

*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. 34

October 27, 1967

**Fidel Castro:**

## **In Tribute to Che**

- *Régis Debray's Farewell to Che*
- *The Area Where Che Fell*
- *"Orders Came Down... To Execute Che"*
- *Fourth International Joins in Mourning*

**October 21 Antiwar Actions:**

## **A Worldwide Success**

**Pierre Frank:**

## **Fiftieth Anniversary of October Revolution**

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. 34

October 27, 1967

**Fidel Castro:**

## **In Tribute to Che**

- *Régis Debray's Farewell to Che*
- *The Area Where Che Fell*
- *"Orders Came Down... To Execute Che"*
- *Fourth International Joins in Mourning*

**October 21 Antiwar Actions:**

## **A Worldwide Success**

**Pierre Frank:**

## **Fiftieth Anniversary of October Revolution**

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.

IN TRIBUTE TO CHE

By Fidel Castro

[Full text of speech made by Major Fidel Castro Ruz, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist party of Cuba and prime minister of the revolutionary government, in memory of Major Ernesto Che Guevara, at the Plaza de la Revolución, on October 18, 1967, Year of Heroic Vietnam. (Translation of the official transcript of the department of stenographic transcripts of the revolutionary government.)]

\* \* \*

Revolutionary Comrades:

I first met Che one day in July or August, 1955. And in one night -- as he recalls in his writings -- he became one of the future expeditionaries of the Granma, although at that time that expedition possessed neither ship, nor arms nor troops.

And that was how, together with Raúl, Che became one of the first two on the Granma list. And twelve years have passed since then -- they have been twelve years filled with struggle and historical significance. During this time death has cut down many brave and invaluable men, but, at the same time, throughout those years of our revolution, extraordinary persons have arisen, forged from among men of the revolution, and between those men and the people, bonds of affection and of friendship have emerged which surpass all description.

Tonight we are meeting to try to express, in some degree, our feelings toward him who was one of the closest, the most beloved and, without doubt, the most extraordinary of our revolutionary comrades -- to express our feelings for him and for the heroes who have fought with him and fallen with him, his internationalist army that has been writing a glorious and never to be effaced historical epic.

Che was one of those people who is liked immediately, for his simplicity, his character, his naturalness, his comradely attitude, his personality, his originality, even when one had not yet learned of his other characteristic and unique virtues.

In those first days he was our troop doctor. And so the bonds of friendship and warm feelings for him were ever increasing.

He was filled with a profound spirit of hatred and loathing for imperialism, not only because his political

awareness was already considerably developed, but also because shortly before, he had had the opportunity of witnessing the criminal imperialist intervention in Guatemala through the mercenaries who aborted the revolution in that country.

A man like Che did not require elaborate arguments. It was sufficient for him to know that there were men determined to struggle against that situation, arms in hand -- it was sufficient for him to know that those men were inspired by genuinely revolutionary and patriotic ideals. That was more than enough.

One day, at the end of November, 1956, he set out on the expedition toward Cuba with us. I recall that that trip was very hard for him, since, because of the circumstances under which it was necessary to organize the departure, he could not even provide himself with the medicine he needed and, throughout the trip he suffered from a severe attack of asthma, with nothing to alleviate it, but also without ever complaining.

We arrived, set out on our first march, suffered our first setback and, at the end of some weeks, as you all know, a group of those who had survived from the expedition of the Granma was able to reunite. Che continued to be the doctor of our group.

We came through the first battle, victorious, and Che was already a soldier of our troop and, at the same time, still our doctor. We came through the second victorious battle and Che was not only a soldier, but the most outstanding soldier in that battle, carrying out for the first time one of those singular feats that characterized him in all military action. Our forces continued to develop and we faced another battle of extraordinary importance at that moment.

The situation was difficult. The information we had was erroneous in many respects. We were going to attack, in full daylight -- at dawn -- a strongly defended, well-armed position at the edge of the sea. Enemy troops were at our rear, not very distant, and in that confused situation it was necessary to ask the men to make a supreme effort.

Comrade Juan Almeida had taken on one of the most difficult missions, but one of our flanks remained completely without forces -- one of the flanks was left without an attacking force, placing the operation in danger. And at that moment, Che, who was still functioning as our doctor, asked for two or three men, among

them one with a machine gun, and in a matter of seconds rapidly set off to assume the mission of attack from that direction.

On that occasion, he was not only an outstanding combatant but, also, an outstanding doctor, attending the wounded comrades and, at the same time, attending the wounded enemy soldiers.

After all the weapons had been captured and it became necessary to abandon that position, undertaking a long return march under the harassment of diverse enemy forces, it was necessary for someone to stay behind with the wounded, and Che stayed with the wounded. Aided by a small group of our soldiers, he took care of them, saved their lives and later re-joined the column with them.

From that time forward, he stood out as a capable and valiant leader, of that type of men who, when a difficult mission is pending, do not wait to be asked to carry it out.

Thus it was at the battle of El Uvero, but he had acted in a similar way on a not previously mentioned occasion in the first days when, following a betrayal, our little troop was attacked by surprise by a number of airplanes and we were forced to retreat under the bombardment. We had already walked some distance when we remembered some rifles of some farmer-soldiers who had been with us in the first actions and had then asked permission to visit their families at a time when there was still not much discipline in our embryonic army. And right then it was thought that possibly the rifles were lost.

I recall that the problem was not brought up again and, during the bombardment, Che volunteered, and having done so, quickly went out to recuperate those rifles.

This was one of his principal characteristics: his willingness to instantly volunteer for the most dangerous mission. And naturally this aroused admiration, and twice the usual admiration, for a fellow combatant, fighting alongside us, who had not been born here, a man of profound ideas, a man in whose mind stirred the dream of struggle in other parts of the continent and who was, nonetheless, so altruistic, so disinterested, so willing to always do the most difficult things, to constantly risk his life.

And that was how he won the rank of major and leader of the second column, organized in the Sierra Maestra. Thus his prestige began to increase; he began to gain fame as a magnificent combatant who was to reach the highest posts in the course of the war.

Che was an incomparable soldier. Che was an incomparable leader. Che was, from a military point of view, an extraordinarily capable man, extraordinarily courageous, extraordinarily aggressive. If, as a guerrilla, he had his Achilles' heel it was this excessively aggressive quality, his absolute contempt for danger.

The enemy believes it can draw certain conclusions from his death. Che was a master of warfare. He was a virtuoso in the art of guerrilla struggle. And he showed that an infinite number of times. But he showed it especially in two extraordinary deeds. One of these was in the invasion, in which he led a column, a column pursued by thousands of enemy soldiers over flat and absolutely unknown terrain, carrying out -- together with Camilo -- an extraordinary military accomplishment. He also showed it in his lightning campaign in Las Villas Province, especially in the audacious attack on the city of Santa Clara, entering, with a column of barely 300 men, a city defended by tanks, artillery and several thousand infantry soldiers.

Those two heroic deeds stamped him as an extraordinarily capable leader, as a master, as a virtuoso in the art of revolutionary war.

However, now after his heroic and glorious death, some attempt to deny the truth or value of his concepts, his guerrilla theories.

The master may die -- especially when he is a virtuoso in an art as dangerous as revolutionary struggle -- but what will surely never die is the art to which he dedicated his life, the art to which he dedicated his intelligence.

What is so strange about the fact that this master died in combat? What is stranger is that he did not die in combat on one of the innumerable occasions when he risked his life during our revolutionary struggle. And many times it was necessary to take steps to keep him from losing his life in actions of minor significance.

And so it was in a combat -- in one of the many battles he fought -- that he lost his life. We do not have sufficient evidence to enable us to make deductions about what circumstances preceded that combat, to imagine how far he may have acted in an excessively aggressive way, but -- we repeat -- if as a guerrilla he had an Achilles' heel that Achilles' heel was his excessive daring, his complete contempt for danger.

And this is where we can hardly agree with him, since we consider that his life, his experience, his capacity as a seasoned leader, his prestige and every-

thing his life signified, were more valuable, incomparably more valuable than he himself, perhaps, believed.

His conduct may have been profoundly influenced by the idea that men have a relative value in history, the idea that causes are not defeated when men fall, that the powerful march of history cannot and will not be halted when leaders fall.

And that is true, there is no doubt about it. It shows his faith in men, his faith in ideas, his faith in examples. However -- as I said a few days ago -- with all our heart we would have liked to see him as a forger of victories, to see victories forged under his leadership, since men of his experience, men of his caliber, of his really unique capacity, are not common.

We have a full understanding of the value of his example. We are absolutely convinced that many men will strive to live up to his example, that men like him will emerge from the heart of the peoples.

It is not easy to find a person with all the virtues that were combined in him. It is not easy for a person, spontaneously, to develop a personality like his. I would say that he is one of those men who are difficult to match and virtually impossible to surpass. But I would say that the example of men like him contributes to the appearance of men of the same caliber.

In Che, we not only admire the fighter, the man capable of performing great feats. And what he did, what he was doing, the very fact of his rising, with a handful of men, against the army of the ruling class, trained by Yankee advisers sent in by Yankee imperialism, backed by the oligarchies of all neighboring countries -- in itself constitutes an extraordinary feat.

And if we search the pages of history, it is likely that we will find no other case in which a leader, with such a limited number of men, has set about a task of such import; a case in which a leader, with such a limited number of men, has set out to fight against such large forces. Such proof of confidence in himself, such proof of confidence in the peoples, such proof of faith in men's capacity to fight, can be looked for in the pages of history -- but the like of it will never be found.

And he fell.

The enemy believes it has defeated his ideas, his guerrilla concepts, his point of view on revolutionary armed struggle. And what they accomplished, by a stroke of luck, was to eliminate him physically -- what they accomplished was

to gain an accidental advantage that an enemy may gain in war.

And we do not know to what degree that stroke of luck, that stroke of fortune, was helped along, in a battle like many others, by that characteristic of which we spoke before -- his excessive aggressiveness, his absolute disdain for danger.

This also happened in our war of independence. In a battle at Dos Rios they killed the apostle of our independence. In a battle at Punta Brava, they killed Antonio Maceo, a veteran of hundreds of battles. Countless leaders, countless patriots of our war of independence were killed in similar battles. And, nevertheless, that did not spell defeat for the Cuban cause.

The death of Che -- as we said a few days ago -- is a hard blow for the revolutionary movement, in that it deprives it, without a doubt, of its most experienced and able leader.

But those who are boasting of victory are mistaken. They are mistaken when they think that his death is the end of his ideas, the end of his tactics, the end of his guerrilla concepts, the end of his thesis. For the man who fell, as a mortal man, as a man who faced bullets time and again, as a soldier, as a leader, was a thousand times more able than those who killed him by a stroke of luck.

