, took up the cudgels against Che Guevara. The latter's message calling for more Vietnams, said Kashtan, "is a point of view also advanced by the Chinese. For them, peaceful coexistence must be abolished. If you examine Guevara's point of view you find implicitly a lack of confidence in the socialist countries and in the international revolutionary movement. Why didn't he demand instead, three or four Cubas?"

[But that was precisely what Guevara was calling for, three or four more Cubas. He had the good sense and the good taste, however, to point to the area of the world where the freedom fighters are actively engaged in combat with the imperialist aggressors. If Kashtan's argument were taken at face value, it would have to be concluded that he is against the struggle being waged by one Vietnam and therefore against any struggles like it, including more Cubas.

[The antirevolutionary view of the Communist party of Canada was expressed even more blatantly and crudely, if that is possible, by Catherine Vance in an article in the September issue of Combat entitled "OLAS, HELAS?" (OLAS, Alas?). This remarkable polemical effort deserves a place in the record. World Outlook has therefore made the following translation.]

* * *

It seems that the Havana conference of the American [sic] Organization of Solidarity ended with a deplorable emphasis on the differences within the socialist and national liberation movements.

The unpublished resolutions which were designed to denounce the Soviet Union and the Communist parties and which, it seems, follow the line of Guevara in calling for "more Vietnams" and a continental guerrilla organization in all of South America are contrary to revolutionary experience and place in danger the parties and peoples of South America.

The composition of the delegations at the conference soon led to a hardening of positions which brought about the final resolution. Three of the main Communist parties were not represented; those

of Venezuela, Argentina and Brazil. The Communist party of Chile, through its representative, reaffirmed the Marxist position which recognizes that the struggle of the proletariat, while being socialist in content, is national in form -- each working class must get rid of its own bourgeoisie.

The representative of the CP of Chile called for a struggle on national fronts and placed the accent on the autonomy of the different parties. He spoke for preparing to utilize all forms of struggle demanded by specific conditions and preparing the people for struggle; in addition, he supported electoral, legal and illegal actions, according to circumstances as well as the need for unity in nonviolent mass action and for armed struggle where the situation requires it. The delegate of the Communist party of Chile, moreover, warned against the glorification of guerrilla war as such, as a tactic, which, if it is utilized without the support of the masses will necessarily lead to disaster. The Communist party of Chile struggled also for recognition of the need for flexibility and the desirability of consultation among the national liberation movements and the parties of Latin America in order to overcome the differences and to facilitate the required common action.

It was against this position that the "ultraleft" spokesmen of a large number of guerrilla groups coming from countries represented there ranged themselves. A large part of the time of the conference was utilized in an attempt to find a compromise that would not be a complete rupture between the Communist party of Cuba -- which supported Guevara's appeal in favor of a continental organization of guerrilla war -- and the Communist parties, including that of the USSR, whose position was defined at the conference by the Communist party of Chile.

The counterrevolutionaries linked with the CIA, who were captured during the conference, provoked the anger of most of the delegates and added water to the mill of those who favored continental guerrilla war against the detested U.S. imperialists. They lost sight of the need to combine international solidarity with an autonomous national struggle; and the final resolution condemned the Soviet Union for not having broken relations with the countries made victim of military dictatorships supported by the USA.*

*Whether deliberate or not, this is a grave misstatement of fact. The resolution did not name the Soviet Union; and it did not call for any rupture in either

It seems that Marxist principles were lost at Havana. The formula of the Communist Manifesto which says "though not in substance, yet in form, the struggle of the proletariat with the bourgeoisie is at first a national struggle. The proletariat of each country must, of course, first of all settle matters with its own bourgeoisie" is true in South America although the conditions of imperialist domination and intervention require the raising of new demands for Latin-American solidarity to defend the gains of the revolution and to advance the struggle where the victory has not yet been assured.*

diplomatic or trade relations. It criticized those "socialist countries" that have granted technical and financial aid to the dictatorships and oligarchies participating in the blockade of Cuba.

*Miss Vance says nothing about one of the main conclusions of the OIAS conference; i.e., that Latin America in reality constitutes a single country in which the unity of the Latin-American oligarchies and bourgeoisie is further sustained by the continentalwide policy and active intervention of American imperialism. Her attitude, of course, drew Marx's fire in the Communist Manifesto itself.

In every country, it is the local revolutionaries who must determine the various aspects and different tasks of the revolution. They know the domestic situation better than anyone else and are in an advantageous position to delimit the aims and objectives that must be faced there. In Havana, however, it would seem that this principle was not recognized and it will be from their own experience that the peoples of Latin America will discover the organizational forms and tactics which will bring them victory and democracy.

He said of the utopian socialists: "Hence, they reject all political, and especially all revolutionary action; they wish to attain their ends by peaceful means, and endeavor, by small experiments, necessarily doomed to failure, and by force of example, to pave the way for the new social Gospel." Contrariwise, Marx, it seems, would have felt a certain kinship with the views of Guevara, for he said in the Communist Manifesto:

"The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions."

SOCIALIST SENATOR ARRESTED IN CHILE

Following his appearance on a television show in Santiago September 22, Carlos Altamirano, a senator of the Socialist party of Chile, who represented his party at the OIAS [Organization of Latin-American Solidarity] conference held in Havana last July, was arrested by a squad of thirty plainclothesmen.

He was charged with slandering the head of the government, insulting the army, and advocating force and violence.

The alleged offenses were said to have been committed verbally during a campus meeting in Concepción last July where Altamirano spoke and in writing in an article published in a Chilean weekly. In both instances, Altamirano supported

the need for armed struggle in Latin America, argued that the armies throughout the continent are under the direction of the Pentagon, and accused President Eduardo Frei of incompetency.

At the insistence of the Frei administration, the Supreme Court canceled Altamirano's parliamentary immunity. He was arrested ten days later.

The U.S. State Department has presented the Frei regime in Chile as a model of democracy -- a show window where all of Latin America can see the alternative backed by the Johnson administration to the example offered by the Cuban revolution.

VIETNAM AN "EXCELLENT LABORATORY," WELL-KNOWN AUTHORITY CLAIMS

U. S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk is being quoted in diplomatic circles, according to J. Alvarez del Vayo, the National Guardian's Geneva correspondent, as having said privately to a foreign diplomat:

"We cannot lose in Vietnam. On the contrary, we are winning on three counts.

It would be enough for us to keep part of South Vietnam joined to Thailand, South Korea and the rest of Asia which is opposed to China. But second, Vietnam has been an excellent laboratory in which to test new American weapons. And third, we are learning guerrilla warfare, which is of great importance in regard to Latin America."

DOMINICAN CP BACKS LINE TAKEN AT OLAS CONFERENCE

[At the OLAS conference the role of the orthodox Communist parties adhering to the Moscow line was to try to weaken the stand in favor of armed struggle. The CP of the Dominican Republic was a prominent exception.

[A statement published by the Dominican Communist party (PCD) in the bourgeois paper El Caribe at the height of the conference (August 7) indicated another healthy divergence from the line of most Latin-American Communist parties. We have excerpted below the most significant parts.

[The first passage, from the introductory part of the statement, is noteworthy for two reasons. First, in denouncing any effort to stage a counter-conference to OLAS, the PCD clearly dissociated itself from the rightist leaders of the Venezuelan CP, who were pushing for such a meeting.

[Second, in solidarizing themselves with Cuba, the Dominican Communists noted the parallel between attacks on the Cuban revolutionaries by those like the Venezuelan CP and the propaganda themes of imperialism. Fidel Castro, too, strongly underlined this parallel in his closing speech to the OLAS conference (August 10).

[The second part of the PCD statement listed eight points that the Dominican CP delegates were proposing at the conference. Noteworthy here are the rejection of the alliance with the national bourgeoisie and the explicit statement that the revolution must be socialist. Significant also is the recognition of the importance of the black struggle and the antiwar movement in the U.S. and of the dialectical relation between the colonial revolution and the movement in advanced countries.

