

Winter 1963

INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

A REVIEW

James P. Cannon's
"The First Ten Years of
American Communism"

U. S. - Cuba Crisis

The Week of the Brink

by Farrell Dobbs

Case History of Guantanamo

by Henry Gitano

*Fidelismo and Marxism
in Latin America*

by Luis Vitale

American Labor - Fact and Fiction

by Art Preis

Unionism and its Critics

by Milton Alvin

**35
CENTS**

Correspondence

Editor:

A recent article by Soviet scientist Peter Kapitza is a devastating criticism of the role of the Soviet bureaucracy in stifling progress in the USSR.

There are people who say: "Stalin committed crimes. But look at Russia today. He led the country for 30 years. Doesn't he deserve some credit for helping build the USSR to its present status as an advanced scientific nation?"

Academician Kapitza puts the role of the Stalinist bureaucracy in the proper light as the strangler of Soviet science.

Kapitza refers to official attitudes toward cybernetics and he quotes from the Russian Philosophical Dictionary (1945) as follows: "Cybernetics (from the Greek denoting steering, controlling) — a reactionary pseudo-science, originated in the U.S.A. after the Second World War . . ."

"It is impossible," Mr. Kapitza says, "to control a spacecraft without cybernetic machinery."

Says Kapitza, in his article published in the Soviet journal *Ekonomicheskaya Gazeta*: "If indeed our scientists had, in 1954, listened to the philosophers . . . the conquest of the cosmos of which we are justly proud, and for which the whole world respects us, could not have been accomplished . . ."

He lists a few other examples of the impeding of progress by the dogmatic imposition of what was pretended to be Marxist ideas on science: the opposition to relativity theory; the incorrect understanding of the principle of indeterminacy in atomic physics; and the criticism of the chemical theory of resonance.

Scientific progress was made despite, not because of the Stalinist bureaucracy, Kapitza's article makes clear. Where the scientists listened (or had to listen) i.e., Lysenko with the backing of Stalin crushed the opposition, the damage to Soviet science was high.

It is a monument to October and to the original Bolsheviks, that Stalin even after 30 years rule, could not abort Soviet power and progress permanently or decisively.

Add another title to Stalin's list: "Betrayal of Revolutions," "Destroyer of Nationalities," and now "Strangler of Soviet Science."

R. K.
New York, N. Y.

Editor:

I've been reading the *Military Background to Disarmament* by P.M.S. Blackett. The article seems to be getting pretty wide distribution. It's the first major literary breakthrough in the cold war hysteria. I think that its ef-

fects will be felt in the new peace movement.

Revolutionists, in my opinion, have a unique critique to make on this issue, i.e., the *solution*. To get a broad solution I suggest that *International Socialist Review* invite *Monthly Review*, the *Nation*, *New America*, *Mainstream* and/or some of the new student publications to co-publish each other's evaluation of the Blackett report. (I remember the time of the Twentieth Congress when *M. R.*, *Dissent*, *American Socialist* and *National Guardian* made such arrangements.)

The articles could be the result of a co-sponsored seminar before a joint New York City audience with a question period. And the authors could simply revise their oral statements for a written seminar. At any rate I hope that this suggestion can be considered for its usefulness and practicability.

Bob Kaufman
Baltimore, Md.

Periodicals in Review

A Russian Expert

We sometimes feel that impressionism and superficial speculation are two sins committed more frequently by scholars who study the USSR and "Communism" than in perhaps any other academic field. It is as if our scrupulous academicians who worship the "facts" have marked off Russian Studies, saying "anything goes." After all, the cold war is a serious business and this is the least scholars can do for the "war effort."

A new, but highly prolific writer in this field is Robert V. Daniels. Within the last two years he has written two books, one on the early Russian opposition, has edited an excellent selection of documents related to the Communist and Marxist movement, and has written a number of magazine articles. He certainly is well acquainted with his subject matter but this acquaintance

seems to have little effect on his theorizing.

This can be seen clearly in two of his recent magazine articles. In "What the Russians Mean" (October, 1962, *Commentary*), Daniels refers to the concept of Lenin and Trotsky "that a workers' uprising in Russia would set off what Trotsky called the 'permanent revolution,' sweeping the whole of Europe into advanced proletarian socialism." "This was not Marxism," Daniels blandly informs us, "it was a revival of the peculiar faith in the Russian national mission which in the nineteenth century had gripped both revolutionaries and Czarists." A pat theory and a useful one, for it fits in with current attempts of the U.S. State Department to equate the spread of "Communism" with Russian imperialism.

The theory is of course absurd once one looks at the facts. Both Lenin and Trotsky, prior to the Russian Revolution, looked to the German working class and its party as the center of the working class movement, as the leading party of the international movement. Trotsky, following his exile from the USSR, lived in many countries and involved himself deeply in analyzing the progress of working class revolutionary struggles in many countries of the world — Germany, France, and Spain stand out particularly. At different times in this period Trotsky saw the greatest hope in sparking a world revolution in the victory of the working class in this or that particular country. Trotsky's ideas were to take root among revolutionary workers in many lands, not the least important being the development of the Socialist Workers Party in this country.

Daniels covers similar ground in another article "Toward a Definition of Soviet Socialism" (Vol. 1, No. 4, *New Politics*). Commenting again on the Russian Revolution, Daniels asserts that: "The Marxist revolution" is in reality "the revolution of the Westernizing intelligentsia with a Marxist ideology." Thus the Soviet system was, from origins, "non-proletarian." Again we see the superficial impressionistic method at work. Many of the leaders of the Bolshevik Party were intellectuals. Compared to more advanced capitalist countries like Germany, pre-revolutionary Russia had a small proletariat. After the consolidation of political power by Stalin and the bureaucracy the working class lost direct political control of the state. The result in Daniels' mind: a non-proletarian revolution led by the intelligentsia.

But what actually occurred? The Bolshevik party was at least 90% working class in composition and its members were intimately linked with the whole Russian working class. The actual revolution was carried out in the concrete by the workers themselves; it brought to power a Soviet government

(Continued in page 29)

The Cuba Crisis

The Week of the Brink

by Farrell Dobbs

COMRADE Chairman, comrades and friends, if there are any of you here tonight who did not live with fear during the period of extreme tension following Kennedy's nuclear war threat, then I can only say you must have been on the granddaddy of all drunks. Throughout the world attention was focused on the Soviet ships sailing toward Kennedy's naval blockade around the embattled revolutionary island of Cuba. Everybody was wondering, will they keep coming, will Kennedy carry out his threat to fire on them, and what will it bring for us? It was as though an announcement had come from the astronomers that a fiery object from outer space was heading toward us and the people of the world were watching with fear and horror to see if it was on a collision course with our planet, and would incinerate us all.

The threat of nuclear war, which had seemed somewhat remote, suddenly and dramatically exploded into an immediate danger. The people of the United States became vividly aware that this country won't be exempt in a nuclear war. Never again will a general war be fought in which people in other lands will be destroyed wholesale, civilians and all, their cities leveled, their country ravished, while the United States experiences no destruction within its boundaries. That day is past. The people of America are aware that we, like the rest of the world, will be the victims of a nuclear war, and they're aware that there is no place to hide.

A most meaningful manifestation of that realization occurred in Washington during the crisis. A Pentagon spokesman was briefing the press. At one point he came to the question of civil defense, whereupon the hardbitten, cynical reporters laughed in his face. Fallout shelters? Evacuation of cities? Everybody knows it's a fake and a fraud. As LeRoy McRae, our candidate for Attorney General said during the election campaign, the shelter program was one of the greatest consumer frauds ever perpetrated on the people here in New York by the Rockefeller administration. Everybody realized that. So they lived with fear and they lived with hope that maybe the threat would go away.

Kennedy kept the brutal pressure on, hour by hour, and day by grueling day, until Khrushchev, acting under the pressure of Kennedy's threats, stated that the Soviet Union

would withdraw the missiles that Kennedy held to be offensive weapons. The whole world breathed a deep sigh of relief. But nobody was quite the same as they were before that grim speech of Kennedy's on October 22. There is a new consciousness in people's minds that nuclear war is a clear and present danger. Some new thoughts are percolating as to why there is the war danger and new and more intensive searches are going on among people to try to determine what can be done to prevent war. I won't try tonight to deal with the tactical issues at the peak of the crisis, although they have a certain importance in probing into the full meaning of the crisis. I won't do that because that is not the real key, in my opinion, to an analysis of the lessons of the crisis.

Let me say first that the main, immediate fact that emerges from the crisis is that nuclear war has been averted — only temporarily — but it has been averted, and that means we have gained precious time in the fight for world peace. To use that time effectively we need to analyze the fundamental lessons of the Cuban crisis. What truths about imperialism were made more evident? How have the various peace programs stood the test of this crisis? How can the peace forces better oppose the imperialist war drive? Discussion of these questions and the arriving at common conclusions by more and more people will have to develop as a process. All I propose to undertake tonight is to make a start in the discussion of some of these basic factors.

LET me pose first the question: Who was proven the aggressor in the Cuban crisis? Was it Cuba? The Cubans were defending their sovereign right to make social changes within their country that they thought would better serve the welfare of the population. Measured in terms of the history of this country, the Cubans can present strong arguments in favor of their position by quoting such figures as Sam Adams, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, Frederick Douglass and Eugene V. Debs, just to mention a few. The Cubans have right on their side. The right of a people — as it's written in our own Declaration of Independence proclaiming the American Revolution of 1776 — to take affairs into their own hands and reshape things in whatever way they see fit to make a better life for themselves. Was it the Soviet Union that was the aggressor? What did the Soviet Union do? Did the Russians try to overturn the Cuban revolutionary regime? No. The Soviets gave the Cubans defensive aid, economic and military. That was a progressive act and they are to be commended for

Farrell Dobbs, National Secretary of the Socialist Workers Party, four times its presidential candidate, spoke before the Militant Labor Forum in New York City, November 9, on the Cuban-U.S. Crisis and the threat of nuclear war. The transcript of the tape recording is published here substantially unchanged.

that act, because it was in keeping with the rights of the Cuban people.

It was not Castro. It was not Khrushchev. It was Kennedy, who precipitated the nuclear war crisis and used the issue of Soviet aid to Cuban self-defense as his pretext. You talk about George Orwell's "double-speak" in the book 1984. You got it in spades from Kennedy during this crisis. Defense is aggression. That was Kennedy's line, and he is going to stop such interferences with his imperialist aims if he has to bomb every Latin American from 90 miles off our shores to the southern tip of South America. He said in effect to the Cubans, "Disarm or we will attack you"; and to the Soviet Union, "Submit your ships to search and seizure on the high seas or we will fire upon you, and if that brings us to nuclear war, so be it." The imperialist ruling class of the United States stands as the only governing power in the world that has ever used nuclear weapons against other human beings. It did so at Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945. Now this same gang of imperialist mobsters, this bipartisan cabal in Washington,

**INTERNATIONAL
SOCIALIST
REVIEW**

Published quarterly by the International Socialist Review Publishing Association, 116 University Pl., New York 3, N. Y. Second class postage paid at New York, N. Y.

Contents

CORRESPONDENCE 2
 PERIODICALS IN REVIEW 2
 THE WEEK OF THE BRINK.....by Farrell Dobbs 3
 CASE HISTORY OF GUANTANAMO
 by Henry Gitano 9
 AMERICAN LABOR — FACT AND FICTION
 by Art Preis 13
 UNIONISM AND ITS CRITICSby Milton Alvin 19
 FIDELISMO AND MARXISMby Luis Vitale 23
 IN REVIEW
 "The First Ten Years of American Communism"
 by Carl Feingold 25
 Fabianism: "The Monstrous Illusion"
 by Maria di Savio 26
 A View of Radical Americaby Carol Lawrence 26
 "A Hatred of Women"by Martha Curti 27
 Hungarian Revolution 1956by Balázs Nagy 27

Vol. 24 — No. 1 — Whole No. 162

Editor, Murry Weiss; Managing Editor, Bert Deck;
 Business Manager, Karolyn Kerry; Editorial
 Board: Joseph Hansen, Shane Mage, Art Preis,
 Myra Tanner Weiss, Tim Wohlforth.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: U.S.A. and Latin America, \$1.25 a year (four issues); single copies, 35 cents; bundles, 25 cents a copy for five copies or more. Foreign and Canada, \$1.50 a year (four issues); single copies, 35 cents; bundles, 26 cents a copy for five copies or more.



stands as the only governmental power that has deliberately threatened to plunge the world into nuclear war when hydrogen bombs of megaton range exist, one of which could virtually level a whole city like New York. And they call the Cubans "aggressors."

There is no question who was and who is still the aggressor. The Soviets are removing their missiles from Cuba and Kennedy is still on the prod. He is now broadening his definition of what he calls "offensive" weapons. If defense is aggression, then so long as the Cubans have any arms with which to defend themselves against attack, they have "offensive" weapons that "threaten" the United States. Cuba will possess "offensive" weapons so long as there is a zip gun in a back alley in Havana. Kennedy's definition just begins with missiles. Why? Because the imperialists are preparing new violations of Cuban sovereignty. They are determined to overturn the revolutionary regime in Cuba. They are determined to turn back the clock and restore exploitation of Cuba by American monopoly corporations. That is why the Cuban revolution still remains in grave peril of United States aggression.

It is our duty to defend from within this country the rights of the Cubans. Back them in their demand that the United States withdraw from Guantanamo. Kennedy wants to dictate what weapons the Cubans can have because they are "threatening" the United States from 90 miles away, and he has a military base right on Cuban soil. It is our duty to support the demands of the Cubans that Kennedy call off that naval blockade, that he call off his violations of Cuban air space, that he quit arming counter-revolutionary gangs to help overturn the Cuban revolution and that he lift the economic embargo against Cuba. These are points stressed by the Cubans as just minimum assurances it would be necessary to have before they could put an ounce of trust in any promise Kennedy might make that he would not invade Cuba. We should add our own demands to these points raised by the Cubans. We should demand that the Kennedy administration restore diplomatic relations with Cuba. Lift the travel ban. Let the people of this country go down there and see for themselves what

STATEMENT REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AS AMENDED BY THE ACTS OF MARCH 3, 1933, JULY 2, 1946 AND JUNE 11, 1960 (74 STAT. 208) SHOWING THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, AND CIRCULATION OF International Socialist Review, published quarterly at New York, N. Y., for Oct. 1, 1962

- The names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are:
 Publisher, International Socialist Review, 116 University Place, N. Y. 3, N. Y.
 Editor, Murry Weiss, 116 University Place, New York 3, N. Y.
 Managing editor, Bert Deck, 116 University Pl., New York 3, N. Y.
 Business manager, Karolyn Kerry, 116 University Pl., New York 3, N. Y.
- The owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a partnership or other unincorporated firm, its name and address, as well as that of each individual member, must be given.)
 International Socialist Review Publishing Assn., 116 University Place, New York 3, N. Y.
 James P. Cannon, Partner, 116 University Place, New York 3, N. Y.
 Vincent R. Dunne, Partner, 116 University Place, New York 3, N. Y.
 Joseph Hansen, Partner, 116 University Place, New York 3, N. Y.
- The known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: (If there are none, so state.)
 None.
- Paragraphs 2 and 3 include, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting; also the statements in the two paragraphs show the affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner.
- The average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the 12 months preceding the date shown above was 3025 per issue.

KAROLYN KERRY

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 18th day of September, 1962

CONSTANCE F. WEISSMAN
 Notary Public, State of New York
 No. 31-959825

Qualified in New York County
 Commission Expires March 30, 1964

it is all about. Restore trade with Cuba. Give the Cubans economic aid and pay them reparations for the damage that has already been done to them by the United States.

NOW look at the lessons of the Cuban crisis from another point of view. Ever since people began to grasp what the horror of nuclear war would probably be, there has been a notion advanced that the imperialists would not risk nuclear war in trying to maintain their rule. It has been argued that they would hold back because they would risk their own destruction in a nuclear war. This contention has been counterposed to the Marxist analysis of the historic role of ruling classes. Marxists hold that the whole history of class struggle demonstrates that no ruling class will peacefully yield up its privileged minority rule upon demand from the majority. The ruling class will try by all available means, through force and violence, to impose its minority will on the majority in order to preserve its privileged position. Well, who has been proven right? In that intensive period beginning with his October 22 nuclear war speech, John F. Kennedy has reaffirmed Karl Marx. He left no room for speculation. If I may comment in this connection on the answer to a paragraph I read in the *Worker* during the heat of the crisis, let me say: The father of Caroline Kennedy is prepared to risk the death of his daughter in nuclear war in order to preserve the capitalist system and maintain imperialist exploitation over peoples in other countries. He proved it. There is no room for argument. The facts are in.

These facts, and the surrounding circumstances in the crisis, offer fresh proof that the war danger stems from the basic nature of capitalism. The roots lie in class exploitation within a capitalist country, in our case the United States. Capitalist exploitation breeds social injustice, creates class inequities within our society. Madison Avenue describes us as a society of equals, but it just happens that the capitalists are more equal than workers, and that is built into the capitalist system, and that's the way it is going to remain under capitalism. Out of this class inequality a surplus accumulation of capital becomes amassed in the hands of our native capitalists and they have to do something with it, in order to make more money for themselves. This thirst for new riches impels the capitalist ruling class into a drive toward exploitation of peoples abroad. An intricate network of imperialist oppression develops, imposed by a combination of political trickery and military force. The consequent social injustices, in turn, provoke class struggles on a world scale that lead to colonial revolutions for independence from imperialism and to social revolution to overturn the whole capitalist system and lay a foundation through workers' states for an advance to a socialist society. Cuba represents a new high-water mark in this rising tide of world revolution that has been gaining in momentum since World War II.

The imperialists, and before all others, the imperialist rulers of the United States, are striving desperately to stem and reverse this revolutionary tide. Their immediate aim in the case of Cuba is to proscribe social revolution from the Western Hemisphere, to keep it a private preserve of capitalism. Profits must come before people. What difference does it make if Cubans again become unemployed by the hundreds of thousands in a land of only seven million? What difference does it make if people again have to live in straw-thatched huts with dirt floors? What difference does it make if the children again have no shoes and are again put on starvation rations and subjected to debilitating diseases of malnutrition? What matter if they are again denied an education? You cannot violate the sanctity of capitalist private profit. It says right in the constitution of the United States that the Cubans can't do that. And the imperialists intend to stop it.

They intend to restore Jim Crow in Cuba. They intend to put an end to this business in which racial discrimination and segregation are actually outlawed to unite all

workers and enable them better to act in common to improve their conditions. They intend to restore discrimination and segregation in order again to split the Cuban workers and enable the imperialists to exploit them. Throughout this whole crisis it has been asserted over and over again that there is no change in the basic policy of Washington with respect to Cuba. And by that they also mean there is no change in their aim to smash all revolutionary gains made by working people throughout the world. They are girding for nuclear war precisely for the purpose of restoring imperialist supremacy over the world. Their aim is to make the world safe for the investments of the Rockefellers and the Kennedys.

IN THE view of the Socialist Workers Party the fight for peace must stem from frank recognition of these iron facts. War can be prevented only by stripping the imperialists of their ability to make war. That can be accomplished only by political class struggle to abolish capitalist rule wherever it still holds sway, including in the United States. All the workers states that have come into being since October 1917 have the same inalienable right as the Cubans to prepare the strongest possible military defense of their countries. But military defense, vital though it is to them, is not the primary key to world peace, to holding back the imperialist war drive. Not while the imperialists retain the power to make war. Reasonable though it would be to have peaceful coexistence between nations; reasonable though it would be to let the different social systems engage in orderly competition to prove which is the superior system — the imperialists won't go for that. They won't go for it because they are wholly aware that they would lose in peaceful competition between the rival social systems. The imperialists won't agree to peacefully coexist a minute longer than they absolutely have to with countries having a non-capitalist social system. Kennedy just made that plain, too, in the Cuban crisis.

A serious question therefore arises as to whether one can fight for peace under a slogan of peaceful coexistence with capitalism. The policy based on that slogan was first shaped by Stalin as the head of the Soviet Union and it has been continued in all its main essentials by the Khrushchev regime. To touch briefly on some of its basic aspects, the policy assumes that Soviet military power can serve as a key deterrent against imperialist war with nuclear arms. On that key premise, the anti-capitalist, anti-war masses of the world are diverted from class struggle opposition to imperialism into pressure groups supporting Soviet diplomacy. More concretely, within capitalist countries such as ours, rebels against capitalist policies are diverted from independent working class political action into support of so-called "peace loving" capitalist politicians. This policy has been known in the terminology of the Communist Party as the popular front, or people's front, or mainstream politics, or similar phrases which add up to the same thing. Within the framework of this basic policy the Soviet leaders have sought to assert unquestioned authority over all anti-imperialist forces in carrying out their international line. Repeatedly, they have acted unilaterally in taking important steps touching the interests of working people in other countries, in other workers' parties. That has been part of the history of Kremlin policy, and it appears to have been repeated in Moscow's negotiations with Washington concerning the Cuban crisis.