However, how must revolutionaries face this serious setback? How must they face this loss? If Che had to express an opinion on this point, what would it be? He gave his opinion, he expressed that opinion quite clearly when he wrote in his message to the Latin-American Conference of Solidarity that if death surprised him anywhere, it would be welcome as long as his battle cry had reached a receptive ear and another hand was stretched out to take up his rifle.

And his battle cry will reach not just one receptive ear, but millions of receptive ears. And not one hand but millions of hands will be stretched out to take up arms.

New leaders will emerge. And the men -- of the receptive ears and the outstretched hands -- will need leaders who emerge from the ranks of the people, just as leaders have emerged in all revolutions.

Those hands will not have available a leader of Che's extraordinary experience and enormous ability. Those leaders will be formed in the process of struggle -- those leaders will emerge from among the millions of receptive ears, from the millions of hands that will sooner or later be stretched out to take up arms.

It isn't that we feel that his death will necessarily have immediate repercussions in the practical sphere of revolutionary struggle, that his death will necessarily have immediate repercussions in the practical sphere of development of this struggle. The fact is that when Che took up arms again he was not thinking of an immediate victory -- he was not thinking of a speedy victory against the forces of the oligarchies and of imperialism. As an experienced fighter, he was prepared for a prolonged struggle of five, ten, fifteen or twenty years, if necessary. He was ready to fight five, ten, fifteen, twenty years, or all his life if need be!

And within this time perspective, his death -- or rather his example -- will have tremendous repercussions. The force of that example will be invincible.

Those who cling to the idea of luck try in vain to deny his experience and his capacity as a leader. Che was an extraordinarily able military leader. But when we remember Che, when we think of Che, we do not think fundamentally of his military virtues. No! Warfare is a means and not an end -- warfare is a tool of revolutionaries. The important thing is the revolution -- the important thing is the revolutionary cause, revolutionary ideas, revolutionary objectives, revolutionary sentiments, revolutionary virtues!

And it is in that field, in the field of ideas, in the field of sentiments, in the field of revolutionary virtues, in the field of intelligence, that -- apart from his military virtues -- we feel the tremendous loss that his death means to the revolutionary movement.

Because Che's extraordinary personality was made up of virtues which are rarely found together. He stood out as an unsurpassed man of action, but Che was not only an unsurpassed man of action -- he was a man of visionary intelligence and broad culture, a profound thinker. That is, in his person the man of ideas and the man of action were combined.

But it is not only that Che possessed the double characteristic of the man of ideas -- of profound ideas -- and the man of action, but that Che as a revolutionary united in himself the virtues which can be defined as the fullest expression of the virtues of a revolutionary: A man of total integrity, a man of supreme sense of honor, of absolute sincerity -- a man of stoic and Spartan living habits, a man in whose conduct not one stain can be found. He constituted, through his virtues, what can be called a truly model revolutionary.

When men die it is usual to make speeches, to emphasize their virtues, but

rarely as on this occasion can one say of a man, with greater justice, with greater accuracy, what we say of Che: that he was a pure example of revolutionary virtues.

But he possessed another quality, not a quality of the intellect nor of the will, not a quality derived from experience, from struggle, but a quality of the heart: he was an extraordinarily human man, extraordinarily sensitive.

That is why we say, when we think of his life, that he constituted the singular case of a most extraordinary man, able to unite in his personality not only the characteristics of the man of action, but also of the man of thought, of the man of immaculate revolutionary virtues and of extraordinary human sensibility, joined with an iron character, a will of steel, indomitable tenacity.

And because of this, he has left to the future generations not only his experience, his knowledge as an outstanding soldier, but also, at the same time, the fruits of the intelligence. He wrote with the virtuosity of a master of our language. His narratives of the war are incomparable. The depth of his thinking is impressive. He never wrote about anything with less than extraordinary seriousness, with less than extraordinary profundity -- and we have no doubt that some of his writings will pass on to posterity as classic documents of revolutionary thought.

And thus, as fruits of that vigorous and profound intelligence, he left us an infinity of memories, an infinity of narratives that, without his work, without his efforts, might have been lost forever.

An indefatigable worker, during the years that he served our country he did not know a single day of rest. Many were the responsibilities assigned to him: as president of the National Bank, as director of the National Planning Board, as Minister of Industries, as commander of military regions, as the head of political or economic or fraternal delegations.

His versatile intelligence was able to undertake with maximum assurance any task of any kind. And thus he brilliantly represented our country in numerous international conferences, just as he brilliantly led soldiers in combat, just as he was a model worker in charge of any of the institutions that he was assigned to and for him there were no days of rest, for him there were no hours of rest!

And if we looked through the windows of his offices, he had the lights on until all hours of the night, studying, or rather, working or studying. For he was a student of all problems, he was a tireless reader. His thirst for learning was practically insatiable, and the hours he stole



from sleep he devoted to study.

He devoted his scheduled days off to voluntary work. He was the inspiration and provided the greatest incentive for that work which is today carried out by hundreds of thousands of persons throughout the country, he stimulated that activity in which our people are making greater and greater efforts.

And as a revolutionary, as a communist revolutionary, a true communist, he had a boundless faith in moral values. He had a boundless faith in moral values, he had a boundless faith in the conscience of man. And we should say that he saw, with absolute clarity, the moral resources as the fundamental lever in the construction of communism in human society.

He thought, worked out and wrote many things. And it is fitting to bring out, on a day like today, that Che's writings, Che's political and revolutionary thinking, will be of permanent value in the Cuban revolutionary process and in the Latin-American revolutionary process. And we do not doubt that his ideas, as a man of action, as a man of thought, as a man of untarnished moral virtues, as a man of unexcelled human sensitivity, as a man of spotless conduct, have and will continue to have universal value.

The imperialists boast of their triumph at having killed this guerrilla fighter in action -- the imperialists boast of a triumphant stroke of luck that led to the elimination of such a splendid man of action. But perhaps the imperialists do not know or pretend not to know that the man of action was only one of the many facets of the personality of that combatant. And if we speak of sorrow, we are saddened not only at having lost a man of action, we are saddened at having lost a morally superior man, we are saddened at having lost a man of exquisite human sensitivity, we are saddened at having lost such a mind. We are saddened to think that he was only thirty-nine years old at the time of his death.

We are saddened at missing the additional fruits that we would have received from that intelligence and that ever richer experience.

We have an idea of the dimension of the loss for the revolutionary movement. But, nevertheless, here is the weak side of the imperialist enemy: they think that by eliminating a man physically they have eliminated his thinking -- that by eliminating him physically they have eliminated his ideas, eliminated his virtues, eliminated his example.

And so shameful are they in this belief that they have no hesitation in

publishing, as the most natural thing in the world, the by now almost universally accepted circumstances in which they murdered him after he had been seriously wounded in action. They do not even seem aware of the repulsiveness of the procedure, they do not even seem aware of the shamelessness of the admission. They have published it as if thugs, oligarchs and mercenaries had the right to shoot a seriously wounded revolutionary combatant.

And even worse they explain why they did it. They assert that Che's trial would have been quite an earthshaker, that it would have been impossible to place this revolutionary in the dock.

And not only that, but neither have they hesitated to spirit away his remains. And be it true or false, they certainly announced they had cremated his body, thus beginning to show their fear, beginning to show that they are not so sure that by physically eliminating the combatant they can liquidate his ideas, liquidate his example.

Che fell defending the interests, defending the cause of the exploited and the oppressed peoples of this continent -- Che fell defending the cause of the poor and disfranchised of this earth. And the exemplary manner and the selflessness with which he defended that cause cannot be disputed by even his most bitter enemies.

And before history, men who act as he did, men who do and give all for the cause of the oppressed, grow in stature with each passing day, and find a deeper place in the heart of the peoples with each passing day. The imperialist enemies are beginning to see this, and it will not be long before it will be proved that his death will, in the long run, be like a germ which will give rise to many men determined to imitate him, many men determined to follow his example.

And we are absolutely convinced that the revolutionary cause on this continent will recover from the blow, that the revolutionary movement on this continent will not be crushed by this blow.

From the revolutionary point of view of our people, how must we view Che's example? Do we feel we have lost him? It is true that we will not see new writings of his, true that we will never again hear his voice. But Che has left a heritage to the world, a great heritage, and we who knew him so well, can become in great degree his beneficiaries.

He left us his revolutionary thinking, his revolutionary virtues -- he left us his character, his will, his tenacity, his spirit of work. In a word, he left us his example! And Che's example will be a

model for our people -- Che's example will be the ideal model for our people!

If we wish to express what we expect our revolutionary combatants, our militants, our men to be, we must say, without hesitation: "Let them be like Che!" If we wish to express what we want the men of future generations to be, we must say: "Let them be like Che!" If we wish to say how we want our children to be educated we must say without hesitation: "We want them to be educated in Che's spirit!" If we want the model of a man, the model of a man who does not belong to our time, the model of a man who belongs to the future, I say from the depths of my heart that such a model, without a single stain on his conduct, without a single stain on his actions, is Che! If we wish to express what we want our children to be, we must say from our very hearts as ardent revolutionaries: "We want them to be like Che!"

Che has become a model of what men should be, not only for our people but also for people everywhere in Latin America. Che carried to its highest expression revolutionary stoicism, the revolutionary spirit of sacrifice, revolutionary combativeness, the revolutionary's spirit of work.

Che brought the ideas of Marxism-Leninism to their freshest, purest, most revolutionary expression. No other man of our time has carried the spirit of internationalism to its highest possible level as Che did.

And in the future, when an example of a proletarian internationalist is sought, that example, high above any other, will be Che's example! National flags, prejudices, chauvinism and egoism had disappeared from his mind and heart. And he was ready to shed his generous blood

spontaneously and immediately, in behalf of any people, for the cause of any people!

And thus, his blood fell on our soil when he was wounded in several battles -- and his blood was shed in Bolivia, for the redemption of the exploited and the oppressed. That blood was shed for the sake of all the exploited and all the oppressed -- that blood was shed for all the peoples of America and for the people of Vietnam, because while fighting there in Bolivia, fighting against the oligarchies and imperialism, he knew that he was offering Vietnam the highest possible expression of his solidarity!

It is for this reason, comrades of the revolution, that we must face the future with optimism. And in Che's example, we will always look for inspiration, inspiration in struggle, inspiration in tenacity, inspiration in intransigence toward the enemy, inspiration in internationalist sentiment!

Therefore, after tonight's impressive ceremony, after this incredible demonstration of multitudinous recognition -- incredible for its magnitude, discipline and spirit of devotion -- that demonstrates that our people are a sensitive, grateful people who know how to honor the memory of the brave who die in combat, that our people recognize those who serve them, that demonstrates the people's solidarity with the revolutionary struggle and how this people will raise aloft and maintain ever higher aloft the revolutionary banners and revolutionary principles -- in these moments of remembrance, let us lift our spirits, with optimism in the future, with absolute optimism in the final victory of the peoples, and say to Che and to the heroes who fought and died with him: Ever onward to victory!