[In the point on guerrilla warfare and the relative weight of the urban and rural arenas in armed struggle, some important lessons from the Dominican experience are singled out. The tactical formulations here are far more flexible than those, say, of Régis Debray on the same subject.

[A similar, realistic flexibility on such questions was expressed in Castro's August 10 speech. For example, in the relevant passage of his speech, after discussing the case of Santo Domingo, Castro generalized: "Guerrilla warfare is the main form of struggle, but that does not exclude all other expressions of armed struggle that may arise."]

* * *

Socialist Cuba shows its solidar-

ity with deeds not with words. It does not waver before threats and slander, nor will it retreat in its policy of aiding the people in struggle despite the concrete possibility of aggression.

But Cuba today has not only to confront the smear campaign promoted by American imperialism and its puppet governments, but also the slanders and falsifications preached by sectors that present themselves to the people in revolutionary apparel and even proclaim themselves "Marxist-Leninists."

Both the "ultrarevolutionaries" who deny the existence of socialism in Cuba and the pacifists who characterize as "intervention in the internal problems of their countries" the material aid given and the relations maintained by Cuba with other revolutionary movements, shake hands with imperialism and the Latin-American bourgeoisie in the anti-Cuba campaign aimed at isolating the only socialist country in America.

Our party has rejected every move aimed at weakening the OLAS conference, at holding [rival] meetings or other parallel events. At the same time we combat any position denying Cuba as the primary revolutionary bastion of America.

* * *

(1) It is necessary to organize the struggle for the revolutionary defeat of all the bourgeois and proimperialist governments of the continent.

(2) The leading role in the revolutionary process in Latin America, because of the development of capitalist relations and the nature of the epoch we live in, belongs to the proletariat. But it is an indispensable condition for victory that the peasantry be incorporated in the struggle, that is, that the worker-peasant alliance be realized in practice.

The national bourgeoisie, though in certain circumstances it participates in the anti-imperialist struggle, is incapable of leading the revolution. It bears within itself a tendency toward conciliation with imperialism.

(3) The destruction of imperialist domination, principal enemy of our peoples, implies the unleashing of the revolutionary process to the very end. No force on the national level, once imperialism is defeated, is capable of stopping the revolution's course toward socialism.

(4) The road to revolution in Latin America is through armed struggle. The peoples of our continent will not only

have to defeat the national army but also, once the proimperialist military structure is destroyed, will have to face the Yankee army. It will be a long war against the invading army, military arm of the Yankee monopolies, which faithfully come to the aid of their allies in the spirit of bourgeois internationalism.

The development of the revolutionary struggle in the various countries of the continent will have its specific features, according to the conditions in each. But in all, or almost all, it will necessarily have the character of a national anti-imperialist war.

That is, the use of armed violence by the oppressed classes and sectors will be necessary on a national scale [culminating in] the armed confrontation of the workers, peasants, and other patriotic sectors with the American army.

(5) The imperialist war potential, which necessitates a prolonged resistance; the importance of the terrain on which a war against an army with great technical resources is waged; and the numerical weight of the peasantry in most Latin-American countries -- these are decisive reasons for considering the countryside the fundamental arena for revolutionary war in the continent.

This criterion does not rule out armed action in the cities, like that which occurred here in April 1965. Events of that type can take place even before the development of guerrilla focos and must be pushed ahead by the revolutionaries. In fact, they could even be the point of departure for extending the armed struggle toward the peasant zones.

It is therefore indispensable for the Latin-American revolutionary movement to prepare itself to put into practice all forms of armed struggle and in particular guerrilla warfare.

In the present conditions of the intensification of the revolutionary process in Latin America, the responsibility of revolutionary leaders is to know when, how, and with what degree of preparation armed actions should be put into practice.

(6) Yankee military intervention is a law in the Latin-American revolutionary process, and this necessarily gives a continentwide character to the revolutionary war.

Imperialist military power can for a time prevent the revolutionary victory in a single country. This will make it quite difficult to have a second victorious revolution separate from the others.

Concrete reality indicates that the most likely way that revolutions in our continent will come about is through the gradual incorporation into armed struggle of a number of countries. Imperialism will be obliged to disperse its forces, steadily increasing the contingent of troops at each guerrilla foco, a situation which will contribute to its overall weakening.

(7) The revolutionary struggle of the dependent countries is the main factor in the internal decomposition of the developed capitalist countries and mainly of the U.S. The deepening of our [revolutionary] process leads necessarily to the increase of internal resistance in the U.S.

Therefore the main internationalist duty of the revolutionary proletariat of that country consists in solidarity with the national liberation struggle.

In the same way the anti-imperialist movement in Latin America must give full support to the internal resistance in the U.S., which today reaches great proportions with the violent struggle of the black people and the great protests that have developed for an end to the Vietnam war and against the high cost of living.

American imperialism is in process of decomposition. The systematic blows of the oppressed peoples, together with its own internal contradictions and the growth of the revolutionary movement in its own territory, are destroying it little by little.

Let us unite these two great revolutionary forces into a single torrent!

(8) In the present conditions of the internationalization of the military forces of capitalism, a more firm and militant stand by the socialist camp is necessary, one that would impede the advance of counterrevolution and ensure the victory of the world proletarian revolution.

Material aid to the peoples in struggle should be unlimited and gauged to counterbalance imperialist military intervention at every step.

"The G.A.O. [U.S. General Accounting Office] quoted from a briefing paper presented at the Guam conference last March, that said the United States and South Vietnam 'do not consider the present overcrowding of hospitals or limited access to medical treatment in remote areas critical to our success in the political-psychological side of the war effort.'" -- New York Times, Oct. 12, 1967.

THE OLAS CONFERENCE AND THE "PRINCIPLES" OF PAUL-HENRI SPAAK

By Ernest Mandel

In the September 13, 1967, Le Soir the following piece of prose appeared under the signature of Paul-Henri Spaak [Belgian Socialist party leader and minister of foreign affairs]:

"It does not mean that one is a 'rightist' if he supports the position that the slogans issued at Havana (call for civil war, the will to resort to systematic violence) can provoke grave dangers for the whole world.

"In Europe, we seem to be unaware of this. There is the rumble of revolt in Latin America and the American Blacks have taken leaders who have lost all sense of proportion and all common sense, but we seem to consider such events as completely unrelated to us. We comment on them -- I refer to our radio and television -- with the serenity and indulgence of people who feel themselves to be secure forever.

"But is it necessary to be a great political seer to foresee what would become of Europe if the theses of Castro, Carmichael or Brown were to triumph?

"How can one fail to understand that we must find solutions for the real and urgent problems confronting us, but that we can only do this if we are united and act together?

"Today it is the American rather than the European continent which is confronted by difficulties. During and after the war it came to our assistance. The hour for repaying our debt has sounded. Even though we find that the United States is making mistakes, even if we find it difficult to accept certain situations, wisdom does not lie in condemning it and moving away from it; on the contrary, it lies in drawing closer to it and jointly finding solutions in conformity with our principles."

These sentences should be read again and again. They warrant a place in the textbooks. It is hard to say what element is most outstanding: its analytical depth, the elevation of its ideas, or its delicate style.

Are the commentators on our radio and television stations discussing the OLAS [Organization of Latin-American Solidarity] conference with "serenity," that is to say, objectively? Spaak is calling them to order! At a time when American capitalism is being threatened, a fig for all objectivity, which is a priori suspect. It is the duty of the strongboxes of Europe to unite with the

strongboxes of the United States. It is the duty of journalists to defend the interests of these safes or shut up. It would be impossible to find a better revelation of the real nature of bourgeois democracy.