It also appears that the Cubans are asserting their right to be consulted and to have a voice in any negotiations, as shown by their opposition to Khrushchev's offer to allow United Nations' inspection of Cuban military installations. In the first place the Cubans have a sovereign right to have any kind of arms they want. What right has Kennedy to insist that he can have missiles here in the United States, or anywhere else in the world, and yet say to the Cubans that they can't have a missile that can strike the United States? Where's the justice in that? Who made him

God? The Cubans have a right to whatever weapons they can get to defend themselves. Moreover, since the United States has made it abundantly clear that it is still preparing for attacks on Cuba, what right has Kennedy to demand that the United Nations — which in the last analysis has always functioned as a front organization for American imperialism — what right has he to demand that the U.N. go down and inspect the Cuban defenses? Why, it would be no less unjust if he would demand that Castro take the top Pentagon brass on a tour of the Cuban defenses so they could better prepare an invasion. It is an outrage and the Cubans are right in standing their ground on this.

At the same time Castro spoke correctly when he told the Cuban people in his speech a week ago last night that the inspection issue is not a question to be discussed with the imperialists. There remains an unbreakable alliance between the Cuban and Soviet states, he said, and these are things they will discuss and work out among themselves. We can expect more to be said on the subject in due course by the Cubans, if not by Moscow. And people who are seriously interested in the question of worker's democracy, should pay close attention to what is said. The disagreement poses the question of democracy in relations between workers' states, as a corollary to the issue of democracy within revolutionary parties. Worker's democracy on both counts is vital to the forces fighting against imperialism and for world peace.

I HAVE described briefly the policy of peaceful coexistence and popular frontism, as developed by Stalin and continued by Khrushchev. Now let us ask, what have been the results of this international policy? It didn't prevent World War II. It didn't prevent the imperialists' intervention in Korea, nor is it preventing the present intervention in Vietnam. It hasn't stopped Kennedy from threatening nuclear war in his attempts to overturn the Cuban revolution. It doesn't seem to be working, does it? Of course, it's true that the Soviet retreat on the missile issue under pressure of Kennedy's threats warded off the immediate danger of nuclear war. It's true that Khrushchev has stripped Kennedy — for the moment — of a phony pretext for an invasion of Cuba. These are important facts, and they are not to be taken lightly. But there are also other facts that we should keep in mind in analyzing the lessons of this latest war crisis. Popular front politics within the United States didn't get to first base in stopping Washington from shaping its nuclear war policy. Soviet military power didn't stop Kennedy from threatening a nuclear attack. And the Cuban revolution remains in grave danger. These are iron facts. They once again call into question the international policy of the Soviet leadership. They compel serious thought about the need for class struggle opposition to imperialism. Military self-defense by the revolutionary countries, as I said, is important to their security. But class struggle action is the key to the fight against imperialist war.

In that connection I want to call your attention to Castro's speech on the issue of UN inspection. You will find the entire text in the Nov. 12 issue of *The Militant*. Right now I want you to note particularly this headline on the back page: "Our principles are powerful, long-range weapons." That headline pinpoints the essence of what Castro has to say in his speech. It pinpoints the fact that the Cubans, learning as they struggle and learning their lessons well — because they know imperialism won't allow them time for second guesses — are shaping a policy increasingly permeated with the concepts of class struggle defense against imperialism. You'll find at the literature table back there a Pioneer pamphlet containing the *Second Declaration of Havana*. It develops the same concept. It's worth your while to study the speeches and documents put out by the Cuban revolutionary movement. They are thinking out loud, learning the lessons of the struggle as they go forward, and we have something to learn from them.

Now let me turn to an altogether different publication, the *Worker*. I do so in undertaking to deal briefly with the question: What are the fruits of Communist Party policy within the United States? The Communist Party has followed the popular front line of supporting "peace loving" capitalist politicians for more than twenty-five years. They have generally supported the Democrats, usually by campaigning against the Republicans. You will recall that they supported Kennedy in 1960 by calling for the defeat of Nixon as the main danger. Well, Nixon is no prize package, and on top of everything else, he just proved he is also a sore loser. But the argument is still phony. In one instance the Communist Party did not support the Democrats. They supported Wallace in 1948. But, as the record shows, the "peace loving" Henry Wallace backed Truman in the Korean War. That should have taught the leaders of the Communist Party something. Yet they repeatedly prove that they learn nothing and they forget nothing. They simply turned from Wallace back to support of Stevenson and Kennedy by opposing Eisenhower and Nixon.

TODAY Kennedy's party has decisively proved where it stands on the burning question of war and peace, and his nuclear war threat had bipartisan support, all the way. Well, did the Communist Party then speak out against Kennedy and his party after he made his nuclear war speech on October 22, about two weeks before the elections? No. They did not. Do you know what they did? They denounced publicly the candidates of the Socialist Workers Party instead. They accused the Socialist Workers Party of being for "peace without peaceful coexistence." This is their clever way of emulating the cartoon figure, Senator Snort, who wrote a book entitled, *How to Fog an Issue*. As I said, no sane person could but welcome peaceful relations between nations. Nobody but a madman wants a nuclear war. But the question is, what kind of a policy should be followed in the fight for peace? And the whole object of the *Worker's* attack on the SWP is to say that if one does not agree with the policy of Khrushchev, if one does not agree with the policy of the Communist Party — which they call "peaceful coexistence" — then you are accused of being against peace.

Then comes another gem in the *Worker* attack. They say that the Socialist Workers Party's policy represents "a soft-sell on anti-Soviet slander." Again the familiar Stalinist technique, twist and distort things so that to disagree with a certain policy of Khrushchev's becomes anti-Soviet. In other words, Khrushchev and the Soviet Union are synonymous. Do you know what's that like? That's like trying to tell workers that if they criticize the policies of David Dubinsky they are scabbing on the ILGWU. You would have a hard time putting that over here in New York, particularly up in the garment district. But it is the same kind of an argument. It contributes nothing but confusion to the search for effective ways to fight against imperialist war. Such political dishonesty is impermissible among genuine communists. The CP leaders resort to this simply as a cover for continuing their same old bankrupt policy. They smear the pro-Cuba, pro-Soviet SWP, and at the same time they continue to seek political coexistence with the anti-Soviet, anti-Cuba, Social Democrats — people who could not even make a demonstration against Kennedy's nuclear war threat without having at the top of their banners a blast against the Soviet Union and a disclaimer on Cuba where they call for a "democratic" counterrevolution.

The *Worker* then sets out to justify continued support to the Democratic Party by a complex exercise in verbal gymnastics. They find there are two power centers down in Washington, one in the White House, and the other in the Pentagon. The Pentagon gang, they say, are in a coalition with the ultra-right, the Republican leaders and Wall Street. They are acting independently of the White House in moving to aggravate the crisis. That's what they say, word for word; you can read it in the *Worker*. Poor old peace-loving Honest John is getting diddled. We must save him from

this Pentagon cabal so that he can show his better self and really be Caroline's daddy again. What to do then? According to the *Worker*, on the eve of the elections, the fight for peace can at present be strengthened by giving a rebuff to the menace of Rockefeller (Mr. Imperialism). That's what they said, word for word. Fight for peace by voting for Kennedy's war party. I agree with Sylvia Weinstein, who in her speech at the election rally last Friday night said, "that means beat Mr. Imperialism by voting for Mr. Invasion." I think she summed it up quite well.

The *Worker* has also opened a polemic against the SWP over the peace question. We welcome such a discussion. We think the more discussion between all tendencies the better. But we regret the factional distortions that have been introduced by the *Worker*. They attribute to the Socialist Workers Party the view that if one is not for socialism he is really anti-peace. That statement simply takes facts and turns them upside down and inside out. The purpose of it is, of course, to oppose a class struggle political policy and try to defend their class collaborationist line. Actually, the Socialist Workers Party welcomes and supports all anti-war manifestations. We recognize — we're not entirely stupid, you know — we recognize that people cannot be expected to leap in one stride to socialist conclusions when they set out to do something to stop a nuclear war. We support all partial steps going in the direction of opposition to the imperialist war policy. We support, for example, the demand for unilateral action by the United States in ending nuclear tests. We believe all tests should be stopped, but we also think people fighting against nuclear tests from within the United States should concentrate on demands that the United States government stop them. It is supposed to represent us and carry out our wishes. So that's where we should direct our demands. We favor demands to withdraw all American troops from abroad, to dismantle all military bases. Let the people of the rest of the world run their own affairs as they see fit, while we concentrate on clearing up the social mess created by the capitalists here in our country.

We urge all fighters for peace to break with capitalist politics. As is the duty of all socialists, we campaign day in and day out for independent working class political action. We seek constantly to explain why working class political action must lead to adoption of a socialist program. Because of the brutal truths about imperialist policy revealed in the Cuban crisis, new fighters for peace are bound to be aroused. If socialists advance a class struggle program to them, more headway can be made in the fight for peace. More can be done to defend the Cuban revolution. We can make progress in explaining to American workers the need for our country to follow the revolutionary example of the Russian, Chinese and Cuban workers.

Summary

LET us take first the missile question: "Why do I think that the Soviets put missiles in Cuba and why did Castro accept them?" Well, I'm not going to try to guess what Khrushchev had in mind, or what Castro had in mind, or what the circumstances were in their mutual relations. Did Castro ask for them? Did Khrushchev insist that he take them whether he wanted them or not? Was there a mutual agreement about it? I do not know, but I would take it for granted that the facts will slowly come to light in the next period. I am quite confident that there will be more information coming from the Cubans, because one of the things you will notice in Castro's speech is that it sets a new and very good example in moving away from the practice of secret diplomacy between governmental powers behind the backs of the people. In reporting his discussion with U Thant, Castro gives a refreshing view of a revolutionary leadership telling the workers the truth. That's what Khrushchev should also be doing.

Until we have more information, I think we should take it rather slowly on the missile question for two reasons: 1) This is not what is most germane to the basic meaning of the crisis and the lessons to draw from it. 2) It's not a very wise thing to make snap judgements on tactical questions without having all the facts. There is an expression for that here in the United States — drug store quarterbacking. On Monday at the drug store lunch counter the experts decide what mistakes the quarterbacks and the coach made in the football game the previous Saturday.

Anybody who has had trade union experience will recognize that it is a chancy thing to be too categorical from too far away about a tactical move made in a given struggle. I would make only this general observation: We should study this aspect of the Cuban question, as we dig more deeply into the lesson of the crisis, in a sense similar for instance to the problem that arose over the question of Soviet resumption of nuclear tests.

The Soviet Union had the right to resume nuclear tests as it did, after the tacit ban on tests which had come about, you will recall, when the Soviets unilaterally declared a moratorium. Our party felt that, even though the Soviet Union had this right, its breaking of the moratorium on tests gave propaganda advantage to the imperialists among people who were strongly opposed to nuclear testing and who had been bringing more and more pressure to bear on the United States government over the issue. In short, you come down to a question of the strategic interrelationship between military defense and political defense of the workers states against imperialism. From that point of view, there is a real question as to whether the missile issue involved tactics which put military above political considerations in the defense of Cuba. Since so many of you are preoccupied with the question here tonight, that in itself is objective testimony to the fact that revolutionary leadership has to be sensitive about taking military defensive steps which may interfere with the mobilization of political defense.

TURNING now to another question asked tonight: Why wouldn't class struggle against imperialism also heighten the danger of nuclear war? It is true that the more the imperialists get crowded, the more likely they are to take long chances, as they just demonstrated in the Cuban crisis. But without the strongest class struggle opposition to stay their hand, the imperialists will become bolder in their drive to overturn all past revolutionary conquests and will throw the world into war anyway. Imperialism is either going to be defeated everywhere or it's going to make war. But the imperialists are not entirely free agents in deciding when they can make war. They have tactical problems, too.

Take the case of the Brazilian government during the Cuban crisis. It voted in the OAS to back Kennedy against Cuba. At the same time the foreign minister spoke at a street meeting of Brazilian workers and students where he admitted the right of the Cubans to establish a socialist regime within the Western Hemisphere. Now, what does that mean? It means that the pressure of class struggle was impeding the firm mobilization of a capitalist government behind the imperialist attack on Cuba. The wider the class struggle, the greater will be the mobilization of humanity on the side of revolution, and the lesser will be that portion of the human race that remains under the influence of imperialism.

Let me try to make that concrete in United States' terms by one simple example. You all know that not a single Democrat or Republican politician in Congress said one word in opposition to Kennedy's line in the Cuban crisis. Let's assume that there had been just one actual representative of the working class to speak within Congress against Kennedy's policy and tell the class truth about the Cuban crisis. It would have had a very significant effect on the minds of the American people. As it was,

though, nowhere in the councils of government, nowhere in the top leadership of the unions was there a voice speaking out against Kennedy's line. People were subjected day in and day out a drum fire of propaganda in support of Kennedy all during the crisis. They couldn't know the class truth. It is significant to note reactions the night after Kennedy spoke, when Carl Feingold, the SWP candidate for senator from New York, got on TV and called Kennedy's policy by its right name and denounced it from hell to breakfast. I'll give you an example. I happened to get the call at the office from a woman who said, "I want to tell you that I listened to your Mr. Feingold last night, and my eyes remained glued to that television screen. I couldn't turn away, my attention was riveted until he finished. I want you to know that it gave me a tremendous inspiration to hear your candidate get on that television and tell the truth and I'm going to vote for your candidate in the election." Her example shows that insofar as we can mobilize forces to break through the curtain of lies drawn around the American people by the imperialists, it can have an effect.

A QUESTION is asked: Who won't recognize the United States as the aggressor, especially because of the missile propaganda? For the moment a lot of people have been taken in by the way Kennedy was able to utilize the missile issue. I think that is a fact. But in time the truth will come out. Missiles or not, Kennedy did provoke quite a few protest actions in the capitalist sector of the world. You'll find in the Militant a round-up on some of these protest actions in various countries, including a very interesting one. While the head of the ILA was announcing his refusal to load any ships at the New York docks that were headed for Cuba, the Ceylon waterfront workers union officially put a boycott on United States ships. That was the Ceylonese way of saying "Hands off Cuba!"

So let's look at the missile issue in still another way. Suppose there were tactical errors on the military defense side involving the Soviet Union and perhaps involving the Cuban leadership. What is going to be the attitude of the anti-imperialist masses of the world? Are they going to join Honest John because a couple of leaders on the anti-imperialist side made a tactical mistake? Well, if that was the way things worked out in the class struggle, you wouldn't have a single trade union in the United States today, because our boys at the top of the union movement don't need to take a backseat for anybody when it comes to making blunders. In fact Kennedy will succeed for a while in doing a snow job on the American people precisely because the leaders of the mass organizations in this country are truckling to him. But he won't fool the world, and he won't change the relationship of forces in the world revolutionary struggle through his propaganda.

ON THE question of what independent socialists can do within the peace movement, this is a big subject in itself, and I can only briefly touch on it in passing. A big problem in the first hours after Kennedy's speech was not what kind of protest action to mobilize but how to impel the people heading the so-called "respectable" peace organizations into calling any demonstrations at all. They wanted to take ads in the newspapers and start firing telegrams to Kennedy. That was one of the very first problems. It constitutes a good starting point to examine the peace movement in terms of the Cuban crisis. What kind of a juice was there in the various peace formations? Did they really stand up for peace? Did they really call things by their right name? These questions require study, particularly since a lot of young people turned up in the demonstrations where they occurred around the country, young militants who wanted some fighting leaders. One of the most important things that socialists can do — independent socialists about whom the question was asked, and organized

socialists as well — one of the most important things they can do is to work in the peace movement to help these young people to develop a class struggle policy and to effectively employ the kind of energy, the kind of courage, the kind of determination that they bring to the fight for peace.

I come now to the last question, the problem of speaking to audiences that aren't sympathetic to the Cuban Revolution as is the audience here tonight. I would suggest to you that things are a little different than they were before October 22, even with an unsympathetic audience. There is better than an even chance that Kennedy is going to overreach himself concerning the momentary propaganda advantage he has gained in this country on things like the missile issue. There is a whole series of questions that will arise as he presses his offensive against Cuba. For instance, I would suggest one question to put to your audience that helps introduce a new dimension into the Cuba discussion. What right has one man to push the American people to the brink of a nuclear war just because he doesn't like what is going on in Cuba? I am speaking in the terms now of cutting through his missile propaganda which won't stand up indefinitely. Now is the time, more than ever, to go back and explain carefully to people what they are doing in Cuba, what they are trying to accomplish. Put it in terms of the things that the working people of this country are struggling for. They are doing the same things in Cuba that the NAACP is organized to do in the United States. They are doing the same things in Cuba that organizations in this country fighting for higher old-age pensions, better medical care, more schools, adequate housing are trying to do. Those are things they are doing down there. Examine the Cuban situation from that point of view.

Of course, the imperialists still harp on the question of Cuban elections. I thought Dick Garza handled that matter well in a discussion with a radio commentator. He brought out that the United States, after it won independence from England, went quite a few years longer than the Cubans have yet gone before they had what passed for elections here. And then the elections were rigged by the ruling class. If you want a little background you can get it by reading Charles A. Beard's *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution*. From another point of view concerning elections, you might put the question, what would happen in strikes in the United States, what would happen when there is police brutality in Harlem, if all the people in the United States had guns in their hands like they have in Cuba? It is entirely possible, you know, that there would be some changes made in this country.

THE MILITANT

Special Offer to New Readers

During 1962 the Militant translated and published eight major documents and speeches from revolutionary Cuba unavailable in the commercial press. To get the facts and read the truth, take advantage of a four-month trial subscription for only one dollar. Send the coupon with payment to: The Militant, 116 University Place, New York 3, N. Y.

Name

Street

City Zone..... State.....

Case History of Guantanamo

All the hypocritical cries about the "Cuban danger" will not erase the record of a classic imperialist land-grab or hide the guilt of the real aggressors

by Henry Gitano

"IF AN invasion eventually is launched against Cuba," notes the *Wall Street Journal* (Oct. 23), "the U.S. already has what in effect is a beachhead in Cuba: the U.S. Naval Base at Guantanamo Bay" which is "a potential springboard for a military offense should war come."

Guantanamo consists of 28,000 acres with about 1,400 buildings. There are two airfields within its confines, the 5,000 foot runway of McCalla Field and an 8,000 foot strip for jets on Leeward Point. It is the largest enclosed harbor in the world; the anchorage can accommodate 50 ships. The normal resident military complement is 2,950 men, dependents number about 2,500. In addition there are usually 5,000 men aboard ships in the bay. Some 3,600 Cubans work on the base. The U.S. has arrogated to itself perpetual exclusive rights over the area, paying Cuba \$3,386.25 annually for this occupied territory or about a penny an acre on a monthly basis.

The presence of American troops in Guantanamo against the wishes of the Cuban people is ever-present aggression. The offensive nature of American bayonets in Cuba was spotlighted during Kennedy's latest attempt to crush the Cuban Revolution, in which Guantanamo played a key role. "Guantanamo Marines Mariner To Go" was the eight column head across the front page of the *N.Y. World Telegram* (Nov. 12). Jim G. Lucas, reporting from Guantanamo, quoted Corporal Jerome Golden: "There's not a man here who doesn't want to go over that fence. That's why we thought we came here."

Reporting from Cuba's occupied territory, David Kraslow of the *Miami Herald* (Nov. 14) saw an "eerie stillness" on the Cuban side. "On the American side there are 'over 8,000' tough Marines spoiling for a fight." Tad Szulc of the *N.Y. Times* (Nov. 12) noted that "the Pentagon could not foresee" if "the crisis would lead to . . . offensive operations that would require support from Guantanamo." He reported that alongside of heavy troop concentrations, there were "Navy underwater demolition teams, its warships, its Navy attack jet fighters, propeller-driven bombers . . ."

Reinforcing the concept of an offensive buildup, Marine Commandant Gen. W.R. Collins gave his evaluation: "There are no signs the Cubans are preparing an attack on the base" (*UPI*, Nov. 13). The same day, a tank march along the fence was projected, to impress Cubans who had allegedly thrown rocks — Goliath had second thoughts, and called it off. The *N.Y. Times* (Nov. 18) displayed a large photo of Douglas Skyraiders on "alert" at Guantanamo airfield, noting that they were "capable of delivering . . . nuclear bombs."

A blueprint for subjugating Cuba was reported by the (Oct. 9) *Los Angeles Times*. Holmes Alexander reported from Guantanamo Bay: "We would be lucky if an 'incident' at this naval base provided us with a new chance to establish a free Cuba on this island. The opportunity would enable us to set up a fighting front . . . Nothing else, except this uncompromising joining of battle in a limited war, with the avowed intention of victory, seems to be in the picture as viewed here." *U.S. News & World Report* (Nov. 26) blustered: "Heavy reinforcement of Guantanamo . . . showed Cuba had been placed at the mercy of U.S. military

force and that the U.S. was ready for action if it were needed."

Guantanamo was set on a collision course aimed at overthrowing the Cuban Revolution by armed force, meanwhile undertaking provocations, espionage and subversion.

DURING the past sixty-four years, Guantanamo has been an integral part of the U.S. drive to transform and maintain the Caribbean as an American lake and Latin America as vassal states. The stakes are very high. They were summarized by Herbert Matthews in the *N.Y. Times* (April 26, 1959): "U.S. private investments in Latin America now reach the amazing total of about \$9.5 billion . . . At every point it has to be said: 'If we did not have Latin America on our side, our situation would be desperate. To be denied the products and markets of Latin America would reduce the U.S. to being a second-rate nation and cause a devastating reduction in our standard of living . . . Latin American raw materials are essential to our existence as a world power.'"