Patria o Muerte! Venceremos!

#### REGIS DEBRAY'S FAREWELL TO CHE

#### "The Death of Che Does Not Mark the End of the Anti-imperialist Struggle, But Its Beginning."

[The press has reported that Régis Debray was so shocked at the news of the death of Che Guevara that he "gave up his defense" against the charges leveled against him by the Bolivian dictatorship. For instance, J. Halcro Ferguson, in the October 15 London Observer, described Debray's reaction as "throwing in of the sponge, admitting he had aided Guevara and the guerrillas..."]

[These reports are tendentious, to say the least. Debray did nothing of the kind. He merely reaffirmed his well-known

views on guerrilla war and specified what Guevara's attitude was on his own desire to join the guerrillas.

[The following is a translation of the full text of the statement which Debray sent October 11 through his counsel Raúl Novillo to the members of the military court in Camiri. The translation, by World Outlook, is from the French text printed in the October 14 issue of the Paris daily Le Monde.]

\* \* \*

After the heroic death of the man



whom the future and all the peoples of the world will list among the greatest liberators of the Americas, in the mourning felt by all revolutionists today, the moment has come for me to define certain points of principle which may be of some interest to the court. But I want to state in advance that the death of "Che" Guevara does not mark the end of the anti-imperialist struggle, but its beginning, just as it has given this struggle, in an irreversible way, its banner. Because "Che" is not one of those who dies -- as an example and guide it is correct to speak of him as immortal, because he will live in the hearts of all revolutionists. One "Che" is dead. Others are on the point of being born, of rising in action; others are already in action or will be tomorrow, here and other places in the continent. As for the "Che" who just died here, history and the revolutionists will undertake to judge those bearing the responsibility for his death, no matter where they may be.

Under these conditions, a full definition of my situation, with regard to you, will not adversely affect anything or anyone. My lawyer, Dr. Novillo, who has done me the honor to defend me and whom I wish to ratify publicly and formally as my counsel, will be able to demonstrate that the concrete charges lodged against me in the indictment -- the instigation, guidance and carrying out of the so-called crimes for which this trial is being held -- lack any real foundation whatsoever. But now, leaving aside the juridical questions, I want to deal with the essence, that is, the political and moral sides, which for a revolutionist are the same.

(1) Without entering into the details of my activities, I wish to emphasize that, completely sharing the ideas of the Bolivian guerrillas, I myself asked, upon reaching the base camp of the guerrillas, to participate in all the duties and daily tasks of the guerrillas, such as mounting guard both inside and outside the camp, helping in the cooking, in hunting and other tasks of the daily life. I asked accordingly that I be put on the list like any other guerrilla for my turn of duty, because as a revolutionist I could not and did not wish to be considered like a mere visitor in a hotel, standing arms crossed or sleeping peacefully while my comrades exhausted themselves providing food for me and guarding my sleep.

This lasted until I was able to meet "Che" on March 20. Although I had arrived as a mere journalist, I myself asked "Che" Guevara at this time to let someone else come and do my job, to put an end to my status as a visitor and to agree to let me join the guerrillas after consulting with the Bolivian members.

But he rejected my request, letting me understand that my mission of reporting to the world about my visit there and his activities was just as important as that of fighting. So the decision was taken to have me leave the guerrilla zone as soon as possible, and that while waiting I could and should continue to participate in the ordinary camp work, but I neither could nor should engage in the fighting and I could not be considered to be a guerrilla. Because of this, after several attempts to leave, I left the guerrilla zone with Bustos and Roth, my destination being La Paz and France, as is known, something I would never have tried to do if I had been incorporated among the guerrillas, and which no guerrilla has yet done up to now. I mean any guerrilla worthy of the name.

(2) To facilitate the task of the military prosecution, I state that this mission, of conveying news abroad about the guerrillas, is an integral part of revolutionary work. Someone who is not in complete solidarity with the actions of the guerrillas cannot accomplish a similar work of solidarity. There are a number of ways of fighting. Providing news and explanations is also a form of combat, which does not exclude the others, except in past times. In this sense, not only do I affirm, but also I request that the court have the kindness to consider me on the moral and political level as equally responsible for the acts of my guerrilla comrades, the legitimacy of which I am convinced and in which I would have participated if "Che" Guevara had not decided otherwise. If unfortunately I cannot claim the honor of having been a combatant, let me at least have the honor of asking to be considered as in solidarity with them.

As for the characterization of these acts -- acts of a just war that cannot be prevented -- as crimes and murders, and the guerrillas as bandits and cowards, it would be an insult to the memory of "Che" Guevara to begin considering such insults two days after his death. We will reply to this on another, better occasion with arguments, details and historic examples. This is not the first time, nor will it be the last, in the history of Bolivia and the world as a whole that a revolutionist has been called an offender and a criminal by representatives of the established disorder.

What I want to make very clear here is that these so-called crimes, although they involved the spilling of innocent blood, which calls for compassion as in any other popular insurrection, are, in my opinion, titles to glory and proofs of duties carried out. Popular insurrection, of which guerrilla war is an example and a variant, is recognized as a right in the last encyclical of Pope Paul VI, and a sacred duty for whoever loves justice. If

I did not participate it was not because of any privilege or right held by intellectuals to not carry out their ideas to their ultimate conclusions, but a mere matter of fact under the discipline and division of revolutionary tasks.

In taking leave of "Che" Guevara

April 20, I felt the separation as a painful necessity -- that of having to carry out my duty as a revolutionary militant abroad, outside the zone of combat, as he had asked me. And now that this separation has become definitive and irreversible, my greatest sorrow today is not to have died at his side.

#### FOURTH INTERNATIONAL JOINS IN MOURNING CHE

[The following statement in tribute to Che Guevara was issued October 17 by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International, the world party of socialist revolution founded by Leon Trotsky in 1938.]

\* \* \*

The Fourth International salutes the memory of Ernesto "Che" Guevara, the illustrious Latin-American revolutionist. It joined in Cuba's mourning which is shared by all those throughout the world who are struggling against capitalism and for the victory of international socialism.

Still under forty years of age when he fell, Che had devoted his life to the anti-imperialist struggle and the socialist revolution throughout Latin America, from Argentina where he was born, to Mexico, Peru, Venezuela, Guatemala and Bolivia. He participated in the Granma epic, which in two years, to the surprise of everyone, swept away the Batista regime and made way for socialist Cuba, the first free territory on the American continent.

The winning of power showed Guevara more faithful than ever to his communist ideals. He struggled against bureaucratism, against stimulants that could favor it. He struggled for a new man, a genuinely new man having nothing in common with the caricatures provided by the bureaucrats. Imbued to the core with the

international character of the socialist revolution, he reminded the "rich" workers states of their duties with regard to those who are still poor.

Even more, he felt that with the exacerbation of the world situation, his duty was to again take up arms, to once again join the guerrillas. Thus he left not only the high posts in which he functioned in Cuba, he likewise left his family. In his last message he said that the supreme task was "to create two, three... many Vietnams." He fell in combat, arms in hand, under the blows of the Bolivian "gorillas" and their CIA masters. Not content with murdering him, they hastened to destroy his body while at the same time they sought to mutilate his memory.

The blow is a hard one, but this indomitable revolutionist will not vanish from the battle. His memory will be there. In all of Latin America and throughout the entire world, the death of Ernesto "Che" Guevara will be mourned in the way he would have wished: "Wherever death may surprise us, let it be welcome if our battle cry has reached even one receptive ear and another hand reaches out to take up our arms, and other men come forward to join in our funeral dirge with the chattering of machine guns and new calls for battle and for victory."

Glory to Ernesto "Che" Guevara!  
Long live the Latin-American socialist revolution!  
Long live the world socialist revolution!

#### THE AREA WHERE CHE FELL

In his speech October 15 stating why the Cubans had become convinced that Che Guevara was dead, despite the glaring contradictions in the declarations of the Bolivian dictatorship, Fidel Castro referred to the coincidence between the descriptions of the terrain given by the reporters at the scene and those contained in the notes presumably written by Guevara and quoted by the Bolivian generals. One of the sources cited by Fidel was the New York Times of October 8, which printed a report written before Che

was killed.

Here are the pertinent paragraphs from the dispatch sent by Paul L. Montgomery from Camiri, Bolivia:

"Even for a man as traveled as Ernesto Che Guevara, the bleak cul de sac where the Andes fall off to the Amazon basin is a long way from anywhere.

"The sun rises blazing each morning on the dusty valley, baking the raw

earth and the brown brambles. The teeming insect life -- monstrous flies and mosquitoes, spiders and stinging beetles -- swarm in the dead stillness. The heat and the dust and the bites turn the skins of humans to a cloak of misery. The harsh vegetation, dry and covered with thorns, makes sustained movement all but impossible except along the well-watched river

banks and trails.

"According to military reports, the erstwhile Cuban major and 16 exhausted guerrilla companions have been bottled up in the valley by a tightening armed forces encirclement for nearly two weeks. The Bolivian military believes Major Guevara will not get out alive."

#### FADED JUNGLE GREENS WERE HIS FUNERAL ROBES

[The following paragraphs are from a report by Marlene Nadle, sent from Camiri, Bolivia, describing how the body of Che Guevara was brought in. The article was printed in the October 19 issue of The Village Voice, a New York weekly.]

\* \* \*

Children were the first to spot the body of guerrilla leader Ernesto Che Guevara lashed to the landing runners of a helicopter that hovered over the small air strip in Valle Grande. At 4:55 p.m. on Monday, October 9, the copter landed in a spot far from the swelling crowd which, except for the press, was held back by soldiers with bayonets.

The corpse was hustled into a Chevrolet van which was pursued across the airport by journalists in jeeps. They passed crates of napalm and stopped in front of a small, three-sided shed that was to serve as a makeshift mortuary.

A uniformed, stocky, blonde man in his 30s emerged from the van and shouted, "Let's get the hell out of here." Later, he denied any knowledge of English. Although the fellow wore no insignia on his jungle greens, he appeared to be directing the operation. No officer would identify him, but rumor was rampant that he was a Cuban exile in the employ of the CIA.

The body was removed from the Chevy and placed on the same slab that, just two weeks earlier, had been used for another guerrilla leader, Coco Peredo. Guevara's patched and faded jungle greens were his funeral robes; they were caked

with blood. For shoes, he had only pieces of leather tied with ropes. His beard was scanty; his hair shoulder length.