There are "some problems" in Latin America. So great a mind as Spaak obviously cannot contest this. But who, then, is called upon to find the solutions for these "real and urgent" problems? The people inhabiting Latin America? Only a knife-between-the-teeth-Castroite could possibly formulate such an antidemocratic thesis. To Mr. Spaak, democracy consists of delegating to American imperialism the power to settle the problems of Latin America, and in "our" uniting with it in order to help it impose its solutions. That is what is in conformity with "our principles."

"Certain situations" are obviously "difficult to accept." But "we," happy bourgeois that we are, satiated by happy Europe, "we" prefer euphemisms, since precise terms have a subversive quality, in fact, they are "Castroite." We therefore talk about "situations," rather than mention fascist and military dictatorships, monstrous infant mortality -- in Brazil alone malnutrition causes the premature death of 300,000 infants before they live out their first year -- general illiteracy, "universal suffrage" limited to ten percent of the population, atrocious superexploitation, annual incomes which hardly equal the monthly incomes of Belgian citizens, etc., etc.

But if "we" are very discreet about certain regrettable "situations," "we" make up for it by condemning the "call to civil war," "the will to resort to systematic violence" emanating from the OLAS conference.

"We" love "order and tranquility." Obviously the world isn't perfect. From time to time violence is inevitable. That is why "we" sent our paratroops to the Congo. Obviously our aim was not to overthrow the Stanleyville government but only to "free" "our" women and our children. When it comes to Latin America, however, it is forbidden to use violence in order to free millions of women and children from their terrible fate. For that is the kind of liberation which directly threatens the colonial superprofits of the United Fruit Corporation, the Creole Petroleum Corporation, the United States Steel Corporation, and even the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, about whom, "we" admit, we have heard some vague reference in the past...

The "call for civil war" launched by Havana is something inadmissable. "We" no longer say that we prefer democracy to dictatorship. Because, unfortunately, the "civil war" which Havana wants is aimed precisely at the dictatorial regimes established almost everywhere in Latin America. No, "we" condemn "civil war" in toto, implying by this (for "we" are never at a loss for logic) that it is preferable to submit passively to fascist dictatorships, concentration camps, the torture of political prisoners, the massacres of strikers, famine wages, a total absence of social legislation, rather than to revolt against such infamous conditions. "Our" German confreres propounded a similar thesis on the very eve of the Nazi accession to power. Since then fifty million dead testify to the validity of this thesis...

The good fellow is no simpleton, however. "There is the rumble of revolt in Latin America," he writes. Is this due to the "calls" of Havana? Only the blind still believe in the legend that revolutions flare up as if by magic as the result of dirty work by "outside agitators." If "there is the rumble of revolt" in that area, this is undoubtedly so because the economy is stagnant, because social conditions are execrable, because the possessing classes are decadent, cruel and incompetent, because the peoples have no peaceful means of correcting the situation, because their patience has been exhausted... Hasn't Paul-Henri Spaak read "his" Kennedy? Is he less intelligent than a political leader of American imperialism?

If revolt threatens, what should we do? Should we help the exploited who are revolting, or run to the aid of the exploiters, who put themselves under the protection of the Dollar Empire? Paul-Henri Spaak's "principles" direct him onto the second road. The content of these "principles" is clear: international solidarity of the strongboxes!

But the reader still hasn't grasped all the subtlety of Spaakist reasoning. "We" condemn the will to resort to systematic violence. For "we" must remain logical with "ourselves." When two dozen Brazilian field-marshals set up a dictatorship in that country, "we" obviously remained silent (one does not meddle in the internal affairs of another country).

When General Onganía suppressed democratic rights in Argentina, "we" did not raise our voice.

When the Argentine army broke strikes, occupied trade-union headquarters, arrested thousands upon thousands of militant workers, "we" never felt that "our principles" were endangered.

When the Bolivian army occupied

the villages of the miners, violated the women, killed hundreds of workers, interned the leading militants in a zone within the country where leprosy reigns, "we" felt it was hardly any concern of ours. When the private armies of the landed proprietors in Peru, Brazil, Paraguay, Ecuador, Colombia, drive the peasants off their ancestral lands, reestablish forced labor or serfdom, "we" are obviously of the opinion that this is a difficult situation to accept. But "we" rely on the forces of progress to change this scandalous situation "progressively" by means of "peaceful reforms," purely peaceful reforms.

But when men and women become fed up with seeing their peoples suffer in vain year after year, decade after decade; when working-class militants become fed up with being arrested, tortured and massacred and prefer to take up arms in self-defense and even to strike a first blow; when the peasants become fed up with being terrorized by private and governmental armies and proceed to organize, arm themselves and take back the land which is rightfully theirs, then obviously everything has changed. Then, obviously, violence is no longer "occasional"; it becomes systematic. From then on it warrants an exemplary condemnation executed in due and proper form. That is what Mr. Spaak's principles proclaim.

And yet, all modern states are the products of revolutions. And yet, the king of the Belgians, for whom Mr. Spaak was such a deferential and loyal prime minister, is king only by the grace of a revolution. And yet, the United States Declaration of Independence, so beloved by Mr. Spaak, itself proclaims the sacred right of peoples to revolt when injustice can be redressed by no other means. Will Mr. Spaak deny that the social situation in America is unjust and cries to heaven for revenge? Will he deny that nine times out of ten it has proved impossible to redress the situation peacefully, if for no other reason than the fact that the brutal dictatorships tolerate no popular actions, even of a peaceful kind? But Mr. Spaak is unconcerned about all these "democratic" truths. American capital is threatened. Yesterday it came to the aid of European capital. Today, this aid must be returned. The reasoning is as simple as that.

Formerly we were told that we had to fight for our country. Then came the turn of democracy. Today country and democracy have disappeared from the vocabulary: "workers, mobilize in defense of the strongboxes, just that!" At least the cause gains in clarity. And so do Mr. Spaak's principles.

Several months ago Dom Helder Camara, archbishop of Recife in Brazil, who is familiar with the poverty of his

famished flock, declared: "I am against the use of violence but I understand that it is possible to use it, and I respect these men who have chosen the road of violence." (He was alluding to the Castroite guerrilleros of Brazil.)

Fifteen bishops recently launched an appeal to the conscience of the world, in which they castigated the poverty of the Third World, Latin America included, and the exploiters responsible for this

poverty. They explicitly asserted that because of this fact "certain revolutions" -- they could hardly go any further -- were legitimate.

Paul-Henri Spaak has so identified himself with capitalist interests that he now occupies a more reactionary position than a part of the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church. It would be difficult for a "socialist" to fall any lower.

VIETNAMESE PLEDGE SOLIDARITY TO STOKELY CARMICHAEL

[Stokely Carmichael, during his recent visit to North Vietnam, met with Premier Pham Van Dong and other officials of North Vietnam and of the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam.

[During the August 31 meeting, Pham Van Dong made a declaration of solidarity with the struggle of black people in the United States for their freedom. The text of his statement appears below. It is reprinted from the September 2 Vietnam Information Bulletin, published in Rangoon, Burma.]

* * *

The Vietnamese people deeply sympathize with the sufferings of black people in the U.S. as their brothers and close comrades in arms in the struggle against the common enemy, U.S. imperialism.

The Vietnamese people sincerely thank black people in the U.S. for the warm support they give to the Vietnamese people's cause of resistance to the U.S. aggressors, for national salvation, and rejoice to see that this valuable support

is developing with every passing day among black servicemen in the U.S. army.

The Vietnamese people fully approve and firmly support the just struggle of black people in the U.S. who under the leadership of their own leaders, are thoroughly opposing the policy of racial discrimination which is made a State policy practiced in a most odious and cruel manner by the U.S. ruling circles.

Since this struggle is aimed at winning the legitimate rights and responds to the deep aspirations of black people in the U.S., it has the power to stimulate the spirit of close solidarity and staunch fighting spirit of black people and is bound to develop broadly and quickly and become an invincible strength.