The end result of U.S. colonial policy was editorially stated by England's respected *Manchester Guardian Weekly* (Jan. 12, 1961) while discussing Cuban-U.S. relations. "In most parts of the world, it is no longer Britain or France — or even the Soviet Union — which is regarded as the arch imperialist. It is the United States." The story of U.S. imperialism is also the story of Guantanamo — America's oldest foreign base.

The U.S. government in its White Paper in reply to Cuban charges (Oct. 13, 1960) spoke of "the historic friendship between Cuba and the U.S.," adding that the U.S. "never 'took upon itself' or 'imposed by force' any right respecting Guantanamo." History tells a different story.

The American government consistently opposed Cuban liberation. Until the U.S. was ready to swallow Cuba, it wanted the Island to remain part of a declining Spain.

Secretary of State John Quincy Adams wrote to the American Minister in Spain on April 28, 1823: "There are laws of political as well as of physical gravitation; and if an apple, severed by the tempest from its native tree, cannot choose but fall to the ground, Cuba, forcibly disjoined from its unnatural connection with Spain and incapable of self-support, can gravitate only towards the North American Union."

On the other hand, Cubans had the curious belief that Cuba had a natural connection with them. This belief was so profound that from 1868-1878 — the first phase of Cuba's 30-year struggle for independence — Spain lost 80,000 soldiers. In this war "the U.S.," says Herbert Matthews, "helped Spain" (*The Cuban Story*).

Eventually, America embarked on her own career of overseas imperialism. The concept that it was the destiny of the U.S. to have this Hemisphere as its private preserve was asserted with inimitable candor by Secretary of State Richard T. Olney in a message to England over the Venezuela dispute in July 1895: "The U.S. is practically sovereign on this continent and its fiat is law . . . its infinite resources combined with its isolated position render it master of the

situation and practically invulnerable against any or all other powers."

The U.S. was not in business to free Latin America; its aim was to change the locale of domination to Washington. In 1895 another Cuban insurrection against Spain began. President Cleveland said that the U.S. because of "its large pecuniary stake" in the fortunes of Cuba was "inextricably involved."

Expansionists were convinced by 1898 that the fruit had ripened sufficiently for McKinley's intervention. An editorial in the *Washington Post* just before the war, explained: "A new consciousness seems to have come upon us — the consciousness of strength — and with it a new appetite, the yearning to show our strength... The taste of Empire is in the mouth of the people even as the taste of blood in the jungle."

On February 15, 1898, the battleship "Maine" blew up in Cuban waters with the loss of 258 crew members and two officers. The origin of the explosion has never been determined. Those were the days during which William Randolph Hearst's scribblers fabricated Our-Man-In-Havana stories to stir up war.

Artist Frederic Remington cabled his desire to return from Cuba: "Everything is quiet, there is no trouble here. There will be no war." Hearst replied: "Please remain. You furnish the pictures and I'll furnish the war."

Spain agreed early in April 1898 to suspend hostilities, call a Cuban parliament and grant generous local autonomy. There had been widespread indignation over the atrocities committed by Spain's General Weyler and he had been recalled. The American Minister in Spain, General Woodford, cabled McKinley that the Madrid government was willing to grant any autonomy which the insurgents would accept, even complete independence for Cuba. But McKinley "without making public the latest concession from Madrid, sent a militant message to Congress on April 11, 1898, declaring that his efforts were brought to a standstill and the issue was in the hands of Congress" (Charles and Mary Beard, *The Rise of American Civilization*, Vol. 2). Congress interpreted the message as a demand for a declaration of war.

In the Senate, Populists suspecting a ruse for imperialist conquest forced the adoption of a supplement disowning all subterfuges. On April 19, 1898, the U.S. was at war with the most powerless, European colonial state, one that had offered to capitulate before the battle started.

The intent of the Joint Resolution for the Recognition of the Independence of the People of Cuba (*U.S. Statutes at Large*, Vol. 30), April 20, 1898, was clear: "Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the USA in Congress assembled, First. That the people of the Island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent... That the U.S. hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction or control over said Island except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the Island to its people." This was the will of the American people. McKinley had become president on a platform calling for Cuban independence.

AFTER four months, hostilities were over. Contrary to our jingoistic textbooks, it was Cuba's General García who provided the strategy for the Battle of Santiago and a troop of 5,000 Cubans who barred the advance from Holguín of the main Spanish body. *Leatherneck*, (Nov. 1962), the Marine Corps magazine, stated in its historical roundup: "There was little opposition on the beach... the Spanish American War did not amount to much militarily."

Cubans, who had borne the brunt of the fighting, "were not invited to the conferences of the commanders, which closed with the Spaniards' unconditional surrender. And Cuban troops with arms were not admitted to enter the liberated city!" (Waldo Frank — *Cuba Prophetic Island*.)

At the peace treaty signed in Paris (Dec. 10, 1898) Cuba was not even represented. Referring to Cuba, the Treaty states: "Spain relinquishes all claim of sovereignty over

and title to Cuba. And as the Island is, upon its evacuation by Spain, to be occupied by the U.S., the U.S. will, so long as such occupation shall last..." and so on in like vein. The American people wanted Cuban independence. The Joint Declaration of April 20 embodied this desire. Now the deceit was unveiled, "free and independent" was transformed into "occupation."

In his message of December 1897 President McKinley had declared that "forcible annexation... would be criminal aggression." Later he remarked, "when the war is over we must keep what we want." Thus, the U.S., as part of its war for the liberation of Cuba, grabbed Puerto Rico, Guam and the Philippines.

On January 1, 1899, Spanish troops evacuated Cuba to be replaced by U.S. General Leonard Wood's dictatorial occupation. The Cuban army had not yet been disbanded. "Wood invited Generalissimo Gómez and a small group of Cuban leaders to a day's picnic sail on his yacht. While the Daiquiris glittered cold, he assured Gómez that the President meant to honor absolutely the promises of Congress. Moreover McKinley had a balance of \$3 million from the war budget voted by Congress, with which he was ready to pay a \$75 bonus to every Cuban veteran, with one proviso: that the army dissolve. Gómez believed Wood and accepted" (Waldo Frank).

On November 5, 1900, General Wood called a constitutional convention in Havana. The delegates were instructed to write a Constitution and frame a treaty defining future relations between Cuba and the U.S.

Washington faced a problem. There was the resolution of Congress proclaiming to the world that the U.S. desired only peace and not jurisdiction over Cuba. But if power were transferred to the Cuban people, would investments be safe? The situation involved profit versus honor. Then as now it was resolved for profit through falsifications, betrayal and armed might.

With Cubans drafting a treaty and their army dissolved, Senator O. H. Platt defined the relations whereby imperialist domination was assured behind a false facade. Sandwiched between liability of officers for failure to report and longevity payments for engineer battalions, was the nullification of Cuban sovereignty:

"The President is hereby authorized to 'leave the government and control of the island of Cuba to its people so soon as... the government of Cuba consents that the U.S. may exercise the right to intervene for the preservation of Cuban independence, the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property and individual liberty... the government of Cuba will sell or lease to the U.S. lands necessary for coaling or naval stations [Guantanamo Bay]... That by way of further assurance the government of Cuba will embody the foregoing provisions in a permanent treaty with the U.S."

The Cuban people who had fought and suffered for thirty years to win their freedom understood this betrayal. They protested in Cuba and in Washington, but to no avail. The alternative to accepting the Platt amendment was indefinite military occupation. On July 12, 1901, by a vote of 17 to 11, it became part of Cuba's constitution.

On May 20, 1902, U.S. military occupation ended — but not for long. By 1906 U.S. Marines again intervened to "restore order... and establish a stable government after serious revolutionary activity," remaining until 1909 (*Situation in Cuba*, U.S. Senate, Sept. 17, 1962).

The formal "treaties" which transformed Guantanamo into occupied territory were signed on February 16 and July 2, 1903. They provided American imperialism with "complete jurisdiction and control over and within said areas." The treaty gave the U.S. a perpetual lease on the base which can be changed only at Washington's whim.

IN A rare instance of historical candor, a memorandum on Guantanamo prepared by the Department of Defense for its 1961 Appropriations clarified the record: "It is perhaps worthwhile to note that the two lease agreements of 1903

were executed by the Presidents of the two countries and were not submitted to the Congresses of either country for approval." Thus Guantanamo was stolen from Cuba behind the backs of both the American and the Cuban peoples.

That didn't stop the *N.Y. Times* (Oct. 29, 1962) from palming off the "exceptionally low" rental as "indicative of Cuban gratitude to the U.S. for having helped Cuba win independence from Spain." (The revolutionary government of Castro feels no "gratitude" for an enemy base on its territory — it has refused to accept payment of the yearly rental since coming to power.) The origin of the Guantanamo Base is illegitimate, it derives from arbitrary occupation and imperialist aggression. It is based on naked force — as befits such a treaty, it was to extend forever.

In his vivid study, *The Shark and the Sardines*, spotlighting American colonialism in action, Dr. Juan Jose Arevalo, former President of Guatemala, exposed these "treaties." "From these pages we denounce once more the go-between function of International Law, shamelessly placed at the service of the Empire, to hide its fraud, to give an honest appearance to the plundering done by its bankers, to cover up carefully the butchering done by its marines and aviators . . . There is only one contracting party — the one that swallows . . . Law without authority for appeal is not Law. And when orders are dictated by foreign troops, how long does such Law last?"

Marion E. Murphy who was Commander of Guantanamo Base in his "*History of Guantanamo Base*" records that "Some indication of the future role of the [Marine] barracks was noted in 1903. A battalion under Major L. C. Lucas spent about a month on the Station awaiting further transfer to Panama . . . The following decades saw a procession of Marine units enroute to or returning from Caribbean actions."

Guantanamo Bay has been used as a staging area, or as a concentration point of troops and weapons whenever imperialist domination was endangered in the Caribbean. This is partially documented in Murphy's book and more fully in a mimeographed 163-page monograph titled "180 Landings of U.S. Marines, [in times of peace] 1800-1934" by Captain Harry Alanson Ellsworth, U.S. Marine Corps, Officer in Charge, Historical Section, August, 1934. A concise listing of armed interventions is available by writing a Senator requesting *Situation in Cuba*, U.S. Senate, Sept. 17, 1962, #89479.

The following are typical examples from this list. To suppress a Haitian revolt, the 24th Company of Marines, under Capt. William G. Fay from Guantanamo Bay, was transported to Haiti and landed on July 29, 1915. Two thousand Haitians were killed in this Marine operation which lasted until August 15, 1934. In Nicaragua "the revolutionary activities begun in the latter part of 1926 increased to such an extent that additional American forces were necessary" (Ellsworth). Guantanamo Bay answered the call with the 2nd Battalion of the 5th Regiment. The Marines left Nicaragua in 1933.

The land laws imposed under U.S. occupation made Cubans landless while laying the basis for vast North American plantations. Four years after military occupation ended, the Marines returned to smash "a revolution of considerable proportion" which Ellsworth tells us, "was well underway." Guantanamo Commandant Ackerman "armed nine steam launches and two tugs and organized a landing force . . . U.S. intervention had the requisite steadying effect" (Murphy).

On September 29, 1906, William Howard Taft proclaimed that Cuba, left without a government "at a time when great disorder prevails," would be governed by the U.S. Taft proclaimed himself provisional governor. Charles E. Magoon succeeded him, administering Cuba under this second occupation until 1909 when the Marines withdrew.

By 1912 "this Island showed distinct signs of again breaking forth in Revolution" (Ellsworth). The First Regiment landed at Guantanamo on May 28 and a few days later was distributed to different points in the eastern end of Cuba.

In 1917 the Marines acted as strikebreakers and Pinkertons for the Cuban Railroad; they were camped on railroad property. The request for additional Marines who remained until 1922 was motivated by Minister to Cuba, Boaz Long: "In event of Revolution or other disturbances American interests will be [the] first to be destroyed." General Crowder in 1922 stated that if any disturbances developed, "the Marines could be rushed back from Guantanamo within 48 hours. Thus the Cuba Railroad would still have recourse to marine protection, if needed" (*The U.S. and Cuba*, by Robert F. Smith).

TWO ships of the U.S. Navy were sent to Havana for their "moral" effect in 1933. Murphy relates that when the bloody Machado dictatorship fell, "financiers, owners of sugar mills, business men and high ranking Cuban officials found a haven on the station . . . U.S. naval vessels cruised around the coast of Cuba ready to act for the preservation of lives and property." It is worthwhile to note that during Machado's regime of the "Sawed-Off Shotgun" (1925-1933) labor leaders, students and political opponents were butchered; Noske Yalob and Claudio Brouzon were thrown to the sharks; there were machine-gun elections; Luis Blanco Neuman was murdered by the police for presenting a petition to the American Embassy; but the Marines never intervened. As Franklin D. Roosevelt once said of Trujillo: "He may be an S.O.B., but he is our S.O.B."

Following a general strike, Gerardo Machado was overthrown in August 1933 and a new government under Dr. Grau San Martin enacted "an eight hour day . . . a minimum wage for cutting sugar cane . . . the initiation of a program for agrarian reform . . . a reduction in electricity rates . . . The Grau government aroused intense hostility on the part of business interests . . . Mr. Sumner Welles, the American Ambassador, was strongly opposed to the regime, and the U.S. refused to recognize it . . . In January, 1934, the army [under Batista] finally turned against Grau, who was forced to resign . . . The resentment of many Cubans has been increased by the accusation that the Mendieta coalition, which succeeded Grau, was and is largely the creature of American diplomacy. It is pointed out that Washington extended recognition to President Mendieta five days after he took office, although it had denied recognition to President Grau, who stayed in office four months" (*Problems of the New Cuba* — Foreign Policy Association, 1935).

The marines at Guantanamo Bay had earned their keep. Carleton Beals reviewed American domination over Cuba in 1933 (*The Crime of Cuba*). Nearly 90% of the cultivated land was owned or controlled by Americans. "Eighty per cent of the sugar industry belongs to citizens of the U.S.; the rest is controlled chiefly by American creditors. Cuba's second industry — tobacco — is also mostly American. Nearly all the banks, railroads, streetcar lines, electric plants, telephone systems and other public utilities are owned by capital from the U.S."

During Grau's presidency, the U.S. ordered at least twenty nine naval vessels to proceed to Cuba or Key West. Marine air squadrons were alerted; guns and bomb racks were mounted on the planes. Regiments of Marine infantry were assembled at Key West, Florida. In case this would prove insufficient inducement, Secretary Cordell "Hull and Ambassador Welles discussed the possibility of armed intervention in some detail" (*The U.S. and Cuba*, Robert F. Smith).

Ruby Hart Phillips, *N.Y. Times* correspondent, in her book, *Cuba — Island of Paradox*, recounts the political atmosphere in 1933 "with Cuban officialdom trembling in their shoes as to the final action which would be taken by the U.S., a word from the Ambassador was usually sufficient. The memory of U.S. intervention in 1907 still gave an American Ambassador considerable prestige." In addition to the Ambassador, there is the army: "Camp Columbia [which revolutionary Cuba has now transformed into a school] controls not only Havana but the entire Island and the government." Controlling the army, "Batista is doing everything he can

to please Consul General Dumont... He has the arms and ammunition and the soldiers. From now on Cuba is in the same category with all Latin American countries — the army rules." President Mendieta signed a decree on March 7, 1934, suspending constitutional guarantees and placing the country under martial law.

R.H. Phillips understood Washington's purpose: "The U.S. was chiefly interested in the amount of sugar Cuba could produce, and was not going to have sugar production hampered by Revolution."

Machado, whose army was trained by U.S. officers, could guarantee U.S. profits until a general strike overthrew him. Now Batista's army would try the same. The military machine had become so powerful and was in such "responsible" and "friendly" hands, that the U.S. could see no reason for using its own troops when Batista would do the job more cheaply. Meanwhile Roosevelt, who refused to recognize Dr. Grau, but in short order embraced the Batista-Mendieta axis, added prestige to a Cuban government which protected U.S. business interests by modifying the hated Platt Amendment on May 29, 1934, retaining control over Guantanamo.

While the original Guantanamo treaties were imposed under threat of continuing U.S. military occupation, the 1934 treaty, reaffirming U.S. seizure of Guantanamo exactly as it was codified in 1903, was in essence a treaty which the U.S. signed with itself using puppets as front men during a period of martial law with a "Provisional President" in Cuba. This is what Washington means when it says, "The U.S. is in Guantanamo by right of treaty."

IN JUNE of 1958 two of Batista's planes, presumably bombing Cuban revolutionaries in the Sierra Maestra, made emergency landings at Guantanamo and were refueled there. About the same time, Angel Saavedra, an agent of the July 26 Movement at the Cuban Embassy in Washington, secured documents showing that 300 5-inch rocket warheads, weighing nine tons, were delivered to Batista's Air Force on May 19, 1958, from Guantanamo. The U.S. State Department later confirmed this transaction.

Tad Szulc and Karl E. Meyer in their recent book, *The Cuban Invasion*, revealed that "In Cuba, the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) worked mostly out of Havana and Guantanamo Naval Base." In discussing leaders of a counter-revolutionary group, we are told: "They were captured hours after [Sergio] Sanjenis in cooperation with CIA agents spirited Nino Diaz into the Guantanamo Navy Base from Havana... There are good reasons to believe that Diaz had gone into the hills from Guantanamo Navy Base and that the CIA had given him some support."

The CIA had a plan whereby some Cuban torpedo boats would escape from the naval base at Baracoa in Oriente province, but they would have to be refueled. "To help the potential defectors, a privately owned undersea-cable repair ship, the Western Union, put in at Guantanamo to load on her deck several thousand drums of high-octane gasoline. But on her way to the Baracoa rendezvous, the vessel was intercepted by a Cuban warship. Anguished radio messages to Guantanamo sent a U.S. destroyer and Navy aircraft rushing toward the Western Union, and, in the end, the Cuban captain let himself be stared down by the American forces and allowed the cable ship to go. Once discovered, however, the Western Union could no longer pursue her mission..." (*The Cuban Invasion*).

A May 10, 1961 UPI dispatch, datelined Washington, disclosed that during the CIA organized invasion a U.S. submarine was on hand. "It was not learned whether the USS Spikefish was acting as an escort for the rebel landing craft or merely observing the operation... The Navy declined to say anything on the subject... The sub... later showed up at the Guantanamo Naval Base."

Items datelined Guantanamo Naval Base, beginning with "Sources in contact with the Cuban underground say..." (AP Sept. 18) are by now routine.

Following the U.S. break in diplomatic relations with

Cuba, Admiral Arleigh Burke reaffirmed U.S. obligation to return fugitives from Cuba (in accordance with Article 4 of the July 2, 1903 treaty, reasserted May 29, 1934). An AP dispatch (*San Juan Star*, Oct. 19) reported: The Navy said its Guantanamo Base in Cuba is sheltering about 350 Cubans who fled from Fidel Castro's regime but is not allowing them to leave the Island." Within less than one month, 300 Cubans had evaporated. An AP dispatch from Guantanamo (*N. Y. World Telegram*, Nov. 12) divulges that "50 refugees from Castro are here now, although U.S. officials do not admit that." This item also claims that "Cuban workers... are a source of information."

This fits in well with the views of Admiral Burke as expressed in an interview with *U.S. News & World Report* (Oct. 3, 1960): "We shouldn't be apologizing to the world. We're powerful and we're the leader of the world." (Question: "Is the Navy concerned about the situation in Cuba?") "Oh, yes, the Navy is concerned — not about our base at Guantanamo, but about the whole Cuban situation."

WHAT is the present function of foreign military bases, specifically Guantanamo? On March 28, 1961, Kennedy requested Congress to cut back military bases. The *N.Y. Times* reported that Kennedy "has already taken steps to have 73 domestic and foreign installations discontinued." The U.S. maintains a total of 2,230 military installations overseas (*Time*, Nov. 9).

In analyzing overseas bases, the *Wall Street Journal* (Oct. 29) admits: "Ironically, the Navy would probably have been willing to give up Guantanamo at the start of the Castro era; it's basically a convenient, warm-water training base for newly outfitted ships and is no longer vital for guarding the Panama Canal. Now such a pullout might be interpreted as a surrender and so is considered undesirable."

In our age of guided missiles, the occupied territory of Cuba does not protect the U.S. mainland; it remains important to Washington's drive against the Cuban Revolution and against the struggles of the Latin American people for their national liberation. The presence of U.S. armed troops in Guantanamo has been a persistent violation of Cuban sovereignty.

The final declaration (Sept. 6, 1961) of the Belgrade Conference of Nonaligned Nations including India, Algeria, Morocco and the United Arab Republics demanded the immediate elimination of all manifestations of imperialism including the abolition of all foreign military bases. The Conference of 25 nations, declared that "the North American military base at Guantanamo, Cuba, to the permanence of which the Government and people of Cuba have expressed their opposition, affects the sovereignty and territorial integrity of that country."

Dr. Fidel Castro in his November 1, 1962, speech asked for "the withdrawal of the naval base at Guantanamo and the return of the territory occupied by the U.S.... A truly convincing deed would be for the U.S. to return the territory which it occupies at the naval base at Guantanamo."

Herbert L. Matthews in his book, *The Cuban Story* (1961), declares: "Sooner or later we are going to have to give up Guantanamo Bay because in the modern world it is not possible indefinitely to hold a military base in a foreign country against the wishes of the people of that country. France, Britain and Spain were unable to hold on to their bases in the Middle East and North Africa, and we are having to give up our air bases in Morocco."

Hanson Baldwin maintains that Guantanamo's importance lies in providing "comparative values"; it is "a sanctuary of freedom."