If Guevara's body looked thinner than his recent photos, it was testimony to the last days when, pursued by the Bolivian army, he traveled great distances and suffered many privations. In the end, he was caught in a canyon-like fold in the hills near Higuera. There had been no cover for escape -- only the bald canyon walls. The Eighth Army troops simply waited him out. On the night of October 8, they got him.

The body was fingerprinted, then stripped of its clothes and washed down. Physicians, assisted by a beaming nun, prepared it for embalming. They incised the neck. The nun, still smiling, handed them forceps, scissors, and swabs. Reporters, clinging to their vantage point, counted bullet holes: two in the neck and one in the thorax. There was also a wound in the abdomen.

While the body was being worked on, General Alfredo Ovando Candia, armed forces commander, made a short visit to the shed. He departed grinning. All the officers seemed jubilant, not so much at the death of Che Guevara, as at their own success in destroying the subject of so much speculation. It was as if Guevara had been apocryphal until they killed him.

Outside the shed, more soldiers held the crowd back with bayonets -- but they couldn't quiet them. "SHOW US CHE. SHOW US CHE," they shouted. When the doctors had finished, they dressed Che Guevara in his bloody uniform and raised him up on the stretcher for all to see.

#### CORRECTION

In the article in the October 6 issue, "Fourth International Greets SDS Congress," the sentence on page 824, beginning: "The lines of action proposed by your congress -- first, to mobilize on

the parliamentary level against the emergency laws..." should read: "The lines of action proposed by your congress -- first to mobilize on the extraparliamentary level against the emergency laws..."

AMERICAN "OBSERVER" PRESENT WITH MURDERERS OF CHE

[The following account of the way in which the Bolivian dictatorship displayed the body of Che Guevara was sent by the special correspondent of Agence France-Presse from Valle Grande, Bolivia. Dated October 11, it was published in the October 12 issue of the Paris daily Le Monde. The translation is by World Outlook.]

\* \* \*

Yesterday afternoon, I saw the lifeless body, riddled with bullets, of a guerrilla known as "Ramón," the alleged nom de guerre of Comandante Ernesto "Che" Guevara. Thirty of us journalists, including three foreign correspondents, went to Valle Grande, a small town, somnolent in the heat of Southeast Bolivia, in order to verify the death of the most prestigious of the guerrillas.

Coming down from the misty heights of the military airdrome at La Paz (13,451 feet), our Dakota landed in Valle Grande during the siesta. At the other end of the deserted streets of the town, a gate, before which some fifty curiosity seekers were standing, opened on a field at the bottom of which, at the side of a hill, a morgue had been improvised in a former stable. Some spruce officers and armed soldiers greeted us.

The body of a bearded man, with long hair, dressed solely in olive green pants, lay on a stretcher placed on a stone sink. The smell of formaldehyde was strong around the body riddled with bullets and drained of blood. The officials charged with meeting all our possible objections concerning the identity of "Ramón" did their utmost to point out the resemblances, feature by feature, between the body and the guerrilla. "No doubt is possible," they told us; "the fingerprints of the body correspond with those of Guevara."

"Ramón" was mortally wounded in a battle last Sunday [October 8], a few miles from Higuera, near Villa Grande. He succumbed to his wounds early Monday morning. "He was not finished off," we were told by Colonel Arnaldo Saucedo, commander of the second battalion of "Rangers" operating in this sector.

"I am 'Che' Guevara, I have failed," he is supposed to have whispered

to the soldiers who took him prisoner. At least that is what General Alfredo Ovando, commander in chief of the Bolivian armed forces stated. Questioned about this a little earlier during a press conference, Colonel Saucedo told us however that "Ramón" at no time regained consciousness.

The journalists who walked around the morgue, among the photographers and cameramen, displayed a mixture of stupefaction and incredulity. Nevertheless, any error in identity seemed impossible.

At the foot of the body of "Ramón," two other guerrillas lay on the same floor. These were the bodies of "El Chino," a Peruvian, and "El Moro," a Cuban doctor. Two other bodies, which appear to be those of Bolivians, had not yet been identified. Colonel Saucedo said that only nine guerrillas remained in all of Southeast Bolivia and that hardly any other insurrectional centers existed. Athletic, his face crossed with a black mustache, he spoke under a religious image decorating one of the walls in the hotel where we reassembled.

An American military man was present at this conference. He wore no insignia, but his bearing, his complexion and his battle dress betrayed his nationality. I went up to him to ask him some questions in English. He turned toward a Bolivian soldier and asked him, in Spanish, what I wanted. In my direction, he added, "No comprendo..." [I don't understand] and left the place.

During the subsequent questioning, Colonel Saucedo told me: "Yes, that's an American military man, an instructor at Santa Cruz center. He came here as an observer. No American 'green berets' are participating in the military operations in Bolivia."

"The guerrilla adventure has come to an end," he said, "as any senseless adventure must come to an end. The defeat was due to the lack of any popular support and to the arid terrain that was chosen." He added: "We will bury Guevara here in Valle Grande."

The guerrilla "Ramón" was killed at the end of a narrow valley, in a desperate battle. The nine shots that hit him were fired from a distance of 50 meters [164 feet].

"ORDERS CAME DOWN...TO EXECUTE CHE"

[The following extracts are from an article about the death of Che Guevara which appeared in the October 20 issue of the reactionary Luce publication, Time magazine.]

\* \* \*

The Quebrada del Yuro, deep in the stifling Bolivian jungle seventy-five miles north of Camiri, is a steep and narrow ravine that is covered with dense foliage. There, early last week, two companies of Bolivian Rangers totaling more than 180 men split into two columns and quietly stalked a handful of guerrillas. Shortly after noon, the troops spotted their men, and both sides opened up with their rifles and automatic weapons at a withering point-blank range of 150 feet. After a lengthy fight, four Rangers and three guerrillas lay dead, and four other guerrillas had been captured.

One of the prisoners was no ordinary guerrilla. He was Ernesto ("Che") Guevara, thirty-nine, the elusive Marxist firebrand, guerrilla expert and former second in command to Fidel Castro whose name had become a legend after his disappearance from Cuba two and one-half years ago. Since that time, much of the world had thought Che dead (perhaps even at Castro's hands) until his presence in Bolivia was dramatically confirmed a short time ago....

Dressed in a dusty fatigue shirt, faded green trousers and lightweight high-top sandals, Che caught a bullet in his left thigh as he advanced toward the government troops; another bullet knocked his M-1 semiautomatic carbine right out of his hands. In Che's rucksack, the Rangers found a book entitled Essays on Contemporary Capitalism, several codes, two war diaries, some messages of support from "Ariel" -- apparently Castro -- and a personal notebook. "It seems," read one recent notebook entry in Che's tight, crisp handwriting, "that this is reaching the end."

At Quebrada del Yuro, Che was loaded onto a stretcher and carried five miles to the town of Higuera. Informed of his capture, army leaders in La Paz, the capital, pondered what to do with him. Since Bolivia has no death penalty, Che at worst, would go off to prison -- perhaps only after a long, noisy trial, a propaganda outcry from the whole Communist bloc and the threat that other guerrillas might streak into Bolivia and make a cause of him. The next day, orders came down to Higuera to execute Che. He was shot two hours later.

Strapped to the runner of a heli-

copter, Che's body was then flown to Valle Grande, a dirt-poor, two-century-old town of 7,000 people set in rolling hills some 3,000-feet high. At the airport, it was loaded into a truck and whisked down the narrow dirt and cobblestone streets to the town's Señor de Malta Hospital, run by German Dominican sisters. There four men in white and a nun went to work on Che, opening an incision in his neck for embalming fluid and washing his body. A man in civilian clothes took his fingerprints. A medical examination by Drs. Moisés Abraham and José Martínez revealed that Che's body had seven bullet wounds, including one through the heart that killed him instantly. "An interesting fact," said Abraham, "is that his feet were very well cared for."

...With the body prepared, the army permitted newsmen and thousands of curious townfolk to file past for a glimpse of the mysterious foreigner, laid out atop a long concrete sink. On into the night, the quiet, stone-faced peasants continued past the body, shining flashlights eerily into the dark, bearded, open-eyed countenance. Even soldiers who moved through the line stood and gaped until a guard barked at them to move along. Two days after his death, Che's fingers were cut off for further fingerprinting, and his body was cremated -- an unusual step in a Catholic country. The ashes were then secretly disposed of.

As it had been with Che in life, there was an air of mystery and confusion about him in death. The army denied reports of the execution; yet the doctors who examined him claimed that Che had died twenty-four hours after his capture. With a bullet in his heart, he could never have lived that long. Flying into Valle Grande from La Paz, Armed Forces Chief General Alfredo Ovando added to the confusion by claiming that Che had said after his capture: "I am Che. I have failed." More likely, the cocky Che would have spit defiance or, if too weak from the wounds, simply remained silent.

Despite the army's clumsy handling of the situation, few doubted that the dead man was Che, and the sigh of relief throughout Latin America was almost as audible as a breeze whistling down from the Andes. "Guevara's death," said Rio's Jornal do Brasil, "is a dramatic warning to the planners of systematic subversion among us." In Camiri, where he is on trial as a member of Che's guerrilla band, French Marxist Régis Debray wept at the news of Che's death. "I would like to be at his side," he said, "and die with him."

PERUVIAN MILITARY COURT SPARES HUGO BLANCO'S LIFE

According to an Agence France-  
Presse dispatch from Lima, October 12,  
the Supreme Military Court handed down a  
decision "confirming the 25-year sen-  
tence" imposed on Hugo Blanco, the well-  
known peasant leader.

The prosecution had countered Hugo  
Blanco's appeal of the savage sentence by  
demanding the death penalty.

Had the court conceded to this de-  
mand, Hugo Blanco could have been exe-  
cuted within twenty-four hours after the  
verdict.

An international campaign was  
mounted to save Hugo Blanco. Peruvian  
consulates and embassies were picketed  
in cities around the world. Hundreds of  
messages and appeals were made to Presi-  
dent Belaúnde to spare Hugo Blanco's life  
and commute the sentence.

The appeals came from a wide range  
of sources, including prominent intellec-  
tuals in many countries and such world-  
famous figures as Jean-Paul Sartre and  
Bertrand Russell.

Organizations representing thou-  
sands of members added their weight to  
the international protest.

Actions in behalf of Hugo Blanco  
continued right up to the very eve of the  
court hearing. On October 10, for in-  
stance, some 500 people were reported by  
Le Monde to have assembled before the  
Peruvian embassy in Paris to demonstrate  
their solidarity with Hugo Blanco.

The decision of the court, reject-  
ing the demand of the prosecution to kill  
Hugo Blanco, represents a victory for the  
international campaign waged in his be-  
half. However, it is only a partial vic-  
tory. Hugo Blanco still faces a quarter  
of a century in prison because of his  
revolutionary-socialist views.