The Vietnamese people firmly believe that the just struggle of black people in the U.S. which is enjoying the sympathy and vigorous support of the African peoples as well as the people of other countries in the world, will surely tide over all difficulties and hardships, and win glorious victory.

THE GOOD LIFE IN VIETNAM -- AMERICAN STYLE

An October 11 report by the U.S. General Accounting Office graphically revealed what the American way of life can do for the Vietnamese people. The agency gave an accounting of the provisions made by the United States for the more than two million refugees whose homes have been destroyed by U.S. bombing.

The October 12 New York Times summarized the GAO report:

"...nearly half the 573,546 so-called temporary refugees carried on the rolls as of last August were not receiving their daily subsistence allowances of 400 grams of rice and three Vietnamese piastres [about US\$.025]..."

The rest of the two million refu-

gees are supposedly permanently "reset-tled" and given an allowance of 500 piastres [about US\$.42] and a six-month supply of rice. The Times reported:

"In the country's five northernmost provinces, where the refugee problem has been greatest this year...only 25 per cent of the eligible refugees have received this larger resettlement allowance, the G.A.O. said...."

"American officials estimate that civilian casualties are occurring at the rate of about 100,000 a year....The report said \$17-million in Defense Department funds had still not been committed to build three new hospitals with a capacity of 1,100 beds for civilian casualties."

IRISH LABOUR PARTY SHIFTS TO THE LEFT

By Gery Lawless

The next conference of the Irish Labour party, due to take place in Dublin in mid-October, will be the most important assembly of Irish Labour in fifty-five years.

With the execution of James Connolly after the 1916 Rising and the imprisonment of Larkin in America, the Labour party, never theoretically well developed, has been led by men who were vague in their aims and bereft of perspective. Its theory was never more than reformism cohabiting with syndicalism.

It has been a "bookless" party, with a contempt for theory. It is based on humanitarian instinct. It pushes ahead blindly, attempting to take a "decent line" on each issue as it comes up. It has only a hazy idea of the type of society it is trying to create and, not surprisingly then, no idea at all of how it is going to construct it.

Labour missed the boat in the War of Independence, accepting De Valera's dictum that "Labor must wait" (until the first bourgeois stage of the revolution was finished).

The party waited while factory workers seized factories and landless men and small farmers divided estates among themselves. Labour waited throughout the forty-five wasted years of the abortion of the Irish revolution. It has acted through all these years as a workers' lobby in a bosses' parliament.

In 1948 it entered a coalition with the semifascist Fine Gael party and other parties at a time of general left swing in Ireland. A determined party with socialist policies could have won power or at least become the main opposition party opposing a bourgeois coalition. In the event, the coalition infused new life into the Fine Gael party.

In 1956, having learned nothing, Labour partnered Fine Gael in applying the British credit squeeze. In the general election the following year Labour was massacred at the polls. This fiasco, proving the bankruptcy of Labour's leadership, gave the impetus for the development of an alternative programme for Labour.

The people who were to develop this programme grouped themselves in the 1913 Club in Dublin -- named after the year of the Irish General Strike. The first lesson which was learned, and which was hammered home and accepted by Labour, was no more coalitions. The previous co-

alition policy has been responsible more than any other factor for the refusal of Dublin workers to vote Labour.

After the 1957 election, Labour promised no more coalitions. This coupled with the open emergence of Fianna Fail under Lemass' leadership as the businessmen's party, set the background for the return of working-class support to Labour.

The process continued to grow as Fianna Fail gave lesson after lesson of its antiworking-class aims -- particularly the proposed laws attacking the right of workers to strike.

The nonpolitical attitude of rank-and-file trade unionists changed and more and more workers began to vote. They voted Labour.

This was reflected again in the decision of the ITGWU [Irish Transport and General Workers Union] to affiliate to the LP and in the sharp increase in the poll in Dublin City from 29 percent to more than 50 percent.

Labour's overall share of the votes rose from 10 percent to 16 percent. In Dublin, Labour's vote went up from 14 percent to 29 percent, making them three seats short of becoming the largest party on the Dublin Corporation. Labour is thus the most rapidly growing party in Ireland.

It has 400 branches and about 15,000 individual members. Twenty-two Labour members sit in the Dáil [lower house of parliament] and six Labour representatives in the Seanad [senate].

In the 1965 general election Labour put forward forty-three candidates contesting thirty-four constituencies. It received 192,750 first preference votes, an increase of 80,992 on its 1957 first preference figures. The party today is predominantly a working-class party but with a small and influential bourgeois element.

Fourteen trade unions are at present affiliated with a total membership of 63,000. The decision taken in May of this year by the Irish Transport and General Workers Union to affiliate, will double this number.

At last year's conference, the vast majority of the delegates were what would be called in England "Tribunites." However, nobody realized this, least of all the delegates themselves, with the result that the conference returned a

right-wing policy and leadership.

This year the left have learned some, if not all, of their lessons. Already deputy Jim Tully, the party right-wing chairman for about eleven years, has decided not to go forward for reelection. At the same time Dr. Noel Browne, who was hounded out of the office of Minister of Health by the church, will be returned unopposed as the party's vice-chairman. Two centrists will contest for the chairmanship, while for the party treasurer-ship there is a contest between a "Tribunite" and an avowed Marxist.

The preliminary agenda for this month's conference reflects the new leftward swing: several motions demand the rewriting of the party's constitution to show clearly that the party aims for a socialist Ireland.

There are several resolutions condemning any kind of coalition. Four resolutions are tabled on the party's constitution and they reflect the new mood. One reaffirms the party's dedication to the achievement of a united Ireland "but believe that such a goal can be achieved only by the united action of the working people against the Tories, North and South. This unity can only be forged under demands which stress that the united Ireland aimed at is one in the interests of the working people of all parts of the country."

The resolution concludes with the words: "Accordingly, conference calls for the reintroduction of the demand for a Workers' Republic in the statement of the basic principles and objects of the Labour Party."

There are five resolutions on Viet-

nam; all condemn America's aggression and one calls for complete solidarity with the National Liberation Front. This parallels the position of the North Ireland Labour party whose conference policy is victory for the National Liberation Front.

A report to conference will deal with progress toward the formation of the All-Ireland Council of Labour. Agreement has been achieved by the parties concerned, but one branch proposed to conference that a United Socialist party now should be formed for the whole of Ireland.

A big danger for Irish Labour is that all these resolutions will be taken as policy and then treated, as Wilson treated Clause Four, as a nice decoration never to be implemented.

But there are checks and balances against this development. The 1913 Club has passed on. Two of its former members are candidates for chairmanship of the party; others have found other places in the establishment, but some have remained to carry through the realignment which was first visualized.

Dublin, for the first time in a generation, has a Marxist discussion movement. The left wing, North and South -- without waiting on the official parties -- have themselves merged. Left-wing students have formed the Irish Association of Labour Student Organizations.

Irish Labour, like a lion rampant from 1913 to 1917, then dormant for fifty years, is now on the march and shows great promise of completing Ireland's unfinished revolution. In the process it will send tremors through British capitalism.

ADVICE ON "RIOT CONTROL"

Writing in the Japan Times for September 10, retired U.S. Brigadier General S.L.A. Marshall turned his attention to the uprisings in Newark and Detroit.

"President Johnson's program to put down insurrection in the cities," the military affairs analyst writes, "is as orthodox as squads right: 'Give the troops -- regulars and National Guard -- more riot training.' But the value of any such directive depends upon the ability of those who decree it accepting the realities of a wholly new problem."

The general believes Johnson isn't taking a new situation into account: "Block-to-block fighting in a city complex against a declared enemy is a prob-

blem which the U.S. Army understands... It is met and solved by calling in heavy support fire, thereafter shooting or capturing any armed person who gets in the way."

