

WORLD OUTLOOK

a labor press service

*With Che Guevara
in the Mexico Days*

Vol.5, No.38

November 24, 1967

Firsthand Account by Ralph Schoenman:

Régis Debray, Che Guevara and the Bolivian Guerrilla Struggle

Debray Sentenced to Thirty Years

Excerpts from Che's Diary Read at Trial

Campaign to Continue for Hugo Blanco

Fresh Controversy over Leon Trotsky's Biography of Stalin



HUBERT HUMPHREY, on four-day inspection tour of Vietnam, found situation in apple-pie order. The only ingredient needed, he said, is "patience" in the U.S. Humphrey is not running for president in 1968 but does feel that Johnson could use his services for a second term as vice-president.

WORLD OUTLOOK

a labor press service

*With Che Guevara
in the Mexico Days*

Vol. 5, No. 38

November 24, 1967

Firsthand Account by Ralph Schoenman:

Régis Debray, Che Guevara and the Bolivian Guerrilla Struggle

**Debray Sentenced
to Thirty Years**

**Excerpts from Che's
Diary Read at Trial**

**Campaign to Continue
for Hugo Blanco**

**Fresh Controversy
over Leon Trotsky's
Biography of Stalin**



HUBERT HUMPHREY, on four-day inspection tour of Vietnam, found situation in apple-pie order. The only ingredient needed, he said, is "patience" in the U.S. Humphrey is not running for president in 1968 but does feel that Johnson could use his services for a second term as vice-president.



HUBERT HUMPHREY, on four-day inspection tour of Vietnam, found situation in apple-pie order. The only ingredient needed, he said, is "patience" in the U.S. Humphrey is not running for president in 1968 but does feel that Johnson could use his services for a second term as vice-president.



HUBERT HUMPHREY, on four-day inspection tour of Vietnam, found situation in apple-pie order. The only ingredient needed, he said, is "patience" in the U.S. Humphrey is not running for president in 1968 but does feel that Johnson could use his services for a second term as vice-president.

THE REAL TURNOUT AT WASHINGTON ANTIWAR RALLY -- 318,000

While Washington escalates the war, it seeks to de-escalate the opposition to it, at least in the mass media.

In its account of the October 21-22 antiwar demonstrations World Outlook [October 27] commented: "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."

Confirmation of this point in respect to the big October 21 mobilization at Washington has come from Nat Hentoff's widely read "Review of the Press" column in the November 9 New York City Village Voice.

Hentoff reports the following: "On the front page of the October 30 New Left Notes, the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) weekly, Bob Grove writes: 'The Chief of Washington, D.C., police forces admitted on Saturday evening (October 21) that his officers stationed at the south end of the Memorial Bridge had officially counted 318,000 marchers proceeding from the Lincoln Memorial to the Pentagon.'

"This admission was made to a number of reporters at a press conference in Washington. The reporters included members of United Press International (UPI) and Associated Press (AP) and a reporter for the Los Angeles Times, Keith Wisely. Wisely and the other reporters had just flown over the Pentagon, the North Parking Lot, the march route over Memorial Bridge, and the Lincoln Memorial.

"In their meeting with police officials later in the evening they expressed amazement at the official police crowd estimate of 55,000 since it was apparent that many more demonstrators and marchers were present. The police chief at this point informed the reporters that police crowd control experts using coun-

ters had been stationed at the south end of Memorial Bridge and had machine counted 318,000 marchers as they passed by.

"The reporters were then asked to not report this real figure but instead to report the figure of 55,000, officially being released to the press by the police and military authorities. All the reporters present pledged themselves to report the 55,000 figure. They were told by the police that if the figure of 318,000 were to be reported in the nation's press "the President would be in a very embarrassing position."

"I subsequently met with Mr. Wisely,' Bob Grove continued, 'and was given the information regarding the true size of the October 21 March on Washington... If the information given by the reporter, Wisely, is correct, it would appear to indicate evidence of a network of falsification of facts extending from the White House, through the Defense Department, the D.C. Police Department, and including important elements of the press, especially AP and UPI.'"

New Yorkers who were present at the mass protest against the attendance of Secretary of State Rusk at the Foreign Policy Association dinner at the Hotel Hilton November 14 had occasion to verify that this deliberate downgrading of the demonstrations continues. The New York Times considered the event important enough to make it the lead story on its front page next day and give it the pre-dominant positions on pages 2 and 3. Yet it estimated the throng on hand, which kept the cops busy for five hours, as no more than 3,000.

The thousand or more policemen cordoned off the streets leading to the demonstration area near the hotel and thus deterred or prevented many people from joining the pickets. But at least 10,000 New Yorkers came out to voice vigorous opposition to Johnson's and Rusk's genocidal war in Vietnam.

JOHNSON THROWS IN THE SPONGE TO POLLSTERS

Public support for Lyndon Johnson and his war in Vietnam has dropped to an all-time low in the U.S. according to the most recent Harris Poll.

Public opinion, as registered by a survey in late October, showed an overwhelming majority of 77 percent feeling no confidence in Johnson's policy. Twenty-three percent approved.

An AP dispatch from Washington, November 15, quoted Johnson as replying: "I may wind up with a poll of one percent before it's over with." We have to admit that he seems well on his way.

In June the supporters of Johnson's war policy stood at 46 percent. The trend reversed briefly in July, hitting 51 percent. This was a consequence of

Johnson's success in maneuvering Kosygin into meeting him at Glassboro in a "summit conference."

The public hoped that the two were getting together and that one of the con-

sequences might be an end to the war in Vietnam.

Once the Glassboro meeting was seen to have no effect on the Vietnam situation, the president's popularity resumed its precipitous decline.

THE NEW YORK RALLY AGAINST DEAN RUSK -- WHAT IT REVEALED

By Joseph Hansen

The reception given to U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk by antiwar demonstrators in New York November 14 is being carefully assessed by all political tendencies; and rightly so. The demonstration provided a fresh gauge of the scope of the domestic opposition to the war in Vietnam and the speed with which it is developing. The outcome, particularly the violence of the police, provided some lessons well worth considering by the antiwar movement.

The demonstration was organized on very short notice, since the information that Rusk was to address a dinner of the Foreign Policy Association was handled much like a state secret.

The Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee nonetheless decided to counter Rusk's projected campaign speech for Johnson by organizing a picket line in front of the New York Hilton hotel where the dinner was to be held.

The Students for a Democratic Society, a campus organization that has taken somewhat of a back seat in recent demonstrations, mobilized energetically in support of the action.

In view of the success of the huge April 15 antiwar demonstrations in New York and San Francisco and the dramatic October 21 march on Washington, the sponsors of the protest action expected a good turnout and prepared accordingly.

But even their expectations fell far short of the reality. Not less than 10,000 persons showed up, most of them coming up out of the subway entrances in and around Times Square, which is not far from the luxurious Hilton hotel where the mink-and-diamonds crowd were to hear Rusk.

Veterans of the antiwar movement -- this category already exists -- noted once more something that began happening on a large scale at the April 15 rallies in both New York and San Francisco. A big proportion of those who responded to the call were very young and this was the first time in their lives that they had participated in an action of this kind.

The veterans welcomed the sight of the new levy of antiwar protesters. But the truth was they had expected it. They had learned from the experience of recent months that this development was quite likely. This expectation was one of the factors that had countered any feeling of letdown after the exhausting work of organizing the October 21 action in Washington. Skeptical voices questioning the efficacy of demonstrations were hard to find after that success. Previously they had been loud, even after the April 15 rallies, serving to dampen enthusiasm.

It was evident early in the evening that the protest against Rusk and his defense of the war in Vietnam was a huge success. The size and composition of the demonstration showed how the mood of opposition in the American public had deepened and quickened even in the few weeks since October 21.

The proof would have been clear for the whole world to see had all the pickets been able to assemble peaceably in front of the New York Hilton to chant their slogans, display their banners and engage in such publicity measures as is customary in the U.S. in demonstrations of this kind.

The crowd, assembled under the central slogan of "Support Our GI's; Bring Them Home Now!" by its sheer size would have served to give fresh impetus to similar demonstrations elsewhere, helping to bring closer the day when the American working class with all its mighty power enters into action on this front.

The most consistent activists in the antiwar movement made it their goal from the very beginning of the escalation of the war in Vietnam to bring ever wider layers of the population into action, seeking to extend participation from the students, who were the first to assail U.S. aggression in Vietnam, to the black liberation movement, the trade unions and the working class as a whole. They have doggedly sought to avoid dissipating the force of the opposition in adventures, factional publicity gimmicks, provocations, or diversions into the

morass of trying to "pressure" the Democratic party "from within."

As against this line, a wide assortment, extending from partisans of the Democratic party to ultraleftists, have advanced a gamut of alternatives. The powers that be, naturally, have not been disinterested spectators of this, as was graphically shown by the conduct of the police at the anti-Rusk protest action.

The sponsors of the demonstration had complied with all the legal requirements and obtained a permit to assemble in accordance with the democratic rights that presumably obtain in the U.S. The place of assembly was designated as opposite the New York Hilton hotel.

The police violated the specifications. When merely the first contingents had arrived, the police closed off all the normal entrances to the designated area, putting up barricades. They manned these with hundreds of cops who turned away the people arriving in droves to join in the chorus of protest.

This, of course, served to cut down the number of protesters who were in the picket line at the hotel and gave a plausible basis for the newspaper reports that the crowd numbered only 3,000. (A figure of 3,000 is, however, still very impressive, considering how little time was available to organize the action.)

But it also served to anger those who were turned back in this way. They felt that their right to demonstrate was being violated by the police. Many of them formed in knots and clusters and sought to reach the assembly point.

The New York police, however, are thoroughly trained in the art of chopping up and dissipating crowds until they can reduce them down to groups which contingents of cops can tackle with their clubs and other weapons. Cutting a crowd into sectors and separating the sectors is one of the main jobs of the mounted police, their horses being trained for this work.

A further complication was the activities of ultraleftists who conducted themselves as if physical combat with the police at all times and places is not only highly desirable but the very essence of a revolutionary attitude.

No doubt the police themselves, as is universal with them in all countries, had provocateurs at work. In any case, they reacted to certain incidents as if they had been expecting them and had been briefed on what to do.

Violence flared and the violence grew worse as the police managed to cut

the protesters into smaller and smaller groups and push them away from the hotel.

One of the remarkable aspects of the struggle, nonetheless, was the way young protesters stood up in face of the police assault. Some forty-six arrests were made. Five policemen were injured. The number of civilians injured was not reported or estimated by the press, an understandable oversight in view of their desire to picture the cops as innocent victims.

More than 1,000 police were mobilized around the New York Hilton to prevent any of the protesters from getting inside where Rusk was speaking. Hundreds of other cops were deployed in the area as if it were a battlefield. A high police officer told The New York Times that "security" precautions were "equal to those given the President."

And Rusk conducted himself like the President. He was slipped into the Hilton well in advance of the dinner. To avoid being seen, he was taken through the garage entrance. He gave his speech (in defense of Johnson's war in Vietnam, of course) and then slipped away like the proverbial thief in the night.

Little attention was paid to his speech by anyone, even the most ardent hawks, since everyone knew he would give the same speech he has been giving since Johnson first escalated the war.

But a great deal of attention was paid to the demonstration in the streets, what it meant and how it might affect the development of the antiwar movement.