The campaign to win his freedom  
will certainly be continued. The partial  
victory gained should serve to intensify  
the demands to President Belaúnde to  
grant amnesty to Hugo Blanco and his com-  
rades who are in prison with him.

BIGGEST ANTIWAR DEMONSTRATION IN HISTORY OF WASHINGTON

Unlike Vietnam, no U.S. bombers  
were raining death from the bright blue  
skies over Washington, Saturday Octo-  
ber 21. But nearly 200,000 demonstrators  
were there who had converged on the na-  
tional capital from all corners of the  
country to demand an end to the war in  
Vietnam. After a rally at the Lincoln  
Memorial they marched to the Pentagon  
where thousands laid siege to the nerve  
center of America's military machine.

This was the largest antiwar dem-  
onstration in Washington's history. The  
turnout exceeded expectations. The au-  
thorities had sought to discourage atten-  
dance by spreading warnings that any dis-  
orderly conduct would be sternly handled  
by the thousands of armed troops called  
up to guard the world's biggest military  
establishment. While this scare propa-  
ganda may have kept some older people  
from Washington, it spurred the militancy  
of the youth and brought them out in  
greater numbers.

Unlike the peace march in Washing-  
ton a year ago, which had a middle-aged  
composition, this assemblage was domi-  
nated by youth. They flocked to Washington  
from campuses and cities across the coun-  
try, thanks in good measure to the orga-  
nizing work of the Student Mobilization  
Committee. In Boston, for example, 900

more students applied for transportation  
the night before than could be accommo-  
dated on the chartered buses.

The program began with a massive  
meeting around the reflecting pool at the  
Lincoln Memorial where the atmosphere was,  
as one participant commented, "more like  
a celebration than a demonstration." At  
2:15 p.m. the march leaders set off for  
the Pentagon two miles across the Potomac  
River. The crowds flowed across the bridge  
to the Pentagon for three hours. A second  
meeting was held in a parking lot close  
to the Pentagon.

From 4 p.m. on, thousands of demon-  
strators set siege to the entrance of the  
colossal structure. One had planted a Na-  
tional Liberation Front flag on the terrace.

Defense of the Pentagon had been  
converted into a major military operation.  
U.S. Army Chief of Staff Harold K. Johnson  
issued a memorandum to all members of his  
task force which stated: "We will have the  
United States and the rest of the world  
watching to see how well we do these jobs."  
The government stationed 5,000 troops to  
guard the Pentagon and had 1,800 National  
Guards, 2,000 policemen, and 300 Federal  
Marshals on hand in addition. This was the  
first time federal troops had been assigned  
to Washington since President Hoover used



them to crush the Bonus Marchers at the depth of the depression in 1931.

The army paratroopers flown into Washington were the same that had been sent to suppress the black uprisings in Detroit last July and to Santo Domingo in 1965. The day before, Senator Stennis of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, called on Defense Secretary McNamara to use "the same resolution in dealing with the protesters as American troops are doing in Vietnam." McNamara watched the demonstrators from his office in the Pentagon where he was in constant communication all day with the White House.

The Federal Marshals, backed by soldiers armed with bayonet-tipped rifles, drove back the demonstrators who tried to enter the Pentagon. Six who succeeded in getting through a side door reserved for the press were quickly ejected. Three hundred seventy-five persons were arrested, including the pacifist leader David Dellinger, chairman of the National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, the novelist Norman Mailer, and Dagmar Wilson, a founder of the Women's Strike for Peace.

Although it was played up most prominently in the press, these direct actions were a separate part of the day's program. The overwhelming majority of the marchers did not participate in them. This included the black contingent who later held their own rally across the street from Howard University, the black campus a few miles from the capitol.

Dellinger opened the meeting at the Lincoln Memorial by asserting that "this begins a new stage in the American peace movement in which the cutting edge becomes active resistance." As the British union leader, Clive Jenkins, general secretary of the large white-collar union ASSET [Association of Supervisory Staffs, Executives and Technicians], started to speak, three members of the American Nazi party came from behind and tumbled the podium and microphones down the stone steps. Demonstrators prevented them from breaking up the program and police led them away as they shouted: "Heil Hitler!"

Jenkins told the crowd that a majority of the labor movement in Britain, by action of both the Trade Union Congress and Labour party, are now morally and formally against the Vietnam war and Wilson's complicity with Washington. "Our task now is to prod the Labour Government to proceed along these lines." Emphasizing the international scope of the antiwar movement, he observed that his speech was being transmitted on a telephone hookup to five cities in Western Europe.

Dr. Benjamin Spock, a prominent

peace advocate, declared that "the real enemy" is Lyndon Johnson "whom we elected as a peace candidate in 1964 and who betrayed us within three months, who has stubbornly led us deeper and deeper into a bloody quagmire in which uncounted hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese men, women and children have died, and 13,000 young Americans, too."

John Wilson, New York director of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee [SNCC], asked for a moment of silence to mark the death of Ernesto Che Guevara. "Che" appeared as the hero of the radical youth. One bore a sign with the slogan "Che lives forever!"; another "Avenge Che." Some shouted "Viva Che" as they advanced on the Pentagon. Almost a thousand of the commemorative posters with his portrait, published by the Young Socialist Alliance, were sold at the rally.

The central slogan of the mobilization was inscribed on the big banner behind the speakers platform: "Immediate Withdrawal of U.S. Troops; Vietnam for the Vietnamese." But the marchers carried a wide diversity of slogans. Among them: "Ladybird, what kind of natural beauty is a bomb crater?"; "War is good business, invest your son"; "Yankees, Come Home"; and "Where is Oswald when we need him?"

The National Mobilization Committee is a loose coalition of scores of groups united only in their opposition to the war. It includes elements ranging from moderate pacifists and anti-Johnson Democrats to the extreme left. The rebuff of attempts made before the march to disrupt the movement by red-baiting shows how firm the resistance is in the antiwar movement to any reversion to McCarthyism.

All shades of radical opinion participated in the Washington action except for that ultrasectarian relic, the Socialist Labor party, which condemned the demonstration as aiding the war-makers because it did not have explicitly socialist objectives. The Socialist Workers party and Young Socialist Alliance delegations bore identifying banners from numerous cities and campuses. So did the Communist party contingent.

Despite the priority in the publicity accorded the idea of individual civil disobedience over the broadest mobilization of all antiwar elements, which tended to narrow participation in the action, the magnitude of the turnout demonstrated the growth of the antiwar moods in the country. This sentiment has not only expanded in scope but become more radical. Many of the demonstrators were not only opposed to the war but favored victory for the National Liberation Front.

The sit-in at the Pentagon lasted all night and the following day.

A WEEK OF ANTIWAR PROTEST ACTIONS IN THE U.S.

The weekend mobilization in the national capital was preceded by a Stop the Draft Week in which antiwar forces in scores of cities across the United States took various protest actions against the war machine. These led to large-scale flareups on several campuses from the east coast to the west.

Draft cards were burned or deposited with federal officials in Boston, New York, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Cincinnati, Washington, Denver, Minneapolis, Portland (Oregon), as well as in several European capitals. In San Francisco 1,000 demonstrators handed the U.S. Attorney a basket containing 180 draft cards. In Los Angeles police arrested nineteen persons for staging a sit-down in front of the Armed Forces induction center.

The most violent protest of this kind took place in downtown Oakland where 3,000 antiwar demonstrators clashed with helmeted police, using clubs and chemical sprays, when they tried to close down the induction center.

Many had come from the Berkeley University campus by bus where an all-night rally had been held in defiance of a court order. A Supreme Court judge had issued the order after Oakland police had arrested 125 demonstrators, including folk singer Joan Baez, the day before. It forbade the university to make its facilities available for any meetings attacking the draft laws. Although the Berkeley chancellor canceled permission for a rally in the Student Union, the students held one in the open air outside Sproul Hall, the traditional staging area for protest rallies in recent years.

In their clash with the Oakland cops more than a score of the demonstrators had to be treated for injuries.

The University of Wisconsin and Brooklyn College of New York were likewise the scenes of stormy campus actions. Students boycotted classes at Wisconsin the day after police attempted to break up a demonstration against job recruiting by the Dow Chemical Company, manufacturers of napalm used in Vietnam. The striking students paraded in front of the academic buildings and the Madison police headquarters, bearing signs saying "Fight Might with Right, Strike!" and "Hell, No." On October 21 almost 2,000 students and professors marched on the state capital protesting the use of police on the campus and demanding the lifting of all reprisals against the demonstrators.

The movement at Brooklyn College was touched off by a protest against the presence of two Navy recruiting officers on the campus. When other students came to the support of one of their leaders who had been suspended by a college officer, police rushed in, beat boys and girls, and dragged forty of them out of the building into patrol wagons. Two professors who objected to the brutality against women students were likewise arrested.

The next day virtually the entire student body went on strike which shut down academic activities. Their united and militant action resulted in victory when the Brooklyn College president agreed to drop all charges against the protesters.

Commenting on the "storm trooper" response of police in many cities to the student demonstrators, the New York Post columnist Harriet Van Horne wrote: "How sad it is that demonstrations in behalf of peace always end nowadays with broken heads, blood in the gutter and freedom's banner a bit more fouled and tattered."

CHAIN OF ANTIWAR DEMONSTRATIONS AROUND THE WORLD

The international scope and character of the movement against U.S. intervention in Vietnam was underscored by the chain of demonstrations staged in cities around the world timed to coincide with the Washington protest rally. These interlinked actions in Europe and Asia were inspired by a common aim and slogan: "U.S., get out of Vietnam and let the Vietnamese settle their own affairs."

A meeting at Finsbury Town Hall, North London, was part of an international telephone hookup with the proceedings at Washington which also included Paris,

Stockholm, Copenhagen and Genoa. It was addressed by Frank Allaun, Labour MP, and Lord Brockway, chairman of the British Council for Peace in Vietnam. It was followed by a torchlight procession to the Prime Minister's residence at Downing Street.

The largest protests took place in Japan where hundreds of thousands of unionists and antiwar demonstrators held rallies in the major cities under the sponsorship of the General Council of Trade Unions. The press reported 20,000 Tokyo protesters marched to the United

States Embassy with antiwar slogans.

(To minimize their importance, press and police estimates systematically underestimate the size of the demonstrations both in the U.S. and elsewhere. For example, the Washington police would acknowledge no more than 25,000 persons at a rally that obviously numbered seven or eight times that many.)

In West Berlin 10,000 demonstrators with a small group of young Americans at their head marched down the Kurfurstendamm, the main street of the city, bearing a fifty-foot-long banner demanding the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam. Members of the Association of German Socialist Students, which lead the radical student movement, carried portraits of Che Guevara and chanted "Ho Ho; Ho Chi Minh." It was the largest demonstration in Berlin since the end of the world war. Twenty-two persons were arrested as the police used water hoses against the demonstrators.