This, General Marshall writes, must be ruled out. Further, "routine methods of riot control" aren't applicable: "Riot is more or less spontaneous mob action and can usually be quelled by shooting to wound or to kill while individuals will still react primarily to fear of death. But if the real menace is not riot per se, but a new form of revolutionary warfare, as insidious as what the Viet Cong has visited on Southeast Asia, the problem has a wholly different dimension."

CLEMENT ATTLEE: LABOUR CARETAKER OF BRITISH CAPITALISM

By George Novack

Clement Attlee, Labour party leader who was prime minister from 1945 to 1951, has died at the age of eighty-four.



Caricature of Clement Attlee drawn in 1945 by the late Laura Gray, well-known cartoonist for The Militant.

He will be buried in Westminster Abbey. The services which Earl Attlee rendered to the possessing classes of England at a time of peril to their domination earned him this distinction.

Attlee found Marxism, the class struggle and the proletarian revolution repugnant to his refined sensibilities. These seemed to him utterly incompatible with British traditions and temperament.

He espoused instead a settlement-house variety of Fabianism which championed philanthropic measures for the "deserving poor" under the aegis of the "Welfare State." This outlook dispensed triple blessings. It sedated the workers, relieved middle-class consciences; and helped the rich perpetuate the system of exploitation which generated poverty in the first place.

He and his similars borrowed the philosophy of gradualism from a superannuated Liberalism and carried it into the Labour party where it acted as a brake upon the growing power of organized labour. From the colorless character of his personality to his prostration before U.S. imperialism Attlee epitomized the conservative and conciliatory attitudes of the right-wing elements in the Labour party and unions.

Attlee boasted of his makeshift empiricism, his readiness to compromise principled issues, and his "fairness" toward all classes. He abhorred all forms of militant mass action and sought the gradual improvement of bourgeois society by purely parliamentary and peaceful means.

Attlee's background was far removed from the working men and women who made up the ranks of the Labour party. The son of a well-to-do lawyer, an Oxford graduate who was trained to follow his father's profession, he was swerved from this career by commiseration for the conditions of the inhabitants in London's East End. He did settlement work there for fourteen years.

This led him to question the basis of the economic system and Fabian propaganda converted him to a mild socialism. He joined the Independent Labour party which was instrumental in bringing the present Labour party into being.

Adhering to the principle of gradualism in all things, he mounted the Labour party hierarchy rung by rung. From 1919 to 1931 he served as Mayor of Stepney, in the House of Commons and in the two MacDonald governments. As one of the few Labour survivors left in the Commons after his predecessor as prime minister, Ramsay MacDonald, betrayed the party and formed a "National Government" in 1931, Attlee became deputy leader.

He was elevated to the top at a time of crisis and confusion within the party in 1935. "Clem" was looked upon as "the least common denominator" of the contending factions, a safe and sane choice to keep the ship afloat until a more capable pilot could be put at the helm.

The war intervened and, as deputy prime minister of the Coalition Government, he became Churchill's chief aide, especially entrusted with the task of keeping the workers in line. He took charge of the government when the Tory bulldog was ill or absent. In that capacity he approved the atom-bombing of Japan



Caricature of Clement Attlee drawn in 1945 by the late Laura Gray, well-known cartoonist for The Militant.



Caricature of Clement Attlee drawn in 1945 by the late Laura Gray, well-known cartoonist for The Militant.

and never changed his mind about that atrocity.

After Germany's defeat in the spring of 1945, he and his associates were, much to their surprise, swept into office by an election landslide which gave Labour 390 seats to 195 for the Conservatives. This stunning victory offered the Labour leadership an unexampled opportunity to deal death blows to English capitalism which would considerably facilitate the transition to socialism. The possessing classes were on the ropes; the workers were ready for far-reaching measures; the middle classes were sympathetic to radical changes. Despite the material difficulties of the postwar years, no Social Democratic government in office ever had a more favorable political situation to show what its methods were worth.

Attlee was closer to MacDonald than to Cromwell. He was not the man for thoroughgoing actions or surgical procedures. Almost everything his government did at home and abroad was half-hearted.

His first administration did inaugurate numerous long-overdue reforms desired and welcomed by the working people. It established a free National Health Service, increased unemployment benefits, retirement and widows' pensions and workmen's compensation. These social welfare measures, which he regarded as his major achievement, won his regime whatever esteem it retained among the masses.

The crucial part of his domestic program, however, revolved around the nationalizations proposed in the Labour party platform. Attlee's government took over the Bank of England, the coal mines, cable and wireless services, public utilities (gas and electricity), rail, air and road transport, and later the steel plants.

These nationalizations did give the government certain levers of control over the national economy. However, the Fabians chose not to overstep the boundaries of capitalism and left the power of the private banks and monopolists intact. They also brought some benefits to the unionized workers in the nationalized sectors. They had greater security of employment, though this could be imperiled by rationalization; more regularized training and promotions; and some ways to check the more arbitrary decisions of an autocratic management.

In spite of their initial apprehensions and resistance, the principal beneficiaries of the limited nationalizations ironically turned out to be the profiteers against which they were directed. Less than twenty percent of British industry was transferred to public ownership. This was inadequate to vest

effective centralized control of the commanding heights of the economy in government hands.

The most prosperous branches of the economy remained under private ownership. Generous compensation payments not only rescued the proprietors of the nationalized industries from bankruptcy but converted their former liabilities into large liquid capital assets. These funds became available for investment in the "growth sectors" of the economy where the highest returns could be raked in.

On top of that, the more efficient operation of the newly nationalized industries, with their subsidized services, lowered production costs and increased the profitability of the private sector.

Instead of placing the newly nationalized industries under the democratic control of the workers, Attlee's government turned over their operation in many cases to executives and monied men intimately linked with private enterprise. While still in office, the prime minister unblushingly reported that sixty out of the 131 persons on the central boards of the public corporations were also directors in private companies, twenty-three were knights, nine were lords, and three were generals.

The results of this hybrid "mixed economy," one-fourth public and three-fourths private, disappointed the hopes of the workers as much as it reassured the capitalist class. After the initial charge of enthusiasm and energy, the Attlee government kept floundering and losing its popularity. It had reached a dead end when the Conservatives made their comeback in 1951.

The Attlee government was shamefully compliant to the interests of Anglo-American imperialism in the field of foreign affairs. Churchill had pugnaciously told Roosevelt that he had not taken office to preside over the liquidation of "His Majesty's Empire." But the economic decline of Great Britain, the growth of the dominions and the irrepressible upsurge of the subject nations necessitated a reorganization of London's imperial system.

Attlee and his Ministers undertook to supervise this inevitable readjustment to the changed relationship of forces on the world arena so that British capitalism could retreat in good order with the minimum losses. They accorded independence to India, Ceylon and Burma and withdrew British troops from Egypt and Palestine.

These moves did not prevent Attlee from extending into the postwar period London's military and diplomatic alliance with Washington which was directed not

only against the Soviet Union but against the advancing colonial revolution. As a junior partner in the cold war, Attlee's regime cooperated with the United States in devising and implementing the Truman Doctrine in the Mediterranean, policing the regions east of Suez, and supporting the Korean war. He set the pattern being pursued by Wilson in respect to Vietnam.

Despite a challenge from the Bevanite opposition, Attlee managed to keep his leadership until 1955 when he was replaced by Hugh Gaitskell. He crowned his political career by filling a seat in the

House of Lords. He felt quite at home in that archaic body.

Attlee used the immense powers put at his disposal by the British working class, not to speed a decrepit capitalism to its grave, but to try and nurse it back to health. His successors are still at this job.

Attlee's services as physician to their sick system undoubtedly endeared him to the Anglo-American bourgeoisie. But the workers and socialists of Britain have no reason to be thankful for them.