The capitalist papers, naturally, pictured the cops as models of restraint and blamed the demonstrators for the fighting that occurred. The New York Times even lectured the leaders of the Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee and the Students for a Democratic Society, saying that they shared "a heavy responsibility for a disgraceful episode..."

The attempts of the police and the capitalist press to cut down, belittle and smear the reception given to Dean Rusk in New York will hardly achieve its purpose, however.

The demonstration provided fresh and dramatic evidence of the fact that the steep decline in Johnson's political standing is being matched by an equally steep rise in popular opposition to the war in Vietnam.

The enormous publicity given to the demonstration by the newspapers, TV and radio constituted indirect recognition of its true meaning.

And that is how it will be judged throughout the country, particularly among those concerned about mobilizing this opposition into a force powerful

enough to actually bring an immediate end to American intervention in the internal affairs of the Vietnamese people.

THE HAPPENING AT BRUTON PARISH CHURCH

The Rev. Cotesworth Pinckney Lewis, rector of the Bruton Parish Church in Williamsburg, Virginia, had an amazing experience Sunday, November 12. Looking down from his pulpit, he saw the Almighty sitting in the front pew.

The good Episcopalian minister at once interrupted his sermon and addressed himself in prayer to President Johnson:

"The political complexities of our involvement in an undeclared war are so baffling," he said, "that I feel presumptuous even in asking questions.

"But since there is a rather general consensus that something is wrong in Vietnam -- a conviction voiced by leaders of nations traditionally our friends, leading military experts and the rank and file of American citizens -- we wonder if some logical, straightforward explanation might be given without endangering whatever military or political advantages we now enjoy."

Since it is the custom in the United States to turn Sunday over to the clergy, leaving the rest of the week free for worship of the Dollar, the presence in the front pew said nothing. This was a rare display of magnanimity in view of the President's awesome powers as a speechmaker. Moreover, he had just completed a 5,100-mile tour in which he had delivered seven orations, all attempting to reply to the very question raised by the humble clergyman. He could easily have taken over the pulpit to come down an eighth time.

As word got around about the hap-

pening at Bruton Parish Church, there was considerable fluttering in the hawkcote. Democratic Leader of the House of Representatives Carl Albert of Oklahoma said he thought it was the "first time in our history anyone has tried to make a captive audience out of the President."

Congressman Albert did not offer to estimate how many times in history American boys have been made captive by the draft and sent to distant heathen lands in undeclared wars to perform such civilizing missions as setting babies on fire with napalm.

Representative Wayne L. Hays, a Democrat of Ohio, said, "It's well known that the best way to get headlines is to attack the President. Nobody ever heard of this minister before today and nobody will ever hear of him again, which will be no great loss."

It would probably be no great loss if nobody ever heard of Representative Hays again...but let that go; no doubt he sounds great to Johnson.

In view of the uproar, the minister apologized profusely that he meant no harm.

He may be telling the truth; but the circumstances are suspicious. If he's not an outright fellow traveler or dupe, he at least may have been brainwashed by the "Prince of Peace," the alias of a subversive who seems to have been active in the church field for a dangerously long time.

REVOLUTIONARY THEMES SOUNDED AT WEST BERLIN GATHERINGS

Berlin

In the demonstrations conducted in West Berlin October 21 against the war in Vietnam, young revolutionary students and workers showed their feelings about the death of Che Guevara by carrying hundreds of large portraits of the martyred Latin-American revolutionary leader. In the following weeks they showed again how deeply they identify with the cause of socialist Cuba and the world revolution as personified by Guevara.

On November 1, progressive students and professors of West Berlin's university founded the "Critical University" [Kritische Universität]. The next day they held the first public session of the new organization in the university's huge auditorium. Some 1,200 students participated in a forum which started with a report on the present situation in Cuba by Gisela Mandel and an analysis of the present stage of the Latin-American revolution by Ernest Mandel that included an appraisal of the contribution made by

Guevara to both the theory and practice of that revolution.

In the lively discussion that followed, only a tiny minority expressed hostility to Cuba and the Latin-American revolution.

When one of them questioned the right of the Cuban revolutionists to turn to the road of "violence" and thereby expose the whole continent to the kind of genocide now being perpetrated in Vietnam by American imperialism, Ernest Mandel drew stormy applause when he pictured the inhuman conditions and the reactionary violence driving the Latin-American masses to revolt.

By widening their revolutionary struggles, he said, the outraged masses make counterrevolutionary intervention by U.S. imperialism more difficult, for even the huge resources it commands do not enable it to simultaneously bring to bear in a number of countries the kind of firepower being concentrated solely against the Vietnamese people today.

On November 6, the Socialist Youth organization of West Berlin celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of the October revolution. Between 3,500 and 4,000 persons turned out at the historic meeting hall called "The New World," which was the scene of such key occurrences as the founding congresses of Liebknecht's and Luxemburg's Spartakusbund and the German Communist party.

In his opening remarks, the third chairman of the West Berlin Socialist Youth, Peter Bischoff, called for recognition of the German Democratic Republic, the defense of all the conquests of the October revolution, the full rehabilitation of Leon Trotsky and all of Lenin's companions who led the Bolshevik party to victory in 1917, and publication of their writings in the USSR, East Germany, and all the workers states. Bischoff's remarks fit appropriately with the huge backdrop portrait of Lenin flanked by Trotsky.

Then the audience rose in tribute to the memory of Ernesto "Che" Guevara while Bischoff read extracts from the message the guerrilla leader sent to Tri-continental magazine in Havana which has become his testament.

Ernest Mandel delivered the main speech of the evening. Frequently interrupted by heavy applause from the very militant audience, he recalled the historic significance of the October revolution in opening the epoch of socialist world revolution, and he dwelt on how the heroic Vietnamese people, the Cuban and Latin-American revolutionists are continuing the struggle started fifty years ago.

He predicted that inside the imperialist countries themselves, the failure of the working class to link up with the Russian revolution of 1917; which was the main historic cause for the bureaucratic degeneration of the USSR, would finally be rectified.

Fifteen speakers from the audience and the platform took the floor before Mandel summarized the discussion. Most of the speakers excoriated the Social Democratic and trade-union bureaucrats.

One representative of the left wing of the Social Democratic party, Harry Ristock, who was seated on the platform, had difficulty making himself heard in face of the disagreement of the audience with his point of view. But the second chairman of the Socialist Youth, Wolfgang Hohmann, who presided at the meeting, made a strong appeal in favor of workers democracy and called for the audience to let Ristock speak, even though he himself shared their distaste for the speaker's attempt to enlist the great German revolutionist Rosa Luxemburg against the October revolution.

A short speech by the West Berlin revolutionary student leader Rudi Dutschke, proved extremely interesting and significant. In calling for the utmost active support for the Vietnamese and Latin-American revolutions, he added that the student movement led by him had been mistaken in underestimating the potential militancy of the German working class.

He called attention to the impressive demonstration staged by the miners October 21 against the closing down of coal pits in the Ruhr. About 15,000 men engaged in the demonstration -- and behind red banners.

He also hailed the strikers in a large West Berlin metal plant who had downed tools that very day to protest an attempted slash in wages.

Ending with a strong appeal for unity between the students and workers against capitalism, he received a tremendous ovation from the audience.

The meeting wound up with the audience singing three stanzas of the Internationale.

Other highlights of the evening included heavy contributions of cash in response to an appeal by Ernest Mandel for help for the Bolivian guerrillas. Some 400 copies of a booklet containing excerpts from Lenin's "April Theses," Trotsky's Lessons of October, and Preobrazhensky's analysis of the New Economic Policy were sold.

The meeting received extensive

coverage in the press and on the radio and television networks of West Berlin and West Germany. It received similar treatment in the German Democratic Republic although the reports there were doctored so as to eliminate all references to Trotsky, to Guevara and to the name of the main speaker.

Ironically, the Soviet mission in West Berlin held its reception in honor of the fiftieth anniversary of the October revolution at the same time as the meeting in the New World hall.

West German capitalists, church

EXCERPTS FROM CHE'S DIARY READ AT DEBRAY TRIAL

[Irregularities upon irregularities continue to be heaped up in the military trial of Régis Debray in Camiri, Bolivia. The latest is the reading of extracts, said to be from the diary of Che Guevara, in the court record.

[The prosecution had announced early that Guevara's diary would be submitted as evidence against the young French journalist. But this did not happen during the time allotted for the submission of evidence when the attorneys for both sides could examine it. The failure caused a good deal of comment, particularly in view of the challenge of the defense that the entire diary be read into the record, since this would definitively prove Debray's innocence.

[Finally the summations were made and all that remained was for the court to bring in its verdict which, it was expected, would be done within a few days.

[On November 13 a surprise move was made. The court was suddenly convened, Debray was dragged in by physical force, and long extracts from the diary were read. Due to the violation of all rules for trial in Bolivia, it was difficult to ascertain the authenticity of what appeared to be photostats.

[At least some of the passages appear to be genuine, however, and were reported by various wire services. The following is a translation from the version that appeared in the November 15 issue of Le Monde. The phrases in brackets were added either by Le Monde or by the wire services.]

* * *

March 20 -- A message has been brought from Marcos [in command of the advance guard]. Benigno's [Cuban guerrilla] suspicion is confirmed: the army, some sixty men, is advancing along the

dignitaries and scientists packed into the luxurious ballroom where they were served caviar and pink champagne. They listened to soft dance music instead of the Internationale. And of course no collection was taken for guerrillas anywhere in the world.

Some members of the working press who happened to come from that official celebration to the somewhat less official one in the New World, found the spirit of the mass meeting decidedly more congenial and in keeping with the Russian revolution than the festivities organized by the Soviet diplomats.

route from Valle Grande. At the camp I found Danton [Debray], El Pelado [Bustos] and Tania.

There is an atmosphere of disorder. Impression of chaos. I talked with "El Chino" [Peruvian guerrilla] who asked for 5,000 dollars a month, for ten months. In Havana they told him to discuss the problem directly with me.

March 21 -- I spent the day talking with El Chino, Danton, El Pelado and Tania. The Frenchman brought news we already knew from Monge, Kolla and Simón Reyes [three leaders of the pro-Soviet, Bolivian Communist party]. He wants to join us. I asked him to go and organize a network of support in France, where he is returning after going to Havana.

March 25 -- Analysis of the errors of Marcos. I removed him from command and put Miguel in charge of the advance guard. Long analysis of the situation for the Frenchman. It was decided to call the movement "National Front for the Liberation of Bolivia."

March 27 -- The news [of the ambush] made a sensation on the radio. Barrientos' press conference. They impute fifteen deaths to us.... Thus we lose five years work. They are also talking about two guerrillas as deserters... We will have to hold a general staff meeting to decide on a course of action in the coming days.

March 28 -- We are encircled by two thousand soldiers with trucks and napalm bombs. Arrival of a Red Cross truck escorted by soldiers. They told us they would return tomorrow to get the remains of the seven [soldiers who fell March 23] and burn them.

The Frenchman is too vehement on the usefulness of his mission abroad.

April 18 -- Meeting with the journalist Roth. His papers are in order, but there is something suspicious about him.

April 19 -- Danton, Carlos [Bustos' other surname] and Roth left. Danton proposed to Roth to prove his good faith by serving as a guide for them in leaving the zone. Carlos accepted this solution sourly; as for me I wash my hands...