J. Robert Moskin in a feature story from Guantanamo (*Look* April 11, 1961) concretizes these lofty values. "Guantanamo's greatest fame has been as a recreation center for the fleet." In the "old days" this "was a lazy, luxurious station and a playground for the men from the ships. Rum and sin in the neighboring towns, were mighty attractions."

But there's something for everybody; there are attractions

(Continued on page 22)

American Labor – Fact and Fiction

A mass of evidence contradicts the steady rumors of the current decline of the American labor movement. The future, in fact, promises a different prospect

by Art Preis

A NATIONAL trade union organization has existed continuously in the United States since the founding of the American Federation of Labor (AFL) in 1886. But only within the past twenty-five years has the organized labor movement assumed truly massive proportions. Organization of the industrial workers — most strategically placed and decisive sector of American labor — was not even successfully begun until the 1935-1941 period. Not until the spring of 1941, little more than two decades ago, did the Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO) win its conclusive victories in the automobile and steel industries with the first successful strikes and union contracts in Ford Motor Co. and Bethlehem Steel Corp.

The swift rise and gigantic growth of American organized labor within the historically brief span of a quarter of a century has induced a condition in the American capitalist class akin to what psychiatrists term a traumatic shock. The owning and employing class is like a person who never has been seriously ill and is felled suddenly by a dangerous ailment. Thereafter, he notes every twinge and palpitation, every rise or fall in his temperature, however slight.

Just within the past twenty-five years, vast staffs of labor experts, economists and statisticians, both governmental and private, have been mobilized to study and plot the growth or decline, the shifts in composition, the tendencies and trends of the American working class, its organized sector in particular.

Now, every day, week and month, new reports on the condition of American labor and its organization pour forth to enlighten us on the slightest change within the wage-earning class and the labor movement. The ruling class and its agencies, particularly the government, track the course of American labor with the absorption and concern of the U.S. Weather Bureau and Coast Guard in charting the path, speed, intensity, area and possible shifts in direction of a hurricane sweeping north out of the Caribbean.

Despite the data being collected on labor and the constant refinement of methods used to obtain this data, it is astounding how much inaccurate and downright false information is being circulated both outside and within the labor movement. For, along with the increasing statistical study and analysis has come a sharpening of the fine art of manipulating and misinterpreting the accumulated data. We have to be ever more on the alert against false, one-sided or misleading conclusions drawn from apparently solid, factual evidence.

Two startling examples of such manipulation and misinterpretation have come to hand recently. Both have to do with the question of the division of the national income, which is at the very heart of the struggle between capital and labor.

In the first example, Herman P. Miller, a special assist-

ant in the demographic section of the Bureau of the Census, exposes the "myth . . . created in the United States that incomes are becoming more evenly distributed," a "view held by prominent economists of both major political parties" and "also shared by the editors of the influential mass media." Miller's exposé appears in *The New York Times Magazine*, November 11, 1962. In his article, entitled "Is the Income Gap Closed? 'No!'," Miller names top economic advisers of the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations, in addition to *Fortune* magazine and *The New York Times* itself as propagators of the myth of the more equal distribution of income.

In giving his "No!" answer to the question, "Has there been any narrowing of the gap between rich and poor?" Miller cites "data in U.S. Government publications available to us all." If we stick to these figures, he points out, "the answers are clear, unambiguous, and contrary to widely held beliefs. The statistics show no appreciable change in income shares for nearly twenty years." The share of the national income going to the lower three-fifths of America's families has not increased in almost two decades; the share retained by the top fifth, who get forty-five per cent of the nation's income, has not decreased. The lowest twenty per cent of the family groups continues to get but five per cent of the national income, the same as in the past twenty years.

NO SOONER is one myth destroyed, however, than another is created. A week after Miller's article appeared, the November 18 *New York Times* published a news story from Washington, headlined:

"Gain in Living Standards Found to Top Price Rises"

According to this dispatch, a seven-city survey by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics shows "that purchasing power has gone up by 20 to 40 per cent in the last 10 to 12 years." A cross-section of families, including exactly 212 families in New York City, was questioned and it was determined that their spending has increased 39 per cent while the consumer price index has risen only 15 per cent since 1950. The survey did not go back before 1950. If it had, Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz might not have cited it. For the findings might have been considerably different. The Bureau of Labor Statistics consumers' price index, which has risen 15 per cent since 1950, recorded a rise in the previous decade of 72 per cent. If purchasing power has actually gone up "by 20 to 40 per cent" since 1950 it means only that the workers have been catching up a bit with the World War II and post-war inflation.

The distortion and misinterpretation of data on such vital matters as the division of the national income and the trend of consumer purchasing power are paralleled in the

study and analysis of the American labor movement and such closely related matters as the class structure of U.S. society and the composition and weight of the wage-earning sector of the population.

Ever since the AFL and CIO merged in December 1955 to form the largest independent labor organization in world history there has been a growing campaign to convey the impression that the labor movement is in rapid decline and that, at any rate, organized labor has reached its natural limits because the so-called "blue-collar" workers, traditionally the main base of the trade unions, are declining in relation to the total labor force and even in absolute numbers.

Within recent months a slew of magazine and newspaper articles, some employing impressive statistical data, have been discussing and analyzing the "decline" of organized labor. Prominent labor leaders themselves have been uttering dire forebodings based on shifts in the per capita intake. Leading liberal publications, generally regarded as having a sympathetic attitude toward organized labor, have been participating in the discussion and expressing apprehensions of their own.

In my article, "The Myth of 'People's Capitalism,'" published in the Winter 1962 issue of the *International Socialist Review*, I examined the claim made in an editorial in *The New York Times*, February 7, 1960, that the numerical strength of organized labor in the United States had "sharply declined" in the 1956-1958 period, thus "reversing a trend of some twenty-five years." Citing the actual statistical data, I showed that the "sharp decline" amounted only to 1.7%.

On February 21, 1961, at a meeting of the AFL-CIO Executive Council at Miami Beach, Fla., organizing director John Livingston reported with great alarm that all organized workers in the country represented 38% of the organizable workers compared to 40% five years before. He said this could spell union labor's "obituary." Seven months before, on June 3, 1960, Jacob S. Potofsky, President of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, declared that organized labor faced the "grave danger" of a fast-shrinking membership. Previously, on November 9, 1959, Walter P. Reuther, United Automobile Workers President and an AFL-CIO Vice President, told a convention of the AFL-CIO Industrial Union Department which he heads that "We are going backward" and that the labor movement was "flabby." His reference to flabbiness came just two days after the termination of the greatest single industrial strike in U.S. history, the grueling 116-day national steel strike. In the same speech, Reuther proclaimed, "The merger we put together in 1955 never got off the ground . . . We have been pushed around and put through the meat grinder. If we sulk in our tents we'll be pushed back and back . . . We have to stand up."

The current crop of articles and statements follows much the same pattern as these earlier complaints of leading union officials. One of these articles, however, has aroused particular attention and interest. It is "Labor's Ebbing Strength," by George Kirstein, publisher of *The Nation*, the venerable liberal weekly. The article was published in the magazine's September 1 issue. Kirstein came to national prominence during World War II when he served for a period as Executive Secretary of the National War Labor Board.

It is not my purpose to discuss the article as a whole and its important conclusions, which are analyzed at some length by Milton Alvin in this issue of the *International Socialist Review*.

I wish to direct attention to the two opening paragraphs of Kirstein's article in which he states the basic premises on which the entire article rests. He writes that "labor's power and prestige have sunk in 1962 to a depth unequalled since World War II" and this is demonstrated first of all by the fact that union membership, "continuing its descending curve, has shrunk to new lows for the last twenty-five years . . ."

BEFORE we look at Kirstein's less measurable point about labor's "power and prestige," let us examine the more tangible matter of the "new lows for the last twenty-five years" allegedly reached by union membership today. Maybe, Kirstein put down a vague impression derived from such sources as the previously quoted *New York Times* editorial comment about union membership "reversing a trend of some twenty-five years." Or maybe his entire editorial staff was out having a beer and he asked the office boy, "Do you think organized labor is as strong now as it was back in the good old New Deal days?" and the kid replied, "I wasn't even born then but I hear tell that the CIO was sure hoppin' back then and even Roosevelt was scared of John L. Lewis." So Kirstein figured it was safe to say union membership is at its lowest point in a quarter of a century.

It just so happens that nothing could be farther from the truth. Total union membership, despite extensive unemployment, particularly in the steel and coal industries, remains not much below the 1956 peak of 18,400,000 — a number based, incidentally, on inflated figures issued by the union leaders at the time of the AFL-CIO merger, as I shall presently show.

The Department of Labor on last October 8 issued a report on its latest and most accurate survey of trade union membership. Total union membership in the United States is 17,546,000. This must be regarded as a reasonably hard figure because the data was obtained under the stringent regulations of the 1959 Landrum-Griffin Act which exacts severe penalties for inaccurate statements by union officials under the Act's compulsory reporting provisions.

What was the union membership twenty-five years ago in the heroic days of the rise of the CIO which Kirstein recalls in such a glowing light. Let me quote from my article, "The Myth of 'People's Capitalism.'" A little more than a year ago, I wrote:

"But before anyone hangs a wreath on the American labor movement . . . let us review certain basic facts. Twenty-eight years ago — in 1933 — there were only 2,782,296 union members, or 7.8% of the organizable workers, after 47 years of AFL activity. In 1935, the year the CIO was formed, organized workers numbered 3,616,847, or 10.6% of potential unionists. By 1937, after the CIO went into action, union membership more than doubled, numbering 7,687,087, or 21.9% of organizable workers."

These figures are from the appendix of Edward Levinson's classic history of the early CIO, *Labor on the March*. Contrary to Kirstein's idealized picture of the American labor movement twenty-five years ago as compared to today, the unions today have two and a third times the number of members and almost double the proportion of organizable workers.

Well, maybe Kirstein slipped up on his dates. Maybe he was really thinking about ten or twelve years ago, not twenty-five. All right. Let's see how today's nearly 17.5 million union members compare with the number in 1950 and 1953.

The *World Almanac*, which annually collates all the data on union memberships from the Bureau of Labor Statistics and from direct questionnaires to the unions, lists in its 1952 edition the "approximate" total of labor union members on June 30, 1950, as "14,000,000 to 16,800,000."

One reason for the wide spread in the approximation is the fact that the CIO leaders — it was before the Landrum-Griffin Act — had reported grossly exaggerated membership and the fact was well known. The *World Almanac* listed AFL membership in 1950 at 8,000,000 and the CIO's at "5,000,000 to 6,000,000." In 1949, the CIO had reached the climax of a four-year internal "cold war" between pro-State Department and pro-Stalinist cliques. It ended with the expulsion of eleven affiliated unions. At the November 1950 CIO convention, it was revealed that the actual CIO

membership at the time of the 1949 split convention had been 3,700,000, not "5,000,000 to 6,000,000."

In the spring of 1953, according to the 1954 edition of the *World-Almanac*, the "approximate total" of labor union membership was "16,500,000 to 17,000,000." This included 8,000,000 in the AFL, 5,000,000 in the CIO and 2,500,000 in independent unions. According to my arithmetic, the three breakdown figures add up to only 15,500,000, not "16,500,000 to 17,000,000."

We do know that two years later, at the time of the AFL-CIO merger, the CIO membership was considerably less than the 6,000,000 claimed. J. B. S. Hardman, for many years editor of *Advance*, official publication of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, one of the major CIO affiliates, revealed in the January 4, 1958 issue of *The Nation* that at the time of the AFL-CIO merger the CIO "entered as pretty much of a junior partner, its stationary 4,000,000 members unimpressive against the AFL's affiliation of 10,000,000 and advancing."

Hardman confirmed what most of us surmised at the time of the merger that the CIO membership was closer to 4,000,000 than to the claimed 6,000,000. If this is true — and it is — then the hard figure of 17,456,000 labor union members today remains impressive compared not merely to 1937 but to 1955.

WHAT is true about the decline in labor union membership is that a few key unions — notably in steel, automobile, coal and railroads — have had a fall in membership of one degree or another in the past decade. The decline has been most steep in coal mining and railroad-ing. Here it is sufficient to note that even before the great depression of the Thirties, during the "Golden Twenties," coal was known as a "sick industry" and the current sharp fall in the United Mine Workers membership — some two-thirds in ten years — is the continuation of a trend, based on technological development, which began more than forty years ago and was halted temporarily only during the exceptional periods of World War II and the Korean War. The railroad unions have gone through a similar technologically based four-decade decline.

We come now to the hard kernel of fact in the talk about the "rapid decline" in union membership. What really is at the heart of this question is the drop in the membership of the United Automobile Workers and United Steelworkers, whose organization in the 1935-1941 period is correctly regarded as the CIO's two greatest achievements.

Both these unions are considerably reduced in membership from their peaks at the end of the Korean War a decade ago. But they are not down to mere skeletons or shadows by any means. Not only are they still completely entrenched in the basic auto and steel industries but they are giants both in membership and material resources compared to any time before World War II and rank among the five largest unions. Here are comparative membership figures from 1941:

	Automobile Workers	Steelworkers
November 1941	400,000	500,000
June 30, 1950	947,598	960,738
April 1953	1,350,000	1,100,000
June 1956	1,353,993	1,032,346
June 30, 1961	995,000	796,000

At the end of 1961, the net assets of the American unions totaled more than \$1.5 billion, aside from huge welfare and pension funds. While the United Steelworkers and the United Auto Workers do not approach the net assets of the United Mine Workers with its \$105,355,886, the UAW isn't doing too badly for a union that owned nothing but debts at the time of its historic General Motors sit-down strike in the winter of 1936-37 which established the UAW for the first time in the biggest corporation of the auto "Big Three."

The UAW, as of December 31, 1961, had net assets of \$57,284,000; the Steelworkers, \$22,010,035. This compares with the \$25,445,296 of the million-member International Association of Machinists; the \$18,430,523 of the 771,000-member International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; the \$22,249,785 of David Dubinsky's 446,000-member International Ladies Garment Workers Union; or the \$36,760,351 of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters with its 1,661,983 members. Of course, there are several dozen capitalist corporations with individual assets larger than those of all labor unions combined. But the unions of today command material resources — cash, investments, real estate — beyond anything even dreamed of in the Forties let alone the depression Thirties. In its first two years, 1935-37, the CIO was largely financed by about a million dollars in grants and loans from John L. Lewis' United Mine Workers. The Steel Workers Organizing Committee (SWOC), the original organization of the CIO Steelworkers, did not even charge dues during its first great organizing drive in 1937.

This is a good point to discuss — and eliminate — one of the major factors most frequently cited as a reason for the membership declines in such unions as the UAW and Steelworkers. That is unemployment due to what has been termed automation — the employment of electronic and other forms of automatic controls in production to reduce the use of labor power to the starting and stopping of the power flow and the maintenance and repair of machinery and equipment. President John F. Kennedy, in his message to Congress last January, termed automation the big economic challenge of this decade.

True enough, unemployment has been a very decisive factor in preventing any over-all growth of organized labor in the past five years, except in the case of such unions as the International Association of Machinists and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, both AFL-CIO, and the independent International Brotherhood of Teamsters. But contrary to what the Kennedy administration, many economists and quite a few labor leaders contend, automation is not the critical element yet in unemployment.

REPORTING a recent study by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the November 5 *Wall Street Journal* noted that in a comparison of the years 1959 and 1953, periods of relatively high industrial activity, more than half the decline in jobs in those industries which had falling employment were due to decrease in total output not increased technological efficiency. The *Journal* wrote that "job declines totaling 745,000 were associated with increases in efficiency, while declines totaling the somewhat larger number of 795,000 were associated merely with decreases in production by the industries concerned."

Increases in "efficiency," however, do not mean improved machinery or automation. A survey in the November *Factory*, McGraw-Hill trade publication, reveals that the major cause of "job displacement" in factories employing 1,000 or more workers is "improvement in business methods" and general "efficiency" rather than "modern machinery," which runs a poor second to the "real villain" in wiping out jobs. Thus, in the basic metalworking industry during the first half of 1962, improved "work methods" — that includes good old-fashioned speed-up — were responsible for the loss of 54% of white-collar jobs and 30% of blue-collar jobs. Only 5% of the white-collar and 16% of the blue-collar jobs were eliminated by new machinery. Improved "work methods" were held responsible for 34% of the white-collar and 49% of the blue-collar job cuts in the chemical industry; slashes due to new equipment were only 19% and 13% respectively.

But "decreases in production," as indicated in the previously cited November 5 *Wall Street Journal*, has been the arch villain in the unemployment situation. Take the automobile industry, which has been issuing such glowing

reports of 1962 last quarter production. Ward's automotive report on November 12 said that the automobile industry is anticipating a total car output for the entire year of 6,846,000. This is more than a million below the peak annual production of 7,942,000 in 1955, seven years ago. It is little higher than the 6,665,628 cars produced in 1950, twelve years ago.

The picture of steel production is even more revealing. During the second and third quarters of this year, the steel industry operated at between 45% and 55% of the 1961 rated capacity. In this month of November, even with the stimulus of the Cuban war crisis, the steel industry has been operating at about 61% of capacity. Based on the tonnage production index of 100 for the 1957-59 period, the index for the four weeks ending November 10 was 95.1. *Iron Age*, steel industry trade magazine, explained on November 14 that the \$1.4 billion capital expenditures expected next year are intended to cut costs and increase efficiency, not to expand production. The steel industry's present "break-even" point — the point where it begins to make profit — is 42% of capacity.

In spite of the factor of unemployment, the major causes of which are "efficiency" and lowered total output, the union movement of today not only remains gigantic in human and financial resources compared to twenty-five years and even ten years ago but it has more contracts and better contractual terms than in all American labor history. More than 100,000 collective bargaining agreements are negotiated each year and it is extremely rare for such agreements not to contain some gain for the workers, although for some key unions, like the Auto Workers, Steelworkers and Ladies Garment Workers, the recent gains have been minimal and not commensurate with the real size and resources of these unions and the capacity of their members for struggle.

EARLY this year, the Kennedy administration sought to impose a ceiling on wage increases in union contracts. The President indicated a limit of 2.5% to 3% based on the estimated annual average increase in hourly output per worker in industry. On November 10, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that in the first nine months of 1962 major collective bargaining settlements covering 3,100,000 workers had been negotiated. The median increase for all the workers covered by these contracts was 3.2% of straight time hourly earnings. (Median is the point where half got more and half got less.) But for those who received raises the median increase was 3.4%.

The significant fact is that the majority of workers securing increases got gains of well over 3%. This was particularly true of construction workers, transportation and other non-factory workers. The San Francisco-Oakland Bay Area construction workers, after a strike of 200,000, won wage increases of from 7% to 8.4%. Airline pilots won 8%, although the Eastern Airlines strike is still not settled at this writing. West Coast dock workers netted 6.2%; textile mill workers from 3.25% in the North to 5% for some mills in the South; non-operating railroad workers, 4.1%; copper miners, 3.8%; telephone workers, 3.5%.

The aluminum, glass and oil workers were restricted to a bare 3% while the steelworkers, under the direct pressure of the Kennedy administration, settled for 2.5%, all in fringe benefits. This latter settlement, involving a half-million workers, seriously dragged down the total average gains.

The fact is that the workers won what the union leaders were willing to let them fight for. Thus, the Teamsters Union, headed by James R. Hoffa, in late September and early October, through a brief strike of several IBT locals won New Jersey-New York area contracts providing a 37-cent an hour wage increase for 57,000 truck drivers.

One fact cited as evidence of the "rapid decline" of the American labor movement is the smaller number of

strikes, strikers and man-days lost due to strikes. In his August 13 broadcast and televised speech on the nation's economy, President Kennedy boasted of his "extraordinary record of labor peace in the last eighteen months." The press prominently reported the fact that in July 1962 man-hours lost in strikes reached the lowest point for any month since World War II.

Of course, the month in question also saw the greatest number of wage earners enjoying union-won paid vacations of any month in U.S. history. Aside from that, as A. H. Raskin noted in an article in the November 11 *New York Times*, "The strike front just won't stay zippered up." In fact, an examination of the over-all strike statistics for the first half of 1962 shows a total of 9,800,000 man-days lost in strikes — a 62% rise over the first half of 1961. During the first quarter of this year, the number of workers on strike rose 38% over the corresponding quarter of 1961.

There are other factors to take into account in analyzing the over-all decline in strikes since 1953 — not just in the "last eighteen months."

A study of the annual strike statistics since 1920 reveals that the eight-year period, 1946 through 1953, coinciding except for 1953 with the last Democratic administration, was the greatest strike period in U.S. history. The years 1950 through 1953, during the Korean war, saw the largest number of strikes for any four-year period, climaxed by the all-time annual record of 5,117 strikes in 1952.

The reason for this great upsurge in strikes ranging over an eight-year period has already been indicated in the early part of this article. A rampant inflation, boosting the consumers' price index 72%, occurred during World War II and the post-war period. In addition, direct federal, state and local taxes levied in the same period took an estimated one-third of the average wage-earner's income. After a brief pause in the inflation during the Truman recession of 1949-50, the rise was resumed during the Korean war, when more than one-half of the 15% rise in the price index during the decade of the Fifties was recorded.