CUBAN ART SHOW DRAWS NEW PRAISE

The Cuban art show in London has made another recruit [see World Outlook, September 22]. This one is Nigel Gosling, art critic for the London Observer.

Writing in that paper September 10, Gosling begins, "A small London exhibition, at the Ewan Phillips Gallery in Maddox Street, may prove to contain an explosive charge which will blow a whole world of assumptions into smithereens.

"It is a collection of 40 works from Cuba and I believe it is a major portent."

Gosling continues, "Now, as every good American knows, Cuba is a Communist State, and we all know what Communist art is like. At least we did. For here are 14 artists, their ages ranging from 30 to 70, all apparently pat loyal to the regime and yet all working cheerfully in artistic idioms as far out as any West End dealer could demand.

"The hitherto unchallenged equation of Communised production with academic realism in art has been wiped out. Fidel Castro has split the Communist atom, taking the part he wanted, and a whole new source of creative power has been unleashed."

Gosling then goes on to describe the various influences he detected in the Cuban paintings: "For obvious reasons it is Paris oriented. Any culture wanting to be modern without taking anything from America will inevitably revert to France (though one day Britain may prove an acceptable alternative), and Picasso in particular forms a natural magnet. Spain and Africa, so important in his art, also form the base of this island's culture.

"Actually a good deal of New York has crept in indirectly -- which is all to the good. It fends off the slightly old-fashioned or over-refined atmosphere which permeates much Paris-inspired South

American art."

Gosling then mentions the paintings he likes best but rushes on to draw more general conclusions:

"...freedom is the thing, with all the release of vitality and eloquence which goes with it.

"There is no question here of a cautious 'thaw' from Marxist primness, no earnest compromise aimed at spooning the contemporary idiom down reluctant proletarian throats. These artists may sometimes strike European eyes as over-colourful or innocently brash, but the language they speak is totally natural.

"They are simply using the images which convey most forcefully what they feel about life.

"That this often involves a savage political slant is normal. What is abnormal is to see a picture in honour of Castro conceived in terms strikingly like those used by Peter Blake to celebrate the Beatles."

Gosling concludes, "basically it must rest on something in the Cuban character.

"Between the European intellectual and the peasant of the Sierra Maestra...there exists a common factor which we revolutionaries can well understand," Castro has declared, and his lieutenant, the popular hero Che Guevara, has actually denounced Socialist Realism outright as being based on a nineteenth century art perhaps more purely capitalistic than the decadent art of the twentieth century."

The London critic ends, "These lively offerings do more honour to their cause than a mile of pedestrian propaganda."

A VOICE OF PEASANT DISCONTENT IN CHINA

[On New Year's Day the People's Daily and Red Flag carried a joint editorial which stated that the principal task of 1967 was to extend the "great proletarian cultural revolution" into industry and agriculture. Since then not much reliable information on the real situation in the rural areas has been made available.

[One document which does cast a beam of light on this sector of Chinese society today comes from the April-June issue of The China Quarterly. It is the partial text of a poster which appeared in Shanghai January 14 with a list of grievances drawn up by peasants in a Shanghai suburb. The basic complaint is discrimination against the countryside in favor of the cities.

[The poster was put up amidst the tumultuous movements among the Shanghai workers at the beginning of this year which for a time threatened to pass beyond the control of any of the contending bureaucratic factions of the regime.

[The bill of particulars in this indictment was evidently formulated by some highly knowledgeable spokesmen for discontented elements among the peasants. The China Quarterly states that the poster listed thirty-five grievances of which it quotes the following.]

* * *

(a) Politically we are second-class citizens.

(1) Why is the countryside used as the general rubbish-bin of the towns? No matter what the crime, anyone in need of remoulding is sent out to the country, some for reform through labour.

(2) There are no proper teachers in the countryside. They are all in the towns. Thus, education in the countryside is not on the same level as in the towns. And even if some do come to the country, they just sit in the office all day.

(3) The division between town and country is perpetuated from generation to generation by the fact that country children who come to the town for education return after graduation to the country. Graduates in the town share jobs amongst themselves. If the father tilled the soil, the son must after him.

(4) It is difficult for some young country lads to find a wife, because the girls are attracted to the workers. These girls may have been born in the country, but their mentality is urban. And this is not surprising, because of the workers' better pay. Moreover, they have a pension,

whereas a farm worker, even after 70 or 80 years of tilling the soil, gets no pension and has to continue feeding himself his whole life long.

(5) Why are all the big hospitals and medical services concentrated in the town? We countryfolk, who have only the mobile medical services, also have to pay for all medical attention. Some people say this is because we country people are never ill. This is untrue.

(6) Why are all the administrative offices centred in the town? All the officials are very comfortable there, and are reluctant to come out into the country. They are unwilling to come out and investigate the real situation, or to get down to grass roots. They are out of touch with us.

(7) The PLA [People's Liberation Army] is composed of the sons and daughters of the whole people. We all say we uphold the glorious PLA, but why is it that the task of supporting the army and giving preferential treatment to the families of soldiers falls only on our shoulders? Nor do we get credit for it, and have never had one single honour for our services. A small group of people in the towns get them all. We demand that honours should immediately be distributed to us!

(8) Workers have their unions, soldiers have theirs, and Party workers have a body to represent their interests. Why don't we have unions?

(9) Chairman Mao has stressed the importance of education, physical exercise and culture. Our cultural level is very low. But we have few such facilities in the countryside, and haven't even a chance to see films. (Singers and other entertainers are loath to come to the country -- they must come more often.)

(10) It is true that the working class is the leading class, and that the peasants are the basis. But this does not mean that the workers should occupy a dominant economic position. Over the last 17 years, the "three discrepancies" have gradually widened. Chairman Mao has always protected the peasants and championed the eradication of the "three discrepancies."

(11) The peasants have no voice. They have only "formal" democracy. At the Second Consultative Conference of Lower-Middle and Poor Peasants, no decisions were made by us. All we had was a few days of free board and lodging.

(12) Originally, the broadening of rivers and building of embankments was a defence measure. So why did the entire

burden fall on the shoulders of the peasants? If the Chiang bandits attack, they won't just attack the villages and leave the towns alone, will they?...

(14) Some people are always stressing the contribution to the nation made by the working class. But were it not for the peasants, there would be no food to eat and no clothes to wear.

(15) Funds are distributed only once a year. If peasants run short of money and apply to the banks for loans they have to pay interest. This leads to dissatisfaction.

(16) Why is it that, in the Shanghai rural region, there are enormous differences between the consumption of this or that family. Some families have so much food they cannot eat it all, and sell off the surplus at a high price, while others eat congee the whole year round and never set eyes on a grain of rice. We should all have an equal amount of grain. We don't mind if our ration is reduced a little to make up for those with little to eat.

(b) Economically we have not yet secured our freedom.

(17) Our only propaganda materials in the countryside are articles from newspapers. Moreover, we are charged 2.40 yuan reception fee. Who is the dog of an official who introduced this measure?

(18) Why is the burden of retired workers and army veterans put on our shoulders?

(19) In the towns, leaders and officials are paid several tens, several hundreds or even over 1,000 yuan. Our wages are only 10 or 20 yuan a month. This discrepancy will open the way for the emergence of a Khrushchev in our country.

(20) In 1966, the price of grain was raised. But taxes were also raised. This measure will not help to reduce the "three discrepancies."

(21) Why do we peasants have to contribute share-capital to enter a commune whereas workers don't have to pay anything to enter a factory?

(22) Workers live in flats provided by the state, have offices provided by the state, use tools provided by the state. We peasants have to buy everything ourselves, even a sickle.

(23) Many workers in the towns live in blocks of flats. We live in huts which are often in a state of collapse, and we are exposed to wind and rain. Just what attitude do the dogs of officials responsible in the towns have towards the peasants?

(24) Why is it that we poor, lower and middle peasants are responsible for planning birth-control?