* * *

A page reserved for a summary of the month read:

"Everything is proceeding normally, except that we lost two of our best men: Rolando and Rubio. Rubio [killed at Iripiti April 10]...was a hard blow. Our isolation remains complete. The peasant ranks are not moving. Held by fear. Their support will come later.

"After the publication of my article in Havana, my presence in Bolivia can no longer be doubted. The Americans are already sending helicopters and green berets, but we have not yet seen them.

"We learned that Danton, Carlos and Roth were arrested [April 20 at Muyupampa]. Two of them are probably in trouble, their papers not being in order. Danton should be able to leave.

"Danton and Carlos fell victim to their haste and my negligence in not holding them back."

A letter signed by "Ramón," Che's pseudonym, dated March 10 and sent to "Leche," who is presumed in the dispatches to be Castro, included a sentence: "Danton and Francisco [doubtless "El Chino"] have arrived. Danton must leave; I do not find him in sufficiently good physical condition....Danton will inform you about the second action [the Iripiti ambush]."

In a second letter to "Leche." dated August 26, "Ramón" allegedly wrote: "We will campaign for the release of Danton. He was carrying a message: We have arms for a hundred men and four 60 mortars, but not a single peasant has enlisted yet. I have twenty-five men under my command; Joaquin has seventeen."

ZENKAKUREN STUDENTS PROTEST SATO'S TRIP TO WASHINGTON

Some 4,000 students, members of Sampa Rengo [Three Faction Alliance], belonging to the Zengakuren [All-Japan Student Federation], attempted November 11 to block the departure of Prime Minister Eisaku Sato for Washington where he was scheduled to announce the escalation of aid from the Japanese government for Johnson's war in Vietnam.

The students, who managed to evade police blockades by sneaking into the Tokyo University campus the night before, marched toward Tokyo International Airport. They were met in the vicinity of Otorii Station by some 7,000 police.

The students, who wore helmets of many colors and carried wooden staves, charged the police lines and threw stones.

The police were prepared for this, however, and caught the stones with aluminum shields and nylon nets. Using their clubs, the specially trained riot police beat down the students and arrested 295 of them one by one.

The press announced that 372 persons were injured in the skirmishes, 320 of them being police.

The police also used tear gas on the students. Some of the students picked

up the canisters from which the white gas was spewing and threw them back at the police. But the students were outnumbered by the police and had to retreat.

Prime Minister Sato took no chances about being late for his appointment with President Johnson. A cordon of police took him to the airport in an armored car.

Sentiment against the escalation of Japanese aid for the aggression of U.S. imperialism in Vietnam is deepening among the ordinary people in Japan, whose memories of World War II and its outcome in the atomic destruction of two crowded cities are still fresh.

The night before Sato left, a 73-year-old resident of Yokohama, Tadanoshin Yui, planted himself near the prime minister's home, poured gasoline over his clothing and struck a match. He was found alive but died the next afternoon around the time Sato arrived at the airport.

Yui left a note saying that he had chosen this unusual method of suicide to appeal for peace in Vietnam and to protest Sato's support of the continued bombing of the people of North Vietnam.

WAR CRIMES TRIBUNAL TO HEAR WITNESSES IN COPENHAGEN

The International War Crimes Tribunal, initiated by Bertrand Russell, is scheduled to hold its second session in Copenhagen from November 20 to December 1.

Laurent Schwartz, an internationally famous mathematician, told the press in Paris November 8 that the session would take up the following questions: Are the Americans utilizing new weapons or weapons banned by the rules of war? Have there been unjustified reprisals against the civilian population? How are prisoners treated? Have acts of genocide been committed?

Roger Pic, Dr. Krivine and Francis Kahn, who returned from a recent investigation in zones controlled by the Liberation Front, gave a résumé of the depositions they will make in Copenhagen.

Dr. Krivine, a well-known Paris surgeon, said that in the areas which he visited in the countryside, most of the houses were destroyed, work in the open fields was impossible, and planes fired

at everything that moved -- both men and animals. "What is involved is the destruction of a population and its means of existence," he said.

Francis Kahn said that he regretted that scientists whose views differed from those of the team he was on had not participated in order to check what had been discovered. He said that Paris laboratories had analyzed the chemical products gathered in the zones in the southern part of North Vietnam under American bombardment.

J.P. Vigier, another member of the tribunal, reported on his recent trip to North Vietnam. "Two-thirds of Haiphong has been razed," he declared.

The Copenhagen session will hear a number of witnesses concerning war crimes being committed in Vietnam. The tribunal has invited both the Vietnamese and the Americans to participate in the inquiry.

U.S. SENATE SCORES VICTORY AGAINST SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

A coalition of Democratic and Republican senators defeated a bill in the Senate November 16 proposing to use public funds to cover the cost of medicines exceeding \$25 a year for persons over the age of sixty-five in the United States.

Hospitalization and other medical benefits are taken care of for elderly people in the U.S. under the provisions of the Medicare law but they must still pay for medicines used at home. At the exorbitant prices charged for drugs, many of them find this to be a major expense.

Senator Joseph M. Montoya, Democrat of New Mexico, who sponsored the measure, said that it would take not more than \$220 million a year to cover the total proposed expenditure.

Senator John J. Williams, Republican of Delaware, who opposed helping the elderly in this way, said the cost would be around \$690 million.

The U.S. government is at present spending \$82 million a day for the war in Vietnam. Thus, even if Senator Williams were correct, medicine for all the senior citizens in the U.S. in excess of \$25 for each one could be covered by a little

more than what it costs the taxpayers to keep up the war in Vietnam for a single week.

The paltry concession to sick people over sixty-five was opposed by the pharmaceutical interests, who have a powerful lobby in Washington. They were particularly aroused by a provision in the measure that would have required doctors to use the generic names of drugs in writing out prescriptions instead of the brand names which drug houses put on the products they package.

The utilization of enigmatic brand names facilitates charging fantastic prices for drugs that may cost only a few cents to manufacture.

Consequently, defeat of the bill assured continuation of the exorbitant profits which the pharmaceutical trust is accustomed to make at the expense of the aged suffering from illness. Compelling old people in the United States to pay for their medicine is just as much a part of the American Way of Life as sending free medicine to the old people in North Vietnam in the form of napalm, high explosives and antipersonnel bombs.

CAMPAIGN FOR HUGO BLANCO TO CONTINUE

Lima, Peru

The hearing before the Supreme Military Court on the appeal of Hugo Blanco [see World Outlook October 27, p. 861], did not have the repercussions in the international press that marked the trial in Tacna (September-October 1966). This was because of the briefness of the hearing as well as the fact that it occurred during the dramatic days in which the death of Ernesto "Che" Guevara preoccupied international public opinion.

The date of the hearing was not announced until a few days in advance and the way in which the court itself convened gave rise to the worst fears as to the intention of the judges.

As is well known, ever since November, 1966, the prosecution had demanded that Blanco be given the death penalty, the sentence handed down by the court at Tacna [against which the Peruvian peasant leader was appealing] being twenty-five years in El Frontón.

The prosecutor thus became the spokesman of the sectors of the army and the police who thought at the time of the Tacna trial that no attention should be paid to the campaign of solidarity in behalf of Hugo Blanco that had developed in Peru and throughout the world. Under the provisions of the law, if the court decided on capital punishment, no further appeal could be made and the sentence would have been carried out almost immediately.

Despite the shortness of time, the solidarity committees in Peru sounded the alarm and stressed the urgency of again launching an international campaign.

In Lima, the FIR [Frente de Izquierda Revolucionario], the Peruvian Trotskyist organization of which Blanco is chairman, distributed leaflets appealing for solidarity from the public and reproducing the text of a message from the prisoner.

The hearing was set for October 12. The public was admitted to the courtroom; the defendant, however, was denied the right to attend.

The prosecuting attorney repeated his demand for the death penalty, while the auditor [judge advocate at the Tacna trial] himself opposed and asked for confirmation of the Tacna verdict.

The next to be heard was Blanco's courageous attorney Dr. Alfredo Battilana, who played such an able role in the Tacna trial. His vigorous and impassioned plea

drew applause from the spectators.

The Military Court then immediately handed down its verdict: twenty-five years in the penitentiary on El Frontón, a small island, one hour by boat from Callao, the port at Lima.

The whole hearing did not last more than a couple of hours.

Since the danger existed that Hugo could be condemned to death, the confirmation of the Tacna verdict was greeted with relief. Nevertheless the sentence is a savage one without any legal justification. In addition, since no provisions exist for further appeal, it must now be concluded that the verdict cannot be overturned.

In a message to the Fourth International, Hugo Blanco said that the worldwide solidarity campaign was decisive in saving him from the firing squad.

It is necessary now to continue this campaign, for we cannot agree to letting the leader of the Cuzco peasants remain in prison for twenty-five years. Moreover, his life is still in danger.

As we have already indicated, certain sectors of the army and the police disapproved the "leniency" of the Tacna judges, whom they accuse of having bowed to international pressure. This view is shared, naturally, by the big landowners who see Blanco as their main enemy. Even in prison, he still strikes fear in them. These sectors -- and all the more so if the class struggle sharpens in Peru -- are quite capable of organizing an attempt to murder Hugo Blanco.

If it is taken into account that the revolutionary leader is confined on the tiny island of El Frontón which has almost 2,000 prisoners, among whom the politicals constitute only a tiny minority, and where the ordinary criminals engage in fights in which wounds and even killings are not infrequent, it is easy to understand the danger Hugo Blanco is continually exposed to.

This danger threatens to become worse in the near future when his peasant comrades, who are worried about him now, are released.

As for Blanco's material situation, it has without doubt improved in comparison with the harsh isolation inflicted on him in the three years he spent in the Arequipa prison. Visitors are permitted on the days provided in the regulations and he can read the books and magazines sent him.

However, to get decent food and to help his family -- he has two small children -- it is necessary for him to work very long hours (among other things he carves small wooden statues and makes hand-colored postcards).

For all these reasons, it is imperative to resume the international solidarity campaign and to consider it a permanent necessity as long as Blanco remains in prison.

The fundamental aims of the campaign should be the following: to obtain a presidential amnesty (this should in-

clude the other political prisoners, from Tauro to Hector Béjar and Ricardo Gadea), and to assure Hugo Blanco the material aid he needs. This aid can be transmitted to him by his attorney.

All those who have already contributed should rally again, bearing in mind, among other things, that it is not possible to collect a large fund in Peru itself where members of revolutionary organizations live in extreme poverty, on starvation wages or without any wages at all on account of unemployment or being blacklisted.

BELAUNDE TERRY IN POLITICAL TROUBLE

The administration of Belaúnde Terry is reported by the press to be in a "delicate" condition. The coalition between Belaúnde's Popular Action party and the Christian Democrats is showing signs of strain in face of deepening unrest resulting from drastic devaluation of the sol. [See World Outlook November 10, page 910.]

The Christian Democrats suffered a split recently and a new party was formed, the Popular Christian party. Belaúnde, who has been casting about for support from any and all quarters in order to shore up his deteriorating position, made a deal with the leaders of the new formation.

The Christian Democrats thereupon attacked Belaúnde, taking the very principled stand that he has not carried out his promises concerning an agrarian reform for Peru.

The two Christian Democrats in Belaúnde's cabinet announced November 12 that they intended to resign. It remains to be seen whether Belaúnde can patch up the differences.

Partial legislative elections held November 12 in the departments of Lima and Libertad also spelled trouble for Belaúnde. The opposition won by a landslide in both departments.