The decline in strikes over the past decade can be attributed neither to Kennedy's policies since he took office in January 1960 nor to any shift in the programs and attitudes of the top union leaders. The latter were just as permeated with the philosophy of class collaboration, just as opposed to militancy, just as subservient to the capitalist government in the 1946-53 period as they have been since and are today. The difference was the greater inflationary pressure on the workers which forced them to strike and forced the union bureaucrats to go along, even though reluctantly.

THERE is another very important element in the decline in strikes over the recent years. That is the long-term contract with built-in automatic annual wage increases. The trend toward long-term contracts, now averaging between two and three years in duration, began with the signing of the notorious five-year General Motors contract in 1950 by UAW President Walter Reuther. It was hoped that such a contract would preserve "labor peace" for a long time in the auto industry and dampen the tradition of militancy among the auto workers. The Korean War was begun about a month after the GM contract went into effect. The renewed inflationary trend brought such rank-and-file condemnation of the five-year "handcuffs" contract that Reuther was forced in 1953 to demand a wage reopener in spite of the contract. In fear of a strike, GM yielded.

It is well to keep in mind, however, that in the glorious days of twenty-five years ago for which *Nation* publisher Kirstein sighs, it took a major General Motors strike, including the historic "sit-down" occupation of the company's main plants in Flint, Mich., to win a six-month contract, after CIO President John L. Lewis indignantly rejected

President Roosevelt's offer to propose a one-month contract to settle the strike and get the workers off GM's property.

A recent study by the Bureau of Labor Statistics shows that union contracts are increasingly of longer duration. In 1956, about 15% of the contracts covering 1,000 or more workers were for three years, in contrast to the traditional one- and two-year contracts of the previous twenty years. By 1961, the proportion of three-year contracts had risen to more than 30%.

In order to get the workers to accept long-term contracts, the employers must agree to automatic annual wage concessions. In a sense, these are deferred wage increases because it is possible that the workers might insist on larger initial increases if the yearly wage raise were not built into the contract. Nevertheless, such automatic increases averaged 8 cents an hour so far this year and 8.2 cents in 1961 compared to average negotiated increases of 7.5 cents and 7.8 cents respectively, according to the Bureau of National Affairs, a Washington research organization in the labor market field.

But even with the diminution of the inflationary pressure and the increase of long-term contracts providing automatic annual wage raises, the current period is by no means the low-point of strikes during the past twenty-five years. The impression that organized labor moved steadily onward and upward following the 1937 upsurge of the CIO is wrong. In the matter of strikes, the three-year period following the smashing of the Little Steel strike in the summer of 1937 and the period of U.S. participation in World War II from December 8, 1941 to August 14, 1945 were far more repressed years for labor than the latest period. Here is the comparative statistical chart:

Strikes in the United States

Year	Number Stoppages	Workers Involved	Man Days Idle
1937	4,740	1,861,000	28,425,000
1938	2,772	688,000	9,148,000
1939	2,613	1,171,000	17,812,000
1940	2,508	577,000	6,701,000
1941	4,288	2,363,000	23,048,000
1942	2,968	840,000	4,183,000
1943	3,752	1,981,000	13,501,000
1944	4,956	2,116,000	8,721,000
1945	4,750	3,470,000	38,000,000
1958	3,694	2,060,000	23,900,000
1959	3,708	1,880,000	69,000,000
1960	3,333	1,320,000	19,100,000
1961 (Jan.-July)	2,010 (est.)	704,000 (est.)	7,410,000 (est.)

Even a cursory study of these figures is revealing. In both 1958 and 1959, regarded as "quiet" years on the labor front, the number of strikers was greater than in 1937, the record year for the two decades, 1920-1940. The figures for 1960, low point of the decade, were still far larger in every strike category than in 1938, 1939, 1940 and 1942. Even for the seven-month period in 1961 for which I have available statistics at this writing, there were more strikers than in the entire years of 1939 and 1940 and more man-days lost due to strikes than in all of either 1940 or 1942. And as I showed earlier in this article, the first half of this year far surpassed the comparable period of 1961 both in the number of strikers and the man-days lost.

This does not tell the whole story. The strikes of the recent "quiet" years with few exceptions brought material gains in wages, benefits and improved working conditions. Most of the strikes in the 1937-1941 period were fought for simple union recognition — to compel an employer to agree to meet with a union committee and negotiate. The Little Steel strike of 1937 — the largest steel walkout since the smashed 1919 Great Steel Strike — was wiped

out in blood. The low figures for man-days lost during the World War II years represent wholesale breaking of strikes by the quick action of the government and the cooperation of the union leaders during a period of fast-rising prices while wages were officially frozen.

The facts I have just cited also throw light on the low state of "labor's power and prestige" which so concerns Kirstein. I do not know if labor's "power and prestige" today are any lower than during the Little Steel strike of 1937, when the police of Roosevelt's "New Deal" colleague, Mayor Kelly of Chicago, murdered ten workers in the Memorial Day Massacre at the Republic steel plant and Roosevelt answered John L. Lewis' plea for help with the cynical reply, "A plague on both your houses."

CERTAINLY, labor's "power and prestige" are no lower than during World War II when wages were frozen while prices soared and every strike was smashed except the four national strikes of the coal miners in 1943, when John L. Lewis stood up to the lynch cries of the national press and the tirades of Roosevelt and Congress and the miners won their greatest victory.

It is not quite clear from Kirstein's article just how he measures labor's "power and prestige." But to my way of thinking, labor's "power and prestige" can't sink much lower than it was during the 1947-1952 period of the Truman administration — the same Truman who woke up on the morning after Election Day, 1948, to find out he'd been unexpectedly re-elected to the Presidency and exclaimed, "Labor did it!"

It was in June 1947 that Congress enacted the Taft-Hartley Act, condemned by every sector of organized labor as a "slave labor law." The most significant political fact about the passage of this Act was that the overwhelming majority of both capitalist parties — Democratic as well as Republican — in both the House and Senate voted for this bill.

What is most significant of all is that President Truman invoked the injunctive powers of the Act against actual or threatened strikes seven times in 1948 and three times more before the end of his term in January 1953. This did not include his strikebreaking seizures of railroads, coal mines and steel plants.

There was not a single union man in Congress to speak or vote against the Taft-Hartley bill. There was no mass action of any kind initiated or led by either the CIO or AFL national leaders in opposition to passage of the T-H Act. All but a handful of labor leaders, notably John L. Lewis, Charles P. Howard of the International Typographical Union and Matthew Smith of the Mechanics Educational Society, took the degrading Taft-Hartley "non-Communist" oath.

In the spring of 1948, the top union leaders, particularly of the CIO, were hurling invectives against Truman and had initiated a "Draft Eisenhower" campaign. On April 4, 1948, the *Detroit Free Press* carried an interview with Walter Reuther, head of the CIO's largest affiliate, who complained that "Truman is hopelessly inadequate" and hoped that "some competent man like Eisenhower will be nominated by the Democrats." Surely, when Reuther and the rest of the labor leaders shortly fell into line behind Truman, campaigned furiously for him and hailed his election as a "great labor victory," that was a pretty low point in labor's "power and prestige."

There is one other measurable factor most frequently cited as the conclusive argument against any further possibility of growth of the U.S. labor unions and, indeed, as certain evidence that the unions must inevitably decline. Kirstein raises the argument as his concluding point when he refers to "the white-collar worker, who is now surpassing the blue-collar worker in numbers" and who, "one thing is certain," will "not join the production worker's union."

It is not my purpose to take up the arguable point of

whether white-collar workers will or will not join a blue-collar workers' union. I wish to concentrate on the fiction, accepted as unquestionable fact by even well-informed and good-intentioned people like Kirstein, that the blue-collar workers are in decline and that the white-collar workers are inheriting the American earth.

In my previously cited article, "The Myth of 'People's Capitalism,'" I reported the Bureau of Labor Statistics data for July 10-16, 1960, on the occupational division of the gainfully employed in this country. As of that date, I wrote:

"Two-thirds of all the gainfully employed are males — 90% of them white. An outright majority — 58.4% — of all employed males are in the manual, service and farm laborer classifications . . . Factory operatives and kindred workers form the largest single group of male employes, 19.2%. Then come craftsmen, 18.7%; non-agricultural laborers, 9%; service workers (a wide category including domestic servants, repairmen, laundry workers, elevator operators, janitors, clothes pressers, garbage collectors, barbers, hotel, restaurant and bar workers, police and firemen, etc.) 6.5%; and hired farm laborers, 4.9%.

"All income earners of both sexes totaled 68,689,000 in the above-cited BLS report. Of these, 37,449,000 — or a 54% majority — are in physical labor categories, including operatives, craftsmen, laborers, service workers and hired farm hands. Clerical workers number 9,907,000 and sales workers, 4,405,000. The latter two 'white collar' groups total 14,312,000. They formed 20.8% of the employed working force in July 1960. Even if we add to them a mixed category listed as 'professional, technical and kindred workers,' numbering 7,042,000, or 10.3% of the total, we cannot stretch the 'white collar' workers to more than 31.1% of the gainfully employed."

I pointed out, however, that in arriving at the conclusion that white-collar workers outnumber blue-collar workers, the classification of the service workers, who until 1960 were classified with the manual labor group, was transferred to the "white-collar" category and the remaining classifications of "managers, officials and proprietors" and "farm owners and farm managers," together representing 14.4% of the total, are lumped in with the white-collar wage-earners.

TO THIS statistical data, I am now able to add information based on an actual census presented in the October 1962 *Scientific American*, unquestionably the finest and most authoritative general science periodical published in this country. It is contained in the article, "More from the Census of 1960," by Philip H. Hauser, chairman of the Technical Advisory Committee for the census of 1960 and head of the department of sociology at the University of Chicago.

Prof. Hauser has broken the census figures down into two general categories, "Providers of Services" and "Producers of Goods."

Before we examine these figures, it should be noted that all managers and proprietors are listed as "producers of services" and all farmers, who are owners of their means of production and very frequently employers, are listed as "producers of goods."

Hauser's article contains a chart showing the continuous ratio of the various sectors of the labor force from 1900 to 1960. This chart reveals that aside from the farmers, who are in the main petty capitalists, the chief classifications of the "producers of physical goods" — the so-called blue-collar workers or operatives (factory workers mainly) and craftsmen (construction trades, etc.) — have increased in absolute numbers every year since 1900 and, every year right through to 1960, have represented a larger proportion of the total labor force. That is, the main base of the labor unions is not narrowing; it is widening.

In his two main categories, Hauser lists 54.4% in "producers of services," including "42.2 per cent in white collar occupations and 12 per cent in household service and other service occupations." Remember, "service occupations" include the \$40-a-week Puerto Rican and Negro hospital workers in New York City who this year engaged in such a militant strike. He adds that "only 46 per cent were engaged in work directly contributing to the production of physical goods."

He immediately adds, however, that "the decline in production workers is entirely attributable to the reduction in the number of farmers, farm laborers and nonfarm laborers. Since 1900 agricultural employment has fallen from 37.5 per cent to only 6.3 per cent of the labor force . . ." He further adds that "men are still engaged primarily in the production of goods (three-fifths of the male work force in 1960, compared with four-fifths in 1900), the white-collar and service functions that have come to the fore have been taken over to a large extent by women . . ." On the average, women workers earn only two-thirds the average wages of male workers.

Here is the break-down for the various classifications of "producers of goods" in 1900 and 1960 as a percentage of the total labor force:

Occupation	1900	1960
Craftsmen	10%	14.1%
Operatives	12%	20.1%
Laborers (non-farm)	12.5%	5.5%
Farm Laborers	17.5%	2.3%
Service (Incl. Domestic)	9%	19.0%

If the unions were to stick to only the above categories of manual workers, although such white-collar and professional workers as the New York City school teachers and newspaper reporters went on strike this year, they could double the present labor union membership, from 17.5 million to 35 million. As a matter of fact, the AFL-CIO announced on November 14 a plan for an organizing campaign in the Los Angeles area, where there are about 5,000 unorganized firms with 750,000 potentially organizable workers.

IF ORGANIZED labor faces a critical period ahead — and it does, it won't be because the union membership is in "rapid decline" or because the blue-collar workers are disappearing. It will be due to the policies and program of the union leadership.

For one thing, the unions will have to develop a political action program and organization that will be completely independent of the old capitalist two-party set-up. The labor experts of the capitalist class don't low-grade labor's potential power and prestige in the political as well as economic arena. Thus, John D. Pomfret, labor reporter, wrote before this year's elections in the October 24 *New York Times* about "labor's principal political asset — sheer mass. The nation's 17,500,000 union members and their families are an enormous political force."

You bet. If they had their own party, they could turn the Democratic and Republican parties almost overnight into minor parties. They could be the government.

November 27, 1962

Subscribe Now!

Unionism and its Critics

The sins of the leaders are visited upon the ranks and a great movement staggers under the dead weight of a narrow, conservative and corrupting bureaucracy

By Milton Alvin

THE bitterest critics of "the state of the unions" are to be found in the shops. The peppery judgments by militants on working conditions and the grievances of Negroes who resent continued inequalities of treatment would have to be expurgated before they could be put in print.

However, the complaints of working men and women rarely get extensive publicity in national publications.

Some magazines and research organizations have recently sponsored friendly critics of the labor movement who are exhibiting growing concern over its defaults and declining influence. These commentators write about labor's future in a pessimistic tone and under lugubrious-sounding titles.

Typical are the following: "The Decline of the Labor Movement," by Solomon Barkin, published by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions; "Labor's Ebbing Strength," by George Kirstein, *The Nation*, Sept. 1, 1962; "Is Labor on the Skids?" by Thomas B. Morgan, *Look* magazine, Sept. 11, 1962.

These critics are not so much bothered by the speedup in the shops as by the failure of organized labor to provide support to middle-class elements looking for allies or leadership in the solution of vital political and social problems. Political differentiation has gone on within the large and heterogeneous middle classes in recent years. Some middle-class elements have moved to the right and have even become a reservoir of recruitment for John Birchism and similar ultra-reactionary trends. At the opposite pole, however, the primary movement has been to the left in support of the civil-rights struggle, civil liberties, and for peace. But to date this movement has developed without the unifying strength of the labor movement.

Consequently liberal spokesmen for middle-class opinion find themselves dangling in mid-air without significant backing from the unions. This has induced the more astute among them to try and find out what is wrong with the unions and what ought to be done about it.

To be sure, the liberal commentators hope to shake the union movement out of its lethargy so that it can provide more effective assistance to their political aims. But they at least have the merit of recognizing that organized labor is sick, that the causes of its sickness should be diagnosed, and some strong remedies prescribed.

It is no secret that labor's influence and strength has been waning for the past fifteen years. The union movement has not only diminished in size but its membership has failed to keep pace with the general increase in population. Even more serious than this absolute and relative decline in numbers has been the erosion of its morale, its militancy and social idealism. This has not been wholly confined to the top echelons, although it is most conspicuous there.

Thus Thomas B. Morgan reports an interview with a

union official "in a tastefully curtained and carpeted office in New York." The official told him:

"Union leaders sit behind expensive desks with carpet under their feet, and most of them don't know what they want, except to preserve the status quo inside their union and get themselves accepted by the community at large. Not all union leaders do this, but too many.

"And most of the members don't know what they want from the union either, because they aren't hungry any more. Between the leaders and the members, there is very little communication. Just cynicism, friend, and it's growing all the time.

"And together *they* make a labor movement that's got nothing to say about politics to the politicians. And nothing to say to the Negroes in the South or to the unorganized farm laborers in California. Nothing, really, to say about automation and unemployment. No purpose, nothing to communicate — that's your story, friend."

Unfortunately, this melancholy view gives an accurate picture of union life today. It highlights the tremendous transformation undergone by the trade union movement that was reborn in the great strike battles of the 1930's. The momentum which carried through the depression years, the second world war and into the first two years of the post-war period, has been exhausted.

The fighting spirit of that aggressive army mobilized to battle the bosses has been drained away; what remains is the outward organizational form. Over the last fifteen years this corrosion of the movement has been brought about partly by external pressures and partly by internal degeneration. This second factor has been weightier than the first in producing the broad and deep-going retrogression in the unions.

The external factors that have been pressing upon the union movement in an atmosphere of prolonged boom and political reaction may be divided into two main categories. First, there are the economic and technological changes that have eliminated workers from certain industries and reduced union membership. Second, there is the unremitting and growing effectiveness of employer opposition buttressed by government aid in the form of anti-union legislation and hostile labor boards and courts.

MANY industries such as coal mining, steel manufacturing and others have introduced technological changes that have thrown masses of workers into the ranks of permanently unemployed. However, this factor might have been offset by the over-all increase in the labor force which presented new opportunities for union growth. A healthy labor movement could have more than made up for its losses in the industries that have been automated or are economically sick.

On the other hand, the campaign of the employers and

the government agencies acting at their behest to restrict the scope of union activity and make it more difficult to organize has been met by retreat on the part of the union leaders instead of a counter-attack or even an effective defense.

This retreat began in 1947 following the unprecedented strike wave of the post-war months. After union victories won in auto, steel, electrical and other industries in 1946 and 1947, the employers changed their tactics. The capitalists learned from their setbacks in these encounters that they could not crush the workers in head-on battle as they did after the first world war. They found it necessary to proceed more slowly, cautiously and in a roundabout manner in their main aim to drain the strength from the unions. They shifted the center of their anti-union activities to the legislative field.

The introduction of the Taft-Hartley Act in Congress and the ensuing nationwide debate became the battleground between the contending class forces chosen by the employers and their political representatives. In the long struggle over the Act, the union leadership gave a miserable account of itself.

The ranks showed willingness to support a call for a 24-hour general strike. The leaders depended instead upon their "friends" in Congress and the White House. The failure of the union leaders to mount an offensive against the Taft-Hartley Act assured its passage. This pattern has been followed every time new anti-labor legislation has been proposed in Washington and the state capitals. Instead of mobilizing the seventeen million unionists for direct action, the leaders come, cap in hand, and plead with their political masters not to be too harsh with them.

This policy has produced one defeat after another. The net result is that existing laws, including state "Right-to-Work" laws, make it extremely difficult and in many cases impossible to organize the unorganized workers.

Solomon Barkin reports that: "The anomaly of the day is that the opponents of trade unions are seeking to restrain the economic and political activities of unions at a time when their growth has been halted." And George Kirstein observes: "Curiously enough, it is at this time of obvious weakness that a strident clamor is arising for further shackles to labor's strength."

This is entirely in accord with the logic of the capitalist offensive. The employers reason that a union movement debilitated by fifteen years of attrition is a setup for some harder blows. Having tasted blood, they are getting ready for the kill. A June 29, 1962 editorial in *Life* magazine is appropriately entitled, "Let's Put Teeth into the Labor Laws."

The union leadership has a no less woeful record with respect to the protection of the workers' economic positions and job security. In industries that have introduced the largest amount of automation and consequent reduction of the labor force, those workers permanently displaced from their accustomed jobs have been left largely to shift for themselves with little or no aid from their unions. Where union leaders have made some effort to deal with this problem, it was not to protect the right of a worker to a job but rather to make his disemployment less painful. This course, followed by John L. Lewis of the coal miners and by Harry Bridges of the West Coast longshoremen, has set a pattern for other unions.

This policy accepts in principle the idea that workers thrown out of jobs because of technological changes no longer have the right to work in the industry where they have probably spent most of their lives. They must add to the permanent army of the unemployed. The workers who remain employed are then confronted with a situation where a smaller number must produce at least as much as the larger number formerly did while those discharged become a constant threat to their jobs. Under such conditions it becomes seemingly impossible to improve the conditions of those who retain their jobs. There is no surer way for the employer to squeeze more from his workers and dis-

courage demands for improvements than by inviting them to look out of the window of the plant at the line in front of the employment office.

The permanently unemployed worker who has been separated from his job through no fault of his own first looks to the union to relieve his situation. When nothing happens and he is left to shift for himself, he can turn bitter and become a ready target for anti-union propaganda, including fascist demagoguery.

In recent years the pressure of the employers and their political agents plus the cringing attitude of the union leaders have resulted in constantly diminishing benefits and gains by the workers as well as substantial worsening of conditions won in the past. As contracts in the large industries expire and new ones are negotiated the demands made by the union leaders for wage increases and better conditions keep dwindling.

PRESIDENT Kennedy has admonished the unions to limit themselves to asking for wage increases of about three per cent per year, a figure approximately equal to the annual increase in productivity of American industry. This has been taken as a guide by many union leaders. The pattern of the annual wage increase, set in the post-World War II years, has been abandoned in favor of asking for various "fringe" benefits, sometimes without any wage increase. At any rate, the wage demands of the unions upon the employers show a descending curve, and this is further reduced by what they actually get in the final settlement.

Even where unionism remains relatively strong, as in most of the mass production industries, the individual worker finds it harder to maintain his existing standard of living against inflation, while substantial improvement is out of the question.

The union leaders have taken exception to the administration over one key point. Although President Kennedy has announced opposition to any shortening of the work week, the AFL-CIO has recently gone on record for a thirty-five-hour week. Here again, the union leaders conceive of the shorter work week as something to be achieved for them by their political allies through federal legislation rather than through direct negotiation and coordinated strike action. Under present circumstances, it would be folly to expect the government in Washington to do anything towards shortening the work week. It would take an uprising against the monopolies by the entire union movement and a break with the administration to win this objective.