(25) We responded to Chairman Mao's call for building small-scale factories in the villages, but they were immediately nationalised by the Municipal Committee, and made into state-owned enterprises.

(26) At New Year and on holidays, workers get special rations. We get nothing at all -- not even bean curd.

(27) Grain grown by us is sold at 10 yuan a picul. But we have to pay 33 yuan a picul for human fertiliser and 16.5 yuan for manure. Of course you can grow a lot of grain with a picul of fertiliser.

(28) Meat is normally sent to us from the city. Why did supplies stop on January 2?

ZENGAKUREN DEMONSTRATES AGAINST SATO TOUR

October must be the month for diplomatic tours of Southeast Asia. Last year it was Lyndon Johnson's "barnstorming." Johnson was greeted by massive antiwar demonstrations in every single country he visited except South Vietnam.

This year it's Japanese Premier Eisaku Sato who is making the rounds and it looks like Sato's tour is going to be just about as helpful for Washington's public image. (Sato will visit Johnson himself in November.)

Sato left Tokyo International Airport October 8. Two thousand members of the All-Japan Student Federation --

Zengakuren -- attacked and nearly seized the airport to demonstrate their opposition to the tour.

According to a firsthand account in the October 9 New York Times, the Zengakuren assaulted the airport from three different routes across bridges. They were opposed by 2,500 club-swinging policemen and nine armored cars.

In a three-hour battle, 407 policemen and more than 100 students were injured. One student was killed. At one point, the students seized the armored cars and forced at least six policemen to jump into the river.

LOGICAL ORDER

Under the title "Ordre Logique," Robert Escarpit, the satirical commentator for the Paris daily Le Monde, had the following to say September 28 about the way the Bolivian army opened its trial of Régis Debray:

"The trial of Régis Debray, it would seem, is offering an interesting innovation, since it opened with the summation by the prosecution before the charges were even read.

"The court, in short, has a much

clearer idea of the punishment called for than it has of the crimes which it is asked to punish. No doubt at the end of the trial, it will be made known, and perhaps even substantiated, to what degree the defendant is guilty.

"All this is quite rational and ought to be considered a model for all political trials. But Régis Debray's attorney is right -- there is one error in the procedure at Camiri. Logically something was missing that should have been placed ahead of the summation -- the sentence."

CANADIANS DEMAND FREEDOM FOR DEBRAY

A petition demanding the release of French journalist Régis Debray, currently on trial by a military court in Bolivia, is being submitted to the Bolivian military junta by more than forty academic and public figures in Canada.

The signers include professors,

journalists, trade unionists, student and antiwar leaders, a poet and a book publisher.

Additional signatures are being sought by the petition's sponsor, Robert McCarthy, Massey College, 4 Devonshire Place, Toronto, Canada.

IMPASSIONED CHARGES OPEN DEBRAY TRIAL IN CAMIRI

[The article below, by Le Monde correspondent Irénée Guimaraes, appeared on the front page of the French daily September 28. Guimaraes was covering the trial of the imprisoned French journalist Régis Debray in Camiri, Bolivia.

[The day following Le Monde's publication of the article, Guimaraes was expelled from Camiri by military prosecutor Colonel Remberto Iriarte.

[In addition to expelling Guimaraes, according to a Reuters dispatch from Camiri printed in the October 2 New York Post, the Bolivian military authorities threatened the remaining correspondents with the same fate if they continued to write "inaccurate and malicious reports."

"If you agree with Guimaraes," Iriarte told the international reporters, "you too are a Communist and will have to leave Camiri."

* * *

Camiri, September 27

On Wednesday September 26 in the little town of Camiri in the heart of the southeast section of Bolivia, the long wait, around a modest one-story pink building bearing the name Casino Militar [Officers' Club], came to an end. There

former Ecole Normale student Régis Debray has been awaiting trial for three months. The waiting came to an end as army detachments in green uniforms with white helmets and red scarves suddenly converged, bayonets fixed, around the blue cement library which has been converted into a courtroom.

The "high society" of Camiri, as they call it here -- a motley agglomeration of pretty wives of officers stationed here, petroleum engineers, and town notables -- flocked to the spectacle of the day: what the military tribunal's presiding judge, Colonel Guachalla, smugly called "the stern majesty of Bolivian military justice."

The entire length of the street leading to the improvised court is blocked off by barbed wire. At the court itself no safeguards are omitted. Passes are checked five times. Everyone, without exception, is frisked, even women, who are given special attention by a nurse in country dress. "Los zapatos también" -- "shoes too," whispers Comandante Etcheverria, the chief of secret police in Camiri.

On the wall at the back of the hall is a sign in pink letters against a green background, testifying to Bolivia's great patriotic longing: "El mar nos pertenece por derecho; recuperarlo es un deber" -- "The sea is ours by right; it is our duty

to regain it."

A mere glance is enough to reassure anyone that the accused are being carefully guarded. Sixteen armed men are spaced out through the hall. Two of them are carrying heavy machine guns. Let me add, lest I forget, the officers in the audience with full cartridge belts over their bellies and colt revolvers at their hips; they are shortly going to give almost forty seconds applause to the prosecutor's impassioned charges, without the presiding judge's making the least attempt to call them to order.

But it is time to begin. Tightly buttoned in their handsome blue-grey uniforms -- Uniform No. 4, their most modest dress uniform -- the military judges and the prosecutor pose for history amid the buzzing of movie cameras, flashbulbs and tape recorders of the small international army of journalists. This background noise will continue throughout the session, despite occasional protests.

Now, here come those for whom this affair is something altogether different from a "show." The three Bolivian guerrilla deserters -- Choque, Rocabado and Barrera -- are of but slight interest to the crowd. The fourth Bolivian, Ciro Algaraz, a stolid, respectable farmer is no star either. But it is a different matter for the Argentine cartoonist Bustos and above all for Régis Debray. The former Ecole Normale student is extremely pale. The thick walrus mustache falling down over his mouth has not made him look any older. He is taciturn and rather unconcerned as he is subjected to the cameras and the popping of flashbulbs.

A "Cruel and Cynical Bandolero"

Are we going to see what lies behind this really rather mediocre stage setting? The beginning of the trial is dumbfounding. Amid the tension of the initial formalities, the outbreak of the first incident comes as almost a relief. The lawyer appointed to defend Régis Debray, Señor Novillo Villaroel, firmly interjects a procedural point. The presiding judge, Colonel Guachalla, obviously taken by surprise, mumbles haltingly. Novillo insists. "Calla te" -- "shut up," Guachalla screams, losing his self-control. Novillo wanted to plant his first banderillos [light lance driven into the bull at the beginning of a bullfight to infuriate and weaken the animal]. He has succeeded.

He is an unusual person this lawyer, this placid provincial who specialized for twenty years in defending military men without resources. He succeeded at last in gaining a kind of nobility by his quiet stubbornness. He has taken this case to heart. He has succeeded in estab-

lishing good relations with Régis Debray but he is still only a court-appointed lawyer. Lacking the wide perspective that this affair demands, he will nonetheless doubtless give the judge-colonels some trouble.

But here comes the first theatrical stroke of the day. Abruptly after the court clerk's reading of two depositions, Choque's and Régis Debray's (36 pages), the reading of the trial brief is interrupted to give the floor to Colonel Iriarte. Amid general consternation, scarcely two hours after the trial has begun, the prosecutor delivers what can only be called the prosecution's conclusion, a violent diatribe against "Castro-Communism," attempting to destroy Debray's status as an intellectual, philosopher and writer. He makes the accusation outright that Debray organized and led the bloody ambushes of Nancahuazú and Iripiti last March 23 and April 10.