The "opposition" consists of the party of Odría, a former dictator, and the APRA [Alianza Popular Revolucionaria Americana]. They already hold a majority in parliament. A further strengthening of their position makes it more difficult for Belaúnde to maintain his equilibrium.

In addition, while the vote is restricted to a small minority in Peru, the returns are watched for indications of deeper changes in the political situation.

The real power, of course, is the army and it may intervene as it has in the past if the situation becomes critical. At the same time, the working class has been moving into action recently in opposition to the skyrocketing cost of living. The shifts on the electoral front and in the administration are but pale and distant reflections of the movement of the class forces in Peru.

WARNING ON RADIOACTIVE POLLUTION OF THE SEAS

Dr. Arvid Pardo, representative of Malta at the United Nations, warned the Political Committee of the General Assembly November 1 that indiscriminate dumping of radioactive wastes in the oceans as presently practiced by such powers as the United States could prevent mankind from utilizing the incalculable food and mineral resources of the sea bottom.

One of the members of the U.S. Congress, he said, had insinuated that "somebody" must have been behind his move.

Dr. Pardo did not identify the

congressman, but answered by explaining: "The Maltese islands are situated in the center of the Mediterranean. We are naturally vitally interested in the sea which we live and breathe."

The U.S. is situated between two oceans but the majority of its rulers appear to have no vital interest in them, considering the Atlantic and the Pacific to be two convenient cesspools, mere extensions of the contaminated waterways of their own country, and not major resources belonging to all of humanity.

Interview with Ralph Schoenman

REGIS DEBRAY, CHE GUEVARA AND THE BOLIVIAN GUERRILLAS

[In their effort to bring world attention to bear sharply on the shocking treatment of Régis Debray at the hands of the Barrientos dictatorship in Bolivia, friends of the young French journalist appealed to the Russell Peace Foundation to help organize a commission of inquiry.

[The Foundation, as well as Bertrand Russell personally, responded to the appeal; and Ralph Schoenman, the secretary of Russell, together with others, went to Bolivia.

[As the trial of Régis Debray came to a close, Schoenman protested the rigged proceedings and the many flagrant violations of human rights and the Bolivian constitution itself committed by the military court.

[He was at once seized by the political police, held for a few days and then deported to the United States in response to the intervention of the U.S. State Department. Schoenman arrived in New York November 2. The following night he spoke at a memorial meeting for Ernesto "Che" Guevara.

[A week later, he addressed the Militant Labor Forum, telling about the Debray case. After the forum, he granted an interview to Les Evans of The Militant. The following is the text of the interview.]

* * *

Question. How was your commission composed and how did it get to Bolivia; was there any problem getting into the country?

Schoenman: The commission was composed of people who had some knowledge of the Debray case and a particular talent such as a working knowledge of the language or a technical skill such as the skill of Tariq Ali in photography.

Perry Anderson is the editor of the New Left Review and first published Régis in English. Robin Blackburn had been with Régis in Havana just before Régis left for Paris en route to Bolivia and he knew of the arrangement Régis had made with Maspero and Sucesos, the Mexican publication, and therefore he was in a position to give direct evidence.

My own role was really as a representative of the Foundation and of Bertrand Russell. And so on that basis the commission had been composed. We had contacted others, some of them eminent, but as often happens, the eminent are less



RALPH SCHOENMAN speaking at a memorial meeting for Ernesto "Che" Guevara held in New York November 3 under the auspices of the Militant Labor Forum.

available so we settled for the five that we had.

There was a German named Lothar Menne who had lived a period of time in Mexico and had a perfect knowledge of Spanish, which was important.

Q: Are any of the members of the commission still in Bolivia?

Schoenman: No All of the other members left very much earlier than I did, for a variety of reasons.

But to return to your earlier question, we entered Bolivia from Lima. In Peru we had talked with Paz Estenssoro, who is in exile in Lima, and although we did not entirely disclose our interest to him he was very helpful to us in terms of suggesting how we might get to Camiri.



RALPH SCHOENMAN speaking at a memorial meeting for Ernesto "Che" Guevara held in New York November 3 under the auspices of the Militant Labor Forum.

We entered La Paz and then we began to make approaches for the necessary credentials to get down to the guerrilla zone. At that time there were no journalists in Camiri. We were in fact the first who got there.

We found that it was very difficult to get these credentials -- they were not letting anybody go down -- but we were able to make contact with some people who helped and eventually we were in touch with Colonel Ríos, the head of army intelligence, and General Ovando, who signed our credentials and facilitated our getting down to Camiri.

We hired a small Cessna, a tiny one-engine toy of a plane, and three of us flew in that to Camiri over the Andes, a very good experience.

When we arrived in Camiri we were lucky in that we arrived almost simultaneously with the helicopter of Colonel Reque Terán who was returning from a guerrilla encounter. I had obtained a letter of introduction, a note, to Reque Terán so he took us back to town in his jeep.

We talked to him for two or three hours. He is a very vain man. He enjoyed having his photograph taken frequently. He began to tell us a number of things.

We then were installed in a hotel, but a very short time after that we were arrested by the military police and one of our number in particular, Tariq Ali, became excited, which became complicated for us because we were then held at gunpoint. Reque Terán came in at that moment and asked the officers whether they didn't think that Ovando's signature was good enough, being head of the armed forces, and so we were released.

We were picked up again the next day and this harassment carried on for some time, a day or two, until finally, owing to the credential of Ovando, the army officers accepted our presence, although reluctantly. I have to say that their instincts were correct.

Despite that we then got to Lagunillas which is the operational command of the Fourth Division from which they were launching their antiguerrilla actions in Nancahuazú. We had numerous talks with the army officers involved and were present when some of the equipment captured from deposits was brought in, including documents.

The other members of the commission began to consider the importance of getting the material we had obtained out of Bolivia. So we sent out Lothar Menne with all our photographs and other things.

And then Tariq Ali was picked up

again and accused of being a guerrilla named Pombo, who in fact is Che's bodyguard, which is a little ludicrous because Tariq doesn't speak a word of Spanish and had never been in Latin America before. In Tariq's case they were resentful of a man with a brown skin and long black hair and a camera who traveled the world; because the army officers are racist. They have a profound contempt for the Indians in Bolivia and they were exercising this with respect to Tariq Ali as well.

They threatened him and in fact it became apparent that they were looking for a way of getting Tariq and so Tariq left.

Shortly after that two of the members of the commission decided to return to England and they wrote some articles at the time about their experience in Bolivia.

I remained there and continued to gather information and I was in touch with Régis. I was able to see him on a number of occasions alone, which was not easy to contrive but it was done with the help of some Bolivians.

We had very long, thorough exchanges and I have a number of letters and documents of Régis' which he wanted to get out of the country.

Then we began to bribe some -- how shall I put it? -- army officers I suppose, and acquired important information relative to the fate of Régis and the fate of certain material witnesses. What became clear was that the Bolivian army doesn't take prisoners unless those prisoners cooperate -- those who do not are dispatched.

We were in a position to document this in a number of instances, the most egregious being that of Jorge Vásquez, who was a guerrilla captured not long after the first encounter in Nancahuazú.

Jorge Vásquez was a very brave man indeed. He refused to accept anesthetic in order to show the military that he had no fear of pain. He knew very well what they were going to do to him.

The order came from Barrientos to torture, to kill him. That order was refused by one officer, who I won't name, but it was carried out by another officer named Major Ibes Alecón, who together with one or two others broke the four limbs of Vásquez and killed him. They cut open his chest as well.

That took place in Camiri. He was taken out of the military hospital, so-called, and his body was disposed of. I am almost certain that he was thrown out

of a helicopter. This is the only aspect of the case of Vásquez about which I am not absolutely certain. I am, however, fairly confident that that was how his body was disposed of.

I can say definitely that Régis, apart from having been tortured systematically, his nails broken, beaten into a coma -- he needed five blood transfusions -- Régis was also taken in a helicopter and the effort was made to throw him out, but he was able to resist that.

Then the army began a systematic interrogation of Régis and Bustos. The interrogation was conducted by a man named Gonzales, who is Puerto Rican and certainly a Central Intelligence Agency operative.

The Argentinian police came up and their intelligence interrogated Bustos. It is fairly certain that there were Central Intelligence Agency operatives in that group as well.

Bustos provided a whole series of sketches of the guerrillas that he had seen in Nancahuazú. And with those sketches the army was able to identify a number of people.

Q: Where is Bustos now?

Schoenman: He's in custody. His two children were in Buenos Aires and you know the Onganía regime is very close to that of Barrientos.

Q: What were your general impressions of the state of the left in Bolivia, both the guerrilla movement and its potential, and the different left parties?

Schoenman: The left is desperately divided and disorganized in Bolivia. The Soviet-oriented Communist party is a reformist party which does not support armed struggle although the youth are very restless in the face of that line.

The Peking-oriented party of Zamora is, of course, much more militant but the evidence suggests that they don't participate actively in the armed struggle. It is possible that some of their cadre has participated but the evidence is that there have been reservations on the part of the Maoist leadership about the orientation of the guerrilla foco.

And in any event the Peking-oriented party is very small, although it has to be said that they are very active despite their small size.

The POR, Partido Obrero Revolucionario [Revolutionary Workers party], which is the Trotskyist organization, is a small party. Its main strength is in the mines. It's true that its cadre is large-

ly working class and of a high standard but it is small.

And in the mines I would say that the left of the MNR retains a following, a large following.

I think that Lechín and PRIN [Partido Revolucionario de Izquierda Nacionalista] have a following yet, although many of the more advanced miners are disillusioned about Lechín because Lechín made what I think is a disastrous mistake when, in opposition to Paz Estenssoro, he supported the Barrientos-Ovando coup d'état in the view that he could manipulate these soldiers. Of course they did more than manipulate Lechín. He's now in exile in Santiago.

Lechín had a number of what I would think opportunistic dealings with the MNR, which I think were mistaken. I think that has cost PRIN some following, but PRIN still has an important role in the mines.

The MNR has a hold in the countryside, but it's a party that has the legacy of the betrayals of Paz Estenssoro of the struggle. And the left of the MNR is not really a coherent group:

There's a federal allegiance between various groupings, elements -- people like René Zavoleta, who was the Minister of Mines, is an extremely capable and energetic man, and Rivieros Tajada, who was in the Ministry of the Interior of Paz, they are people active in the left of the MNR. But my impression is that although they have a broad base it's not a very disciplined one and I'm not very convinced that they're capable of a sustained struggle.

As to the guerrilla: the guerrilla seemed to be comparatively cut off from the traditional left formations. And one consequence of this is that in the cities and in the mines there was an absence of struggle which related to what the guerrilla were doing. In the cities very little is known of the Liberation Army.

The absence of an underground paper or leafleting or political activity, psychological warfare in support of the guerrilla, the absence of these things was an important contributory factor to the isolation of the guerrilla.

I think that the guerrilla made a number of mistakes. Partly they were mistakes in the elements that were permitted to incorporate themselves into the guerrilla: lumpen proletariat in some part, people untested and who proved totally incapable of sustaining the trials of a protracted guerrilla struggle. Certainly incapable of standing up to the treatment the Bolivian army metes out to anybody

they have in their control.

I think as well that there are some mistakes for which there is no rational explanation. The Bolivian army was led to a deposit of arms and documents by a young captured guerrilla who broke under torture. He led them to a place where the passports, documents, plans, organization and names of contacts in the cities were buried.