The union movement's weakness is most starkly revealed in politics. Thomas B. Morgan reports: "For labor, the loss of political influence has depressing consequences, yet no relief is in sight. When the Democrats were selecting a running mate for John F. Kennedy in the summer of 1960, most labor leaders would have preferred almost any delegate in the Los Angeles Sports Arena to Sen. Lyndon B. Johnson. Since many of them had been early Kennedy supporters (brought to camp by the Steelworkers' general counsel, Arthur Goldberg, now Secretary of Labor) [and since promoted to Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court for services rendered — M.A.] they thought they ought to have a voice in the selection of Kennedy's Vice-President. But nobody asked them."

Despite their loyal services the union leaders have less influence at the summit of the Democratic Party than they had twenty-five years ago. At the 1944 convention a movement to dump the incumbent Vice-President Henry Wallace and replace him with Harry Truman won ratification from Roosevelt only after the sponsors of the change had obtained approval from Sidney Hillman, head of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union and an appointed official in the administration.

"CLEAR it with Sidney," Roosevelt told the group that supported Truman's candidacy. This remark was later used by anti-labor elements to try and prove that the unions

were really running the government. In its own way, it served to inflate the egos of the labor "statesmen" who began to imagine themselves a first-rate power in big-time politics. Roosevelt was smarter than they; he took them into the tow of his political machine and made the labor leaders serve his purposes, not those of the organized workers.

Morgan sets forth the extent of the loss of union influence from Roosevelt to Kennedy. "Today, talk of labor's political power is received in and around the White House with a disinterest bordering on indifference. Secretary Goldberg told *Look*, 'The Government has to be the Government. The labor movement has to be the labor movement. We don't fall over backwards when they are critical of us.'" Truly, there is no gratitude in politics.

Since the Democratic politicians know they have the union leaders in their pockets, they can proceed without "clearing" anything important with them. The failure to organize a labor party in the U.S. has led the unions into this enfeebled state. Samson has cut off his own hair.

In his analysis Solomon Barkin states: "Union leaders know that an institution that does not grow tends to stagnate and atrophy, and the trade union movement cannot adequately serve its following if it is not expanding. Restrictions on the area of union organization necessarily circumscribe the movement's economic power and political prestige even in the sectors where it is most powerful. It must constantly seek to capture the leadership of new unorganized groups in order to maintain the buoyancy of social leadership, the role of innovator in working conditions and employee benefits, and the position of social and industrial critic to which it is committed."

This conclusion suffers from exaggerating the purely quantitative aspect of the problem. Barkin's argument that the unions must constantly grow to be effective, would apply more to the movement of thirty years ago than that of today. The unions now total seventeen million members who represent, along with their families and supporters, the largest force in the nation.

The unions ought to be and could be bigger. But their ineffectiveness cannot be blamed only or even mainly upon stagnation in growth. The main reason for their impotence comes from an inner source: the conservative and corrupted leadership. Narrow-minded and in many cases woefully ignorant, obsequious before the imposing posture of big capital and still more to big government, these leaders have converted the unions from the fighting organizations they started out to be in the 1930's into dues-collecting bodies that do as little as possible for the members.

In fact, the key to growth among the unorganized now depends more than ever upon the ability of existing unions to demonstrate to workers *outside the organization* that they are capable of solving the problems of their present membership. This qualitative change will have to be brought about within the unions before they can make significant additions to their numbers. It is difficult to see how growth can be stimulated in any other way, given the present circumstances.

The truth is that the unions have announced all kinds of organizing campaigns in the last fifteen years from "Operation Dixie," first approved at a 1941 CIO convention, to the drive to organize California's agricultural workers. Unfortunately, every one has been aborted. The blame for this sorry record rests squarely upon the shoulders of the AFL-CIO leaders. They have proved themselves incapable of organizing anyone. Only the Teamsters under Hoffa, who are outside the AFL-CIO, have carried on energetic and partly successful organizing drives.

While Barkin sees the main source of the unions' troubles in their failure to grow, George Kirstein locates the crux of the problem elsewhere. While favoring a shorter work week, he believes that will do no more than mitigate the problem. "For palliative is all that the shorter work week would be. Man and his hand labor are the basic surplus in the affluent society. With the mechanization of agriculture,

surpluses rise year after year, although fewer and fewer farmers till less and less acreage. It takes little imagination to foresee that the country's steel needs could be satisfied with one-tenth the present work force," he writes.

KIRSTEIN thinks it possible that blue-collar unions will disappear altogether or be reduced to insignificant factors in American society. On the other hand, he is pessimistic about the possibility of organizing the white-collar workers whose numbers are increasing absolutely and relatively to the manual workers.

In our opinion, Kirstein's analysis is weakened by an underlying presupposition: that the affluence and stability of American society and the trend of automation can be continued without profound economic and social crises. Nevertheless, Kirstein raises questions that go far deeper than numerical growth of the union movement, questions that raise social problems of the most fundamental character.

The outstanding anomaly in America today is not, as both Kirstein and Barkin state, that opponents of the unions are trying to further restrict their activities during a period when their growth has been halted. It is the gap between the possibilities that are before the unions and what they are actually doing and failing to do.

Kirstein mentions some of these. He says: "At this writing, organized labor is not participating in the progressive programs of our era. The peace movement, which is slowly gaining strength with the support of the intellectuals and women, has no labor support whatever . . . Toward the other great progressive movement occupying the country's attention, the crusade for equal rights for the Negroes, the labor movement is indifferent — although lip service is sometimes paid to the ultimate objective of racial equality, as long as no immediate action is required that might threaten the privileged position of white union members . . . Labor for the most part is divorced from this struggle."

The failure of the unions to take up and lead broad struggles of a social character noted by Kirstein is a primary reason for the loss in prestige and influence they have suffered. When the AFL and CIO merged forces in 1955 after a twenty-year split many thought this marriage would lead to a regeneration of the entire movement, that the unions would move out effectively into the field of organizing, take up progressive causes, and even begin to act independently of the old parties in politics. But nothing of that sort has come of the marriage and from time to time it looks as though it may again end up in the divorce court.

Some functionaries in the unions disappointingly talk of the AFL-CIO merger as really a "submerger." They feel that the AFL leaders have imposed the leaden weight of their conservatism upon the formerly more militant CIO on top of a steady drift to the right by the CIO leaders themselves.

The stifling atmosphere in the unions keeps these critics from openly airing their dissenting views. Discussions among them are confined to infrequent griping sessions in homes where current problems are mulled over. The overwhelming majority of union office-holders fear to appear in opposition to authority, whether elected or appointed. Those who hold their posts by appointment from the top and not by election by the ranks are under special pressure from the top leaders.

There are occasional exceptions, such as the reported effort by Emil Mazey, Secretary-Treasurer of the United Automobile Workers, to get his union to adopt a resolution opposing testing of atomic bombs by both the United States and the Soviet Union. This initiative aroused considerable opposition from many of the appointed officials allied with Walter Reuther, president of the union, who does not want to embarrass Kennedy, especially on foreign policy.

Reuther's machine is largely constructed of appointees to well-paying jobs who are expected to jump to his support in any and all circumstances. Similar machines oper-

ate in all the major unions. Consequently very little criticism comes from the professional layers of the union movement and very little initiative or even energy.

It becomes a noteworthy event when a figure like Mazey, who has national standing in the labor movement and is known to hold views somewhat less submissive than his colleagues, takes a public stand on questions like Cuba and atomic testing. However, up to the present time, neither Mazey nor others who occupy posts similar to his, have attempted to solicit support from the ranks of their unions for dissident views.

UNDER these circumstances the unions continue to be dominated by the most conservative figures who have led the movement from one failure to another.

The rottenness in the unions starts and spreads from its head. Thomas B. Morgan's union official hit the nail on the head when he said: "Union leaders sit behind expensive desks with carpet under their feet, and most of them don't know what they want, except to preserve the status quo inside their unions . . ." Keeping the status quo means holding on to posts with salaries and expense accounts far above the wages earned by the highest paid workers in the ranks. How can the union leader whose pay is \$25,000 or in some cases \$50,000 a year and more be expected to understand the problems of workers who take home one-tenth as much?

To hold on to these immense privileges, this caste of labor bureaucrats has all but throttled democratic rights in their organizations. They look upon opponents, who challenge their policies, as the worst enemies because this might lead to a loss of their entrenched positions. They show more zeal and energy in combatting the few rebels in their organizations than in combating the corporations.

The labor bureaucracy looks upon the union as a business — their business. Most of the top leaders and those immediately below them in the hierarchy play the role of policemen and pacifiers of the ranks. Above all they want peace and quiet in their organizations and in their relations with the employers. The cynicism reported by Morgan's union official is caused by the fact that most union members know it is usually a waste of time and effort to file a legitimate grievance. The official responsible for taking it up will more likely than not explain why he cannot win it rather than try to do something about it.

The negligible attendance at ordinary union meetings from one end of the country to the other is another sign of cynicism on the part of the ranks. Very few are willing to waste an evening listening to routine speeches that do not report any advance or advantages for them.

Most union officials, especially in the upper echelons, do not have a feeling of responsibility to a social organism whose members have placed them in posts of leadership for the benefit of all the members. They have a purely proprietary attitude.

The official guards his post and his right to re-election year after year just as a corporation president who owns the majority of the outstanding stock guards continuing control over his business. In both cases, challengers to their power and policies are dealt with on the assumption that they do not even have the *right* to try to replace the incumbents. Although this may be justified under the present order so far as corporations are concerned, there is no such perpetual writ given to union officials.

Some of the critics think and hope that the union leaders can be made to see the errors of their ways by an appeal to their good sense and through judicious re-education. They do not understand that the conduct and views of the AFL-CIO heads correspond to their narrow material interests.

Meany and his associates do not believe there is anything wrong with their business unionism, their collaboration with the corporations, their indifference to the Negro struggle for equality and their fanatical allegiance to the State Department's cold war policies.

They can be forced to modify their current views only by extreme pressure from the ranks but even this would not fundamentally alter their methods, their goals, their way of life.

While the U.S. and the world reel from crisis to crisis, from Mississippi to Berlin to Cuba to Algeria to Laos, the American union movement, potentially the most powerful of all social formations, has its hands tied and its voice stilled by this most conservative and dictatorial of all labor leadership. Even the voices of those union leaders of the secondary and local levels who stand to the left of the Meanys and Reuthers are heard in whispers, if at all.

The problems before the American trade union movement will begin to be solved only when a new formation within its ranks begins to come together around a program that is primarily designed to benefit the seventeen million members and the millions of others who should be organized. Such a development is not yet perceptible. But neither was the birth of the CIO on the eve of that event in the 1930's.

Such a new leadership would not only tackle the problems of the workers and of the Negro people who need the support of labor. It could also win to the side of labor significant numbers of middle-class elements who are repelled by the present drift of the country toward economic dislocations, growing unemployment and extreme belligerency in foreign affairs. These people are looking for help in their struggle to solve the burning problems of the atomic age. The labor movement could and must provide that help.

... Guantanamo

(Continued from page 12)

for upholders of togetherness. The *Wall Street Journal* (Jan. 10, 1961) reports: "About 600 Cuban women clean the homes and cook meals of military men. Top pay \$35 a month plus meals . . . An officer's wife, sunning herself at the swimming pool here while a Cuban band plays pleasant music, worries that her maid may never come back into the compound from the vacation she is now on."

An old American custom was introduced to Guantanamo in March, 1960, when the militant leader of the base workers' union, Frederico Figueras Larrazabal, was fired for allegedly making offensive remarks.

Though the workers are in daily contact with American values, including the twice-daily bodily frisking by Marines, an *AP* dispatch from the base on May 1, 1961, reported only forty-five workers had entered Guantanamo Base on May Day morning.

To give credit where it is due, we note President Kennedy's press conference of March 8, 1961, at which he announced to the world that the Red Cross and the U.S. Navy at Guantanamo had cooperated that very day with the Cubans "to combat a polio outbreak" in nearby Guantanamo City. Permission was granted "to send all the vaccine which could be spared." The Cuban Red Cross man upon entering the U.S. gate was met by photographers ready to record this humane act for posterity.

Kennedy's statement closed with these moving words: "I want to take this opportunity — and this incident — to emphasize once again that our difference of opinion on matters affecting Cuba are not with the Cuban people. Rather, we desire the closest and harmonious, and friendly and most sympathetic ties with them." (The "outbreak" consisted of four suspected cases, none of which developed into polio.)

The Cubans gave no thanks for this generous, though not anonymous contribution — the vaccine was both ineffective and dangerous; it had an expiration date of December 16, 1960.

Fidelismo and Marxism

A forward step of the Cuban Revolution pushes the realignment of political forces in Latin America into "movements of a new type"

by Luis Vitale

THE best guarantee for making secure the Cuban Revolution — and for preventing the resurgence of new Escalantes, Pomapas and Garruchos — is an outbreak of the revolution in every one of the countries of the continent. [Anibal Escalante, old-line Communist Party leader in Cuba, followed a Stalinist bureaucratic policy and was denounced by Castro in his March 26, 1962 speech. — Ed.]

The truly revolutionary nuclei of Latin America have been fortified by the campaign against sectarianism and bureaucracy, and the Cuban Revolution — as Fidel says in his speech — has once more gained in prestige among the Latin American masses.

The New Forces Liberated by the Revolution

Every social revolution has a decisive impact on the masses and its leadership, not only in the country where it is taking place but also on all the anti-imperialist and workers superstructures of the world. The example of a revolution — whether it triumphs or not — produces crises in the different parties, crises which take on different characteristics depending on the relative revolutionary growth of the masses of each country. The important thing is that every revolution liberates new forces; that it speeds the contradictions between the rank and file and the bureaucratic leadership; that it gives rise to processes of differentiation, centripetal and centrifugal tendencies, violent ruptures, the birth of new organizations.

The European revolutions of 1848, especially the French Revolution, produced a crisis of the bourgeois "democratic" parties and speeded the breaking away of the proletarian wing, making possible the creation of the first mass workers parties. In 1871, the heroic Paris Commune demonstrated conclusively that the conditions were ripe for revolution in the developed countries, as well as the road and the forms which the revolution would take.

The lessons which the revolutionists drew from the Paris Commune, brought about a process of differentiation within the Social Democratic parties. The Russian Revolution of 1905 not only demonstrated that conditions were ripe for social revolution in the highly industrialized countries, but that this was also the case in the under-industrialized ones. As a result the Bolshevik revolutionary wing widened its separation from the reformist Mensheviks. This differentiation within the Russian Social Democratic movement was

The above article is from a book published in Chile by the Partido Obrero Revolucionario. The book, "Cuba Denounces Bureaucracy and Sectarianism," with speeches by Fidel Castro on March 13 and March 26, and selections from further speeches on this subject by Castro and Guevara, contains also an analysis by the author, part of which is published here. Luis Vitale is secretary of the Movement of Revolutionary Forces of which Clotario Blest is president. At this writing, Blest is in jail and Vitale is being hunted by the Chilean police as a result of their participation in street demonstrations in Santiago in defense of the Cuban Revolution against Kennedy's blockade.

transferred to all the Social Democratic parties of the world. But, the revolution which liberated the most forces was the Russian Revolution of 1917. It gave rise to a polarization of all the tendencies of the worker movement. That is how the communist parties arose, principally from the break of the new revolutionary forces with the corrupt reformism of the Second International.

The Chinese Revolution (1926) and the Spanish Revolution (1936) — and its later defeat — as the result of the betrayal of that great organizer of defeats (Stalin, leader of the degenerated Third International) made clear the urgent necessity for building a new Marxist-Leninist leadership; and thus the Fourth International was born (in 1938), with the help of militants who had broken with Stalinism and reformism. The revolutionary process in the post-second world war period, caused crises in all the traditional parties. It even extended to the area of Eastern Europe; the uprisings of East Germany (1953) and Poznan, prepared the ground for the violent clash between the masses and the bureaucracy, freeing new forces which culminated in the first great political revolution which history has produced — the Hungarian Revolution (1956). The crisis of Stalinism reached worldwide proportions; an appreciable number of communists broke with their party and others stayed within it creating a series of tendencies.

Fidel's victory is the most vivid example of a revolution's impact. The Cuban Revolution, in this sense, is for the Latin American masses what the Chinese Revolution is for the people of Asia and what the Algerian is for the Arabs and the Africans. The Cuban Revolution has posed in a striking manner the question of the struggle for power, national and social liberation in a short period of time, in each of the Latin American countries.

The contradictions have become sharper between those sections of the rank and file who want to proceed rapidly along the revolutionary road and those leaders who want to bridle them. This is the reason for the schisms in the Latin American parties. All the superstructures of the anti-imperialist and workers movements begin to break down and new revolutionary forces begin to gain ground. This has taken place from north to south. In the small countries of Central America new movements have arisen which engage in guerrilla struggles to overthrow the pro-imperialist and oligarchic governments, in the Dominican Republic, the *Movimiento Popular Dominicano*, whose leader, López Medina, struggles to make his country "the second Socialist Republic of Latin America." In Jamaica, coincident with the struggle for the independence of their country (1962), several revolutionary groups were organized, among them a Trotskyist one. In Mexico, new revolutionary alignments are beginning to be formed. In British Guiana, Cheddi Jagan has triumphed. In the very heart of the anti-imperialist movement an anti-capitalist wing fortified itself.

In Colombia, seven revolutionary groups joined in 1962 to form the *Frente Unico de Acción Revolucionaria* (United Front of Revolutionary Action), and new guerrilla fronts have been established. In Venezuela, *Acción Democrática* was split and from its core the powerful *Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionaria* (Movement of the Revolutionary Left) was formed — its most militant wing carried out the uprisings at Carúpano and Maracaibo in the early months of 1962. In Brazil, a new movement was born — the Peasant Leagues. While to the west of Brasilia the guerrilla war phase has been initiated. The Brazilian Communist Party is undergoing one of the most serious crises in its history; a strong nucleus has broken with the Party while others continue the struggle within as a pro-China and pro-Cuba wing. The (Brazilian) Socialist Party has also suffered the loss of several militants who have formed a new class organization. Inside of the *Partido Trabalhista* (Workers Party) an intense process of differentiation has taken place since Janio Quadro's fall. In Ecuador the *Aranjista* left wing has been fortified and a hard-driving organization, the *Movimiento de la Juventud Revolucionaria Ecuatoriana* (Movement of the Revolutionary Ecuadorian Youth), was formed which has already begun guerrilla warfare. In Peru, APRA broke up and from its ranks sprang *APRA Rebelde*. From the break-off of a Communist Party nucleus, a Marxist-Leninist group has been formed. The Peruvian Trotskyist movement (POR) is developing on a mass scale and its leader, Hugo Blanco, in 1962 began guerrilla warfare at the head of 72,000 *campesinos* from the valley of Convención in the department of Cuzco. In Bolivia, the MNR (National Revolutionary Movement) is in a state of permanent crisis; workers and miners of COB (Bolivian Central Labor Council), together with POR, struggle to find a revolutionary solution. In Chile, the Socialist Party has been shaken by an intense process of differentiation and its rank and file demand the application of the line of the Workers' Front. An anti-imperialist faction broke away from the *Partido Radical* and founded the *Movimiento Social-Progresista* in 1961. Valuable revolutionary militants continue to break away from the Communist Party. From the labor movement leaders like Clotario Blest, sprang forth, who adopted a revolutionary line, and who together with other groups VRM, POR, PRT, anarchists), have formed the *Movimiento de Fuerzas Revolucionarias* (Movement of Revolutionary Forces). In Argentina, the Socialist Party has been shattered; the Peronista movement entered a period of complete crisis and within it there have developed tendencies which are not only anti-imperialist but anti-capitalist as well. The Radical Intransigence Party has been smashed into a thousand pieces. Trotskyist groups have developed at the same time that other groups like *Praxis y Mira* have been formed. In Uruguay, the internal crisis of the Socialist Party became more severe; the Paysandú group was formed; the POR established itself and a great movement in support of Cuba developed. In Paraguay the nucleus which directs the guerrilla warfare continued in operation.

What are the Characteristics of the New Forces?

The new forces liberated by the Cuban Revolution are essentially different from those which were promoted by the nationalist movements of the post-war period. *Peronismo*, *Varguismo*, *Velazco-Ibarrismo*, *Ibañismo*, etc., were movements which, basing themselves on the proletariat, hoped to offer some resistance to imperialism in order to be able to negotiate with it under better conditions, but within the concept of bourgeois-nationalism. On the other hand, the movement led by the petty bourgeoisie, like APRA, MNR, Arbenz in Guatemala, *Acción-Democrática*, etc., quickly capitulated to the bourgeoisies, thereby giving rise to pro-capitalist governments which did not differ in any way from previous ones.

The new forces liberated by the Cuban Revolution back a program which clearly sets them apart: support of Socialist Cuba. This involves the majority in the carrying out of

a program, not only of national liberation and Agrarian Reform, but also of social liberation. But what is more important, many of the militants of the new movements have reached the conclusion that without a social revolution there is no effective way of achieving national liberation and agrarian reform. The new forces' methods of struggle are openly revolutionary: the majority rejects the road of the ballot box, it poses the need for and carries out guerrilla warfare and direct action in the cities through struggles in the streets and general strikes, and in the countryside, the occupation of the land. In addition, those parts of the new forces who are of a petty bourgeois origin, have a different attitude from that assumed by the petty bourgeoisie after the second world war. In accordance with the present radicalization of the middle class, activities are carried out with revolutionary methods. They take as a model the socialist road taken by the Cuban Revolution and, as a consequence, they not only come under the influence of the anti-imperialist program but of the anti-capitalist one as well.