About 15,000 marched through the center of Amsterdam for two hours in a largely silent protest which was occasion-

ally broken by shouts of "Johnson, murderer" from some young people.

In Copenhagen more than 15,000 went to the American Embassy where a straw puppet depicting President Johnson was burned. It took 160 police to drive off the crowd. A mass meeting in Stockholm's park Vasaparken urged the Swedish government to restrict diplomatic, cultural and commercial relations with the U.S. until its forces get out of Vietnam. Similar demonstrations were organized by the Committee for Solidarity with Vietnam in most of Norway's major cities.

The largest single European demonstration occurred in Paris, where police admitted that at least 35,000 joined in a giant march that ended up with speeches in the Place de la Bastille. Other demonstrations were held in many other cities in France.

This round of antiwar protests was to be extended to a fourth continent on Sunday, October 22, with a big demonstration scheduled for Sydney, Australia.

#### THE SCARBOROUGH LABOUR PARTY CONFERENCE

By Ernest Tate

After the Labour government's defeats at the Trades Union Congress in Brighton, followed shortly by severe electoral setbacks in the Cambridge and Walthamstow by-elections [see World Outlook, October 6], left-wing delegates to the annual Labour party conference in Scarborough arrived there with high expectations that the right wing would be defeated on several important policy issues.

From what took place, however, it is clear that victory for the left will neither be as easy nor as automatic as some may have liked.

Not that the left's hopes were unfounded. A glance at the resolutions shows a deep hostility to the government's course of action. Even resolutions from the loyalist sections of the party, which supported the incomes policy for instance, found that they had to hedge their bets and criticize the government because of its failure to keep down prices.

On the first day, the debate was on health, education and welfare and it did not provide any real test to gauge the strength of the left. At one point the conference was thrown into an uproar when John Boyd of the AEU [Amalgamated Engineering Union], newly elected party

chairman, refused to call a card vote when requested. (In the bloc voting, a raised hand can represent 1,000 votes or 1,000,000 depending on whether it belongs to a constituency delegate or a trade-union leader.)

"Is this Boyd's law?" a delegate enquired, referring to an incident at the TUC where AEU president William Carron had bureaucratically voted the union bloc over the objections of a number of AEU delegates. Carron had cynically referred to his ruling as "Carron's law."

But the two central issues before the conference were the Labour government's continued support for Washington's policies in Vietnam and the Prices and Incomes Policy.

So far as Vietnam is concerned, the Wilson government suffered a rebuke. On the Incomes Policy, it was a different matter.

The main debate took place on five composite resolutions: two supported the government although one of these called for control of prices, rents and dividends (and the NEC [National Executive Committee] asked that it be remitted); two were critical of the government; and one called for a £15 minimum wage.

Speaker after speaker complained about the loss of Labour party support caused by the Incomes Policy. Moving the composite which the NEC found acceptable, even a loyalist, Raymond Bellchambers, Buckley CLP [Labour party constituency], stated that it had been unfair.

The people were prepared to wait for things to work themselves out, he said, but "we can't wait indefinitely. There has been a rash of rent increases and, while people might find it difficult to understand the complexities of sterling, nevertheless they see prices going up."

Doreen Bellerby, the seconder, to cries of "Hear! Hear!" from the delegates, added her grievances too: "We are exceedingly unhappy," she said, that "rents went up almost immediately after the announcement of the wage restraint" and that "the government did nothing when local authorities put up rents affecting lower paid workers."

The first left speaker was Dan McGarvery of the Boilermakers, the union sponsoring one of the critical composites calling for an end to the Incomes Policy. He asked, doesn't the leadership understand what is happening? The employers organizations, the Confederation of British Industries, want to defeat the government -- their purpose is to demoralize the supporters of the party. "What we want from this government, this great party of ours, is an acceptance," he went on, "that they are on the road to ruin and destruction, abetted by Callaghan [Chancellor of the Exchequer]."

The argument that the government is taking unpopular decisions for the long-term good of the country is "so much eyewash." You have tried the policy and failed, McGarvery said, "have courage to say you are sowing the seeds of your own destruction."

Brian Bolton, seconding the Boilermakers composite, argued that the government "seems to think we already have a socialist economy." "We are opposed to a Prices and Incomes Policy under capitalism," he said, "and will only accept it when Clause 4 of the party's constitution [calling for the nationalization of industry] is implemented."

A great mass of incomes are uncontrolled, he went on, and only some can be controlled. The capitalists' incomes are not controlled because they don't make the products. That's why the CBI [Confederation of British Industries], he said, gives solid support to the Labour government.

Speaking on the composite which called for a £15 minimum wage, a delegate

from Blackpool CLP gave a picture of conditions in Britain for the great mass of workers. "Nine million, one hundred and twenty-five thousand earn less than £10 a week," he said. "Hotel, catering and shop-workers are being used as cheap labour. It's a bit of a national joke that you can receive more money on unemployment insurance than when working."

Clive Jenkins of ASSET [Association of Supervisory Staffs, Executives and Technicians], moving the composite that approximated the TUC position -- abandonment of deflationary policies and a reduction of arms expenditures -- stated that any debate on Prices and Incomes Policy was a "debate about what the party is about, democracy, equality and the right to work."

He pointed to the catastrophic effects of government policy upon London-derry where one-third of all employable workers are out of work. As far as he was concerned, it was a question of basic standards because the poor are always the first victims of any freeze yet today share prices are at their highest on the stock market.

Jenkins charged that the government's present policy dictated that there must be a pool of unemployed. The economic measures had been bad for the people and also incompetent, since we still have stagnation, unemployment and an unstable balance of payments.

"We should say that the present level of unemployment is unacceptable and that the present level is intolerable. We must have a change in strategy and not a situation where a man's work hangs by the unseeable thread of the monthly trade figures."

Jenkins said the heart of the problem is that the country has been spending overseas £150 million a year for over a decade on defence. This had escalated to a £500 million balance of payments deficit and yet £100 million is spent on one Polaris submarine. "The government has always gone for the soft options. The tough decision would be to take on the bankers."

T.J. Smith of SOGAT [Society of Graphical and Allied Trades], seconded the motion. Many of us experienced unemployment in the thirties, he stated, "with the utter dejection, despair and hopelessness that it produces." "If the Tories had pursued the same policies as this government, there would be today a big opposition..."

"You can't feed a family on speeches," he said. "If the government had attacked the capitalists instead of the friends of the party, they would have a lot more sup-

port and confidence." He called for an end to the wage restraint.

Other speakers defended the government. Most typical was John Orford, assistant general secretary of the National Union of Vehicle Builders. "There seems to be a tendency to blame the government for our difficulties," he said, "but do we need to remind you that the country was on the point of collapse?" (Did he think a Labour government would come into office under any other circumstances? a left-winger quipped.)

"It's no time to throw away all we've gained," Orford continued, "even if progress has been slower than anticipated. The people below the poverty line have been with us for many years, no one can blame the government for that."

Yes, he agreed, wages for some workers were too low, but would this be altered by leaving others to get what they can? "It is only through the government policies of restraint that we as trade unionists can look after our own."

Already at this point in the conference, it had become apparent that the right wing had won the day. They, on the whole, were far more assertive and aggressive and they charged that there were no alternative policies to theirs.

The left let the right wing off with the most flagrant dictatorial actions. When the chairman refused to put Composite 34 on the floor, calling for the nationalization of Britain's 360 monopolies and advocating other socialist measures, this was not challenged. It was left to the movers of the composite, Liverpool, West Derby CLP, to make their lonely protest. (The advocates of Compos-

ite 34 are supporters of the English Militant.)

The two remaining major left-wing speakers were Michael Foot, MP for Ebbw Vale, and Frank Cousins of the Transport and General Workers Union. Foot pointed out that Callaghan had stated in the Commons on more than one occasion that he would not use the "sledgehammer of deflation," yet, this was what he had done. The use of unemployment as a weapon of economic policy had been fought by the labour movement throughout its entire history.

Stating that there had been many recessions and the country had come out of them, to roars of laughter he commented, "If we get out of this recession, no doubt the Prime Minister and others will tell us that it is the greatest economic miracle since the loaves and the fishes."

Cousins continued on the same theme: Can the country afford an incomes policy? he asked. "My answer is no -- because the incomes policy has been related to deliberate action on the part of the government to create a degree of unemployment." Using deflationary methods is good politics for the Tories. "It can never be good politics for us because we will not allow it." He was the last speaker from the floor.

In the voting, the two progovernment composites carried. One, recording continued support for the government, got 3,213,000 to 3,091,000 votes; and the other got 2,657,000 to 2,461,000. The ASSET composite was defeated by 3,997,000 to 2,324,000 votes; the Boilermakers motion was rejected by 3,860,000 to 2,535,000. The composite on the minimum wage also went down.

#### THE HOLDOUTS

"President Johnson has just issued a moving appeal to the nations of the earth, asking them to stop manufacturing instruments of war and to devote their resources instead to the great task of universal education.

"Let us hope that he will be heeded by all countries and above all by this

North Vietnam which, insanely engaged in the worst warmongering, obstinately continues to meet the peace-seeking visits of the American planes with its gigantic arms industry, systematically placing its schools under the trajectory of the bombs aimed at educating the Vietnamese people." -- Robert Escarpit, in the October 11 Paris daily Le Monde.

#### KEEPING GREECE SAFE FOR THE FREE WORLD

A military court in Athens condemned Anastasios Kokoris, a thirty-three-year-old businessman, to four years in prison October 11. He was found guilty of trying to hoist a banner above the Acropolis bearing the inscription, "Democracy 114."

The number 114 refers to the final article in the Greek constitution, which was suspended by the generals who seized power April 21. The article reads: "The present Constitution is to be safeguarded by the patriotism of the Hellenes."

ON THE FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION

By Pierre Frank

In 1917 the October Revolution was regarded by the governments of that time and treated in the world press as an episode of brief duration. Today, fifty years later, both friends and enemies recognize that the event was a momentous, if not the most momentous, date in human history. The Russian Revolution is certainly far from finished; on the contrary, signs of new bounds forward can already be discerned within it. But a balance sheet of October is all the more necessary to get an insight into that future.

October has become an important date for the general public primarily because the revolution brought about the transformation of Czarist Russia -- which combined a substratum of economic, social and cultural backwardness with the features of an imperialist and semicolonial power -- into the second power in the world. This transformation was accomplished in the course of a half century which encompassed two foreign invasions, a civil war, unparalleled human and material destruction and enormous expenditures for unproductive armaments.