I would regard that as the turning point in the fate of the guerrilla and the fate of Che Guevara. When that was discovered the army was possessed of information which was decisive.

So the question that has to be answered is how on earth was it possible for men of considerable experience and revolutionary discipline to bury anywhere documents of that kind?

I don't know the answer to that. In part it related to some of the members of the guerrilla, in part it relates to the failure on the part of the party to help the guerrilla with cadre and in certain material ways.

I think other mistakes that were made include the selection of the zone, because in my opinion the zone was not suitable in important respects although very suitable in others. That's just a personal opinion.

Q: One last question. How severe is the repression against the POR and the two CPs in the cities and in the mines?

Schoenman: It's perfectly true that the government is attacking the Trotskyist leadership and cadre much more vigorously than it is the Communist party leadership. It is also true that they are attacking the left of the MNR and PRIN. The cadre of the CP, in relation to what the other groupings are experiencing, is unmolested.

I think that's an assessment the regime has made as to the militancy and danger these groups offer. But I want to emphasize that the conditions of struggle in Bolivia are objectively right. The problem is mainly that of the subjective conditions, in my opinion.

I think that the guerrilla in a country such as Bolivia cannot struggle in isolation. An armed struggle in Bolivia must arise from some measure of coordination between the mines and the

countryside and the towns.

I don't say that the party of the revolution must direct the guerrilla struggle from the towns, I think that's a folly. But I certainly think that there has to be a revolutionary party which is not merely an expression of the guerrilla foco itself and I also think that the guerrilla must conceive their strategy in terms of some form of coordinated struggle with the mines and the towns in Bolivia.

The mines are the place where the most experienced and the most tested and the most politically advanced elements of the workers and peasants are to be found. And I think that the guerrilla must take that into account in his strategy of struggle. I think the role of the guerrilla in Bolivia is to harass the army, to disperse it and to get it off the backs of the miners.

The miners and the city dwellers have an essential tactical and strategic role to play in the revolutionary struggle.

There isn't any doubt that the setbacks that have been suffered are very severe. And they demand a reassessment, they demand a reassessment largely in the realm of tactics.

No reassessment can go outside the necessity of armed struggle. No reassessment can deny the importance of guerrilla struggle in the country. But a reassessment must be made as to how a guerrilla is going to operate and what his relationship is going to be with regard to the urban proletariat in these countries and the role of the vanguard party.

I think in these respects mistakes were made which need not have been made. But I'm not saying that this could have been known in advance. That would be presumptuous. I'm saying that we can learn from the bitter defeat, setback that has been experienced -- that we have to.

When Che Guevara worked his perspective out, he had an expectation of at least a decade of struggle in Bolivia. The struggle in Bolivia in this phase is no more than eleven or twelve months old.

I'm sure it's going to unfold in the next decade in a form not very different to that expected by Che in the large. In tactical terms there may be differences but I think Che's estimate is the correct one.

JOHNSON'S POPULARITY DECLINING IN BRITAIN, TOO

Last July the London Daily Mail reported 43% in a public opinion poll favored supporting the U.S. in the war in Vietnam, 44% were opposed and 13%

abstained. On November 9 the paper reported a new poll showed only 21% in favor; those opposed had increased to 66% and 13% still abstained.

ERNESTO GUEVARA IN THE DAYS WHEN WE WERE FRIENDS

By Lucila Velásquez

[The following reminiscences of Ernesto "Che" Guevara appeared in the Caracas weekly, El Nacional (the third issue in October). Although the author is utterly opposed to Guevara's revolutionary Marxist views, as she makes clear at the end of her article, her account of the days she knew him in Mexico is of considerable interest and helps fill in the picture of Guevara personally.

[The original title is "Aquel Amigo Ernesto Guevara" and the translation is by World Outlook.]

* * *

Because death strips away the whole shell of pretenses arising out of human passions, leaving ideas, differences and outlooks bare and shorn of emotion, it is possible for me to bridge the distance and reach a balanced and objective judgment of his course; and I can speak of Ernesto Guevara de la Serna with poignant and sincere freedom, without prejudices or ideological digressions.

Besides the bold and energetic commandante of the Cuban militias and the guerrilla fighter struck down in a remote place on the Bolivian altiplano, there was an Ernesto Guevara who was my friend, whom I came to know profoundly at a time when our destinies ran together, a time of affectionate and daily closeness.

I want to remember it today as it was yesterday in my life in that Mexico of our best experiences. I want to rediscover it, since a long time ago I became lost in that intricate labyrinth of differences in which our opposing outlooks -- his, internationally prominent within a system and style I did not share -- separated us forever.

I want to say today what Ernesto Guevara was like as a man -- the doctor, the friend, the ideologist, the idealist. I want to say how he lived and how he came to be caught up among the elements that brought about the Cuban revolution. Many people, of course, have their own reasons for speculating about Ernesto or Fidel. Both adversaries and partisans. Many lies have been written about the origin of the Cuban revolution. I was a good friend of both leaders, although I never boasted of this first-hand experience, even during the famous Venezuelan-Cuban honeymoon. Nevertheless, I always felt that one day I would tell many truths about its history.

And I will tell about Guevara; for example, what our first meeting was like.

An elegant young man with clear eyes -- sad or ironic according to his mood -- surprised me one afternoon stretched out on a couch in the apartment I shared with Dr. Hilda Gadea, an exiled Peruvian economist. "Who are you?" I said, surprised at finding him comfortably installed among my things. "I am Guevara, a friend of Hilda's." Later, she came in gaily, and bubbling over, introduced me to the man she had been waiting for, whom she had been expecting at any moment to cross the Guatemalan border at Tapachula as she had done two months before, owing to the fall of the Arbenz regime. Guevara was the man Hilda loved with all her heart.

From that time on, he visited us daily, shared our best moments, our meals, our difficulties. He was a vegetarian with an expert understanding of tastes and predilections. He taught me to enjoy raw carrots and potatoes roasted in their skins, to drink mate [the national drink of Argentina] -- which he consumed in great quantities as is the custom in his country -- to eat churrasco [barbecued meat], and papayas with lime juice. This was his daily fare. He ate one meal a day, which was at once lunch and breakfast; he had a whole system of dietary discipline.

What to do in Mexico where means of subsistence are not easily found? Guevara sought out professional contacts and managed to get a job as a hospital assistant. He could not freely exercise his profession as a doctor but he worked as the assistant of a Mexican scientist. His modest means finally barely equaled his daily needs. Hilda was his constant and vigilant helpmate. A functionary of a United Nations body, she received a good income which enabled her to share pleasures and comforts with him. Sister, lover, collaborator, her tenacity created a manifold web of needed opportunities, and Guevara married her. Love? Gratitude? Life is as subtle a tangle as it is inextricable; and looking below the surface one would have to say that Hilda needed Ernesto just as much as she was indispensable to him. They shared a profound solidarity.

One time Guevara got a job as a sports correspondent for an Argentine paper: I think it was when the Bolívar Games were held in Mexico City. In this hectic struggle for existence, in December he sold toys on the streets of Santa María de la Rivera. Delayed by this, our Christmas dinner had to wait for him until the morning.

The historic meeting between Fidel Castro and Ernesto Guevara took place in our apartment. We were hostesses to almost

all America's exiles. Our enthusiasm, open-mindedness, and solidarity with all Latin Americans favored bringing people together and helped to provide an opportune meeting ground. Guatemalans, Argentines, Cubans, Venezuelans (including Venezuelan Communists), Peruvians, Nicaraguans, Colombians -- in short, the Latin-American exodus -- shared a moment of sociability with us, a moment of brotherhood. Hilda Gadea plied her "Apri-sta Indo-Americanism"; I my democratic humanism. In this sense, Hilda was indefatigable.

She invited Fidel Castro. She had met him at a public meeting for solidarity with the Guatemalans and invited him to visit us. She was to make dinner for him. They were the "Moncada boys" just arrived in Mexico. The Central American writer Edelberto Torres, Doña Laurita de Albizu Campos, a Puerto Rican soprano whose name I don't remember, Ernesto Guevara and I waited one night for the Castro Ruz brothers. The table was set. In the deepening chill, talk died away. Words waiting and waiting for Fidel. Nine o'clock. Ten o'clock. Eleven o'clock. The guest of honor did not come. The night was a long slow impatience which I could not overcome. I went to bed before the "Moncada boys" arrived. Later, I was awakened by the register of the soprano and the loud almost shouting voice of Fidel. "Let the Venezuelan come out, I want to meet her." I did not come out. Perhaps for that reason Dr. Castro Ruz determined to be my friend; he tried from that night on to win me over.

And he returned the next day. At all times, and always, he was at my side in a constant friendship of pleasant times, of moments richly shared. I never had such a gentle and close friend; he was someone who enriched my loneliness with so many glowing walks along the Paseo de la Reforma or by the taco shops of the Avenida Bucareli. We were infected with the same joy of surviving the separation from our homelands, longed for in clenched hands, in impressions, in anxiety. Letters, projects, contacts, all his world of Cuban possibilities was confided to me and shared in sympathy and collaboration. Fond of cooking, Fidel sometimes helped us with this task; he excelled in preparing his favorite dish -- macaroni with clam sauce.

Guevara, Castro, Hilda and I. And sometimes, Raúl, the Montanés, a few other friends. Fidel's Cuban passion and Guevara's revolutionary thought came together like striking a spark, with an intense light. The one impulsive; the other reflective. The one emotional and optimistic; the other cold and skeptical. One related to Cuba, the other to a framework of social and economic concepts "which had to stand for." One talked about the Ba-

tista dictatorship; the other about socialism and imperialism. Meat and the sauce of ideas, a good mixture of circumstances and outlooks which in our house led to working out a course, knitted a solidarity. Without Ernesto Guevara, Fidel Castro would have never become a Communist; without Fidel Castro, Ernesto Guevara would never have been more than a Marxist theoretician, an idealistic intellectual. A Bohemian, a rebel, an individualist -- perhaps Guevara's revolutionary ideas would have found expression only in wandering around the world, in an inconstant and constant landing in ports and visiting peoples with realities and problems to witness or denounce. "All I want is to travel around the world with nothing but my knapsack as my comrade," he told me one day when he was arguing with Hilda and I tried to intervene.

When they were married in the most beautiful of Mexican villages, the baroque Tepozotlán, Raúl Castro Ruz and I signed as witnesses. We four took a bus trip together in one of those dilapidated Mexican "camiones" [trucks or buses] which scare you when you get on. On the way back we sang to our hearts' content and deluded ourselves with the idea that we were all happy.

Living together under one roof was an experience of deep fraternity. Ernesto treated me, diagnosed my aches and pains, gave me injections, joked ironically about my supposed illnesses, assumed sardonic poses, catching me with all kinds of improvisations of his quick and biting wit. His attacks of asthma often found Hilda and me glued to the head of his bed in the middle of the night. As a preventive measure, Guevara did a lot of walking, made frequent excursions to Popo [Popocatepetl], habitually went on outings.

He was also a determined reader, a man of inflexible intellectual discipline. Together, Hilda and Ernesto read books on economics. She oriented him in this direction; they spent hours reading and discussing these subjects, putting together data cards and notes. Guevara was a man of solid general culture. He talked about Aristotle as he would about Kant or Marx; about André Gide or Faulkner; he ranged from the poetry of Keats to that of Sara de Ibañez, his favorite writer. Both he and Fidel pushed the publication of my book Poesía Resiste. I wrote once to Rómulo Betancourt in Puerto Rico: "My friend Fidel Castro Ruz has been my best collaborator in distributing Poesía Resiste." Indeed, Fidel not only helped to sell it with excellent results in the Cuban colony, but sent it to Jorge Mañach in Havana with his recommendation.