It is for these reasons that we dare to characterize the new forces liberated by the Cuban Revolution as being *intuitively class conscious and revolutionary as well, and, consequently, decidedly more anti-imperialist.*

The role of conscious revolutionaries is to know how to differentiate these new forces from those of bourgeois or petty bourgeois tendencies which claim to support Cuba, which give lip service to the Cuban Revolution with the end of blackmailing imperialism and the oligarchies, in order to be in a better position to make deals with them and to channelize the drive of the masses. Other bourgeois tendencies, like del Castillo, Alejandro Gómez and other bourgeois elements of Argentina demagogically support the Cuban Revolution to help them win elections. The Communist parties and Socialist parties pursue similar ends, although their rank and file militants feel support for the Cuban Revolution in a different way from that of the leadership. Today all these political superstructures have felt the impact of the Cuban Revolution, but none of them can be reformed. They can only be used to form very well defined Anti-Imperialist United Fronts, and for the very precise purpose of mobilizing the masses. For these reasons, it is very dangerous for the new revolutionary forces to form indiscriminate fronts with the traditional parties and much less to propose the formation of new parties and movements with them merely because at the present time they give "lip service" to the Cuban Revolution.

Tendency Toward Realignment of the New Forces and the Revolutionary Movements of the New Type

The forces liberated by the Cuban Revolution show a very marked tendency toward realignment. As they are still very fragmented they have a tendency to unite. They understand the need to struggle together with other revolutionary groups to accelerate the downfall of capitalism which they see approaching closer every day. They see the need to break through the cobwebs of prejudice against the older revolutionary groups, like that against the Trotskyists. They press the old cadres to be done with sectarianism and to work out the differences between Marxist groups.

The revolutionary realignment — which has already begun in several Latin American countries — takes on different forms. In some cases it is formed by the union of Marxist forces alone. In others, it is formed by the union of Marxist with non-Marxist yet class-conscious groups who favor the road of revolution.

These new forces tend to regroup on the basis of a *program of immediate action* which will speed the revolutionary process. The majority are allergic to twaddle, to never-ending verbalism of the traditional labor parties. They want action, but at times they do not know how to carry it out. That is why, in the heart of these forces "infantile-extremist" tendencies develop which mechanical-

(Continued on page 31)

"The First Ten Years of American Communism"



by Carl Feingold

THE FIRST TEN YEARS OF AMERICAN COMMUNISM: Report of a Participant, by James P. Cannon. Lyle Stuart, New York. 1962. 343 pp. \$6.

JIM CANNON once said, "I have thought many times that, if despite my unbelief, there is anything in what they say about the hereafter, I am going to be well rewarded — not for what I have done, but for what I have had to listen to." Actually, if Cannon is in line for rewards it should be given because of this book, his best yet. And obviously he wrote this book with deep enjoyment and not from onerous duty. Here is a book about the past, written for the future.

The author, who began as a Wobbly and a Socialist in Debs' day, was a central leader of the Communist Party of the U.S. in its early years. He writes about that period as he experienced it and sees it in retrospect as an un-reconstructed American Leninist.

The First Ten Years of American Communism is not a history in the usual meaning of that term. It is more accurately a narrative, by a participant and witness, of the first decade of the American communist movement — its earlier heroic days and its later corruption. *The First Ten Years* tells what happened and why, and perhaps more important to its purpose, it tells how it happened.

Cannon's work is the outgrowth of correspondence initiated in 1954 by Theodore Draper who began making inquiries of participants for his own history of the American communist movement. The book is a gathering of letters extending over a five-year period plus related essays, resultant from Draper's probing questions, on such divergent topics as the Negro question, Eugene V. Debs, the I.W.W. and a critical review of Theodore Draper's history. Surprisingly this compilation hangs together as a unit.

The reason is that the book has a line — a central theme. Several related

themes run through the narrative all bound together. Cannon's book is really a critique of Theodore Draper's volumes, *The Roots of American Communism* and *American Communism and Soviet Russia*. Draper's thesis is that the course of the American CP was determined at the beginning when it became influenced by the Russians and looked to Moscow for advice. Looking toward Soviet Bolshevism at the beginning, in Draper's view, led to the downfall of the American communists in the end. Cannon's line, on the other hand, is a defense of the Russian Revolution and its influences here expressed in its genuine internationalism and in the validity and applicability of Lenin's organizational methods for American soil.

The First Ten Years traces the assembling of the socialist left wing under the impact of the first world war and the 1917 Russian Revolution. It depicts the Bolshevizing of the American communists as the militant spirit of the Russian Revolution fused with native radicalism. It helped make them thoroughgoing American revolutionists determined to build a vibrant movement. These were the years the Comintern played a helpful advisory role.

Cannon's narrative tells about the years of degeneration, 1924 to 1928, when the movement became permeated with blind factional dog fights and its original aims became blurred and then buried. Cannon describes this atmosphere:

"In the underworld of present-day society, with which I have had contact at various times in jail and prison, there is a widespread sentiment that there is no such thing as an honest man who is also intelligent. The human race is made up of honest suckers and smart crooks, and that's all there is to it; the smartest crooks are those who pretend to be honest, the confidence men. Professional factionalism unrelated to the living issues of the class struggle of the workers, is also a sort of underworld, and the psychology of its practitioners approaches that of the other underworld."

The moral fiber of the CP and its

leaders were sapped by the prosperity of the Twenties and the effects of Russianization and finally Stalinism. "These two combined national and international factors," Cannon wrote, "operated interactively on the American Communist party in the later transition period of its gradual degeneration, which began in the middle of the Twenties and was virtually completed by the end of the decade. At that juncture the deadening conservatism of American life, induced by the unprecedented boom of post-war American capitalism, coinciding with the reactionary swing in Russia, caught the infant movement of American communism from two sides, as in a vise from which it could not escape."

Cannon takes the reader through these broad stages and their various phases and turns. The witch-hunted party, its Americanization and legalization, the disputes over the labor party question, the Passaic strike, the different party regimes and factions, the Comintern plenums and Moscow's interventions are kaleidoscopically presented in these letters. They are like nails aimed at anchoring a point firmly in the reader's mind. Cannon hammers his nail home so that it would be very difficult to remove, should the reader want to.

Interwoven in this narrative is another important theme. Along the way, the CP lost its character as a self-governing party and the great majority of its members and leaders lost their bearings. How did this happen? How did it happen that most of those who started as honest revolutionists ended by serving either the Soviet bureaucracy or American capitalism? Why did they succumb? Foster, Browder, Lovestone, Bittleman, Pepper, Fraina, Gitlow, Bill Dunne are representative character types who change on the way and are perceptively portrayed in the pages of the story. "Revolutionary politics takes a lot out of people who take it seriously," Cannon tells us. Eventually, in one form or another, most of the leaders

lost their way or forgot what they stood for.

All were affected, but those that survived retained their youthful ideals and stood by their principles. It was a question of character.

Can such qualities as character and

principled politics be learned? Cannon tells this story as one who believes it can be learned and that perhaps today's youth can do better than his generation. That's the purpose of his book. That is why he tells it as it really happened.

ophy? In her preface, Margaret Cole notes "the basic Fabian aims: . . . the abolition of poverty, through legislation and administration; . . . the communal control of production and social life, and . . . the conversion of the British public and . . . the British governing class (or 'caste,' according to date), by a barrage of facts and informed propaganda . . ." More precisely, Fabianism consists of eclecticism of theory (preferably excluding Marxist theory); gradualism; reformism; working within the capitalist structure; denial of the class war and the state as a "weapon, by consideration of it as a Supreme Court"; denial of imperialism's need for war as resolution of its economic problems; and conversion of the ruling class by surveys, statistics, facts, and graphs.

As Trotsky says, in his demolition of Fabianism in *Where Is Britain Going?* "The compassion of the rich for poverty has never safeguarded the poor from degradation and misery." Thus the sentimentalism of Fabianism — a bourgeois sentimentalism that substitutes for identification with the aims of the working class — is revealed as shallow and potentially dangerous. Dangerous, because, as Trotsky points out, "in struggling against proletarian class-consciousness the reformists are in the last resort the instrument of the ruling class."

Fabianism: "The Monstrous Illusion"

by Maria di Savio

THE STORY OF FABIAN SOCIALISM by Margaret Cole. Stanford University Press, Stanford, California, 1961. 366 pp. \$6.50.

The author of this book was the Secretary of the Fabian Society from 1939 to 1953. Her book reads like a collection of all the minutes of all the meetings from '39 to '53 — without the deletion of a single detail or the addition of one Marxist idea. Paradoxically, the mood is one of enthusiasm: Mrs. Cole relishes the minutiae of personality and tea parties. This bustling about triviae is symbolic of the Fabian Society as a whole, which is a tremendously busy group intent on forwarding only the lamest of reforms in the slowest possible way. Unfortunately for the English working class, Fabian "gradualness" won the day, and hand in glove with the labor bureaucrats (and for a while, the Stalinists) has been and is the chief force in British Socialism, managing thereby to subvert all revolutionary situations in England to date; e.g., the Shop Stewards Movement of the first world war and the General Strike of 1926.

The Fabian Society began in 1883 as a group of petty bourgeois intellectuals; it is thus the oldest English "socialist" group, a feat accomplished partly by its base in the middle class — after all, the ruling class — and partly by its respectable "evolutionary" rather than revolutionary program. The Fabian Society has been disasterously successful. It helped in the formation of the Labour Representation Committee in 1894, which eventually, with several other groups, became the British Labour Party in 1900. Sidney Webb helped write the constitution of the Labour Party. The Fabians have been either in direct leadership of this party or have controlled it in conjunction with their labor bureaucrat toadies.

There have been four Labour Governments in England; the first, in 1924, lasted only eight months. Dependent on Liberal votes, the Government collapsed when the Liberals defected, mainly on the issue of a loan to the Soviet Union. The second Labour Government was maneuvered into office in 1929 by the ruling class that could see the coming world crisis. The government, under Ramsey MacDonald, subject to many

economic pressures, including that of mounting unemployment, simply threw up its hands and quit. The resultant national government, a "coalition" of Conservative, Liberal and Labour parties with MacDonald again as Prime Minister, promptly cut wages and unemployment benefits. The post-World War II Labour governments of 1945-50 and 1950-51 continued the wartime austerity program of food rationing and frozen wages, and used troops to break strikes under the Emergency Powers Act. The loudly touted nationalizations simply took over unprofitable parts of the economy, thereby giving new life to capitalism and a sop to the working class.

What, specifically, is Fabian philos-

A View of Radical America

by Carol Lawrence

A RADICAL AMERICA by Harvey Swados, an Atlantic Monthly Press Book, Boston. 1962. 347 pp. \$5.

This book is a collection of articles written by Harvey Swados for such diverse publications as the *Menorah Journal*, *Antioch Review*, *Anvil* and *Student Partisan*, *Mademoiselle*, *Saturday Review*, the *Nation*, *Monthly Review* and *American Socialist*, to name a few of the magazines in which these essays have appeared over a thirteen-year period. Widely known for the novel, *On the Line*, a book about assembly line workers in an automobile plant, Harvey Swados has also written a study of the muckrakers and three other novels.

Skimming through the book's twenty-five essay titles, can give the reader some of the flavor of this book. "Labor's Cultural Degradation," "The Myth of the Happy Worker," "Less Work — Less Leisure," "Three-Penny Opera — Three-Dollar Seats," "Exurbia Revisited," "Be Happy, Go Liberal," and lastly, "Why Resign from the Human Race?"

The best of this book is found in the author's absolute rejection of the myth that the American worker is happy, leisured, satisfied on the job, and making a living wage. As he observes so

trenchantly, "It is not simply status-hunger that makes a man hate work that is mindless, endless, stupefying, sweaty, filthy, noisy, exhausting, insecure in its prospects, and practically without hope of advancement." Furthermore he suggests that it is not the worker who is becoming middle class but the white collar man who is becoming increasingly alienated from his work and is becoming proletarianized.

In his introduction, Swados describes himself as a novelist who is a middle-class man of the mid-century, a Jew and a socialist. Disavowing the Russian, Chinese and the Cuban way, he describes himself as a skeptic as well as a socialist. But unlike most skeptical socialists he does not reserve his criticisms for the weaknesses of the anti-capitalist countries alone; he bitterly attacks the Kennedy-Nixon campaign and Kennedy's Hundred Days as a cynical betrayal of the American people. He is equally outraged at the US-supported invasion of Cuba, which he calls the most shameless maneuver in modern American history, and the liberal intellectuals who "lacked the guts" to dissociate themselves from the Kennedy regime.

But deeply as he understands the working class, and much as he respects the individuals who compose it, he

frankly lacks confidence in the revolutionary role of the working class as such. In his last article he calls upon youth who wish to move from the morass of American society in which they are now floundering, into a future which is incalculable, but which they can help to shape, to volunteer their services to underdeveloped countries and revitalize the American pioneer tradition. The original of this essay, written for *Esquire* magazine in 1959, foreshadowed President Kennedy's Peace Corps, but in a footnote dated 1961, he suggests that despite the fact that

the President's motives are suspect, its impact on the youth who participate can only be salutary. While one cannot quarrel with the fact that an experience living in an underdeveloped community will be worthwhile for those young people who join the Peace Corps, one can certainly argue that they will be serving the same imperialist interests abroad that they are fleeing from at home. Swados himself points out, service in the Peace Corps isolates these idealistic youth from the bulk of American youth whom they might otherwise influence.

trating analysis. For the information of our readers we here publish excerpts from that pamphlet, which they can obtain from the above address.

* * *

Although the Central Workers Council was born after Nov. 4, similar endeavors were already apparent during the victorious days. This was clearer in the provinces, where sometimes the workers' council directed the political, economic, and administrative life of an entire industrial region. The absence of any central power made it easier for the councils to take over the direction of a region, and thus to create their own power. But even in Budapest, where the Imre Nagy government expressed the people's demands, the workers attempted to organize themselves independently of the administration and the political organizations

The surprise-attack of the Soviet army at dawn on Nov. 4 completely altered the situation Just as the workers had determined to resume work on Nov. 5, they now naturally went on strike. And this was a much more important weapon than the armed struggle which was hopeless from the outset. There never has been a strike so total, so general, as the strike of the Hungarian workers following the Soviet invasion

What were the demands advanced by the workers? They were the same as those of the revolution. The Hungarian people, and in particular the workers, wanted to transform the Stalinist regime into an authentic socialism. In doing this they had to confront a system established by the Communist Party and thus by its foreign protector, the U.S.S.R. Consequently the revolutionary struggle was inevitably intertwined with the struggle for national independence. The reprisals therefore involved both the Soviet attack and the installation of Kadar in power The workers in response could only demand the evacuation of Soviet troops and the restoration to power of Imre Nagy, who they viewed as the sole guarantor of the realization of their revolutionary objectives

Against the counter-revolutionary activity of the Soviet army and the Kadar government the workers could see no real political force capable of defending their interests and those of the revolution. In these circumstances the workers themselves represented that force, the workers' councils entered the political arena, even made up that arena. This demanded of them an increasingly developed organization, all the more so since it was they who were continually putting forward demands and protests backed by the weapon of the general strike

The intentions and aspirations of the workers could, in essence, be specified as: collective ownership of the factories in the hands of the workers through the medium of workers' councils as the

"A Hatred of Women"

by Martha Curti

THE ABORTIONIST by Dr. X as told to Lucy Freeman. Garden City, New York. Doubleday & Company. \$3.95.

When it comes to the cruelty of society to individuals, there are millions of examples. Of these, the topic of abortion provides some of the best. To cite the most obvious, the refusal of the law to grant abortions when the baby will doubtless be deformed (as if life weren't tough enough already for healthy children); or to terminate pregnancies caused by rape — can be regarded as nothing but the survival of medieval torture.

Dr. X's attitude toward this is revealing: "Society's present attitude toward abortion stems from hatred, a hatred of women. Why else would it force them to submit to such terror and degradation in the seeking of an abortion . . . ? Society wants to punish these women, not help them to become better mothers someday. Society is afraid to look sanely at sexual problems." And: "Significantly, it is men who make our abortion laws. If women had a voice in shaping them, we would as-

surely see quite different words on the statute books, if, indeed, there would be any laws at all restricting abortion."

Unfortunately, Dr. X is a rare man. Possessed of a keen sense of social justice, a sensitive understanding of human beings, and a high quality of medical skill, he has devoted his life to the dangerous practice of abortion. After several narrow escapes from the police, Dr. X was finally caught and spent four years in prison, after which he reestablished himself in practice.

The dozens of case histories in this book provide such a panorama of humanity — of cruelty, pathos, misery, betrayal, on the one hand; and courage and compassion, on the other — that one might almost be inclined to suspect their veracity, except that Lucy Freeman is known to be a writer of integrity. A summary of existing abortion laws in this and other countries, and a chapter entitled, "The Facts of Life, Abortionwise," in addition to the story of Dr. X's personal development, combine to make this a most worthwhile book.

Hungarian Revolution 1956

by Balázs Nagy

THE FORMATION OF THE CENTRAL WORKERS COUNCIL OF BUDAPEST IN 1956 by Balázs Nagy, *Correspondances Socialistes*, 72, avenue de Paris, Vincennes (Seine), France.

The decisive characteristic of the Hungarian proletarian revolution of 1956 was the leadership of the struggle by workers councils. This fact has been more-or-less consciously slighted by most "Western" accounts of the revolution, which generally stop at the second Russian intervention, Nov. 4, 1956. For

Marxists, nevertheless, it is of vital importance to draw the crucial lessons of a revolution which, like the Paris Commune, stands as a prototype of future working-class revolutions. The study of the Budapest Central Workers Council by the Hungarian Marxist Balázs Nagy, published as a supplement to the French magazine "Correspondances Socialistes," is an important contribution to a socialist comprehension of the Hungarian experience, both by its vivid and thoroughly documented retelling of events and by its provocative and pene-

true and only directors of enterprises; on the basis of this council system an enlargement of their power in the economic, social, and cultural fields; organization of a public force of the militia type; on the political level, a system with several socialist parties.

Of course this amounted to a draft, rather than a true plan of social reorganization. In practice several problems would have arisen concerning the administrative form of collective property, the relationship between councils and parties, and so forth. But in Budapest it was workers, not theorists, who drew up this program. Their main concern was to formulate common demands; they were involved in a day-to-day struggle in which theory played almost no role. It was their spontaneous intentions, their working-class instinct, and, to a certain extent, their political "education" in a People's Democracy which together made the profound goals of the Hungarian working class appear in these demands

The call for formation of the Central Workers' Council was initiated at a meeting on Nov. 12 of the Workers' Revolutionary Council of Ujpest. As was the general practice, several young intellectuals took part in the meeting. They proposed that the Council take the initiative of putting out an appeal for the formation of a central workers' council. The proposal was speedily accepted, since the workers present wished for exactly the same thing The council called on the young intellectuals present to draw up and distribute a convocation of the delegates of all workers' councils to a meeting to set up a Central Council.

This was done. The historic text entitled "Appeal" was written and approved by the council. It explained that the workers of Budapest wanted to establish order. "Of course we do not want any sort of order whatever" said the Appeal, "we want a revolutionary order based on the realization of the great demands of the revolution. The workers of Budapest will combat, on one side, all those who dishonor our revolution by illegal acts and, on the other, all those who merely recognize the revolution with purely formal phrases the better to make its essential content vanish"

Shortly thereafter a discussion took place between Kadar and the workers. The delegation presented the workers' claims to Kadar and demanded, notably:

- a) Re-establishment of Imre Nagy as Prime Minister; the existence of several parties and the immediate convocation of an elected assembly
- b) evacuation of Soviet troops
- c) recognition of the workers' councils and their right to take over the factories as collective property
- d) recognition of the right to strike
- e) re-establishment of democratic trade unions and cessation of the activity of "transmission-belt" unions

The answer of Kadar was brief, haughty, and blunt. The workers can do what they want, he said. If they do not work that is their concern — the government can work. The delegation has the right not to recognize his government but that is of no interest to him since the Soviet Union supports him

The founding meeting of the Central Workers Council took place on Nov. 14. The delegates were elected democratically by the ranks. In each factory the workers themselves chose that member of the council who would go to the meeting. He was elected, not by the council, but by the totality of workers

We do not mean to praise the spontaneous organization of that meeting, but to recognize that, despite its importance, it did without any bureaucratic organization, admission procedures, ushers, etc. It would, in a certain sense, be correct to speak of disorder. But this fact underlines an important factor, namely that the birth of the Central Workers Council had the approval of a working-class meeting — a parliament in which the representatives and the represented had the same speaking rights. Disorder, certainly, but disorder of a significant kind

Regarding the composition of the delegates the first important characteristic is that many were old militants of the labor movement. They had gained their experience in union struggles, in the Soviet Republic of 1919, and in the social-democratic party. Several of them were members of the Communist Party when, after the war, the CP appeared to be a real workers' party

The other characteristic fact was the massive participation of youth. Almost half were young workers aged from 23 to 28 years who had therefore had their entire education under the People's Democracy

Several provincial delegates were present also, notably those of the two most active provincial workers' councils (the industrial province of Borsod and the industrial city of Győr Several intellectuals, individually or as representatives of an organization of intellectuals, also participated. Once more this underlines the revolutionary alliance of workers and intellectuals which had already contributed substantially to the preparation of the Central Council

The meeting represented the workers of Budapest, but several delegates put forward the idea of immediately establishing a National Council that would express the will of the workers of the whole country. This proposal expressed an obvious truth, and that is why many delegates applauded it. Nevertheless several objected that, for one thing they were mandated only to establish a Central Workers Council for Greater Budapest, and, for another, that the absence of numerous provincial delegates made

it impossible to take a decision without them.

