



Svetlana Alliluyeva

—UPI Photo

Mr. McCloskey [the State Department spokesman] confirmed that the United States has "communicated" with the Soviet Union about the case. He declined to go into the nature of the conversations, but apparently the United States has been assuring the Soviet Union that it had no hand in Mrs. Alliluyeva's defection and has been inquiring into the Soviet reaction if she were admitted to the United States. (*The New York Times*, March 23.)

If one considers, however, the Russian "courtesies" in such areas of U.S. preoccupation as Southeast Asia, it is clear that the American *quid pro quo* is cheap indeed.

While the sensitive U.S. consideration of Soviet pleasure in a case of potential monumental propaganda advantage makes perfect diplomatic sense, it is scandalous that Mrs. Alliluyeva's freedom of speech should be under total CIA control. There is much to suggest that this is precisely the case. Mrs. Alliluyeva, having been issued a United States visa, was persuaded to spend some time in Switzerland before availing herself of her American asylum "after interest in her case has subsided." (*Ibid.*) That she was accompanied on her trip from India to Switzerland by Robert F. Rayle, a CIA officer at the U.S. Embassy in New Delhi, and that all access to her has been effectively barred from newspapermen, indicates that her complete public silence is U.S. imposed.

A paradoxical analogy offers itself with the treatment Marina Oswald, another Russian woman, received from Secret Service men after her husband had been accused of assassinating President Kennedy. For months she was kept incommunicado while the agents in charge pretended to speak for her when claiming her public silence to be voluntary. What really transpired in that period, what kind of "tutoring" she was receiving can only be deduced from the fact that when she at last was called upon to perform as the Warren Commission's star witness, she not only turned out to be her late husband's chief accuser but in doing so contradicted her own initial reactions after the assassination.

Now Stalin's daughter may be receiving similar treatment. She, like Marina Oswald, is in a situation that lends itself to manipulation through promises and/or threats. Her

Swiss "vacation" is likely in fact to be a tutorial service to make sure that if and when she is permitted to speak in public, she would merely be repeating compositions written by State Department officials. What the public will or won't learn from Stalin's daughter will depend not on her knowledge of historically significant events nor on her own desire to disclose them, but on diplomatic exigencies.

For its own record, the CIA will undoubtedly labor to extract every last bit of information from the celebrated Soviet defector. Any Soviet-embarrassing information so gained could then be used to threaten the USSR with public disclosures unless it gave in to the United States on one matter or another.

Whatever personal reasons caused Stalin's daughter to become a voluntary refugee will hardly prevent the U.S. authorities from using her as an inadvertent political tool. She may console herself that her move came at a time when the U.S. mischief vis-a-vis the Soviet Union is being severely curtailed. Since Mrs. Alliluyeva no longer owns her own person, henceforth her biography will be written by others. So may some of her past.

Miss Stalin's Tutors

Even in the perspective of a few short years it is incredible to what lengths U.S. authorities are going in the case of one particular defector from the Soviet Union to avoid embarrassing or displeasing the Soviet government.