Let us take, for comparison, the United States whose development fully flowered after the Civil War. The following fifty years bring us to the eve of U.S. entry into the first world war. Throughout that time this country did not experience any wars on its territory and engaged in only a few unimportant foreign expeditions. At the same time it received millions of European emigrants and an influx of European capital along with them. This is a comparison on a truly historical scale. The United States is clearly outclassed. On this scale the capitalist mode of production has shown itself to be very inferior to the socialist mode of production. And, on the socialist side of this balance sheet, we have not taken into account the harmful role of the bureaucratic leadership which we will deal with later on.

The building of socialism presupposes, first of all, an immense economic development to arrive at abundance. The Soviet Union has not yet achieved this; it is an international problem which cannot be resolved within the framework of a single country. However, the balance of the past fifty years cannot be measured solely by the economic progress. It is necessary to take into consideration the price paid by the masses for this progress and it is also necessary to draw up a political and cultural balance sheet. Finally, since the construction of socialism is involved, it is also necessary to inquire into the relations which existed

during this period between the development of the Soviet Union and the progress of the world revolution.

The negative aspects -- the miserable living standards to which the worker and peasant masses were reduced for a long time, the total elimination of every element of workers and socialist democracy, and the intellectual conformism over the past forty years -- can be passed by in silence or regarded as negligible only by sycophants of the Soviet power. Lenin in his day never glossed over what he believed to be negative -- and the negative aspects increased enormously after his death.

The bourgeois criticisms can be unhesitatingly dismissed. During that same period, not to mention the past, the capitalist system struck heavy blows at the masses through wars, unemployment and fascism with which the limited progress recently made in a very small part of the world pales in comparison. As for the Social Democrats, when they entered governments, they did so at the behest of the capitalists to curb and crush revolutionary movements or to deliver blows at the living and working conditions of the masses in periods of reorganization or readjustment of the capitalist economies.

The big break in the history of the Soviet Union and the Communist movement between the first years of the revolution and the subsequent period disfigured by Stalinism is nowadays denied only by ignorant people, numskulls or servitors of the Kremlin. How many controversies there were over Stalinism and the nature of the Soviet state of which nothing is heard but lingering echoes today! "De-Stalinization" has demonstrated to anyone who does not think in empty formulas that the bureaucracy was not engaged in building for "1984" the world that Orwell depicted with such great talent. The USSR is heading toward something very different from "state capitalism" or "bureaucratic collectivism."

Henceforth the balance sheet will have to include the question of deciding whether or not Stalinism was unavoidable. This question is not only raised by apologists for Stalinism, by people anxious to cover up their Stalinist past or to ingratiate themselves with the post-Stalinists. There are those who sincerely view the problem in this manner and thereby switch over from a Marxist explanation of history to a belief in the ineluctability of accomplished facts in history. To explain, for example, the forces which have produced Stalinism or Nazism does



not mean that the victories of Stalinism or Nazism were inevitable. Is it necessary to conclude that "forced collectivization" and the Moscow Trials were inevitable? No, there is no great book where, according to divine decree, history is inscribed in advance.

Bureaucratic deformations were unavoidable in the USSR. These already existed in Lenin and Trotsky's time. They accompany, and will accompany, every victorious revolution in varying degrees, and not only in underdeveloped countries, for objective reasons which are nowadays well known. The transition from bureaucratic deformations to a frightful bureaucratic degeneration came as the consequence of a struggle over many years in which the Left Opposition was defeated.

The outcome of this struggle was not predetermined. Stalinism was not a simple phenomenon. It embraced the degeneration of the isolated workers' state, the degeneration of the Bolshevik party as a party of the Soviet proletariat, the decomposition of the leadership of the Bolshevik party in the face of the mounting bureaucratism, the degeneration of the Communist International and its sections. Each of these phenomena had its own dialectic of development, distinct from that of the others. The fate of the Communist International was not the same as that of the Soviet state or that of the various Communist parties.

Between Trotsky, who tirelessly defended the program of October, and the pragmatic Stalin, who was as much the instrument as the director of the bureaucracy, were inserted the successive political errors (tardily and poorly understood) committed by Zinoviev, Kamenev, Bukharin and others which considerably weakened the resistance of all the organisms to the gangrene of bureaucratism by provoking the decay of the leadership of the Bolshevik party.

Those who believe that Stalinism was inevitable deprive themselves of understanding the dual role of the Soviet bureaucracy and are thus incapable of establishing a precise balance sheet of the revolution. For they do not know how to dissociate the dynamic belonging to the productive forces liberated by October from the role played by the bureaucracy in relation to this dynamic, an executive role which functions far more as a brake than as an accelerator. It is certainly impossible to measure such things mathematically. Nonetheless, it is noteworthy that Stalin's successors have all, more or less explicitly, referred to this opposition between the power of the productive forces and the bad use which was made of them by Stalin's policies, at least, in their view, from a certain date.

The obvious objection can be made that these men express themselves in this manner because they need a scapegoat. But, whatever be the motivation for their observation, it is an implicit recognition of the harm wrought by the bureaucracy in Soviet society. They reserve this judgment for the past period of Stalin's rulership. But we think it likewise applicable to the period of "de-Stalinization" in which the bureaucracy retained its direction of society while exhibiting a certain degree of "liberalization."

The contradictions between the forces of this society and its leadership have become more and more flagrant precisely because economic development has now attained a high level. The reforms having been put into effect only from above, they produce less and less results. The society emanating from the October Revolution which has been subjected to such constraint and coercion from Stalinism wants to express itself. Having no independent political organs at its disposal, it is beginning to do so in those circles where ideas are dealt with daily, among the intelligentsia. The Brezhnev-Kosygin leadership has continued the orientation against free expression in the cultural field imparted by Khrushchev during his last year in office.

"De-Stalinization" has not only more clearly disclosed the existing antagonism between Soviet society and its leadership. If it be taken into account that the "de-Stalinization" began almost fifteen years ago, that the principal reforms were enacted in the first five years, and that it has given only limited results, these very facts confirm that it will be impossible to put an end to bureaucratic power by simple reformist interventions, and that it will be necessary to resort to a revolutionary struggle, to the political revolution envisaged by Trotsky, in order to restore a regime of Soviet democracy which, by itself, will give an impulsion to the productive forces incomparably greater than any previously known.

In the international arena the dual role of the bureaucracy is apparent throughout its career. It has, certainly, defended the mode of production engendered by October because it draws the substance of its privileges from it. But it has done so in its own manner which was to seek incessantly, even during the war, notably at the Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam conferences, a global agreement with world imperialism for the establishment and maintenance of the status quo.

In accord with this objective, whenever all those anywhere in the world who rose up against capitalism turned hopefully toward the Soviet Union to find support there, the leaders of the Kremlin and the

Communist parties offered them a policy which restricted and often broke their revolutionary upsurges. Hence a heavy succession of defeats. Let us mention only the darkest: the defeat of the Chinese Revolution of 1925-27 after Moscow had hailed Chiang Kai-shek as the "hero" of this revolution; the paralysis of the German proletariat in the face of the rise and victory of the Hitlerites when the Stalinist leadership, in line with its "third period" policies, declared that the Social Democracy was "the main enemy"; the defeat of the Spanish Revolution of 1936-38 in which the Stalinists and Social Democrats resurrected a pseudo bourgeois-democracy incapable of standing on its own feet; the liquidation of numerous revolutionary movements for the benefit of the imperialist democracies in the immediate postwar period, notably in France and Italy, together with the abandonment of the Greek resistance fighters on two occasions in 1944 and 1947; the collapse of the Indonesian Communist movement whose opportunist policy was supported by both Moscow and Peking, etc.

It has taken an experience like that which the Vietnamese people are presently undergoing for larger sections of people to grasp that Soviet aid is not only quantitatively inadequate but that it is not intended to assure victory. It is rather designed to induce American imperialism to draw back to the extent required to undertake negotiations in accord with an illusory "peaceful coexistence." The Soviet bureaucracy does not push for victory but for "peace" in Vietnam, and that explains its hostility to the only realistic policy -- because it is revolutionary -- which Che Guevara formulated in these terms: "to create two, three...many Vietnams." The "socialism in one country" of the Soviet bureaucracy has cost and still costs the world socialist revolution dearly. The bureaucrats are more eager to plant the red flag on the moon than to see it triumph the world over.

The bureaucracy endeavors to falsify the balance sheet by concealing its misdeeds. The formula of "the cult of personality" serves less to make the truth known than to cast a veil over Stalinism. Its crimes remain in the shade, save for a few carefully selected "rehabilitations." Stalin's official history, crammed with lies, has been replaced by other official histories, following one after the other, replete with different lies and some half-truths. Let us run rapidly through the latest version of the history of the revolution and the Soviet Union presented by the Central Committee of the Communist party of the Soviet Union in its "Theses for the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution."

Before Lenin, according to these "theses," there were Marx and Engels. With Lenin and after him, there were only nameless figures. We are not told what men constituted the Central Committee which directed the revolution, what men formed the first Soviet government, who led the Red Army during the civil war, etc. We learn, on the other hand, that "the Trotskyites sought to deprive our Party and people of their faith that socialism could be successfully built in the USSR." How very felicitous was Stalin's perspective and its realization in contrast!

No forced collectivization took place, it seems, for we read in the theses that "the 15th Party Congress charted the political line for the gradual transition of the scattered peasant households to large-scale socialist production....The collective farms were set up in a fierce struggle against the kulaks. The resistance of the exploiting elements in the countryside was broken by the efforts of the working class and the rural poor in alliance with the middle peasants....Collectivisation...still further strengthened the alliance between the working class and the peasants..." It is hard to tell which is more repugnant, Stalin's calumnies against the Old Bolsheviks or these shameful lies about his dreadful policy in the rural areas.

Further on we read: "The triumph of socialism was legislatively recorded in the Soviet Constitution adopted in December 1936 by the Extraordinary 8th Congress of Soviets. This constitution fixed the socialist principles underlying the social and state system in the USSR and the broad social freedoms and rights of citizens, instituted a system of direct, equal and universal suffrage by secret ballot for elections to organs of power and enlarged the representation quota of all the Union and Autonomous republics, Autonomous regions and National areas in the highest organ of power." However, 1936 witnessed the Stalinist repression, the deportations, the beginning of the Moscow Trials. The Constitution was merely a smoke screen.

There is no reference in these "theses" to the entire nightmare that Soviet society has not yet come through. Or, more exactly, it is necessary to read some pages further on and learn that, on the occasion of the Twentieth Congress, Stalin was found guilty of "unwarranted [sic!] reprisals and other violations of socialist legality which inflicted harm on our society." A single point, and that's all. In substance, the wording of these theses conforms to the logic of the bureaucrats from whom they emanate; the Stalinist repression did not officially exist before the Twentieth Congress and so it could not be mentioned sooner.