"This young Franco-Cuban talent is not even a guerrilla; he is nothing but a bandolero, a highwayman, cynical and cruel, who despite his gifts does not want to see that Latin America's great social revolution can be made by means of ideas and constructive acts." At last, with a grand theatrical gesture, Colonel Iriarte takes out a yellow envelope of "conclusive pictures" which are purported to show Régis Debray armed with a machine gun and with a cartridge pouch tucked in his belt. After having proclaimed his solemn "J'Accuse" [I Accuse], he demanded, to thunderous applause, the maximum penalty of thirty years in prison.

The Mystery of the "Conclusive" Pictures

The defense, noting the extent of these procedural errors, concentrates its fire. It has not been shown these pictures. The reading of the depositions has not been completed. There has been no examination of the accused. Witnesses have not been heard. And already the prosecution presumes to come to conclusions.

Mendizabal, the lawyer for the Argentinian Bustos, then denounces "these transports of military passion which are injecting disorder and chaos into this trial." He adds: "To maintain the impartiality and serene majesty of the law, you must imagine yourselves stripped of your uniforms and attired in the robes of magistrates."

A violent gavel blow echoes in the hall: "I will not allow the honor of this nation's military justice to be challenged," cries Colonel Guachalla; however, he accepts Mendizabal's procedural protest before adjourning the session.

A second theatrical stroke came

with the distribution to the press of the "conclusive" pictures. Certainly, they show Régis Debray in the company of guerrillas but they by no means show him armed nor do they show anything to support this accusation.

The opening session probably showed one thing definitively: the military court convened at Camiri is manifestly unprepared for a trial of this magnitude. Let us hope that in the days

to come what is discussed here will be the case of the philosopher, the writer and the political theoretician and the mission he took on himself to find and interview the legendary personality who, in the heat of passion, is indirectly being tried here -- Ernesto "Che" Guevara. But perhaps we must take the moral of this story from the huge prison van which transports the accused back to their prison; it is a gift to Bolivia included in the American technical aid plan for the Latin-American countries.

PRD THREATENS ELECTION BOYCOTT IN RESPONSE TO RISING TERROR

Santo Domingo

The pall of terror under which the Dominican people have lived since this country's invasion by U.S. forces on April 28, 1965, has deepened, the Partido Revolucionario Dominicano [PRD -- Dominican Revolutionary party], the party of Juan Bosch and the adversary of the government party in last year's elections, declared in a communiqué published September 21 in the conservative daily El Caribe.

"Despite the promises of peace and justice made by the president of the Republic and the chiefs of the armed forces, repression, crimes, and abuses of authority inspired by them continue to run rampant throughout the length and breadth of the nation," said the statement.

The communiqué adds that, accepting the guarantees offered by the government, the party's National Executive Committee had set about reorganizing all party bodies with a view toward contesting the municipal elections, should political conditions prevailing in the country permit. "It was for this reason that we sent work teams all over the country with the aim of setting up plenary meetings of party leaders and carrying through the reorganization of the municipal committees. This work ran up against a wall of terror erected everywhere to obstruct the development of the democratic forces."

The communiqué cites the following incidents as examples of assaults on civil liberties and human rights committed by the government of Dr. Joaquín Balaguer:

Recently in San Pedro de Macorís, 75 kilometers east of Santo Domingo, "31 party members who had left a meeting held in the Placer Bonito section of the city" were arrested.

In Nagua, a town of some 7,000 inhabitants in the northeast of the country, five members of the PRD were jailed fol-

lowing a regional party plenum, which was attended by members of the National Executive Committee.

In the towns of Valle and Sabana de la Mar in the interior, two recently slated meetings could not be held because the chiefs of the national police post there demanded that "our comrades get an authorization from the secretariat of the interior and the police, threatening to use any and all means to break up these functions if our leaders went ahead and held them "

In Monte Plata, 60 kilometers north of Santo Domingo, four members of the town PRD bureau were arrested on the order of an army lieutenant as they were getting ready to attend a plenum in the country.

The communiqué notes that the persecution and terror unleashed by the government show no respect for rank or position. Proof of this, it states, is the incident where a police sergeant threatened the mayor of Guaymate, which is near San Pedro Macorís, and two other party members with a gun "because, according to the policeman, it is forbidden in that town for more than three persons to walk together at night."

In the same locality, a PRD athletic club for young people was closed down on the pretext that it served as a center for political gatherings.

In Duvergé, in the western part of the country, a PRD town councilman was jailed because he tried to stop a policeman who was beating up a PRD member.

This Saturday in Jarabacoa, a summer resort located in the mountains in the central part of the country, a PRD member accused of being a Communist was jailed and beaten. In Santo Domingo, a local party member, Carlos Torres, was arrested and brutally beaten by police; "he is being kept under doctor's care in the Frank Díaz Clinic as a result of the wounds he suffered."

The communiqué declares that "the present wave of terror is also directed against the Constitutionalist officers; the government and its foreign allies want to keep on humiliating these officers to teach them such a painful lesson that they will not dare again in the future to lead another uprising like that of April 24.

"It is for this reason that Polonio Pierret, an ex-Constitutionalist sergeant and former member of Juan Bosch's guard, was imprisoned in Jimaní last week. In Neiba former sergeant Nelson William Méndez Batista was jailed and assaulted, and here in Santo Domingo former corporal Santana González García was picked up in the middle of Avenida Mella by two secret service agents and taken off to prison streaming blood."

"Thanks to the generosity displayed by the president of the Republic," says the communiqué, "to a member of his party on whom he bestowed the rank of major in the national police, Nagua has become the principal center of social unrest in our country. The repression being carried out in this town extends even to the Reformistas [Balaguer's party] themselves. The following cases are authentic examples of this:

"A few days ago, Señor Ofelia Hernández was shot and wounded three times by a policeman.

"On Saturday, September 2, national police patrolman Morris O'Neil shot and wounded Señor Fulvio Monegro three

times; this same policeman struck the youth Sergio Aponte unconscious with his club, according to the complaint signed by the young man's father.

"On Sunday, September 3, Patrolman Darío Tejeda shot and wounded Señora Daniela Castillo, although she was still recovering from giving birth to a child.

"Recently, on Major Castrillo's order, the chairman of the National Civic Union, Buenaventura Paredes, and many members of our party have been arrested in Nagua."

The PRD asserts that "this brief list of assaults, a tiny part of those which have taken place in our country recently, shows us clearly that the democracy espoused by the U.S. intervention is nothing more than a bloody farce where laws are not written with the pens of lawmakers but with the barrels of machine guns."

The communiqué states that the PRD is "determined not to permit a repetition of the farce of June 1, 1966."

It warns that if the repression continues, a proposal will be made to the PRD convention to consider "our party's repudiation of the 1968 municipal elections on the grounds that they are absolutely invalid as means for political expression in solving the manifold and growing problems of the Dominican Republic in this conflict-ridden phase of its historic development."

In this issue

	<u>Page</u>
A Conversation with Fidel Castro	826
Brazilian CP Attacks OLAS Conference	830
Alas for the Canadian CP on OLAS	831
Socialist Senator Arrested in Chile	832
Vietnam an "Excellent Laboratory," Well-Known Authority Claims	832
Dominican CP Backs Line Taken at OLAS Conference	833
The OLAS Conference and the "Principles" of Paul-Henri Spaak -- by Ernest Mandel	835
Vietnamese Pledge Solidarity to Stokely Carmichael	837
The Good Life in Vietnam -- American Style	837
Irish Labour Party Shifts to the Left -- by Gery Lawless	838
Advice on "Riot Control"	839
Clement Attlee: Labour Caretaker of British Capitalism -- by George Novack	840
Cuban Art Show Draws New Praise	842
A Voice of Peasant Discontent in China	843
Zengakuren Demonstrates Against Sato Tour	844
Régis Debray Case:	
Logical Order	845
Canadians Demand Freedom for Debray	845
Impassioned Charges Open Debray Trial in Camiri	845
PRD Threatens Election Boycott in Response to Rising Terror	847