The Venezuelans who frequented our apartment, among them many Communists, passed by Fidel and Ernesto without sus-

ERNESTO GUEVARA IN THE DAYS WHEN WE WERE FRIENDS

By Lucila Velásquez

[The following reminiscences of Ernesto "Che" Guevara appeared in the Caracas weekly, El Nacional (the third issue in October). Although the author is utterly opposed to Guevara's revolutionary Marxist views, as she makes clear at the end of her article, her account of the days she knew him in Mexico is of considerable interest and helps fill in the picture of Guevara personally.

[The original title is "Aquel Amigo Ernesto Guevara" and the translation is by World Outlook.]

* * *

Because death strips away the whole shell of pretenses arising out of human passions, leaving ideas, differences and outlooks bare and shorn of emotion, it is possible for me to bridge the distance and reach a balanced and objective judgment of his course; and I can speak of Ernesto Guevara de la Serna with poignant and sincere freedom, without prejudices or ideological digressions.

Besides the bold and energetic commandante of the Cuban militias and the guerrilla fighter struck down in a remote place on the Bolivian altiplano, there was an Ernesto Guevara who was my friend, whom I came to know profoundly at a time when our destinies ran together, a time of affectionate and daily closeness.

I want to remember it today as it was yesterday in my life in that Mexico of our best experiences. I want to rediscover it, since a long time ago I became lost in that intricate labyrinth of differences in which our opposing outlooks -- his, internationally prominent within a system and style I did not share -- separated us forever.

I want to say today what Ernesto Guevara was like as a man -- the doctor, the friend, the ideologist, the idealist. I want to say how he lived and how he came to be caught up among the elements that brought about the Cuban revolution. Many people, of course, have their own reasons for speculating about Ernesto or Fidel. Both adversaries and partisans. Many lies have been written about the origin of the Cuban revolution. I was a good friend of both leaders, although I never boasted of this first-hand experience, even during the famous Venezuelan-Cuban honeymoon. Nevertheless, I always felt that one day I would tell many truths about its history.

And I will tell about Guevara; for example, what our first meeting was like.

An elegant young man with clear eyes -- sad or ironic according to his mood -- surprised me one afternoon stretched out on a couch in the apartment I shared with Dr. Hilda Gadea, an exiled Peruvian economist. "Who are you?" I said, surprised at finding him comfortably installed among my things. "I am Guevara, a friend of Hilda's." Later, she came in gaily, and bubbling over, introduced me to the man she had been waiting for, whom she had been expecting at any moment to cross the Guatemalan border at Tapachula as she had done two months before, owing to the fall of the Arbenz regime. Guevara was the man Hilda loved with all her heart.

From that time on, he visited us daily, shared our best moments, our meals, our difficulties. He was a vegetarian with an expert understanding of tastes and predilections. He taught me to enjoy raw carrots and potatoes roasted in their skins, to drink mate [the national drink of Argentina] -- which he consumed in great quantities as is the custom in his country -- to eat churrasco [barbecued meat], and papayas with lime juice. This was his daily fare. He ate one meal a day, which was at once lunch and breakfast; he had a whole system of dietary discipline.

What to do in Mexico where means of subsistence are not easily found? Guevara sought out professional contacts and managed to get a job as a hospital assistant. He could not freely exercise his profession as a doctor but he worked as the assistant of a Mexican scientist. His modest means finally barely equaled his daily needs. Hilda was his constant and vigilant helpmate. A functionary of a United Nations body, she received a good income which enabled her to share pleasures and comforts with him. Sister, lover, collaborator, her tenacity created a manifold web of needed opportunities, and Guevara married her. Love? Gratitude? Life is as subtle a tangle as it is inextricable; and looking below the surface one would have to say that Hilda needed Ernesto just as much as she was indispensable to him. They shared a profound solidarity.

One time Guevara got a job as a sports correspondent for an Argentine paper: I think it was when the Bolívar Games were held in Mexico City. In this hectic struggle for existence, in December he sold toys on the streets of Santa María de la Rivera. Delayed by this, our Christmas dinner had to wait for him until the morning.

The historic meeting between Fidel Castro and Ernesto Guevara took place in our apartment. We were hostesses to almost

all America's exiles. Our enthusiasm, open-mindedness, and solidarity with all Latin Americans favored bringing people together and helped to provide an opportune meeting ground. Guatemalans, Argentines, Cubans, Venezuelans (including Venezuelan Communists), Peruvians, Nicaraguans, Colombians -- in short, the Latin-American exodus -- shared a moment of sociability with us, a moment of brotherhood. Hilda Gadea plied her "Arista Indo-Americanism"; I my democratic humanism. In this sense, Hilda was indefatigable.

She invited Fidel Castro. She had met him at a public meeting for solidarity with the Guatemalans and invited him to visit us. She was to make dinner for him. They were the "Moncada boys" just arrived in Mexico. The Central American writer Edelberto Torres, Doña Laurita de Albizu Campos, a Puerto Rican soprano whose name I don't remember, Ernesto Guevara and I waited one night for the Castro Ruz brothers. The table was set. In the deepening chill, talk died away. Words waiting and waiting for Fidel. Nine o'clock. Ten o'clock. Eleven o'clock. The guest of honor did not come. The night was a long slow impatience which I could not overcome. I went to bed before the "Moncada boys" arrived. Later, I was awakened by the register of the soprano and the loud almost shouting voice of Fidel. "Let the Venezuelan come out, I want to meet her." I did not come out. Perhaps for that reason Dr. Castro Ruz determined to be my friend; he tried from that night on to win me over.

And he returned the next day. At all times, and always, he was at my side in a constant friendship of pleasant times, of moments richly shared. I never had such a gentle and close friend; he was someone who enriched my loneliness with so many glowing walks along the Paseo de la Reforma or by the taco shops of the Avenida Bucareli. We were infected with the same joy of surviving the separation from our homelands, longed for in clenched hands, in impressions, in anxiety. Letters, projects, contacts, all his world of Cuban possibilities was confided to me and shared in sympathy and collaboration. Fond of cooking, Fidel sometimes helped us with this task; he excelled in preparing his favorite dish -- macaroni with clam sauce.

Guevara, Castro, Hilda and I. And sometimes, Raúl, the Montanés, a few other friends. Fidel's Cuban passion and Guevara's revolutionary thought came together like striking a spark, with an intense light. The one impulsive; the other reflective. The one emotional and optimistic; the other cold and skeptical. One related to Cuba, the other to a framework of social and economic concepts "which had to stand for." One talked about the Ba-

tista dictatorship; the other about socialism and imperialism. Meat and the sauce of ideas, a good mixture of circumstances and outlooks which in our house led to working out a course, knitted a solidarity. Without Ernesto Guevara, Fidel Castro would have never become a Communist; without Fidel Castro, Ernesto Guevara would never have been more than a Marxist theoretician, an idealistic intellectual. A Bohemian, a rebel, an individualist -- perhaps Guevara's revolutionary ideas would have found expression only in wandering around the world, in an inconstant and constant landing in ports and visiting peoples with realities and problems to witness or denounce. "All I want is to travel around the world with nothing but my knapsack as my comrade," he told me one day when he was arguing with Hilda and I tried to intervene.

When they were married in the most beautiful of Mexican villages, the baroque Tepozotlán, Raúl Castro Ruz and I signed as witnesses. We four took a bus trip together in one of those dilapidated Mexican "camiones" [trucks or buses] which scare you when you get on. On the way back we sang to our hearts' content and deluded ourselves with the idea that we were all happy.

Living together under one roof was an experience of deep fraternity. Ernesto treated me, diagnosed my aches and pains, gave me injections, joked ironically about my supposed illnesses, assumed sardonic poses, catching me with all kinds of improvisations of his quick and biting wit. His attacks of asthma often found Hilda and me glued to the head of his bed in the middle of the night. As a preventive measure, Guevara did a lot of walking, made frequent excursions to Popo [Popocatepetl], habitually went on outings.

He was also a determined reader, a man of inflexible intellectual discipline. Together, Hilda and Ernesto read books on economics. She oriented him in this direction; they spent hours reading and discussing these subjects, putting together data cards and notes. Guevara was a man of solid general culture. He talked about Aristotle as he would about Kant or Marx; about André Gide or Faulkner; he ranged from the poetry of Keats to that of Sara de Ibañez, his favorite writer. Both he and Fidel pushed the publication of my book Poesía Resiste. I wrote once to Rómulo Betancourt in Puerto Rico: "My friend Fidel Castro Ruz has been my best collaborator in distributing Poesía Resiste." Indeed, Fidel not only helped to sell it with excellent results in the Cuban colony, but sent it to Jorge Mañach in Havana with his recommendation.

The Venezuelans who frequented our apartment, among them many Communists, passed by Fidel and Ernesto without sus-

pecting that they were the leaders of a movement.

The "Moncada boys" were just other exiles, bold valiant boys, and nothing more. The exile political groups, including the Communists, did not perceive the signs of their future course. The imprisonment of Castro and Guevara in the Miguel Schultz jail in Mexico City (where they were visited by Ildegar Pérez Segnini, who was a friend of both and had an objective vision of the militant spirit that was theirs); and finally the Granma expedition and invasion that led to the Sierra Madre had to occur before the

world learned how to gauge them.

Such was the man whom I knew intimately, a man of highways, adventures and reflection -- Ernesto Guevara, Marxist, Bohemian, a near stoic, and fundamentally a solitary personality, a romantic, an eternal rebel. A name, a destiny, an idea which we can keep on fighting. An adversary of whom it must be said that he was mistaken in his violent and subversive way of confronting the Latin-American reality but whom we could never -- with the profound respect ideas inspire -- call an opportunist.

REGIS DEBRAY SENTENCED TO THIRTY YEARS

Régis Debray was sentenced to thirty years in prison November 17 by a drumhead military court in Camiri, Bolivia. The severity of the sentence came as no surprise after the caricature of judicial procedure that passed under the name of a trial.

Ciro Bustos, the Argentine artist, who, like Debray, had spent time with the guerrillas in March, was also sentenced to thirty years.

The four other defendants, deserters from the guerrilla movement who testified for the prosecution, were "absolved."

Debray and Bustos were convicted of "rebellion, murders, assault and robbery." No evidence was produced in the entire course of the trial that either had ever fired a shot. Debray had come to Bolivia as a journalist to interview Che Guevara; Bustos to make sketches of the guerrillas.

The two were arrested with an Englishman named Roth, unarmed and in civilian clothes, at Muyupampa, April 20.

Throughout the trial no defendant was allowed to speak. Debray was given a court-appointed lawyer who neither sympathized with nor understood his revolutionary views, although it was precisely Debray's politics rather than his actions that were on trial.

Foreign correspondents were expelled from Bolivia by the military for daring to write dispatches critical of the irregular procedures in the trial.

Private meetings between Debray and his lawyer were secretly recorded and introduced into the trial.

The only testimony against Debray came from deserters from the guerrillas,

men completely at the mercy of the court and creatures of the army. Other guerrillas who were captured and would not give false evidence were murdered in cold blood by army officers.