The general approval shown for these objections may seem to show a petty outlook, the more so since a National Council would have been politically more effective, more dangerous for the government. But this problem, which at first sight seems like a purely organizational one, illuminates a very important aspect of the councils, namely, that the problem of the National Council was envisaged by the workers not only from the point of view of political efficacy but also and above all in a democratic spirit

In the concrete instance of the National Workers Council, for example, its formation would have given the workers a much greater and more effective political weight. It is certain that the government would have found itself in a much more embarrassing situation. Moreover the formation of a National Council would perhaps have mobilized the provincial workers more easily and led them more effectively.

But this is only a hypothesis, and not as good a one as it might seem to be. The attachment of these workers to democratic procedures is perhaps astonishing, but it was later shown to pay off, since it facilitated the adhesion of several dynamic provincial workers' councils (for instance, those of the Northern miners) which for a certain period were critical of the policy adopted by the Central Workers Council of Greater Budapest. Thus political "efficacy" is not always the most effective way

Should the Central Workers Council have envisaged the seizure of political power, or was it right in developing a struggle aimed at gaining concessions from the regime installed after Nov. 4? This is a question that demands a clear and unequivocal response

Two important points should here be emphasized. First of all, a political opposition, in itself, is never static. In other words, it always tends to go over to an attack upon the political power, even despite the opinions of its leaders. The nature of political struggle must sooner or later oblige any real oppositional movement to attempt to conquer power. Secondly the leaders of the Council spoke of it as a body "representing the entire country." It is impossible to speak of such a body without raising the possibility of its taking power.

There was thus a contradiction here. The workers did not seek to take power, and their Central Council so declared, but in practice they did everything possible to gain power, notably by organizing a powerful and dynamic political opposition. This contradiction marked the formation of the Central Workers Council and its development constitutes one of the most interesting problems raised by the history of the Central Workers Council of Greater Budapest.

... Periodicals

(Continued from page 2)

made up of workers; it was defended on 21 fronts by a Red Army made up of workers and peasants. These indisputable facts changed the course of history and led to the formation of a Communist International whose national sections were made up of *workers* from all the advanced countries of the world. In some cases like Italy and France these parties represented the majority of the workers in the country.

Thus Daniels, in many respects a diligent scholar we are sure, sees the essence of internationalism as spelled out in the concept of permanent revolution as Russian nationalism and the most profound workers' uprising in history as a non-proletarian revolution of intellectuals. The problem we fear lies not with the failings of an individual but rather with a social system which finds it most difficult to look honestly at a world it long since ceased to play a progressive role in.

Pakistan's Burden

One of the more lasting values of the new student radical magazines is when they publish extensive and serious studies of questions ignored or distorted by scholars committed to the status quo. One of the best recent examples of such articles is the special feature "Pakistan: The Burden of U.S. Aid" which appeared in the Autumn, 1962 issue of *New University Thought*. Written by two Pakistani students presently residing in England, Hamza Alavi and Amir Khusro, the article presents a thorough, factual account of an "Alliance for Progress" in action — and it is devastating.

Over a nine-year period from 1951 to 1960 the U.S. pumped one billion, two hundred and thirty thousand dollars into Pakistan in various types of foreign aid. Rather than producing at least some spurt in the industrialization of Pakistan, the authors conclude it has actually hindered the economic growth of the country. Aid is so tailored that it "discourages industrialization and exerts pressure for a plan which would develop our economy along lines complementary to and subordinate to the economy of the United States." The U.S. is able to accomplish this because "the allocation of resources to agriculture and industry is no longer decided freely by the Pakistanis but according to the wishes of the aid donors." This has produced "a steady move away from a policy of industrialization."

The mechanics of the way the U.S. accomplishes this task are really quite amazing. Investment is largely funnelled into two types of operations: raw material production and assembly or packaging facilities for products produced abroad but sold within Pakistan. While both operations are necessary to

the U.S. neither leads to any serious industrial growth within the country (and thus potential competition with American industry). To make matters worse, foreign firms move in to precisely those enterprises that offer the most profit and drain this profit out of the country thus preventing its re-investment within Pakistan. To do this, they utilize *Pakistani* capital in large part! "In most cases the bulk of working capital of foreign concerns is raised from local borrowing. Thus it is profits earned by utilizing Pakistani resources which are remitted out and which constitute a drain on our foreign exchange resources."

These Pakistani students make it clear that the alliance of the U.S. with Pakistan is designed for the progress — of the U.S. The massive foreign aid dispensed by the U.S. government is not a matter of Uncle Sam's philanthropy but rather economically necessary for the exploitation of the bulk of the world's resources in the interests of U.S. capital. The political price in Pakistan is military dictatorship. So works the free world. The editors of *New University Thought* are to be commended for exposing its true inner nature.

Nation and Class

We are not at all surprised that Harold W. Cruse's article "Revolutionary Nationalism and the Afro-American" (*Studies on the Left*, Vol. II, No. 3) should have brought forth the controversy printed in the current issue of *Studies on the Left* (vol. III, No. 1). As we commented in our last column, Cruse's article presented in a very thought-provoking way some of the very real theoretical problems coming out of the Negro movement today.

The current discussion in *Studies* is as important as the original article in that Cruse's real views are brought out in relief by the polemical character of the exchanges. Cruse's own thought is of some importance whether or not he may personally have a large following. This is because he both expresses a prevalent mood among radical Negro intellectuals and also attempts to present the views of this trend in a Marxist theoretical fashion.

Richard Greenleaf begins the polemic with an attack on the nationalist aspect of Cruse's thinking. He states the "main theory of American Marxism" as follows: "The exploitation of the American Negro is but a refinement and extension of capitalism's exploitation of the American worker. The best way to end the first is to end the second." Seeing the American Negro simply as a part of the American working class and not recognizing the fact that there does exist a strong national element — a strong desire for identity and representation as Negroes — within the American Negro community, Greenleaf is easily attacked by Cruse for being "dogmatic," "doctrinaire," etc.

Cruse, however, goes further than this. He faces a world in which the American working class remains relatively quiescent while the Negro people leap ahead in the most significant and potentially revolutionary mass struggle in the United States today. Reacting impressionistically to this state of affairs, he then projects this as the pattern for the foreseeable future. Thus, in the style of C. Wright Mills, he proclaims: "The belief in the revolutionary potentialities of white workers is a carry-over from the 19th century classic Marxism. In my opinion the changes that have taken place both in the structures and relationships of Western capitalism and the underdeveloped world have rendered 19th century Marxian concepts obsolete." Or as he puts it bluntly a little later on in his reply to Greenleaf, "the class struggle is no longer a reality between capitalist and proletariat within Western nations."

Writing off as he does the white American workers (not to mention the European workers) he considers the concept of "Negro-Labor unity" as simply a "hackneyed, sing-song recitative." How, then, does Cruse hope to achieve the liberation of the Negro people? After reading both his past and his current contributions we feel that Cruse himself is not too clear on this. He clearly and correctly attacks the Negro bourgeoisie as being incapable of effectively leading the struggle of the Negro people. At times he seems to place his faith in the Negro working class which has so decisively rejected the leadership of the Negro bourgeoisie. But he seems to have only ephemeral faith in even the Negro workers. He tells us in his reply to Clark Foreman's, "In Defense of Robert F. Williams": "The Negro working class must either follow the Negro bourgeoisie when it leads on civil rights, or swing to the (bourgeois) Nationalist wing." Why, one is forced to ask Cruse, can't the Negro worker lead the Negro struggle? Why must it rely on a bourgeois leadership whose inadequacy he so persuasively illustrates?

The problem is posed before Cruse in another way. He is quite contemptuous of Robert Williams whom he accuses of having "no program." He insists that the Negro struggle must go beyond mere demands for "civil rights" to a fundamental struggle on the economic front — that is a *socialist* struggle (though Cruse shies away from using this term). But what *program* do the Nationalists, Cruse so warmly embraces, have for the Negro struggle? So far as we can see, the Nationalists have refrained from participating in any of the real battles of the Negro people in the past few years with one exception — the struggle to turn white businesses over to Negroes in Harlem. Certainly the Negro people have the right to expect more leadership than that from the Nationalists.

Of course Williams has not elaborated

a full program for the Negro struggle nor developed his own clear socialist convictions in this regard. However, he has played an important role in leading the actual struggle in the South in a militant way. He has done this by relying in the concrete struggle itself upon the working class Negroes and breaking with the bourgeois leadership of the NAACP. Certainly, if we are not to be "dogmatic" or "doctrinaire," we must expect that the revolutionary program of the Negro people will be developed through precisely the type of struggle that Williams and others have been engaged in — that it will not be developed by those who remain isolated from this struggle be they white radicals or black nationalists.

It is very understandable why Negro intellectuals should take such a pessimistic attitude towards the American working class. It is also understandable that many Negroes, burned by the misleadership of the Negro movement by the Communist Party wherever it has had influence, should resist collaboration with radicals and seek to work out their ideas on their own.

However the facts of life itself in the United States, not any radical "dogma," will force upon the Negro intellectuals and workers a realization of the necessity of common struggle of the Negro and white working class. The Negro trade unionist in the North, and he numbers now in the millions, must of necessity struggle in common with his fellow white workers, and vice versa. Does this mean that the Negro worker must simply sit around and await the action of the white working class? Certainly not. In fact the Negro workers, organized in the NALC and other formations already are having a militant impact within the trade union movement — not to mention the role Negro workers can play within the Negro movement itself.

We hope that Harold Cruse and others continue to write their views in the radical press. A discussion of these key issues has long been overdue and can produce nothing but good.

by Tim Wohlforth

The American Female

We doubt if there is a more fertile source for humor (or what passes for it), for speculation, conjecture, bitter polemics, outraged protestations, or pure fantasy, than the American woman. Somehow women in other countries have managed to get off easier. As one might expect, the vast amount of attention devoted to this subject in the popular press has contributed very little, if any, solid understanding. A welcome exception is a special supplement in the October, 1962 issue of *Harper's*, called "The American Female." The cover blurb promises, "An inquiry into the emotions . . . work . . . marriages . . . divorces . . . education . . . politics . . .

and other dilemmas of contemporary American women." This is a big order; and though the articles are far from being of equal interest, and do not even treat some vitally important questions, several deserve serious attention. It is a relief to find that none of the articles are geared primarily to an exposition of the unequal position of women in our society: apparently the assumption is that readers of *Harper's* do not need to be convinced of this fact, which is an encouraging sign in itself, and enables the whole discussion to start on a somewhat higher level.

The most important article is *Growing Up Female*, by noted psychoanalyst, Bruno Bettelheim. It is an unusual experience to find such a sensible treatment of the subject of women by a man, and a psychoanalyst at that. Most analysts, basing themselves on one side of Freud's contradictory views of women, maintain quite a Victorian view: the biologically determined, and therefore innate and unchangeable, Role of Woman is to serve man: to be a wife and mother, period. Any woman who does not accept this Feminine Role is fighting a battle that is guaranteed to be lost; in struggling to change the unchangeable she is, naturally, going to be quite unhappy.

Lest we create a mistaken impression, let me make it clear that, at the same time as he held this Victorian view, Freud also maintained a more radical view, as the following quote from the biography of Freud by Ernest Jones indicates: "Women suffer more than men from the prevailing morality. Only a mentally healthy woman can successfully endure marriage. And any intellectual inferiority shown by women as a whole . . . [Freud] would explain not . . . by any biological difference, but by the stricter morality imposed on women which leads to general inhibition of the thinking powers as surely as religious beliefs do." Freud recognized, and emphasized over and over again, the role of society in warping and stunting the emotional and intellectual lives of people. He felt that piecemeal reforms could not eradicate this problem, but that a basic social change was necessary. As in certain other fields, the originator of a school of thought towers above the epigones.

Bettelheim, while recognizing that men and women are different, says that they have far more in common than people generally care to admit. The main emphasis of the article is in tracing the conflicting expectations that girls are brought up with, the "irrational demands" that society makes of them, and what this does to a woman. "She must shape herself to please a complex male image of what she should be like — but alas it is often an image having little to do with her own real desires or potentialities." The problem is, as the author sees it, the "social self-realization" of women, the necessity for them

to be involved and committed to something outside the home. He rejects completely the traditional middle-class solutions: ceaseless activity in Parent-Teachers Associations, League of Women Voters, and other civic groups (could not most of the so-called "political" activity of women be included here?), gardening, and using the children as a total outlet for one's intellectual and emotional needs. The civic groups and the hobbies "are often used to cover up a void of really serious and interesting involvement"; the "cult of the child" is not at all what the child himself needs, but rather reeks devastating and often irreparable damage to him. So what is to be done?

Bettelheim proposes a two-pronged approach: one, a serious examination, especially among those who deal with young people, of our attitudes, prejudices, and assumptions about the role of women; and adopting methods used in some other countries for taking some of the child-rearing functions out of the hands of isolated mothers and providing competent professional care.

The problem and the solution as Bettelheim approaches them, however, is not even relevant to the problems of the majority of women in this country — working-class women. His outlook, as indeed that of nearly all the contributors to this supplement, is limited to a rather small section of American womanhood — the articulate, well-educated, more or less well-off middle-class woman. Not that working-class women are exempted from the conflicts that Bettelheim deals with. But before they can face these, they have to deal with much more pressing ones: stretching a husband's pay check to take care of the never-ending needs of the family; fighting the daily and often futile battle with the landlord to get heat, repairs, hot water; often being forced, to make ends meet, to get a job. In this case, added to all the other problems is the worry about how the children are going to get taken care of. For it is a fact, which some lament and others try to ignore, that in this society children need mothers; and that mothers, whatever help they get from husbands and from others, are ultimately responsible for the welfare of their children. A mother of young children, who has to get a job, is doing at least two full-time jobs. She seldom, if ever, gets the credit or the respect she deserves for this. And on the job, she faces, along with all women workers, a new set of problems: the fact that a man doing the identical work she is doing may get \$20 a week more than she; the fact that many men on the job regard her very presence as a threat to their own job security; the fact that in the many industries, such as garment, where the vast majority of the workers are women, the unions that are supposed to represent them do not have a single woman in their leadership, to say nothing of

an adequate representation of women; and the fact that industry makes no effort to accommodate itself to the special needs of women — it could do this to some extent by offering part-time jobs, extra days of paid sick leave for mothers to take care of their children when they are sick, providing help to take care of household chores when mothers are sick, automatic days off with full pay whenever school is closed — to mention a few possibilities.

Other articles in the supplement include an article by Esther Raushenbush called, *Second Chance: New Education for Women*, which describes various programs recently instituted by several colleges and universities to enable women to continue and complete their education after several years' interruption by marriage and babies, taking into account their special needs and abilities. *The Swedes Do It Better*, by Richard F. Tomasson tells how, and one looks with some envy upon what even a thoroughly capitalist country can do to make woman's lot a bit happier. *Speaking for the Working-Class Wife*, by Patricia Cayo Sexton is sort of a personalized description of what the author considers to be working-class

attitudes, values, and mores. Though she teaches educational sociology at New York University, the author comes from a working-class family in Detroit, worked in an auto plant, then for the UAW, and passionately identifies herself with the working class. A very sensitive and well-written story by Paule Marshal, *Reena*, gives us a picture of the life and attitudes of a brilliant young Negro woman from Brooklyn who, among other things, has "gone through" the radical movement.

Considering the limitations of a liberal popular magazine, *Harper's* has done a commendable job.

Before leaving the subject of women, we would like to give hearty recommendation to an article which appeared in the September issue of *Mademoiselle* and appears now in condensed form in the December *Reader's Digest*: *Et Tu, Brute!* by Elaine Kendall. For any woman whose morale is low (perhaps because some man has gotten her goat for some reason or other), this article is sure to lift her spirits, restore lost energy and verve, and, in short, accomplish more than any pill could. Miss Kendall simply turns the tables and puts a few questions to men. For in-

stance, "What have men done with the vote?" And, "How successful have men been at combining marriage with a career?" "What have men been doing with their new sexual freedom?" Her answer on this is: "Heaven only knows. I suspect that they're doing just what they did with their old sexual freedom — exploiting it." And, "Is a college education really necessary for men, or is it a waste of money?" Answer: "For most men I know, doing the things they're doing, a college education is about as necessary as a Karmann Ghia." "Are men's morals deteriorating? Men are always asking each other, hopefully, if the morals of women have changed for the worse. We count ourselves lucky if the questioning stays general. None of us ever speaks up and says that women's morals could hardly have declined unless men's morals went right along with them, at breakneck speed and with a head start at that. It takes two to be immoral." And so on. If possible, get the *Mademoiselle* version — it's much funnier, being longer; and keep it for bad days. As with all good humor, this article contains more than a grain of truth.

by Martha Curti

... Fidelismo and Marxism in Latin America

(Continued from page 24)

ly prepare guerrilla warfare everywhere or any other ill-conceived type of direct action which brings disaster to the workers. This deviation is more common in those groups where there is a greater number of the desperate petty bourgeoisie.

In some countries the realignment has been confined to the formation of a new type of revolutionary movement. We say that they are of a new type because they are not formed in the mold of the traditional labor parties of Latin America. As a general rule, they reject the road of the ballot box. They carry out direct actions with the ever present prospect of taking over power. They have a certain amount of contempt for theory. Their program is revolutionary even though in some cases they do not want to stamp it as Marxist. Not only are they anti-imperialist movements but anti-capitalist as well because their program is the program of the Cuban Revolution. They are very suspicious of those political figures and tendencies which for years have been talking about "national liberation" but have done nothing to achieve it.

These movements — wherein they have gathered — have not yet taken on a mass character, but they are the beginnings, the pole around which the best of the revolutionary vanguard begins to be polarized. The young workers and students have no faith in the traditional parties and they look with sympathy on the formation of new movements. The communist and socialist militants who break with their parties now have a new pole around which to direct their activities.

A Unified Revolutionary Movement for All of Latin America?

The pro-Cuba, Fidelista, pro-Castro current has become generalized among the vanguard of the Continent. But it has not yet assumed a concrete or organized form. The revolutionary forces in each country are trying to establish contacts with similar forces in other countries. That is why we deem it important to propose the propaganda slogan —

for the present — of forming a Latin American revolutionary movement which will gather within one broad organization all revolutionary tendencies. It would be an error to pose this as the immediate formation of a United Centralized Party. Preliminary steps must be taken; differences between revolutionary groups have to be worked out in life. It is because of this that we would dare to propose for purposes of agitation the slogan of a Latin American Conference of Movements, Groups and Revolutionary Workers Parties.

The Strategy of the United Revolutionary Front

The characteristics being acquired by the new type revolutionary movements are propitious for the application of the strategy of the United Revolutionary Front. Considering the form which the crisis of the political superstructures is taking it is indispensable to preserve and develop the revolutionary embryos which the new movements represent. They constitute the pole made up of the young workers and students, of the militants who break with the Socialist and Communist parties and nationalist movements. It will be decisive to prevent these groups from becoming demoralized and fragmented, for they are the basic contingent for any revolutionary activity which today in Latin America is an ever present possibility. From this it follows that the great task is to regroup the new forces which the Cuban Revolution has liberated and to act decisively within the existing revolutionary movements.

* * *

These new-type revolutionary movements form the props of an effective defense of the Cuban Revolution. They make possible the carrying out of combative actions and general strikes in case of an imperialist attack on Cuba. They provide the motive power which once and for all will make possible the creation of the Latin American Labor Union. Finally, they are the ones who will unleash the revolution in each country, and who will establish the Socialist Workers Republics of Latin America, the only real guarantee of support for the Cuban Revolution.

James P. Cannon

Still going strong at the age of 71, James P. Cannon became a revolutionary socialist when the campaigns of Eugene V. Debs were stirring all of America. A disciple of Vincent St. John, the great leader of the Industrial Workers of the World, Cannon knew and learned from such figures as William D. Haywood. But he also knew how to learn from the Russians. An outstanding figure in the rebel generation that founded the American Communist Party, Cannon became one of its top leaders in the twenties.

But that was only his apprenticeship. His greatest contributions came after he took up the cause represented by Leon Trotsky and in 1928 founded the movement that later became the Socialist Workers Party.

We are proud to offer Cannon's writings to the generation now considering the best way to dedicate their lives to the service of mankind.

●

The First Ten Years of American Communism: Report of a Participant. Just published. An outgrowth of correspondence initiated in 1954 by Theodore Draper, the historian of American communism. Cannon's own thesis on the rise and fall of the American CP is the product of mature and reflective thought on the problem of revolutionary leadership. (cloth) \$6.

Notebook of an Agitator. A collection of articles on current topics beginning with the struggle to save Sacco and Vanzetti from the electric chair. (cloth) \$4; (paper) \$2.50.

The History of American Trotskyism. Tells about the early difficult years. (cloth) \$2.75; (paper) \$2.

The Struggle for a Proletarian Party. Contributions made during an important inner-party struggle. Recommended by Trotsky. (cloth) \$2.75.

Socialism on Trial. Verbatim court record of Cannon's testimony in the first Smith Act trial. \$.50.

Send for catalog listing many more titles
by the same author.

Pioneer Publishers
116 University Place
New York 3, N. Y.