It is also stated in this document that "During the stern years of the war the people fought under the leadership of the Communist Party....Huge organisational, Party and political work was conducted in the army by political workers who included prominent functionaries of the Party and Government." This anonymity has at least the advantage that Brezhnev and Kosygin's successors will not be obliged to fabricate new books from which certain names will have to be dropped. But these "theses" say nothing about that particular aspect of the leadership of the party that Khrushchev revealed at the Twentieth Congress and that no one has controverted, that Stalin never called a meeting of the Central Committee during the entire year.

We can't comment on everything. But it would be a pity to pass over the following, which appears toward the end, without saying a word about it: "a spirit of innovation and a bold search for the new are all inherent traits of our art." They'd better praise it themselves for no one else would think of doing so. It's clear that this passage in the "theses" refers to "socialist realism," and not to the literature and art in the first years of the revolution.

Let us close on international problems. "The rapprochement of the countries that have embarked on the socialist road and their consolidation in the socialist community falls in with the fundamental interests of the peoples..." But then to what, to what interests, does the absence of rapprochement and consolidation correspond? Why was there a Soviet-Yugoslav conflict? Why are there differences with Rumania? Not a word.

Since the Sino-Soviet rift cannot be entirely omitted, a dozen lines are devoted to saying that Mao took up "a policy which combined petty-bourgeois adventurism with great-power chauvinism..." Take away the word "adventurism" and you have the policy of the Kremlin. Equal treatment is given in these theses -- a single line! -- to the subjects of the war in Vietnam, the threats against Cuba, and the experience of the People's Republic of Mongolia. The Communist International is entitled to a dozen lines in which we learn that it formed "eminent" leaders who, however, likewise remain nameless.

The bureaucracy not only strives to hide its misdeeds; it even seeks to deny its own existence. It appears in these theses only through the references to the Soviet state where its members are included in the categories of workers and sometimes of the intelligentsia. Although they dispose of considerable privileges and a power such as a genuine possessing class has rarely held, it does not wish anyone to see the imprint of its footsteps. This "modesty," this ambition to be dissolved into "the people as a whole,"

testifies that the bureaucracy is in its own fashion aware of the parasitic role it plays in Soviet society.

We mentioned above the impossibility of calculating the liabilities owing to the bureaucracy in economic development. But human societies engage not only in material production; they also produce ideas. History shows, among other things, that all ruling classes have created their own ideologies to justify and consolidate their domination. The history of the Soviet Union shows that in almost half a century the bureaucracy of the country has produced no ideology of its own. Out of its own needs, it has concocted only a hodgepodge with Marxism transformed into an "ideology" and petty-bourgeois democracy. This is further testimony to its parasitic role and a manifestation of the bonapartist position it occupies between the proletariat and capitalism.

This bankruptcy on the plane of ideas finds striking expression in the fact that the Soviet leaders from Stalin to those of today have offered no theory of the October Revolution, of the conquest of power by the proletariat in a country which had not carried out a bourgeois revolution. Moreover, the only theory which explains October, which is embodied in Lenin's "April Theses" of 1917 and many of Lenin's writings after October, the theory of the permanent revolution (as a number of informed people nowadays acknowledge) is still banned.

October inaugurated a new epoch for humanity, that of the transition from capitalism to socialism through the world revolution. In the fiftieth year of this era, we can say with undiminished assurance that nothing that has happened in the intervening years has invalidated the fundamental lessons of October. To be sure, the road to socialism has been shown to be more complicated than anyone imagined before October. The hopes of the first years of the revolution turned out to be exaggerated. But the postponements are essentially due to the subjective factor. The formation of the Communist parties was in a certain measure undertaken too late. At that time these formations were too inexperienced to know how to take advantage of the revolutionary situations in the European countries; after that they were too weak to resist the Stalinist degeneration.

Fifty years after October, the world presents an extremely variegated picture. The new mode of production encompasses one-third of this globe and a third of the human race. The revolution has begun by breaking the weakest links of capitalism; and its most advanced wing is today found paradoxically in the economically less developed countries, those where the building of a socialist society is the most difficult. On the organization-

al level, the workers' movement is dominated by bureaucratic leaderships imbued with the aberrant outlook of peaceful and parliamentary paths to socialism.

A century after the foundation of the First International, there is no longer a mass international. A caricature of an international leadership is provided by Moscow's impotent "Peace Movement." Revolutionary Marxism does not, either nationally or internationally, head a mass organization. The Chinese peasant is learning to think in Marxist terms while the workers of the United States have yet to constitute a class political party of their own, on a scale corresponding to their weight, even of a reformist character.

This unexpected combination is a source of great confusion. Some people, who cling to obsolete schemas, deny that the revolution has made any progress, as if any document could have foreseen all the forms of development of world history, while others repudiate Marxism in order

to replace it with ephemeral theories. Only the Fourth International has succeeded in interpreting the actual dialectic of the world revolution which has assumed such unanticipated forms and it has thereby enriched revolutionary Marxism since the days of the October Revolution and the Communist International of Lenin and Trotsky.

After the years of ebb in the revolution and the isolation of the first workers state, when the tide turned, the theoretical and political confusion bred by Stalinism still continued to impede the advancement of socialism. We are only at the first important steps on the road to a regroupment around the ideas of revolutionary Marxism. This fiftieth anniversary cannot be better celebrated than by carrying forward more vigorously than ever the task to which the Fourth International has been dedicated since its birth: to work for the reconstruction of new revolutionary leaderships and a revolutionary mass Marxist International which can assure the world victory of socialism.

#### MAO FINDS IT DIFFICULT TO CONSOLIDATE HIS POSITION

By Livio Maitan

The violent struggle in China, now in its second year, is still far from ended. The most recent official documents themselves reveal -- in their explicit admissions and their not less meaningful omissions -- that the attempts of the Mao-Lin Piao group to crush all opponents and to establish tight control through the so-called triple alliances [coalitions of Red Guard, municipal and army "cadres"] have only had partial results.

It was already clear last spring that the role of the army was becoming more and more important. On one hand it had to solve the problem of rallying many of the cadres; on the other, it had to orient various sectors of the "Red Guards" and the "Revolutionary Rebels" in the desired direction.

This summer's events seem to indicate that while the struggle at the top has continued with extreme violence, the army has often found itself shaken by deep divisions and in conflict with sectors of the popular masses.

Also to be taken into account are the recurring allusions by the Chinese press to multiple and opposing organizations (some of which, like the so-called May 16 Movement, are now denounced as counterrevolutionary and are forced to work at least partially underground) and the continuous political fire against anarchistic and "left extremist" tenden-

cies. These propaganda attacks confirm the existence -- and perhaps even the growth -- of a phenomenon which we noted in September a year ago, a phenomenon that is a striking feature of the "Cultural Revolution." This is the emergence of "orthodox" Maoist tendencies operating outside the teachings and perspectives of Mao.

The polemics have become ever more voluminous and ever more explicit in their attacks on opponents, especially on Liu Shao-chi, and have increasingly exposed deep divisions on fundamental problems -- domestic and international -- which have existed in the Chinese Communist party for many years.

Behind these vicissitudes, it is clear that solutions for the problems really exist: from the problem of industrial development to the problem of factory management, from the problem of the rate of agricultural collectivization to that of prices and the limits of individual peasant property, from the problem of the orientation of military strategy to the way to meet the problems of art and culture, from the problem of the united front against imperialism to the strategy of revolutionary movements, especially in the colonial or former colonial countries. It is the proposed solutions to these problems that are involved in the current conflict, just as they were involved in the conflicts of the preceding decade.

In the factional presentations of the Mao group things are extremely clear: it is a matter of choosing between the capitalist road and the socialist road, between Liu Shao-chi and Mao. The technique of the whole polemic against Liu -- which only incurable simpletons or those who applaud for pay or out of zeal could take for good coin -- is too transparent, too strongly reminiscent of the well-known Stalinist technique.

Liu is presented not as a Communist with different ideas but as an agent of the bourgeoisie who infiltrated the party from the earliest years in order to defend the interests of this same bourgeoisie. Resorting to the method of truncated quotations and the most grotesque distortions, the Mao group tends on one hand to charge Liu with responsibility for the actual rightist attitudes assumed by the entire party and by Mao in the first place. On the other hand, it charges Liu with the most disparate positions that are probably held by different tendencies and by various persons. The result is that the struggle is presented to the masses as opposition between the infallible Mao, converted into a "magic" symbol (the word appears frequently in the Maoist press) of the forces of good, and the degenerate Liu, the personification of the Evil One. And the masses, whose sovereignty is proclaimed in words, are actually subjected to a continuous barrage of one-sided propaganda and are deprived of the most indispensable information.

a few of his writings literally have become cheerleaders for the "extensive" democracy of Mao, to think about the enormous value and the enormous educational import to the Chinese masses and the entire international workers movement the actual discussion would have had, if it had developed along the real lines of the argument, in total clarity and concreteness, and if the opinions of Liu Shao-chi, Peng Chen or Tao Chu could have been expressed and defended by those directly interested at all the levels where the ideas of Mao and Lin Piao are expressed and ultimately before the entire Chinese people.

The distance between such a dialectical process -- and that it is not utopian was demonstrated by the Bolshevik party in the days of Lenin -- and the methods of the Maoist group (calumny and systematic distortion; silence imposed on opponents; deification of Mao; exaltation of Stalin against Zinoviev, Bukharin and Trotsky; defense of Zhdanov's concepts, etc.) is one of the criteria that enables us to measure the distance between the theory and practice of Mao -- even the real Mao -- and a theory and practice really suited to the needs of socialist construction and an internationalist revolutionary strategy.

If such a policy were actually put into effect, the consequences could shortly prove extremely significant. A new phase would open in a crisis that has already deeply shaken China and the Chinese workers movement.

We invite all those who by taking

September 20, 1967

In this issue

	<u>Page</u>
In Tribute to Che -- by Fidel Castro .....	850
Régis Debray's Farewell to Che .....	855
Fourth International Joins in Mourning Che .....	857
The Area Where Che Fell .....	857
Faded Jungle Greens Were His Funeral Robes .....	858
American "Observer" Present with Murderers of Che .....	859
"Orders Came Down...to Execute Che" .....	860
Peruvian Military Court Spares Hugo Blanco's Life .....	861
Biggest Antiwar Demonstration in History of Washington .....	861
A Week of Antiwar Protest Actions in the U.S. ....	863
Chain of Antiwar Demonstrations Around the World .....	863
The Scarborough Labour Party Conference -- by Ernest Tate .....	864
The Holdouts .....	866
Keeping Greece Safe for the Free World .....	866
On the Fiftieth Anniversary of the October Revolution -- by Pierre Frank .....	867
Mao Finds It Difficult to Consolidate His Position -- by Livio Maitan .....	871
Correction .....	858