Finally, on November 13, after both prosecution and "defense" had made their final summaries, the court read selected extracts, allegedly from Che Guevara's diary, into the record. There was no opportunity for Debray to examine them, verify their authenticity, or see the entire context from which they were taken.

Debray has protested the refusal of the court to allow a presentation of the political views for which he was tried. In an interview with Juan de Onis of the New York Times the day before the verdict was handed down he declared:

"What I will never tolerate is that a political conviction for an ideological crime be allowed to stand as a criminal conviction. I am not a murderer or a thief."

As the trial closed, Jaime Mendizabal, a Bolivian lawyer for Bustos, tried to argue before the court that the proceedings had been irregular. Col. Efraín Guachalla, president of the court, shouted, "This trial has ended," and brought down his gavel with such force that the head broke off and flew into the first row of spectators.

Juan de Onis reports that there was a scramble to recover the souvenir.

Debray and Bustos plan to appeal -- to a higher military court.

It was not announced where Debray would be imprisoned, but the New York Times reported that "military sources" had indicated he would be sent to a military prison in the Beni Department, a hot lowland region in northeast Bolivia.

ARRESTS CONTINUE IN GREECE

The military dictatorship in Greece is continuing its policy of massive arrests and jailings.

Agence France-Presse reported from Athens November 6 that thirty persons had been picked up the previous week. They were accused of illegal acts committed in connection with resistance to the regime. Since August, according to the same source, several hundred arrests have been made on such charges as "attempted sabotage" and "acts of resistance."

On November 11, a military tribunal at Larissa in central Greece, condemned Ioannis Fetsis to five years in prison.

The charge was that he had "attempted to overthrow the regime by force, praised the detainees on Yaros [the notorious prison island] and insulted the national government and the revolution in a poem which he circulated clandestinely."

Perhaps the most serious crime in the list was the illegal poem.

Four other persons were condemned by the same court to penalties ranging from three to eighteen months in prison. The crimes included "insulting the authorities and the person of the king, collecting funds illegally for the EDA [United Democratic Left], breaking the martial law, etc."

The police were much exercised about an incident which occurred November 9 in Athens. A Soviet flag was attached to the window of a bar on the street facing the city hall. It bore the inscription, "Long live the October revolution."

The flag was quickly hauled down and the police arrested everyone in the bar. The two malefactors had escaped, however.

It appeared that they had gone up to the second floor, attached the flag, and let it unroll down the window. They then went to the cashier, paid for their drinks and left before the cops could get there from across the street.

ARE CANADIAN INDIANS RESPONDING TO RADIO HAVANA?

Toronto

Officials of the Canadian Fair Play for Cuba Committee charged November 9 that the recent wave of accusations made against the Cuban diplomatic staff and Expo personnel by Social Credit Member of Parliament Robert Thompson, and indirectly backed by External Affairs Minister Paul Martin, are "completely without foundation, and constitute a deliberate move on Mr. Thompson's part to worsen diplomatic relations between Cuba and this country."

Without exception, said the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, Mr. Thompson's charges are secondhand or based on outright hearsay. Many of them appear to be warmed over rumors circulated earlier this year by a right-wing U.S. scandal sheet, the Inside's Newsletter, alleging that Cuban Expo officials were engaged in the training of separatists.

Mr. Thompson's charge that Radio Havana, which has been broadcasting to North America in both English and French for many years, is inciting Canadians to revolt "is equally fallacious," the FPCC statement says.

"Ottawa has had nearly one month since Thompson's charge to investigate the broadcasts, which Mr. Martin admits

are monitored by American authorities, and they have not been able to come up with any evidence to suggest that 'outside subversion' is behind any unrest among Canada's Indians or French-speaking population.

"That Mr. Thompson should indulge in such irresponsible rumour peddling itself is not surprising," the statement continues, "since his party has been pressing continually for a break in diplomatic relations with Cuba. What is much more serious is that External Affairs Minister Martin has lent official credence to these ridiculous slanders by assuring Mr. Thompson that 'the charges are not being treated lightly.'

"Surely Mr. Martin is not unaware of the flood of provocations against the Cuban diplomatic mission, not to mention the bombings, which the government has to this day not cleared up.

"Rather than resolutely rejecting these accusations -- a duty Mr. Martin owes the Cuban mission -- he has himself added grist to the rumour mill. His behavior indicates a move on the part of the Canadian government to create friction between Ottawa and Havana.

"Only a full apology to the Cuban Embassy can dispel that impression."

CONTROVERSY OVER INTRODUCTION TO TROTSKY'S BIOGRAPHY OF STALIN

[The following two letters, concerning the publication of a new edition of Trotsky's biography of Stalin, are being circulated to book reviewers in the United States. They deal with the inclusion of an introduction which, aside from serious factual inaccuracies, is directed against Trotsky in a venomous way both politically and personally.

[It would seem that the rising interest in Trotsky's writings, which has gone up another notch with the publicity attendant to the fiftieth anniversary of the October revolution, led the publishers to calculate that it would be a profitable enterprise to add a book by Trotsky to their list.

[At the same time, Trotsky's views are so abhorrent to them that they felt it necessary to include a prophylactic in the package. Thus, instead of a mere disclaimer that Trotsky's views scarcely coincide with theirs, they hired a professional to cook up something "fitting" for the opening pages. It must be admitted that they chose the right man for this delicate task, and they can sleep with their good bourgeois conscience properly tranquilized.

[This is not the first time a publishing house has displayed an ambivalent attitude toward Stalin. The original publishers, Harper & Brothers, pressed Trotsky, much against his will to do the biography. Trotsky was assassinated before the manuscript was completed but enough was prepared to make a substantial volume which was printed at the beginning of World War II. Harper & Brothers thereupon refused to release the book until the war had ended. The gesture, intended to please Stalin, was in line with the official policy of the State Department during the war years. (That policy went so far as to persuade Hollywood to produce a propagandistic film, Mission to Moscow, which presented the monstrous Moscow frame-up trials as genuine.)

[For the past twenty years, of course, "anti-Communism" has been Washington's official policy. And so the new publishers, patriotic Americans that they are, insist on making clear to the world that despite their understandable aggressiveness in exploiting a profitable-looking item, still they're not exactly the ones to be caught helping Trotsky to spread his revolutionary, pro-Soviet views.]

* * *

New York, N.Y.
November 3, 1967

Dear Sir:

On behalf of Esteban Volkov of

Mexico City, Leon Trotsky's grandson and heir to Trotsky's literary properties, I am sending you his attached protest against the introduction by Bertram D. Wolfe which Stein and Day has included in the new edition of Trotsky's biography of Stalin.

When Mr. Volkov signed the contract for the republishing of Stalin, he did not realize that a new introduction was intended; and when he saw the draft of that introduction, he immediately protested and demanded its removal. Stein and Day refused to omit it but offered to include a statement of objection to it by Mr. Volkov. The latter thereupon retained Attorney Philip Wittenberg of New York, who sought to obtain the removal of the introduction. When that effort failed, he asked that Mr. Volkov's letter of objection be included in the book's front matter. He was informed that the pages had already been printed and that was no longer possible but that Stein and Day would send copies of Mr. Volkov's letter to all reviewers who were being sent advance copies of the book. The same information was given to Mr. Perry H. Knowlton of Curtis Brown, Ltd., who arranged the original contract between Mr. Volkov and Stein and Day.

Accordingly, a copy of Mr. Volkov's letter of protest to Mr. Knowlton was sent on September 18 to Stein and Day with the request that it be duplicated and sent out to the reviewers.

Stein and Day, however, has not sent out copies of the letter and has not given any reason for not doing so. Consequently I have been authorized by Mr. Volkov to send you the attached letter of objection to the introduction.

Sincerely yours,

George L. Weissman

* * *

Mexico, D.F.
July 31, 1967

Dear Sir:

In my letter of July 13, among other things I told you that:

With respect to Mr. Wolfe and his text, my opinion is as follows:

1. Mr. Wolfe is a person who is diametrically opposed to Leon Trotsky, and he does not hide it in his text, beginning with the first paragraph in which he pretends not to know whether Trotsky or Stalin is the "Prince of Heaven" and

which is the "Lord of the Powers of Darkness."

2. Mr. Wolfe puts the slanders against Trotsky on an equal footing with Trotsky's truthful and proven record of Stalin's crimes.

3. Mr. Wolfe denies the objectivity of Stalin and claims that the book can only be understood as an allegation pro domo sua. Besides being false, this is a commonsense vulgarity which could be offered by any man in the street.

4. Mr. Wolfe attributes to Trotsky the same dogmatism which he finds in Stalin; this is another commonsense vulgarity: Marxists are dogmatic, Trotsky is a Marxist, therefore....Nevertheless, it is enough to read a little of Trotsky's theoretical work to understand his nonconformism and the freedom of his thought.

5. Mr. Wolfe likes truculent contrasts. He presents Trotsky as obsessed with writing a biography of his adversary Stalin. This is false. Leon Trotsky committed himself to write it because at that moment it was the work which in the judgment of his literary advisers and editors could most surely provide money in his exile. To work on this book he had to suspend his Lenin, which interested him more. Mr. Wolfe himself guessed this when he wrote that Stalin is written "with disgust, as a disagreeable duty."

6. Mr. Wolfe puts a fantasied drama into Trotsky's stage setting while he wrote Stalin: a house which was half fortress, machine guns, etc. This is not true. The reinforcing of security in the house came after the first assassination attempt, only a few months before the assassination. Stalin was written in a simple study, with a window opening on the small house garden.

7. Mr. Wolfe is ignorant of the fact that it was not Trotsky who, on the night of the first attack, pushed Natalia Sedova out of bed; on the contrary, she pushed Leon Trotsky out of bed and, after putting his head under a night table, she threw herself on top of him to protect him. Trotsky was hardly awake, because before going to bed he had taken a sleeping tablet and he was under its effects. This is only an incidental clarification.

8. Mr. Wolfe tells a Judas-Jesus type story of the relations between the assassin and Leon Trotsky. This is false. The assassin infiltrated the house through Trotsky's friends and guests, and not through Trotsky himself, who had not seen him more than twice, for a few minutes each time, while the assassin waited for Trotsky's friends. If Trotsky did not refuse to read the assassin's manuscript it

was so as not to offend his guests; this is what he told Natalia Sedova after he was wounded.

9. Mr. Wolfe asserts that the assassin "exploited the vanity" of Trotsky and was able to be esteemed by him as a "disciple." False, as is implied above in point 8.

10. I do not see why Mr. Wolfe should allude in this text to the supposed utility that the publication of Stalin during the war of 1939-45 might have held for the United States.

11. Mr. Wolfe thinks he demonstrates that Stalin was not mediocre because he was successful in his struggle for personal power; and he implicitly rejects Trotsky's opinion that successes of this type are more the result of the fitness of a man for a role that the development of the situation demands at a particular moment. Let us remember that General Eisenhower was president of the most powerful nation on earth for eight years.

12. The historical necessity which Trotsky perceived in the Russian "Thermidorian Reaction" did not impede him from continuing to struggle for the revolution, because Leon Trotsky was not a Russian politician in the sense that a senator from California is an American politician. Trotsky struggled to prepare an international revolutionary leadership for the next outbreak of popular rebellion which would appear somewhere in a certain future, although the time and place could not be predicted. Trotsky used to say that politics were a matter of "great patience." During the last months of his life, he thought that this next revolutionary wave would come from colonial areas.

13. Mr. Wolfe presents as a single equation, of what perhaps he would like to call dogmatic dictatorial Marxism, three concepts: the Leninist concept of the party with its democratic centralism, Stalin's reactionary bureaucratic machine, and the application of the permanent revolution manifest in Trotsky's refusal to conform. This is an unacceptable confusion.

14. What Trotsky would have thought of the Stalin of the war and postwar is so much conjecture. No one has the right -- in the prologue to a work by Trotsky -- to suppose that this Stalin would have sealed the lips of the great revolutionary (pp. 11 and 12).

15. I will not dwell on Mr. Wolfe's confusion in regard to the permanent revolution, the April Theses, the Leninism of Trotsky and the Trotskyism of Lenin.

16. On page 16 of his text one finds the epitome of Mr. Wolfe's rancor to the point of calling Trotsky not a critic but

a spiteful "pretender" who denounces the usurper who defeated him.

Given what I have expressed I believe it is an insult to Leon Trotsky to put Mr. Wolfe's text before Trotsky's Stalin.

For this reason I refuse my authorization for and radically oppose the plan to publish this prologue. In addition the work does not need a prologue, nor does Trotsky need an introduction by Mr. Wolfe or any other. The name of the author would be enough, his text and the opinion of the readers.

I urgently request, therefore, that you omit Mr. Wolfe's text from the Stalin book that is being printed and published.

In your letter of July 20, you say that "Wolfe has agreed to make the factual corrections which you point out as being necessary, and I gather this means that he will correct the points brought up in paragraphs six, seven, eight, and nine of your letter of July 13th. Maybe there are other corrections which he will make as a result of some of your other objections, but I can't be sure until we see it."

In addition, in the same letter, you said: "I do think, however, that an outright refusal on your part to the publication of the book with the Wolfe introduction would not actually stop Stein and Day from publishing. They do have a signed contract, and they are sincerely trying to have the introduction corrected as much as possible and they are also providing you with an opportunity to speak your mind. They are, in other words, making a reasonable effort to satisfy you. It is my guess that Mr. Stein's legal advisers have probably told him that a reasonable attempt to satisfy you is enough to make it possible for him to go ahead and publish. I have no way of knowing this, of course, but I have a feeling from some of the things that have been said that this is what we have in store for us." (I suppose you mean you and I.)

I think that the section of my letter reproduced above and the sections of your last letter to which I have referred above, reflect accurately the situation in which Mr. Wolfe's introduction to Stalin is being published, and the value that should be attributed to it.

Let me only add the following words about the Moscow Trials, taken from Isaac Deutscher: "...and a man like Roman Rolland, the admirer of Gandhi, the enemy of violence, the 'humanitarian conscience' of his generation, used his sweetly evangelical voice to justify the massacre in Russia and extol the master

hangman -- with such zeal that Trotsky thought of suing him for defamation. Where Gorky and Rolland gave the cue, hosts of minor humanitarians and moralists followed suit with little or no scruple. Their manifestoes and appeals in support of Stalin make strange reading. In the United States, for instance, they declared a boycott on the Commission of Inquiry set up under John Dewey's auspices. They warned 'all men of good will' against assisting the Commission, saying that critics of the Moscow trials were interfering in domestic Soviet affairs, giving aid and comfort to fascism, and 'dealing a blow to the forces of progress.' The manifesto was signed by Theodore Dreiser, Granville Hicks, Corliss Lamont, Max Lerner, Raymond Robins, Anna Louise Strong, Paul Sweezy, Nathanael West, and many professors and artists, quite a few of whom were to be in the forefront of the anticommunist crusades of the nineteen-forties and nineteen-fifties.

"Louis Fischer and Walter Duranty, popular experts on Soviet affairs, vouched for Stalin's integrity, Vyshinsky's veracity, and the G.P.U.'s humane methods in obtaining confessions from Zinoviev, Kamenov, Pyatakov, and Radek. Even Bertram D. Wolfe, a member of the Lovestonite Opposition long expelled from the Communist party, still gave Stalin credit for saving the revolution from the Trotskyite-Zinovievite conspiracy."

Deutscher* goes on to cite the following from Wolfe's past writings: "'Today, whatever his [Trotsky's] subjective intentions may be, and I shall not try to judge them, his objective role is to mobilize labour sentiment against the Soviet Union. He has departed ever further from communist fundamentals...He has even come out for civil war in the Soviet Union and thus become an open enemy of the class and land he once served so faithfully.' Thus Bertram D. Wolfe wrote about Trotsky in 1936! ('Things we want to know,' Worker's Age Publications.) Only when the Great Purges were coming to a close, shortly before Bukharin appeared in the dock, did Wolfe, the 'Communist fundamentalist,' express (in the New Republic of 24 November 1937) his regret at having given moral support to the purges. This led Trotsky to remark that Wolfe still had a lot of things to learn and unlearn in order to avoid committing grievous mistakes in the future. In later years Wolfe attacked other writers (who had always denounced the Stalinist purges) as 'apologist for Stalin!'"

I ask you, Mr. Knowlton, to arrange for this letter of mine to appear in extenso after the "introduction" by Mr. Wolfe to the book by Leon Trotsky.

Very sincerely,
Esteban Volkov B.

*Isaac Deutscher, The Prophet Outcast.

PARIS MEETING COMMEMORATES OCTOBER REVOLUTION

Paris

The Parti Communiste Internationaliste (French section of the Fourth International) commemorated the fiftieth anniversary of the October revolution at a meeting November 10 in the Mutualité. Some 500 turned out, the large majority of them youth.

The hall was decorated with large portraits of Lenin and Trotsky and inscriptions hailing October and the soviets of workers, peasants and soldiers.

The meeting was chaired by Michel Lequenne, who opened the proceedings with some brief remarks contrasting the spirit of this celebration, faithful to the tradition of October, with the gatherings of the partisans of "peaceful coexistence." Three speakers followed.

Pierre Frank began by recalling in broad lines the first imperialist war and the betrayal of the Social Democracy which preceded the October revolution. He then stressed how, after 1923, following several years of revolution, the ebb set in, marked by heavy defeats in China, in Germany, in Spain and so on. What had been a workers state, Communist parties and a Communist international began to degenerate. He dwelt in particular with the tragic fate of the Third International, which was dissolved by Stalin and which survives today, thanks to the efforts of the Trotskyists, in the form of the Fourth International.

He then dealt with the upsurge that began in 1943 and which in an uneven way, with both victories and defeats, has been heading, through the war in Vietnam, toward a proxysm. He emphasized the role of the youth in the capitalist countries who are at present refuting in the sharpest way the ideology of neocapitalism and preparing a fusion with the colonial revolution and the awakening of the workers states. This makes it possible to reaffirm with certainty the final words of Trotsky: "I am sure of the victory of the Fourth International. Go forward!"

Livio Maitan dealt with the colonial revolution. He began by recalling the fundamental role played by October in arousing the colonial peoples, and the enormously progressive example provided by the successes of the Soviet Union to the peoples which imperialism had plunged into the worst misery.

But in this field, too, as the speaker demonstrated, the bureaucracy played a dual role. He stressed how, by opposing the concept of the permanent revolution, the Moscow bureaucracy, long be-

fore Khrushchev and the present officials, blocked revolutionary movements from achieving victory. He called attention in particular to the second Chinese revolution of 1925-27 and the uprising in India in 1942.

Most of his speech was devoted to the current scene in Latin America, particularly Bolivia and Peru. With regard to Bolivia, he examined the objective conditions leading necessarily to guerrilla war in this country and he denounced the Stalinists who made so bold as to utilize the heavy blow represented by the death of Che Guevara to advocate the "peaceful" road to power.

He hailed OIAS [Organization of Latin-American Solidarity] as a united front of Latin-American revolutionists established under the sponsorship of the Cubans, who were contributing to the reconstruction of a mass, revolutionary Marxist international.

In dealing with Peru, he referred to the leadership of the Trotskyist Hugo Blanco.

Ernest Mandel dealt mainly with the Soviet Union and its problems as well as those of the other workers states. He referred first of all to the progress achieved, the demonstration of the power inherent in the relations of production, a power that had proved even greater than had been forecast by the leaders of the October revolution, who held to the perspective of early victories of the socialist revolution in other countries or the crushing of the revolution in Russia.

He noted next that if the essential foundation remained, nevertheless, owing to Stalinism, many of the conquests of October had to be reconquered.

As an example he cited the contrast between the bad job conditions in the plants and the labor legislation enacted following the October revolution. As another example, he mentioned the flagrant inequalities still existing in face of the rising equalitarian tendencies which were so brutally repressed by Stalin. Finally, he pointed to the gag of the censorship and all the means employed to deny any expression to nonconformist thought.

He called attention to the demonstrations to be observed in the Soviet Union and the other workers states, especially those seeking to debate the past and cleanse Soviet society of the "burning shame" which the Stalinist lies and crimes constitute.

Mandel ended by declaring that the

youth in the advanced capitalist countries and the revolutionists in the underdeveloped countries will join in a single stream in which all of them together will complete the work begun in October 1917.

The meeting which had thus associated the October battle with the battles of today ended by enthusiastically singing the Internationale.

MEXICAN POLITICAL PRISONERS WIN CONCESSION

Mexico City

The authorities at the Lecumberri penitentiary in this city have finally agreed to designate the political prisoners held in the institution as "political prisoners" and separate them from the rest of the prison population.

More than forty men are affected by the decision. They will be placed in a ward by themselves.

The campaign for this elemental reform has been waged by various organizations for more than two years -- ever since Adolfo Gilly and five members of the Partido Obrero Revolucionario were

placed behind bars because of their political views.

With the imprisonment of the well-known journalist Victor Rico Galán for similar reasons, the campaign gained momentum. A Defense Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners in Mexico [Comite de Defensa de los Presos Políticos en México] was set up to coordinate efforts.

The committee announced November 8 that the main job -- to secure the release of all the political prisoners -- still lies ahead and that efforts must be redoubled to gain this objective.

In this issue

	Page
The Real Turnout at Washington Antiwar Rally -- 318,000	946
Johnson Throws in Sponge to Pollsters	946
The New York Rally Against Dean Rusk -- What It Revealed -- by Joseph Hansen	947
The Happening at Bruton Paris Church	949
Revolutionary Themes Sounded at West Berlin Gatherings	949
Régis Debray Case:	
Excerpts from Che's Diary Read at Debray Trial	951
Régis Debray, Che Guevara and the Bolivian Guerrillas [Interview with Ralph Schoenman]	956
Régis Debray Sentenced to Thirty Years	962
Zengakuren Students Protest Sato's Trip to Washington	952
War Crimes Tribunal to Hear Witnesses in Copenhagen	953
U.S. Senate Scores Victory Against Socialized Medicine	953
Hugo Blanco Case:	
Campaign for Hugo Blanco to Continue	954
Belaúnde Terry in Political Trouble	955
Warning on Radioactive Pollution of the Seas	955
PHOTO: Ralph Schoenman Speaking at Meeting in Tribute to Guevara	956
Johnson's Popularity Declining in Britain, Too	959
Ernesto Guevara in the Days When We Were Friends [With Che Guevara in the Mexico Days] -- by Lucila Velázquez	960
Arrests Continue in Greece	963
Are Canadian Indians Responding to Radio Havana?	963
Controversy over Introduction to Trotsky's Biography of Stalin	964
Paris Meeting Commemorates October Revolution	967
Mexican Political Prisoners Win Concession	968